Formal Verification of Debates in Argumentation Theory

Ria Jha
Imperial College London, UK
ria.jha15@imperial.ac.uk

Francesco Belardinelli
Imperial College London, UK &
Université d'Evry, France
fbelard@ic.ac.uk

Francesca Toni
Imperial College London, UK
f.toni@imperial.ac.uk

arXiv:1912.05828v1 [cs.LO] 12 Dec 2019

ABSTRACT

Humans engage in informal debates on a daily basis. By expressing their opinions and ideas in an argumentative fashion, they are able to gain a deeper understanding of a given problem and in some cases, find the best possible course of actions towards resolving it. In this paper, we develop a methodology to verify debates formalised as abstract argumentation frameworks. We first present a translation from debates to transition systems. Such transition systems can model debates and represent their evolution over time using a finite set of states. We then formalise relevant debate properties using temporal and strategy logics. These formalisations, along with a debate transition system, allow us to verify whether a given debate satisfies certain properties. The verification process can be automated using model checkers. Therefore, we also measure their performance when verifying debates, and use the results to discuss the feasibility of model checking debates.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Theory of computation → Modal and temporal logics**; **Verification by model checking**; • **Computing methodologies → Temporal reasoning**;

1 INTRODUCTION

Humans engage in informal debates on a daily basis. By expressing their opinions and ideas in an argumentative fashion, they are able to gain a deeper understanding of a given problem and, in some cases, find the best possible course of actions towards resolving it.

Verifying a debate gives us the ability to learn about its overall outcome. It allows us to reason about the strategies available to a participant as well as to determine the acceptability of some argument they have made. Given a debate, we can verify relevant properties such as "the proponent will be able to refute any attack from the opponent" or "the proponent has a strategy such that it will eventually win the debate".

A key technique for verifying properties of debates is model checking. Model checking is a verification technique that has been developed over the last thirty years [3, 10]. This process includes developing and examining the full model of a system to ensure that it satisfies a specific property, which is normally expressed in some logic-based language. Typically, this procedure is completely automated. While there are model checking tools and techniques that have been developed for verification of properties of general transition systems [9, 20], to the best of our knowledge, methodologies for the formal verification of debates have not yet been considered .

In this paper, we develop a novel methodology to verify debates formalised as abstract argumentation frameworks. We first present a translation from debates to transition systems. Such transition systems can model debates and represent their evolution over time using a finite set of states. We then formalise relevant debate properties using various flavours of temporal logics. These formalisations, along with a debate transition system, allow us to verify whether a given debate is able to satisfy certain properties. The verification process can be automated using model checkers. Thus, we also measure the performance of model checkers when verifying debates, and use the results to discuss the feasibility of model checking debates.

Related work. On the formal analysis of debates in Argumentation Theory, [22] and [12] consider debates between two agents, the proponent and the opponent. In [22] a debate between the two agents is formalised as a turn-based game with the purpose of determining the acceptability of the initial argument put forward by the proponent. An agent may put forward all the arguments that can be made legally according to the rules of the game, in order to refute its counterpart's argument. The proponent winning such a game, where all arguments have been made legally, indicates that its initial argument is acceptable. The debates introduced in [12] can be used for the same purpose. Unlike [22], the proponent must behave deterministically and only select a single argument to refute its counterpart. Moreover, [12] introduces several debate properties which, if satisfied, indicate the initial argument's acceptability.

In this paper, we present a translation for the debates in [22] into transition systems. We then formalise certain debate properties [12] so that they can be interpreted on these transition systems. These formalisations take into consideration the notion of a deterministic proponent, as introduced in [12]. This enables us to reason about the different strategies available to the proponent in a debate.

There has not been much work done in the development of formal methods for the verification of debates. [4] models debates between agents, where each agent holds private, possibly infinite, argumtentation frameworks. Thus, agents are able to exchange arguments and build a public framework. Then, [4] looks at formally expressing and verifying relevant properties of abstract argumentation frameworks. However, it does not consider the notion of dispute trees nor acceptability conditions, as we do in this paper.

Other works include [17], where abstract argumentation frameworks are treated as Kripke frames [16]. [17] then uses modal logic to formalise notions of argumentation theory including conflict-freeness and admissibility. However, as with [4], no attempts are made to formally verify the acceptability of arguments.

Structure of the Paper. In Sec. 2.1 we present the basics of Argumentation Theory [11], including the various semantics, as well as the notion of dispute tree introduced in [22]; while Sec. 2.2 is devoted to the preliminaries on model checking temporal and

Semantics		Criteria
conflict-free	iff	there are no $a, b \in E$ such that $(a, b) \in Att$
admissible	iff	it is conflict-free
	and	every argument in E is acceptable w.r.t. E.
complete	iff	it is admissible
	and	it contains all arguments acceptable w.r.t. E
grounded	iff	it is complete
	and	minimal w.r.t. set inclusion
preferred	iff	it is admissible
	and	maximal w.r.t. set inclusion
ideal	iff	it is admissible
	and	a subset of every preferred extension

Table 1: Semantics of argumentation frameworks.

strategy logics. In Sec. 3 we define a translation from debates in Argumentation Theory [22] to Interpreted Systems [16], and in Sec. 4 we formalise various winning conditions as formulas in Strategy Logic [23]. Finally, in Sec. 5 we evaluate the performance of our approach against state-of-the-art argumentation reasoners. We conclude in Sec. 6 and discuss directions for future work.

2 PRELIMINARIES

In this section we present preliminary materials on abstract argumentation (Sec. 2.1) and verification by model checking (Sec. 2.2), which will be used in the rest of the paper.

2.1 Abstract Argumentation

To provide debates with a formal vest, we consider *abstract argumentation frameworks* as introduced in [11].

*Definition 2.1 (**AF**).* An *(abstract) argumentation framework* is a pair $\mathcal{AF} = \langle Args, Att \rangle$ where:

- $Args$ is a set of arguments $a, b, c, \ldots$.
  The internal structure of each argument $a \in Args$ is abstracted and the arguments are perceived as atomic entities.
- $Att \subseteq Args \times Args$ is a binary (attack) relation on $Args$.

Given an argumentation framework, it is possible to compute the "acceptable" sets of arguments, referred to as *extensions*. Notably, [11, 12] present several extension-based semantics. An extension $E \subseteq Args$ computed under a particular semantics must fulfil some specific criteria. We start with the notion of acceptable argument.

*Definition 2.2 (**Acceptability**).* An argument $a \in Args$ is *acceptable* with respect to set $E \subseteq Args$ iff for each argument $b \in Args$ that attacks a, there is some argument $c \in E$ that attacks b. In other words, a is defended by E.

In Table 1 we present the different semantics and the criteria that a given set $E \subseteq Args$ must fulfill under each of them [11, 12].

Example 2.3. As an example of an argumentation framework, consider $\mathcal{AF} = \langle \{a,b,c,d,e,f,g\}, Att \rangle$ with $Att = \{(a, b), (b, a), (b, b), (d, c), (e, f), (f, e), (f, d), (g, f)\}$.

An argumentation framework can also be depicted as a graph with nodes and directed edges. The nodes represent the arguments and the directed edges represent an attack from one argument to another. See Fig. 1 for a representation of framework $\mathcal{AF}$. Given this framework, we can compute the acceptable sets of arguments under the different semantics:

- The complete extensions are $\{c, e, g\}$, $\{a, c, e, g\}$.
- The grounded extension is $\{c, e, g\}$.
- The preferred extension is $\{a, c, e, g\}$.
- The ideal extension is $\{a, c, e, g\}$.




Figure 2: The dispute tree induced by argument c, generated using $\mathcal{AF}$ in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: The abstract argumentation framework $\mathcal{AF}$ in Example 2.3.

The acceptability of some argument a under the grounded, preferred, or ideal semantics can be determined by constructing a *dispute tree*, where a is the root argument [22]. Each branch in a dispute tree is a sequence of attacking arguments, which are put forward by the proponent and the opponent in a turn based fashion. A branch in a dispute tree is finite when the last played argument is unattacked. Otherwise, the branch may be infinitely long.

*Definition 2.4 (**Dispute Tree**).* Given an argumentation framework $\mathcal{AF} = \langle Args, Att \rangle$ and an argument $a \in Args$, a *dispute tree* T induced by a is a tree of arguments where

(1) The root node of T is a, played by the proponent.
(2) For all $x, y \in Args$, x is a child of y iff $(x, y) \in Att$.
(3) Each node is labelled either **P** or **O**, for the proponent or the opponent, indicating the player that put forward the argument.

Example 2.5. Consider the argumentation framework $\mathcal{AF}$ depicted in Fig. 1. The argument c induces a single dispute tree using Def. 2.4, which is shown in Fig. 2.

Within such a dispute tree, we can find subtrees that are the result of an agent applying one of its *strategies*.

