

# Case-Based Reasoning with Language Models for Classification of Logical Fallacies

Zhivar Sourati<sup>1,2</sup>, Filip Ilievski<sup>1,2</sup>, Hông-Ân Sandlin<sup>3</sup> and Alain Mermoud<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Information Sciences Institute, University of Southern California, Marina del Rey, CA, USA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Computer Science, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

<sup>3</sup>Cyber-Defence Campus, armasuisse Science and Technology, Switzerland  
{souratih,ilievski}@isi.edu, {hongan.sandlin,alain.mermoud}@ar.admin.ch,

## Abstract

The ease and the speed of spreading misinformation and propaganda on the Web motivate the need to develop trustworthy technology for detecting fallacies in natural language arguments. However, state-of-the-art language modeling methods exhibit a lack of robustness on tasks like logical fallacy classification that require complex reasoning. In this paper, we propose a Case-Based Reasoning method that classifies new cases of logical fallacy by language-modeling-driven retrieval and adaptation of historical cases. We design four complementary strategies to enrich the input representation for our model, based on external information about goals, explanations, counterarguments, and argument structure. Our experiments in in-domain and out-of-domain settings indicate that Case-Based Reasoning improves the accuracy and generalizability of language models. Our ablation studies confirm that the representations of similar cases have a strong impact on the model performance, that models perform well with fewer retrieved cases, and that the size of the case database has a negligible effect on the performance. Finally, we dive deeper into the relationship between the properties of the retrieved cases and the model performance.

## 1 Introduction

The ease and speed of spreading misinformation [Wu *et al.*, 2019; Allcott *et al.*, 2019] and propaganda [Da San Martino *et al.*, 2019; Barrón-Cedeno *et al.*, 2019] on the Web motivate the need to develop trustworthy technology for understanding novel arguments [Lawrence and Reed, 2020]. Inspired by centuries of philosophical theories [Aristotle, 1989], recent work has proposed the natural language processing (NLP) task of *Logical Fallacy Detection*. Logical Fallacy Detection goes beyond prior work on binary detection of misinformation and aims to classify an argument into one of the dozens of fallacy classes. For instance, the argument *There is definitely a link between depression and drinking alcoholic drinks. I read about it from Wikipedia* belongs to the class *Fallacy of Credibility*, as the validity of the argument is based on the

credibility of the source rather than the argument itself. Here, the focus is on informal fallacies that contain incorrect or irrelevant premises, as opposed to formal fallacies, which have an invalid structure [Aristotle, 1989]. The identification of informal fallacies is challenging for both humans and machines as it requires complex reasoning and also common knowledge about the concepts involved in the fallacy [Hansen, 2020]. To predict the correct fallacy type, the model has to know what Wikipedia is and how it is used in societal discourse, the potential relationship between depression and consuming alcoholic beverages, and also the causal link between the first and second parts of the argument.

The currently dominant NLP paradigm of language models (LMs) has been shown to struggle with reasoning over logical fallacies [Jin *et al.*, 2022] and similar tasks that require complex reasoning [Da San Martino *et al.*, 2019; Barrón-Cedeno *et al.*, 2019]. As LMs are black boxes, attempts to improve their performance often focus on adapting their input data or the modeling choices. Prior work has pointed to the need to include context [Vijayaraghavan and Vosoughi, 2022], simplify the input structure [Jin *et al.*, 2022], or perform special training that considers soft logic [Clark *et al.*, 2020b]. However, these ideas have not been proven successful in classifying logical fallacies yet. Alternatively, methods that leverage reasoning by example, e.g., based on Case-Based Reasoning (CBR), have shown promise in terms of accuracy and explainability for other tasks like question answering [Das *et al.*, 2022], but have not been applied to reason over logical fallacies to date. We conclude that integrating such explainable methods with generalizable LMs provides an unexplored opportunity to reason over logical fallacies.