*Definition 2.6 (**Strategy**).* Given $\mathcal{AF} = \langle Args, Att \rangle$, a *strategy* $\sigma : Args \rightharpoonup Args$ is a partial function that maps an argument $x \in Args$ to one of its attackers, if there are any.

In a dispute tree T, induced by argument a, the proponent can apply some strategy σ from a to obtain a subtree T_σ where:

- The root argument of T_σ is a.
- For any argument i played by the opponent, the proponent must play at most one argument, $\sigma(i)$.

To justify a's membership to some extension, the proponent must have a *winning strategy* σ. By applying σ from a, the proponent can guarantee acceptability of a under a particular semantics.

Definitions 2.7, 2.8, and 2.9 define the grounded, admissible, and ideal winning strategies, respectively [12]. For these definitions, consider a dispute tree T, induced by some argument a.

*Definition 2.7 (**Grounded Winning Strategy**).* A strategy σ applied at root a is a *grounded winning strategy* iff:

- Every opponent node in T_σ has exactly one child.
- Every dispute within T_σ is finite.

To justify membership of a in a preferred extension, it suffices to show that a belongs to some admissible extension [22].

*Definition 2.8 (**Admissible Winning Strategy**).* A strategy σ applied at root a is an *admissible winning strategy* iff:

- Every opponent node in T_σ has exactly one child.
- No argument is labelled by both the proponent and the opponent.

*Definition 2.9 (**Ideal Winning Strategy**).* A strategy σ applied at root a is an *ideal winning strategy* iff:

- σ is an admissible winning strategy.
- There does not exist an admissible winning strategy σ' for any argument $b \in Opp(T_\sigma)$, which is the set of all arguments played by the opponent in T_σ.

Example 2.10. Consider the argumentation framework in Fig. 1 and the dispute tree T in Fig. 2, which shows that the proponent has a choice when attacking arguments d and f. As a result, there are three strategies available to the proponent: σ_1, σ_2, and σ_3. By applying each of these strategies from c, we obtain the subtrees $T_{\sigma_1}, T_{\sigma_2}$, and T_{σ_3}, respectively. The dispute tree T_{σ_1} is depicted in Fig. 3 whereas T_{σ_2} and T_{σ_3} are depicted in Fig. 4 and 5, respectively. We find that the dispute trees T_{σ_1} and T_{σ_3} satisfy the properties described in Def. 2.8 and therefore σ_1, and σ_3 are both admissible winning strategies. Whereas, only T_{σ_3} satisfies the properties in Def. 2.7 and so σ_3 is the only grounded winning strategy. Finally, according to Def. 2.9, σ_1 and σ_3 are also ideal winning strategies.

2.2 Verification by Model Checking

An interpreted system is a transition system that allows us to reason about the behaviour and strategies of agents in a multi agent system [21]. Given a set $\Sigma = \{1,.., n\}$ of agents and a special agent Env for the environment, let $Ag = \Sigma \cup \{Env\}$.

*Definition 2.11 (**Interpreted System**).* An *interpreted system* is a tuple $IS = \langle (L_i, Act_i, P_i, t_i)_{i \in Ag}, I, h \rangle$ where:

P: c — **O:** d — **P:** e — **O:** f — **P:** e - - -

Figure 3: The sub dispute tree T_{σ_1} induced by c in Ex. 2.10.




Figure 4: The sub dispute tree T_{σ_2} induced by c in Ex. 2.10.

P: c — **O:** d — **P:** e — **O:** f — **P:** g

Figure 5: The sub dispute tree T_{σ_3} induced by c in Ex. 2.10.

- For each agent $i \in \Sigma$, L_i is the set of all possible local states of i. The local state of each agent $i \in \Sigma$ is private. For agent Env, its set of local states is referred to as L_{Env} and may be observed by the other agents. We refer to the local states of the agents in Ag collectively as a global state $g \in L_1 \times \ldots \times L_n \times L_{Env}$.
- For each agent $i \in Ag$, Act_i is the set of all actions available to i. The set $Act = Act_1 \times \ldots \times Act_n \times Act_{Env}$ refers to the joint actions for all the agents in Ag.
- Protocol $P_i : L_i \times L_{Env} \rightarrow 2^{Act_i}$ is a function for an agent $i \in \Sigma$, which takes the local states of i and Env as its input and return all actions for i that are enabled at the given state.
- $t_i : L_i \times L_{Env} \times Act \rightarrow L_i$ is a deterministic transition function for agent $i \in \Sigma$, which describes the evolution of i's local state. Using the local states of i and Env, along with the enabled actions of all the agents, it returns the "next" local state for agent i. In particular, $t_i(l_i, l_{Env}, \alpha)$ is defined iff $\alpha_i \in P_i(l_i, l_{Env})$. Similarly, the transition function for the environment Env is $t_{Env} : L_{Env} \times Act \rightarrow L_{Env}$. A global transition function $t : G \times Act \rightarrow G$, where $G \subseteq L_1 \times \ldots \times L_n \times L_{Env}$ refers to the set of *reachable* global states, combines the output of the local transition functions and provides the next accessible global state of the system. In particular, $t(g, \alpha) = \prod_{i \in Ag} t_i(g_i, g_{Env}, \alpha)$.
- $I \subseteq L_1 \times \ldots \times L_n \times L_{Env}$ is the initial set of global states. The set $G \subseteq L_1 \times \ldots \times L_n \times L_{Env}$ refers to all the global states that are *reachable* from I through the transition function t.
- $h : AP \rightarrow 2^G$, where AP is a set of atomic propositions, is a valuation function.

Strategy Logic (SL) is a logic used to reason about strategies of agents in multi agent systems [23]. Consider an interpreted system IS, its agents Ag, and fix a set Var of variables for strategies. Each variable $x_i \in Var$ is typed according to an agent $i \in Ag$.

*Definition 2.12 (**SL syntax**).* The syntax of SL is presented below:

$$\phi ::= p \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi \vee \phi \mid X\phi \mid G\phi \mid \phi U \phi \mid \exists x_i \phi$$

The strategy quantifier $\exists x_i$ is read as "there exists a strategy x_i" while $\forall x_i ::= \neg\exists x_i \neg$ can be read as "for all strategies x_i". The intuitive meaning of the linear-time operators is standard [3]: $X\phi$ is read as "at the next moment ϕ holds", $G\phi$ as "always ϕ",

and $\phi U \phi'$ as "ϕ until ϕ'. The operator $F\phi$ is read as "ϕ eventually holds", which may be equivalently expressed as $\top U \phi$. In interpreted systems, each agent $i \in \Sigma$ is assumed to have its own strategy $f_i : L_i \times L_{Env} \rightarrow Act_i$ such that $f_i(l_i, l_e) \in P_i(l_i, l_e)$. Similarly, Env can also have a strategy $f_{Env} : L_{Env} \rightarrow Act_{Env}$ to determine its next action. Str_i refers to the set of strategies available to agent $i \in Ag$. We can use an *assignment* to associate a variable $x_i \in Var$, for $i \in Ag$, to one of its strategies f_i. An assignment $\chi : Var \rightarrow Str$, for $Str = \bigcup_{i \in Ag} Str_i$, is a function mapping each variable $x_i \in Var$ to a strategy $f_i \in Str_i$. Given χ, $x_i \in Var$, and i's strategy f_i, $\chi[x_i \mapsto f_i]$ denotes the new assignments on $dom(\chi) \cup \{x_i\}$.

From an assignment χ and a global state s in IS, we can obtain an outgoing path λ from s, known as a *play*. A *play* is the unique possible outcome obtained from each agent $i \in Ag$, applying the strategy that they are assigned to in χ, from s. We use χ-s to denote a play from a global state s, with respect to χ.

*Definition 2.13 (**SL semantics**).* Given IS, its current global state s, an assignment χ, an SL formula ϕ, the semantics of SL are given below. Note that for a play λ, $\lambda[i]$ refers to the global state occurring in the i-th position in λ, for $i \geq 0$.

$(IS, \chi, s) \models p$	iff	$s \in h(p)$
$(IS, \chi, s) \models \neg\phi$	iff	$(IS, \chi, s) \not\models \phi$.
$(IS, \chi, s) \models \phi_1 \vee \phi_2$	iff	$(IS, \chi, s) \models \phi_1$ or $(IS, \chi, s) \models \phi_2$.
$(IS, \chi, s) \models \exists x_i \phi$	iff	for some strategy $f_i \in Str_i$, $(IS, \chi[x_i \mapsto f_i], s) \models \phi$
$(IS, \chi, s) \models X\phi$	iff	$(IS, \chi, \lambda[1]) \models \phi$
$(IS, \chi, s) \models G\phi$	iff	for all $i \geq 0$, $(IS, \chi, \lambda[i]) \models \phi$
$(IS, \chi, s) \models \phi_1 U \phi_2$	iff	for some $i \geq 0$, $(IS, \chi, \lambda[i]) \models \phi_2$ and for all $0 \leq j < i$, $(IS, \chi, \lambda[j]) \models \phi_1$

A sentence ϕ is satisfied in IS if for all initial global states $g \in I$, $(IS, \emptyset, i) \models \phi$, where $\emptyset$ refers to an empty assignment.

Alternating-Time Temporal Logic (ATL) is a branching time temporal logic that is used for strategic reasoning in a multi agent system [1]. ATL can be seen as a syntactic fragment of SL, where formulas $\langle\langle A \rangle\rangle \phi$, for $A = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\} \subseteq Ag$, is defined as $\exists x_1 \ldots \exists x_k \forall x_{k+1} \ldots \forall x_n \phi$: "the coalition A of agents has a joint strategy to enforce some property ϕ, regardless of the behaviour of the other agents in $Ag \setminus A$".

Computation Tree Logic (CTL) is another branching-time temporal logic that is strictly less expressive than ATL [3]. CTL can be considered as a syntactic fragment of ATL as it only allows quantification either over all or over a single path in an interpreted system. Within CTL, the quantifier A refers to all paths in the system, and is equivalent to path quantifier $\langle\langle \emptyset \rangle\rangle$ in ATL. The quantifier E refers to the existence of an individual path in IS and is equivalent to the ATL quantifier $\langle\langle Ag \rangle\rangle$, where Ag is the set of all agents within the interpreted system.

Given a finite-state model IS of a system and a formal property ϕ that the system must satisfy, *model checking* is an automated verification technique that can be used to check whether $IS \models \phi$ [3], where $IS \models \phi$ iff for all $g \in I$, $(IS, g) \models \phi$. There are several model checking tools available that can be used for the verification of multi-agent systems, including MCMAS [18, 20], which is a model checker tailored on interpreted systems. A variant of MCMAS, MCMAS-SLK [5], will be used in the experimental evaluation in Sec. 5.

3 CONSTRUCTING INTERPRETATION SYSTEMS FROM DEBATES

In order to verify a debate using model checking, a transition system representing the debate is required. The transition system should be able to represent the debate's state at all points in time and also represent its evolution. Once the transition system has been generated, it can then be used to verify certain properties of the debate.

This section provides a translation for a dispute tree T, as described in Def. 2.4, to an interpreted system IS_T as per Def. 2.11. An advantage of this approach is that we can use a single interpreted system IS_T to verify the existence of a winning strategy σ in T for the proponent, under multiple semantics. We can do this in one step by formally expressing the properties of the subtree T_σ under the different semantics, and checking whether IS_T satisfies them.

In order to construct IS_T, we require an abstract argumentation framework $\mathcal{AF} = \langle Args, Att \rangle$, where $Args$ is finite. Furthermore, we require the dispute tree T, induced by some argument $a \in Args$, whose acceptability we would like to determine.

*Definition 3.1 (**The Interpreted System** IS_T).* Given an abstract argumentation framework $\mathcal{AF} = \langle Args, Att \rangle$ and corresponding dispute tree T starting in argument $a \in Args$, the interpreted system $IS_T = \langle (L_i, Act_i, P_i, t_i)_{i \in Ag_T}, I_T, h_T \rangle$ is comprised of:

- Set $Ag_T = \{Pro, Opp, Env\}$ of agent including the proponent Pro, the opponent Opp, and the environment, Env.
- For every agent in Ag_T, the set of local states are:
  - $L_{Pro} = Args$;
  - $L_{Opp} = Args \cup \{empty\}$;
  - $L_{Env} = \{Pro, Opp\} \times Args \times AttSeen$, where $AttSeen \subseteq 2^{Att}$

  The unique initial state of the system is $(a, empty, (Opp, a, \emptyset))$, indicating that argument a has been put forward by Pro. Therefore, $I_T = \{(a, empty, (Opp, a, \emptyset))\}$.
- The set of actions available to agents Pro and Opp is $Act_{Pro} = Act_{Opp} = \{attack_{xy} \mid (x, y) \in Att\} \cup \{nothing\}$. Whereas, the set of actions available to Env is $Act_{Env} = \{nothing\}$.
- The protocol functions for Pro and Opp determine the available actions that the agents may perform, based on their current local state and the local state of environment Env:

$$P_{Pro}(_, (turn, last, _)) = \begin{cases} attacks(last), & \text{if } turn = Pro \text{ and} \\ & attacks(last) \neq \emptyset \\ \{nothing\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

  where $attacks(y) = \{attack_{xy} \mid attack_{xy} \in Act_{Pro}\}$ and $_$ indicates that the input provided is not used in the function. Symmetrically,

$$P_{Opp}(_, (turn, last, _)) = \begin{cases} attacks(last), & \text{if } turn = Opp \text{ and} \\ & attacks(last) \neq \emptyset \\ \{nothing\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

  where $attacks(y) = \{attack_{xy} \mid attack_{xy} \in Act_{Opp}\}$.

Unlike the standard agents, *Env* only has one action available: $P_{Env}(_,_,_) = \{nothing\}$.

- The transition functions determine the evolution of the debate, based on the agents' actions and their current local state:
  - $t_{Pro}(,(Pro,\ y,\ _),(attack_{xy}, nothing, nothing)) = x$
  - $t_{Opp}(,(Opp,\ y,\ _),(nothing, attack_{xy}, nothing)) = x$
  - $t_{Env}((Pro,\ y,\ attacksSeen),\ (attack_{xy}, nothing, nothing)) = (Opp,\ x,\ attacksSeen \cup \{(x,y)\})$
  - $t_{Env}((Opp,\ y,\ attacksSeen),\ (nothing, attack_{xy}, nothing)) = (Pro,\ x,\ attacksSeen \cup \{(x,y)\})$
- For each argument $b \in Args$, we consider two propositional atoms, Pro_b and Opp_b. The global states $g \in G$ of IS_T at which these atoms hold are described by the valuation function h_T:
  - $h_T(Pro_x) = \{g \in G \mid l_{Pro}(g) = x$ and $l_{Env}(g)$ is a tuple of the form $(Opp, x, _)\}$
  - $h_T(Opp_x) = \{g \in G \mid l_{Opp}(g) = x$ and $l_{Env}(g)$ is a tuple of the form $(Pro, x, _)\}$

  where l_{Pro}, l_{Opp}, and l_{Env} are functions that return the local states of *Pro*, *Opp* and *Env* respectively from a given global state $g \in G$.

The interpreted system IS_T, for a dispute tree T, evolves as each player selects an argument to play. The local states for proponent *Pro* and opponent *Opp* therefore store their most recently played argument. Both agents may select any argument in the set *Args*. The root argument of T, which is played by the proponent, is the initial local state of *Pro*; whereas the initial local state of *Opp* is *empty*. This state takes into consideration the case where *Opp* has not yet put forward an argument, while *Pro* has already played *a*. The initial state of *Env* also indicates that *a* has already been played and *Opp* must now find an argument attacking *a*.

At any given point in time, exactly one agent *Pro* or *Opp* plays an argument. Thus, we use *Env* to store information about the agent's turn. Moreover, *Env* also tracks the most recently played argument in the dispute as well as the attacks seen so far.

In T, each player attacks their counterpart's argument made in a single dispute, with an argument of their own. *Pro* and *Opp* have actions for all attacks available in the abstract argumentation framework $\mathcal{AF}$, which may be enabled depending on their private local state along with the information stored in the local state of *Env*.

For each $(x, y) \in Att$, there is a corresponding action $attack_{xy}$. The action *nothing* is also available, which an agent may select when it is their counterpart's turn or when their counterpart's most recently played argument in the dispute is unattacked. This is indicated in the protocol functions above, where the only enabled action for an agent is *nothing*, when it is their counterpart's turn to play. Otherwise, the agent must find all actions corresponding to an attack against the most recently played argument, *last*. This information is stored in the local state of *Env*, which *Pro* and *Opp* may observe.

The transition functions for *Pro* and *Opp* update their private local states, to their most recently played argument, based on the action taken by all of the agents. The states of *Pro* and *Opp* will not change if their chosen action is *nothing*. Similarly, the local state of *Env* is updated according to the actions taken by the standard agents. All three variables stored by *Env* are updated simultaneously.

Finally, the valuation function above describes the states at which the propositional atoms hold. These atoms indicate the most recently played argument at a global state, and by which agent.

4 FORMALISING WINNING CONDITIONS ON DISPUTE TREES

In this section, we formalise the dispute tree properties in Def. 2.7, 2.8, and 2.9. These formulae can be interpreted on debate transition systems to verify the existence of a winning strategy σ under a particular semantics.