In this paper, we pursue the question: *Does reasoning over examples improve the ability of language models to classify logical fallacies?* To answer this question, we develop a method based on the idea of CBR [Martin, 1989]. We focus on the interpretive problem-solving variant of CBR, which aims to understand novel cases in terms of previous similar cases while not necessarily using the solutions from previous cases directly [Leake, 2001]. We adapt this idea to the task of classifying logical fallacies, by using LMs as backbones when retrieving and adapting prior similar cases. We measure the ability of our models in terms of accuracy, generalizability, and explainability. The main contributions of this paper

are as follows:

1. We design the first **Case-Based Reasoning method** for logical fallacy classification to solve new cases based on past similar cases. The framework implements the theory of CBR with SOTA techniques based on language modeling and self-attention.
2. We design four **enriched case representations**: *Counterarguments*, *Goals*, *Explanations*, and *Structure* of the argument to improve the effectiveness of CBR. To our knowledge, we are the first who investigate the effect of these case representations on CBR performance.
3. We perform **extensive experiments** that investigate the impact of CBR against Transformer LM baselines on in-domain and out-of-domain settings. We perform ablations to provide insight into the sensitivity of our CBR method on its parameters and investigate the explanations extracted from the model.

We make our code and data available to support future research on logical fallacy classification.

## 2 Method

CBR [Daelemans and van den Bosch, 2005] is a method that reasons over new cases based on similar past cases with a known label [Martin, 1989]. Our CBR formulation (Figure 1) consists of three steps: (1) given a new case, *retrieve* similar cases from the case database, (2) *adapt* the fetched similar cases based on the current one, and (3) *classify* the new case based on the adapted exemplars. In this work, we use LMs as key components in the retriever and the adapter. We opt for this choice because of their strong ability to encode and compute similarity for any natural language input.<sup>1</sup>

**Retriever** finds  $k$  similar cases  $S_i$  ( $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ) to the new case  $C$  from a case database. The retriever estimates the similarity between  $C$  and  $S_i$  by encoding each of them with the same LM encoder, and computing the cosine similarity of the resulting encodings. The retriever then picks the  $k$  cases with top cosine similarities from the database. The new case is concatenated to its similar cases, i.e.,  $S = C \oplus \langle SEP \rangle \oplus S_1 \oplus S_2 \oplus \dots \oplus S_k$  and is passed as input to the CBR adapter.

**Adapter** aims to prioritize the most relevant information from  $S$  for reasoning over the new case  $C$ . Based on the second step of the pipeline by [Aamodt and Plaza, 1994], after fetching similar cases, not all of them are equally useful and therefore, they should be weighted according to their utility for approaching the new case. The fusion of the current case with its previously seen similar problems would give the model the chance to come up with a better representation of the current problem, as well as better abstractions and generalizations for further uses.

The adapter consists of two parts: an *encoder* and an *attention mechanism*. The encoder is an LM that takes as an input  $C$  and  $S$  separately, then outputs their respective embedding

<sup>1</sup>We also experimented with encoding the input cases as either AMR graphs [Banarescu *et al.*, 2012], using explanation graphs [Saha *et al.*, 2021], or their combination. However, we did not pursue this direction further due to poor performance.




Figure 1: Three stages of the CBR pipeline. Using the new case  $C$ , the retriever finds  $k$  similar cases  $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k\}$  and creates  $S = C \oplus \langle SEP \rangle \oplus S_1 \oplus S_2 \oplus \dots \oplus S_k$ . The adapter processes both the new case and fetched similar cases and tries to adapt  $S$  based on the new case  $C$  and extracts more abstract information from the fusion of the two. Finally, the classifier receives the adapted information and returns the probabilities associated with the new class belonging to each fallacy type. Note that in the example we are using  $k = 1$ .

representations  $E_C$  and  $E_S$ . We use the hidden states of the last layer of the LM as the input embedding. A multi-headed attention component [Vaswani *et al.*, 2017] with  $H$  heads selects the most useful information from the similar cases embeddings ( $E_S$  as *key*  $K$  and *value*  $V$ ) given the embedding of the new case ( $E_C$  as *query*  $Q$ ). The output of the attention component is the adjusted embedding  $A$ .