Consider an abstract argumentation framework $\mathcal{AF} = \langle Args, Attacks\rangle$ and an argument $a \in Args$. Let T be the dispute tree induced by a. By translating T according to Def. 3.1, we obtain the interpreted system IS_T with initial state s_0. Further, Var refers to a fixed set of variables with $p, o, e \in Var$. Finally, the set of paths obtained by applying strategy f_i, for some agent $i \in \{Pro, Opp, Env\}$, from state s in IS_T is referred to as $out(s, \{f_i\})$.

4.1 Grounded Winning Strategy

For verifying the existence of a grounded winning strategy σ in T by using IS_T, ATL is used to formalise the dispute tree properties in Def. 2.7.

Theorem 4.1. *The proponent has a grounded winning strategy σ in T iff $IS_T \models \langle\langle\{Pro\}\rangle\rangle F\Big(\bigvee_{i \in Args} AG(Pro_i)\Big)$.*

The formula in Theorem 4.1 states that *Pro* has a strategy f from the initial state s_0 in IS_T, such that every path λ in $out(s_0, \{f\})$ must have a steady state s_k ($k \geq 0$) along the path, where *Pro* will play some argument $i \in Args$ that is unattacked. We use the CTL universal quantifier A instead of its ATL equivalent $\langle\langle\emptyset\rangle\rangle$ for readability.

Proof. Let D_T refer to the set of disputes beginning at a in the dispute tree T, where each dispute is a sequence of attacking arguments. For example, if $\delta \in D_T$ is an infinite sequence $a_0, a_1, \ldots$, then for all $i \geq 0$, $(a_{i+1}, a_i) \in Att$. With an abuse of notation, we write $a \in \delta$ to say that argument a occurs in δ. Similarly, we write $s_i \in \lambda$, for $i \geq 0$, to say that state s_i occurs in path λ in IS_T.

$\Longrightarrow$ Consider the set $D_{T_\sigma} \subseteq D_T$ of disputes for a grounded winning strategy σ. Each dispute $\delta \in D_{T_\sigma}$ corresponds to a path $\lambda = s_0, s_1, \ldots$. Consequently, there exists a set P of paths from s_0 that is associated with the set D_{T_σ} of disputes.

Select an arbitrary path $\lambda \in P$. The dispute $\delta \in D_{T_\sigma}$ corresponding to λ must be finite as it occurs in T_σ. This implies that there is a terminating argument $y \in \delta$ labelled by the proponent. Accordingly, there must be a state $s_k \in \lambda$, for $k \geq 0$, such that $(IS_T, s_k) \models Pro_y$.

Then, select an arbitrary path λ' from s_k and a state $s_{k'} \in \lambda'$, for $k' \geq k$. As y is the winning argument, there is no further action associated with an attack from either agent. The dispute must have reached a steady state and therefore, $(IS_T, s_{k'}) \models Pro_y$. This holds for all $k' \geq k$. As this holds for an arbitrary λ', it must hold for all

possible paths from s_k and so we have $(IS_T, s_k) \models AG(Pro_y)$. Thus, we also have $(IS_T, s_k) \models \bigvee_{i \in Args} AG(Pro_i)$ (1).

As (1) holds for an arbitrarily chosen path, then for all other paths in P there must exist a state s_k ($k \geq 0$) where (1) holds. (2)

Finally, as the proponent has a winning strategy σ, there is a corresponding strategy f for Pro in IS_T that allows Pro to select an action deterministically at each state. P is the result of applying f from the initial state s_0 and so we have that $out(s_0, \{f\}) = P$ (3). From (2) and (3), it follows that $IS_T \models \langle\langle\{Pro\}\rangle\rangle F\Big(\bigvee_{i \in Args} AG(Pro_i)\Big)$. As λ was selected arbitrarily, every other path in $out(s_0, \{f\})$ must also be a translation of a finite dispute $\delta \in D_T$ (3). That is, there is a set $D_{T_\sigma} \subseteq D_T$ of finite disputes, where each dispute in D_{T_σ} is translated to a path in $out(s_0, \{f\})$. The disputes in D_{T_σ} form a subtree T_σ, with a being the root argument, where:

- Every opponent node has exactly one child. An opponent node always has a child as the terminating argument in each dispute in T_σ, labelled by the proponent. An opponent node must have no more than one child as T_σ is associated with $out(s_0, \{f\})$, the set of paths obtained from Pro always selecting one action at each state.
- Every dispute in T_σ is finite. This is shown as (2).

□

By Theorem 4.1, we can check whether the proponent has a grounded winning strategy in T, and therefore whether the argument at the root of T is acceptable according to the grounded semantics, by model checking the corresponding ATL formula on IS_T.

4.2 Admissible Winning Strategy

For verifying the existence of an admissible winning strategy σ using IS_T, SL is used to formalise the dispute tree properties in Def. 2.8.

Theorem 4.2. *The proponent has an admissible winning strategy σ in T iff $IS_T \models \exists p \forall e \left(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2\right)$ where*

$$\phi_1 = \forall o\, G\Big(\bigwedge_{i \in Args} \neg G(Opp_i)\Big)$$

$$\phi_2 = \bigwedge_{i \in Args} \Big(\exists o\, F(Pro_i) \Rightarrow \forall o\, G(\neg Opp_i)\Big)$$

Proof. Note that $Pro(\delta)$ refers to the set of arguments played by the proponent in a dispute δ.

Let Str_{Pro}, Str_{Opp} be the set of strategies available to Pro and Opp.

$\Longrightarrow$ Agent Pro must have a strategy $f_{Pro} \in Str_{Pro}$ such that every path $\lambda = s_0, s_1, ..$ in the set $out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$ corresponds to a dispute $\delta \in D_{T_\sigma}$, where s_0 is the initial state of IS_T. (1)

The environment Env only has one action available, which does not affect the evolution of the debate. This means that Env only has one strategy, f_{Env}, where it always selects the action *nothing*. As f_{Env} does not impact the evolution of the debate, the set of paths obtained from Pro and Env applying their strategies f_{Pro} and f_{Env} from s_0, must still be $out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$). (2)

Using Var, we define a new assignment χ_0 where $\chi_0(p) = f_{Pro}$ and $\chi_0(e) = f_{Env}$.

We select an arbitrary strategy $f_{Opp} \in Str_{Opp}$ for Opp, map variable o to f_{Opp} ($\chi_1 = \chi_0[o \mapsto f_{Opp}]$). We now have a *complete* assignment, χ_1, as every agent has been assigned a strategy.

From χ_1, we obtain the (χ_1-s_0) play $\lambda \in out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$. Then, we select a state $s_k \in \lambda$, where $k \geq 0$.

For each $i \in Args$:

- Assume that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_k) \models G(Opp_i)$. This means that for all states $s_{k'} \in \lambda'$ ($k' \geq k$), where λ' is the χ_1-s_k play, it holds that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_{k'}) \models Opp_i$. This implies that Pro has no further actions available that could correspond to an attack against i. This suggests that the dispute $\delta \in D_{T_\sigma}$ corresponding to λ contains a terminating argument i that is labelled by the opponent (3).
- (3) contradicts the initial assumption that there exists an admissible winning strategy σ, as δ contains an opponent node i that does not have a child.
- Therefore, we have that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_k) \models \neg G(Opp_i)$.

We have that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_k) \models \bigwedge_{i \in Args} \neg G(Opp_i)$. This must hold for all $s_k \in \lambda$ ($k \geq 0$) so that the initial assumption, that the proponent has an admissible winning strategy σ is not contradicted. As a result, we also have that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_0) \models G\Big(\bigwedge_{i \in Args} \neg G(Opp_i)\Big)$.

The strategy f_{Opp} was chosen arbitrarily. It must be the case that for all strategies $f'_{Opp} \in Str_{Opp}$, it holds that $(IS_T, \chi_0, [o \mapsto f'_{Opp}], s_0) \models G\Big(\bigwedge_{i \in Args} \neg G(Opp_i)\Big)$.

It follows that $(IS_T, \chi_0, s_0) \models \forall o\, G\Big(\bigwedge_{i \in Args} \neg G(Opp_i)\Big)\Big)$. (4)

We have assignment χ_0. For each $i \in Args$:

- Assume that $(IS_T, \chi_0, s_0) \models \exists o\, F(Pro_i)$. This means that Opp must have some strategy $f_{Opp} \in Str_{Opp}$ that allows this assumption to hold. We associate Opp's strategy $f_{Opp} \in Str_{Opp}$ to variable o and obtain an assignment χ_1 ($\chi_1 = \chi_0[o \mapsto f_{Opp}]$). Let $\lambda \in out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\}))$ be the χ_1-s_0 play and let $\delta \in D_{T_\sigma}$ be the dispute corresponding to λ.
- There exists a state $s_k \in \lambda$ ($k \geq 0$) where it holds that $(IS_T, \chi_2, s_k) \models Pro_i$. Accordingly, we have that the proponent plays argument i in δ at some stage.
- There must be no dispute $\delta' \in D_{T_\sigma}$ where i is labelled by the opponent, as σ is admissible. (5)
- For each strategy $f'_{Opp} \in Str_{Opp}$ available to Opp, we obtain a new assignment χ_1 from χ_0 ($\chi_1 = \chi_0[o \mapsto f'_{Opp}]$). According to (5), for the χ_1-s_0 play $\lambda' \in out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$, there must not exist a state $s_{k'} \in \lambda$ ($k' \geq 0$) where it holds that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_{k'}) \models Opp_i$. This means that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_0) \models G(\neg Opp_i)$. (6)
- As (6) holds for each strategy f'_{Opp} available to Opp, it must be the case that $(IS_T, \chi_0, s_0) \models \forall o\, G(\neg Opp_i)$.

We have $(IS_T, \chi_0, s_0) \models \bigwedge_{i \in Args} \exists o\, F(Pro_i) \Rightarrow \forall o\, G(\neg Opp_i)$. (7)

From (4) and (7), we have that $(IS_T, \chi_0, s_0) \models \left(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2\right)$. (*)

From (1), (2), and (*) it follows that $IS_T \models \exists p \forall e \left(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2\right)$.

$\Longleftarrow$ Pro has some strategy $f_{Pro} \in Str_{Pro}$ and Env has its only strategy f_{Env}, which does not affect the evolution of the system. We obtain a set of paths $out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$ from the initial state s_0,

when both Pro and Env apply their strategies. The set $out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$ corresponds to a set of disputes $D_{T_\sigma} \subseteq D_T$.

We have an assignment χ_0 where $\chi_0(p) = f_{Pro}$ and $\chi_0(e) = f_{Env}$. We have that:

$$(IS_T, \chi_0, s_0) \models \forall o\, G\Big(\bigwedge_{i \in Args} \neg G(Opp_i)\Big)\Big) \quad (1)$$

$$(IS_T, \chi_0, s_0) \models \Big(\bigwedge_{i \in Args} \exists o\, F(Pro_i) \Rightarrow \forall o\, G(\neg Opp_i)\Big)\Big) \quad (2)$$

Select an arbitrary strategy $f_{Opp} \in Str_{Opp}$. We obtain a new complete assignment $\chi_1 = \chi_0[o \mapsto f_{Opp}]$. We now have a ($\chi_1$-$s_0$) play $\lambda \in out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$. We have that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_k) \models \bigwedge_{i \in Args} \neg G(Opp_i)$, for all $s_k \in \lambda$ ($k \geq 0$). This implies that for all $i \in Args$ there exists at least one state $s_{k'} \in \lambda'$, where λ' is the χ_1-s_k play and $k' \geq k$, such that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_{k'}) \not\models Opp_i$. This suggests that Pro has been able to counter attack any argument i that was put forward by Opp in λ. Accordingly, the dispute $\delta \in D_{T_\sigma}$ that corresponds to λ does not contain opponent nodes with zero children. (3)

From (1), we know that (3) must hold for all strategies available to Opp. Therefore, for all plays $\lambda \in out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$, their corresponding disputes $\delta \in D_{T_\sigma}$ do not contain opponent nodes with zero children (*).

We have assignment χ_0. Select an arbitrary dispute $\delta \in D_{T_\sigma}$. The play $\lambda \in out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$ that corresponds to δ must be obtained from some complete assignment $\chi_1 = \chi_1[o \mapsto f_{Opp}]$, where $f_{Opp} \in Str_{Opp}$ is some strategy of Opp (4).

For some argument $b \in Pro(\delta)$, there must exist a state $s_k \in \lambda$ ($k \geq 0$) such that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_k) \models Pro_b$. This gives us $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_0) \models F(Pro_b)$. Given (4), we have that $(IS_T, \chi_0, s_0) \models \exists o\, F(Pro_i)$ (5).

From (2) and (5), we have that $(IS_T, \chi_0, s_0) \models \forall o\, G(\neg Opp_b)$ (6).

For some strategy $f'_{Opp} \in Str_{Opp}$ available to Opp, we obtain a new complete assignment $\chi_1 = \chi_0[o \mapsto f'_{Opp}]$. We know that for all states s_k ($k \geq 0$) in the χ_1-s_0 play $\lambda' \in out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$, it must hold that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_k) \models \neg Opp_b$. Accordingly, the dispute δ' that corresponds to λ' must not have b labelled by the opponent. From (6), we know that for every strategy $f'_{Opp} \in Str_{Opp}$ available to Opp, the χ_1-s_0 play $\lambda' \in out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$ corresponds to a dispute $\delta' \in D_{T_\sigma}$ where b has not been labelled by the opponent. This means that there is no dispute $\delta' \in D_{T_\sigma}$, where the opponent labels b (7).

As b was arbitrary, (7) must hold for every argument $b \in Pro(\delta)$ (8).

As δ was also selected arbitrarily, (8) must hold for every dispute $\delta \in D_{T_\sigma}$ (**).

We have that:

- Every opponent node in T_σ has children. The number of children must be exactly one as T_σ is associated with $out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$, the set of paths obtained from Pro always selecting one action at each state. This was shown in (*).
- No argument is labelled by both the proponent and the opponent. This was shown in (**).

Hence, σ must be an admissible winning strategy in T.

□

Intuitively, the formula in Theorem 4.2 states that Pro has a strategy f in IS_T such that

(1) ϕ_1 is satisfied. The subformula ϕ_1 states that for any strategy f' applied by Opp, the resulting play λ does not contain a steady state s_k ($k \geq 0$) that is associated with an argument played by Opp. Thus, for any $i \in Args$, λ must not contain a steady state s_k where a propositional atom Opp_i holds.

(2) ϕ_2 is satisfied. The subformula ϕ_2 states that for any two plays $\lambda, \lambda' \in out(s_0, \{f\})$, no argument $i \in Args$ must be put forward by both agents. As a result, if Pro_i holds at some state $s_k \in \lambda$ ($k \geq 0$), then there must be no state $s_{k'} \in \lambda'$ ($k' \geq 0$) where Opp_i holds.

4.3 Ideal Winning Strategy

For verifying the existence of an ideal winning strategy σ using IS_T, SL is used to formalise the dispute tree properties in Def. 2.9.

Theorem 4.3. *The proponent has an ideal winning strategy σ in T iff $IS_T \models \exists p \forall e\Big(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \wedge \phi_3\Big)$, where ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are the same as in the statement of Theorem 4.2, and*

$$\phi_3 = \forall o\, G\Big(\Big(\bigvee_{i \in Args} Opp_i\Big) \Rightarrow \neg\exists o\, \Big(\phi_{3.1} \wedge \phi_{3.2}\Big)\Big)$$

where

$$\phi_{3.1} = \forall p\, G\Big(\bigwedge_{j \in Args} \neg G(Pro_j)\Big)$$

$$\phi_{3.2} = \Big(\bigwedge_{j \in Args} \exists p\, F(Pro_j) \Rightarrow \forall p\, G(\neg Opp_j)\Big)$$

Proof. $Pro(\delta)$ refers to the set of arguments played by the proponent in a dispute δ, while $Opp(\delta)$ refers to the set of arguments played by the opponent in δ. $Opp(T_\sigma)$ refers to the set of arguments played by the opponent in the tree T_σ.

Let Str_{Pro}, Str_{Opp} be the set of strategies available to Pro and Opp.

$\Longrightarrow$ Agent Pro must have a strategy $f_{Pro} \in Str_{Pro}$ such that every path $\lambda = s_0, s_1, ..$ in the set $out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$ corresponds to a dispute $\delta \in D_{T_\sigma}$, where s_0 is the initial state of IS_T. (1)

The environment Env only has one action available, which does not affect the evolution of the debate. This means that Env only has one strategy, f_{Env}, where it always selects the action *nothing*. As f_{Env} does not impact the evolution of the debate, the set of paths obtained from Pro and Env applying their strategies f_{Pro} and f_{Env} from s_0, must still be $out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$. (2)

Using Var, we define a new assignment χ_0 where $\chi_0(p) = f_{Pro}$ and $\chi_0(e) = f_{Env}$.

As σ must be admissible, we have that:

$$(IS_T, \chi_0, s_0) \models \phi_1 \quad (3)$$

$$(IS_T, \chi_0, s_0) \models \phi_2 \quad (4)$$

Please see the proof of Theorem 4.2 for (3) and (4).

We have assignment χ_0. Select an arbitrary strategy $f_{Opp} \in Str_{Opp}$. We associate f_{Opp} to variable o such that we obtain assignment $\chi_1 = \chi_0[o \mapsto f_{Opp}]$. As every agent has now been assigned a strategy, we have an χ_1-s_0 play $\lambda \in out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$. Select an arbitrary state $s_k \in \lambda$ ($k \geq 0$).

Assume that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_k) \models \bigvee_{i \in Args} Opp_i$.

Now, assume that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_k) \models Opp_i$, where i is an argument in $Args$ (5).

Also, assume that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_k) \models \exists o \left(\phi_{3.1} \wedge \phi_{3.2}\right)$ (6).

From (6), we know that Opp has some strategy $f'_{Opp} \in Str_{Opp}$. We now obtain a new assignment $\chi_2 = \chi_1[o \mapsto f'_{Opp}]$. It holds that $(IS_T, \chi_2, s_k) \models \phi_{3.1} \wedge \phi_{3.2}$ (7).

Let $out(s_k, \{f'_{Opp}\})$ be the set of paths from s_k, obtained from Opp applying its strategy f'_{Opp}. The set $out(s_k, \{f'_{Opp}\})$ corresponds to a subtree $T_{\sigma'}$ of T where i is the root node labelled by the opponent and σ' is a strategy of the opponent from i. We select some strategy $f_{Pro} \in Str_{Pro}$ for Pro and assign it to the variable p, such that $\chi_3 = \chi_2[p \mapsto f_{Pro}]$. From (7), we now have that $(IS_T, \chi_3, s_k) \models \phi_{3.1}$ (8).

Let $\lambda' \in out(s_k, \{f'_{Opp}\})$ be the χ_3-s_k play. According to (8), for all $s_{k'} \in \lambda'$ ($k' \geq k$), it holds that $(IS_T, \chi_3, s_{k'}) \models \bigwedge_{j \in Args} \neg G(Pro_j)$. This implies that Opp is able to counter attack any argument played by Pro in λ'. Hence, the dispute $\delta' \in D_{T_{\sigma'}}$ that is associated with λ' does not contain proponent nodes with zero children (9).

According to (8), (9) must hold for any strategy $f_{Pro} \in Str_{Pro}$ available to Pro. Therefore, all plays $\lambda' \in out(s_k, \{f'_{Opp}\})$ correspond to a dispute $\delta' \in D_{T_{\sigma'}}$, where there is no proponent node with zero children. The number of children for each proponent node must be exactly one as $T_{\sigma'}$ is associated with $out(s_k, \{f_{Opp}\})$, the set of paths obtained from Opp always selecting one action at each state. (*)

We have assignment χ_2. Select an arbitrary dispute $\delta' \in D_{T_{\sigma'}}$. The play $\lambda' \in out(s_0, \{f'_{Opp}\})$ that corresponds to δ' must be obtained from some assignment $\chi_3 = \chi_2[p \mapsto f_{Pro}])$, where $f_{Pro} \in Str_{Pro}$ is some strategy of Pro (10).

The assignment χ_3 is *complete*, as every agent has been assigned a strategy.

For some argument $b \in Pro(\delta')$, there must exist a state $s_{k'} \in \lambda'$ ($k' \geq k$) where $(IS_T, \chi_3, s_{k'}) \models Pro_b$. This gives us $(IS_T, \chi_3, s_k) \models F(Pro_i)$.

From (10), we have $(IS_T, \chi_2, s_k) \models \exists p\, F(Pro_b)$ (11).

From (11) and (7), we obtain $(IS_T, \chi_2, s_k) \models \forall p\, G(\neg Opp_b)$ (12).

For some strategy $f'_{Pro} \in Str_{Pro}$ available to Pro, we obtain a new complete assignment $\chi_3 = \chi_2[p \mapsto f'_{Pro}]$. We know that for all states $s_{k'}$ ($k' \geq k$) in the χ_3-s_k play $\lambda'' \in out(s_k, \{f'_{Opp}\})$, it must hold that $(IS_T, \chi_3, s_{k'}) \models \neg Opp_b$. Accordingly, the dispute $\delta'' \in D_{T_{\sigma'}}$ that corresponds to λ'' must not have b labelled by the opponent. From (12), we know that for every strategy $f'_{Pro} \in Str_{Pro}$, the χ_7-s_k play $\lambda'' \in out(s_k, \{f'_{Opp}\})$ corresponds to a dispute $\delta'' \in D_{T_{\sigma'}}$ where b has not been labelled by the opponent. This means that there is no dispute $\delta'' \in D_{T_{\sigma'}}$, where the opponent labels b (13).

(13) must hold for every argument $b \in Pro(\delta')$ (14).

As δ was also selected arbitrarily, (13) must hold for every dispute $\delta \in D_{T_{\sigma'}}$ (**). From (*) and (**), it follows that σ' is an admissible winning strategy for an opponent node i (15).

(15) contradicts the initial assumption that σ is ideal as i has an admissible winning strategy σ'. Therefore, the assumption made in (6) does not hold and we have that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_k) \models \neg\exists o \left(\phi_{3.1} \wedge \phi_{3.2}\right)$ (16).

The assumption in (5) can be made about any argument $i \in Args$ and would still lead to (16).

We have that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_k) \models \left(\bigvee_{i \in Args} Opp_i\right) \Rightarrow \neg\exists o \left(\phi_{3.1} \wedge \phi_{3.2}\right)$ (17).

(17) must hold for all $s_k \in \lambda$, where $k \geq 0$, as s_k was selected arbitrarily. As a result, we have that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_0) \models G\left(\left(\bigvee_{i \in Args} Opp_i\right) \Rightarrow \neg\exists o \left(\phi_{3.1} \wedge \phi_{3.2}\right)\right)$ (18).

This implies that there is no admissible winning strategy for any of the nodes labelled by the opponent in $\delta \in D_{T_\sigma}$, the dispute that is associated with λ (19). This means that for all other strategies $f_{Opp} \in Str_{Opp}$, (19) must hold.

We have $(IS_T, \chi_0, s_0) \models [\![o]\!](Opp, o)\, G\left(\left(\bigvee_{i \in Args} Opp_i\right) \Rightarrow \neg\phi_2\right)$ (20).

We have (3), (4), and (20). From (1) and (2), it follows that:

$$IS_T \models \exists p\, \forall e \left(\phi_1 \bigwedge \phi_2 \bigwedge \phi_3\right).$$

$\Longleftarrow$ Pro has some strategy $f_{Pro} \in Str_{Pro}$ and Env has its only strategy f_{Env}, which does not affect the evolution of the system. We obtain a set of paths $out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$ from the initial state s_0, when both Pro and Env apply their strategies. The set $out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$ corresponds to a set of disputes $D_{T_\sigma} \subseteq D_T$.

We have an assignment χ_0 where $\chi_0(p) = f_{Pro}$ and $\chi_0(e) = f_{Env}$. We have that

$$(IS_T, \chi_0, s_0) \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \tag{1}$$

$$(IS_T, \chi_0, s_0) \models \forall o\, G\left(\left(\bigvee_{i \in Args} Opp_i\right) \Rightarrow \neg\exists o \left(\phi_{3.1} \bigwedge \phi_{3.2}\right)\right) \tag{2}$$

Let T_σ be the dispute tree, with root a, constructed from the set of disputes D_{T_σ}. The proof of Theorem 4.2 shows that if (1) holds, then σ must be admissible (*).

Consider $Opp(T_\sigma)$. There are two cases: $Opp(T_\sigma) \neq \emptyset$ (Case 1) and $Opp(T_\sigma) = \emptyset$ (Case 2).

(Case 1) Select an arbitrary dispute $\delta \in D_{T_\sigma}$. The play $\lambda \in out(s_0, \{f_{Pro}\})$ that corresponds to δ must be obtained from some complete assignment $\chi_1 = \chi_0[o \mapsto f_{Opp}]$, where f_{Opp} is some strategy available to Opp.

We select some argument $b \in Opp(\delta)$ arbitrarily. There must be a state $s_k \in \lambda$ ($k \geq 0$) such that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_k) \models Opp_b$ (3).

From (3), it holds that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_k) \models \bigvee_{i \in Args} Opp_i$ (4).

From (4) and (2), we have that $(IS_T, \chi_1, s_k) \models \neg\phi_2$.

Consider a strategy $f'_{Opp} \in Str_{Opp}$. The set $out(s_k, \{f'_{Opp}\})$ corresponds to a set of disputes $D_{T_{\sigma'}}$, which can be used to construct a dispute tree $T_{\sigma'}$ where b is the root and is labelled by the opponent. We now show that the opponent's strategy σ' is not an admissible winning strategy for b.

Let $\chi_2 = \chi_1[o \mapsto f'_{Opp}]$. We have $(IS_T, \chi_2, s_k) \not\models \phi_{3.1} \wedge \phi_{3.2}$.

This implies that one of two, or both, could hold:

$$(IS_T, \chi_2, s_k) \not\models \phi_{3.1} \tag{5}$$

$$(IS_T, \chi_2, s_k) \not\models \phi_{3.2} \tag{6}$$

Consider the first case, which is the statement in (5). There must exist some strategy $f'_{Pro} \in Str_{Pro}$ such that $(IS_T, \chi_3, s_k) \not\models G\Big(\bigwedge_{j \in Args} \neg G(Pro_j)\Big)$, where $\chi_3 = \chi_2[p \mapsto f'_{Pro}]$. There must exist some state $s_{k'} \in \lambda'\,(k' \geq k)$, where $\lambda' \in out(s_k, \{f'_{Opp}\})$ is the χ_3-s_k play, such that $(IS_T, \chi_3, s_{k'}) \not\models \bigwedge_{j \in Args} \neg G(Pro_j)$. This implies that for some argument $j \in Args$, we have that for all $s_{k''} \in \lambda'\,(k'' \geq k')$, $(IS_T, \chi_3, s_{k''}) \models Pro_j$. This shows that there are no attacks available against j.

Accordingly, there exists a dispute $\delta' \in D_{T_{\sigma'}}$, that corresponds to λ', where j is the terminating argument labelled by the proponent. As j has no children, σ' cannot be an admissible winning strategy of the opponent, for b (**).

Consider (6). There must be some argument $j \in Args$ such that $(IS_T, \chi_2, s_k) \not\models \exists p\, F(Pro_j) \implies \forall p\, G(\neg Opp_j)$. This means that we have the following:

$$(IS_T, \chi_2, s_k) \models \exists p\, F(Pro_j) \tag{7}$$

$$(IS_T, \chi_2, s_k) \not\models \forall p\, G(\neg Opp_j) \tag{8}$$

(7) implies that there exists a strategy $f'_{Pro} \in Str_{Pro}$ such that $(IS_T, \chi_3, s_k) \models F(Pro_j)$, where $\chi_3 = \chi_2[p \mapsto f'_{Pro}]$. In the χ_3-s_k play $\lambda' \in out(s_k, \{f'_{Opp}\})$, there must exist a state $s_{k'}$ $(k' \geq k)$ such that $(IS_T, \chi_3, s_{k'}) \models Pro_j$. Accordingly, the dispute $\delta' \in D_{T_{\sigma'}}$ that corresponds to λ' contains an argument j that is labelled by the proponent (9).

(8) implies that there exists a strategy $f''_{Pro} \in Str_{Pro}$ such that $(IS_T, \chi_3, s_k) \not\models G(\neg Opp_j)$, where $\chi_3 = \chi_2[p \mapsto f''_{Pro}]$.

Therefore, there must exist a state $s_{k''} \in \lambda''\,(k'' \geq k)$, where $\lambda'' \in out(s_k, \{f'_{Opp}\})$ is a χ_3-s_k play, such that $(IS_T, \chi_3, s_{k''}) \models Opp_j$.

Accordingly, the dispute $\delta'' \in D_{T_{\sigma'}}$ that corresponds to λ'' contains an argument j that is labelled by the opponent (10).

From (9) and (10), it follows that σ' cannot be admissible as the same argument is labelled by both the proponent and the opponent (***).

As the strategy f'_{Opp} was selected arbitrarily, it must be the case that (**) and (***) hold for any $f'_{Opp} \in Str_{Opp}$ (12).

Similarly, $b \in Opp(\delta)$ was selected arbitrarily. This means that (12) must hold for any argument $i \in Opp(\delta)$ (13).

Finally, (13) must hold for any dispute $\delta \in D_{T_\sigma}$ and this implies that for any argument $i \in Opp(T_\sigma)$, the opponent does not have an admissible winning strategy for i (14).

Consider the second case, where $Opp(T_\sigma) = \emptyset$. In this case, we find that the root argument a of T (and also T_σ) is unattacked. There are no opponent nodes that could have an admissible winning strategy (15).

We have (*), and from (14) and (15) it follows that σ must be an ideal winning strategy for a in T.

□

Intuitively, the formula above states that *Pro* has a strategy f in IS_T such that

(1) ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are satisfied. These two formulas are presented in Theorem 4.2. In particular, f is guaranteed to be an admissible winning strategy.
(2) ϕ_3 is satisfied. The subformula ϕ_3 is used to verify that *Opp* does not have a strategy f' from any state $s_k \in \lambda\ (k \geq 0)$ that satisfies Opp_i, where $\lambda \in out(s_0, \{f\})$ and $i \in Args$, that corresponds to an admissible winning strategy for i.

Discussion. In Theorem 4.1, we are able to express the existence of a grounded winning strategy in ATL. The problem of model checking an ATL formula is *P-complete* [1], while the problem of deciding membership of an argument to a grounded extension is in *P* [14]. This suggests that it is possible to express the acceptability conditions in Def. 2.7 using ATL. On the other hand, we require the strictly more expressive SL for admissible and ideal winning strategies as deciding membership under both of these semantics is a significantly harder problem [13, 14]. In this contribution, we do not explore whether the latter notions can also be formalised in ATL as such a problem would require a substantial amount of work, possibly an impossibility result, which is beyond the scope of the present paper. We only observe that, since formulas ϕ_2 an $\phi_{3.2}$ refer to counterfactual situations, it is unlikely that these can be expressed in ATL, where counterfactuals are not readily expressible.

5 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section we compare the performance of MCMAS and MCMAS-SLK [5], a model checker that supports a fragment of SL, to the performance of argumentation solvers in determining the acceptability of a given argument.

The International Competition on Computational Models of Argumentation (ICCMA) 2017 [24] focused on several tasks involving abstract argumentation frameworks, one of which included determining whether some argument is acceptable under a given semantics. For each of the semantics, the solvers submitted were ranked according to their performance in all tasks. The top ranking solvers for the grounded, preferred, and ideal semantics were the open source solvers CoQuiAAS [19], ArgSemSAT [6, 8], and Pyglaf [2] respectively.

In our experiments we used AFBenchGen2 [7], an open source generator of random abstract argumentation frameworks. Attacks are selected randomly between any two arguments a and b [15] by providing the generator a probability p ($0 \leq p \leq 1$), which determines the likelihood of an attack from a to b and vice versa. For each generated framework $\mathcal{AF}$, we selected an argument $a \in Args$ randomly and determined its acceptability.

All tests were ran on a machine running Linux kernel version 4.15.0-50, with 16GB RAM and an Intel Core i7-6700 3.40GHz Processor CPU. A timeout of 1800s was set for each test.

5.1 Grounded Semantics

This section compares the performance of MCMAS to that of CoQuiAAS in determining membership of some argument in the grounded extension. The results are presented in Table 2.

Using AFBenchGen2, we generated 10 argumentation frameworks per probability interval. Each framework was automatically translated to an interpreted system, on which we model checked an ATL formula ϕ based on the argumentation framework and the formalisation in Theorem 4.1.

While the results provided by MCMAS were consistent with those of CoQuiAAS, Table 2 shows that CoQuiAAS was considerably faster in determining membership in the grounded extension.

Argumentation Framework		MCMAS			CoQuiAAS
Args (n)	Prob. attack (p)	Avg exec. time (s)	Avg reachability (s)	Model checking (s)	Avg exec. time (s)
20	$0.0 \leq p < 0.5$	0.1742	0.1190	0.0131	0.0046
	$0.5 \leq p < 1.0$	1.4473	1.1280	0.3013	0.0048
40	$0.0 \leq p < 0.5$	3.6242	2.2740	0.2493	0.0049
	$0.5 \leq p < 1.0$	11.581	7.7710	3.7900	0.0050
60	$0.0 \leq p < 0.5$	617.72	586.54	30.291	0.0050
	$0.5 \leq p < 1.0$	1532.4	1471.3	59.229	0.0055
80	$0.0 \leq p < 0.5$	1683.1	1583.6	98.175	0.0057
	$0.5 \leq p < 1.0$	Timed out	Timed out	Timed out	0.0062

Table 2: The performance of MCMAS compared to the performance of CoQuiAAS

Argumentation Framework		MCMAS-SLK			ArgSemSAT
Args (n)	Prob. attack (p)	Avg exec. time (s)	Avg reachability (s)	Model checking (s)	Avg exec. time (s)
6	$0.0 \leq p < 0.5$	0.1700	0.0010	0.1866	0.0055
	$0.5 \leq p < 1.0$	122.65	0.0010	121.39	0.0067
8	$0.0 \leq p < 0.5$	0.3470	0.0359	0.2493	0.0062
	$0.5 \leq p < 1.0$	274.88	0.1860	270.42	0.0065
10	$0.0 \leq p < 0.5$	Memory error	0.1803	Memory error	0.0071
	$0.5 \leq p < 1.0$	Memory error	0.5306	Memory error	0.0076

Table 3: The performance of MCMAS-SLK compared to the performance of ArgSemSAT

This is unsurprising as MCMAS, unlike CoQuiAAS, is a general purpose model checker. In addition, the table shows that on average, most of the execution time for MCMAS was spent generating the set G of reachable states, rather than performing model checking. Computing the set of reachable states is one of the factors that can greatly impact the performance of MCMAS [20]. We observed that an increase in the number of arguments as well as the size of the attack relation is positively correlated with the amount of time spent by MCMAS in generating G. This was expected, as a larger attack relation implies that at any state, agents are likely to have a greater number of actions enabled, resulting in an increase in the size of G. Finally, the tests that timed out from 80 arguments onward were unable to reach the model checking step as their reachable state space was not fully generated.

5.2 Preferred Semantics

In this section we compare the performance of MCMAS-SLK against that of ArgSemSAT in determining acceptability of some argument under the preferred semantics. The results are shown in Table 3.

There were 10 argumentation frameworks generated per probability interval and translated to interpreted systems, as in Sec. 5.1. An SL formula ϕ, based on the corresponding framework and the formalisation in Theorem 4.2, was used to verify the existence of an admissible winning strategy. The results provided by MCMAS-SLK were consistent with those returned by ArgSemSAT. As expected, ArgSemSAT was considerably faster than MCMAS-SLK. Compared to Sec. 5.1, the argumentation frameworks used were significantly smaller due to the higher model checking complexity of SL[5]. With smaller frameworks, MCMAS-SLK did not require as much time to generate the set of reachable states. Consequently, most of the execution time was spent model checking. For frameworks with less than 10 arguments, we found that an increase in the value of p had an significant impact on the average execution time.

Finally, we found that for most frameworks that consisted of 10 or more arguments, MCMAS-SLK ran out of memory when verifying the property ϕ, rather than timing out. This may be due to the high model checking complexity of SL as well as an increase in the size of formula ϕ, which is positively correlated with the number of arguments in the framework.

5.3 Ideal Semantics

In this section we compare the performance of MCMAS-SLK against that of Pyglaf in determining acceptability of some argument under the ideal semantics. The SL formula ϕ used for verifying a debate was based on the framework generated as well as the formalisation in Theorem 4.3.

The results are presented in Table 4. Compared to Sec. 5.2, we observed more timeouts. This may be due to the size of ϕ, which would be much larger than the SL formula used to verify membership in a preferred extension, as in Sec. 5.2. The formula ϕ would have also required more strategy assignments compared to the formula used in the previous section [5].

6 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we developed a methodology to verify debates formalised via abstract argumentation frameworks. By building on previous works on debates in abstract argumentation [12, 22], in

Argumentation Framework		MCMAS-SLK			pyglaf
Args (n)	Prob. attack (p)	Avg exec. time (s)	Avg reachability (s)	Model checking (s)	Avg exec. time (s)
6	$0.0 \leq p < 0.5$	0.2111	0.0010	0.2101	0.0570
	$0.5 \leq p < 1.0$	131.66	0.0013	130.31	0.0600
8	$0.0 \leq p < 0.5$	0.3700	0.0210	0.2493	0.0590
	$0.5 \leq p < 1.0$	Memory error	0.1777	Memory error	0.0633
10	$0.0 \leq p < 0.5$	Memory error	0.3151	Memory error	0.0582
	$0.5 \leq p < 1.0$	Memory error	0.6240	Memory error	0.0681

Table 4: The performance of MCMAS-SLK compared to the performance of Pyglaf

Sec. 3 we introduced a translation from debates to interpreted systems [16]. Then, in Sec. 4 we formalised various winning conditions as formulas in ATL and SL[23]. Finally, in Sec. 5 we evaluated the performance of our approach against state-of-the-art argumentation reasoners. While the experimental results point to a considerable gap in performance between the proposed model checking approach and traditional argumentation reasoners, this is not surprising as model checker are general purpose tools. Nonetheless, we deem the present contribution theoretically relevant under at least two aspects. Firstly, we provided an automated translation from debates to interpreted systems amenable to formal verification. Secondly, we captured various winning conditions in debates as formulas in well-known logic-based languages. We believe that these two contributions can pave the way for a wider application of verification techniques in Argumentation Theory, particularly in cases where argumentation frameworks are more naturally represented as debates.

We plan to develop the results in this paper further. Particularly, we are interested in formalising winning conditions for other argumentation semantics, as well as improving the performance of the verification procedures and tools.

Acknowledgements. F. Belardinelli acknowledges the support of ANR JCJC Project SVeDaS (ANR-16-CE40-0021).

REFERENCES

[1] R. Alur, T. A. Henzinger, and O. Kupferman. 2002. Alternating-time Temporal Logic. *J. ACM* 49, 5 (2002), 672–713.
[2] M. Alviano. 2018. The Pyglaf Argumentation Reasoner. In *Technical Communications of the 33rd International Conference on Logic Programming (ICLP 2017)*, Vol. 58. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2:1–2:3.
[3] C. Baier and J.-P. Katoen. 2008. *Principles of model checking*. MIT press.
[4] F. Belardinelli, D. Grossi, and N. Maudet. 2015. Formal Analysis of Dialogues on Infinite Argumentation Frameworks. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI'15)*. AAAI Press, 861–867.
[5] P. Čermák, A. Lomuscio, F. Mogavero, and A. Murano. 2014. MCMAS-SLK: A Model Checker for the Verification of Strategy Logic Specifications. In *Computer Aided Verification*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 525–532.
[6] F. Cerutti, M. Giacomin, and M. Vallati. 2014. ArgSemSAT: Solving Argumentation Problems Using SAT. *COMMA* 14 (2014), 455–456.
[7] F. Cerutti, M. Giacomin, and M. Vallati. 2016. *Generating structured argumentation frameworks: Afbenchgen2*. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications, Vol. 287. IOS Press, 467–468.
[8] F. Cerutti, M. Giacomin, M. Vallati, and T. Zanetti. 2017. ArgSemSAT-2017. http://argumentationcompetition.org/2017/ArgSemSAT.pdf.
[9] A. Cimatti, E. M. Clarke, E. Giunchiglia, F. Giunchiglia, M. Pistore, M. Roveri, R. Sebastiani, and A. Tacchella. 2002. NuSMV2: An Open-Source Tool for Symbolic Model Checking. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV02) (LNCS)*, Vol. 2404. Springer-Verlag, 359–364.
[10] E. M. Clarke, O. Grumberg, and D. A. Peled. 1999. *Model Checking*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
[11] P. M. Dung. 1995. On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games. *Artificial intelligence* 77, 2 (1995), 321–357.
[12] P. M. Dung, P. Mancarella, and F. Toni. 2007. Computing ideal sceptical argumentation. *Artificial Intelligence* 171, 10 (2007), 642–674.
[13] P. Dunne. 2009. The computational complexity of ideal semantics. *Artif. Intell.* 173 (12 2009), 1559–1591.
[14] P. Dunne and M. Wooldridge. 2009. Complexity of Abstract Argumentation. In *Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence*. Springer US, 85–104.
[15] P. Erdös and A. Rényi. 1959. On random graphs I. *Publ. Math. Debrecen* 6 (1959), 290–297.
[16] R. Fagin, J. Y. Halpern, Y. Moses, and M. Y. Vardi. 1995. *Reasoning about Knowledge*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
[17] D. Grossi. 2010. On the Logic of Argumentation Theory. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems: Volume 1 - Volume 1 (AAMAS '10)*. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, Richland, SC, 409–416.
[18] VAS Group. 2015. MCMAS v1.2.2: User Manual. https://vas.doc.ic.ac.uk/software/mcmas/manual.pdf. [Online. Accessed 19-11-2018].
[19] J. Lagniez, E. Lonca, and J. Mailly. 2017. CoQuiAAS v2.0: Taking Benefit from Constraint Programming to Solve Argumentation Problems. http://argumentationcompetition.org/2017/CoQuiAAS.pdf. [Online. Accessed 19-11-2018].
[20] A. Lomuscio, H. Qu, and F. Raimondi. 2017. MCMAS: an open-source model checker for the verification of multi-agent systems. *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer* 19, 1 (2017), 9–30.
[21] A. Lomuscio and F. Raimondi. 2006. Model Checking Knowledge, Strategies, and Games in Multi-agent Systems. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS '06)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 161–168.
[22] S. Modgil and M. Caminada. 2009. *Proof Theories and Algorithms for Abstract Argumentation Frameworks*. Springer US, Boston, MA, 105–129.
[23] F. Mogavero, A. Murano, G. Perelli, and M. Y. Vardi. 2014. Reasoning About Strategies: On the Model-Checking Problem. *ACM Trans. Comput. Logic* 15, 4 (Nov. 2014), 34:1–34:47.
[24] M. Thimm. 2018. International Competition on Computational Models of Argumentation (ICCMA). http://argumentationcompetition.org/2017/index.html.