**Classifier** predicts the final class based on the adapter output  $A$ . The classifier is designed as a fully connected neural layer with a depth  $d$  and an activation function. The objective function of the classifier is the cross-entropy loss. The cross-entropy loss is computed over the probabilities that are extracted from  $C$  logits that correspond to each of the  $C$  classes. Also, during training, the retriever's component weights are frozen, while the adapter and the classifier are trained in an end-to-end fashion.

Overall, our CBR architecture resembles a standard 'vanilla' LM with a classification head but brings the additional benefit of having access to prior relevant labeled cases

weighed based on the attention mechanism. We hypothesize that the CBR models bring two benefits over vanilla LMs: (1) the integration of similar labeled cases helps the model understand the new fallacious argument better and classify it more accurately, and (2) provides explicit insights into the reasoning of the model by yielding similar cases to the current one [Renkl, 2014].

### 3 Case Representation

Merely retrieving labeled cases may not be sufficient for reasoning on new cases, as it is unclear what dimensions of similarity their relevance is based on. For instance, two cases may be similar in terms of their explanation, structure, or the goal behind the cases. As the goal, structure, or explanation of arguments are implicit and not apparent from the plain text, we make them explicit by enriching the original text of the case with such information. We consider four representations in which the case formulation is enriched with its *counterargument*, *goal*, *explanation*, and *structure*. As a baseline, we also include the original *text* without any enrichments. Table 1 illustrates examples of these representations for the sample case *There was a thunderstorm with rain therefore I did not finish my homework*.

Each of the enrichment strategies  $r$  modifies the case representation by concatenating it with additional information,  $I$ . We introduce a case representation function  $R(\text{case}, I, r)$  that concatenates *case* with additional information  $I$  ( $\text{case} \oplus I$ ) according to a representation strategy  $r$ . In our CBR framework (§2), these representations modify both the new case  $C$  to  $C \oplus I$  and cases from the database  $S_i$  to  $S_i \oplus I$ . As a result, the cosine similarity within our retriever module is based on the enriched representations ( $C \oplus I$  and  $S_i \oplus I$ ), instead of the original values ( $C$  and  $S_i$ ). We next describe the design of the enrichment strategies.

**Counterarguments.** Counterarguments are common in persuasive writing, where they explain why one’s position is stronger than the counterargument and serve as a preemptive action to anticipate and remove any doubts about arguments [Harvey, 1999]. We hypothesize that counterarguments are often implicit in the argumentation of authors, and would therefore be useful to be provided directly to the model. For instance, in the argument presented in Table 1, although the plain text claims that the reason for not finishing the homework is the thunderstorm and heavy rain, the counterargument points out *other reasons for not finishing the homework such as the person being too tired and not motivated enough*.

**Goals.** Studies of argumentation often focus on the interplay between the goals that the writer is pursuing and their argumentations [Tracy, 2013]. Thus, when classifying logical fallacies, we expect that it is beneficial to take into account the goals of the arguments as well. The goal may be entirely missing in the argument’s text, or the argument may implicitly hint at the goal. An example of the latter is shown in Table 1, where the phrase *therefore I did not finish my homework* alludes to the implicit goal of the writer to *justify not finishing their homework*. As shown in this example, we include an explicit goal statement to fill this gap.

**Explanations.** By using explanations about logically fal-

lacious arguments, we aim to augment the arguments with a broader notion of information that might be useful for classifying logical fallacies but is not already included in the original argument, such as reasoning steps getting from premises to conclusions of an argument [Barker, 1965].

As we do not impose any restrictions on the explanations, their content may overlap with the previous two strategies of recording the counterarguments or the goals of an argument. Alternatively, explanations may provide different complementary information. Such is the example in Table 1 that discusses the *causal relationship between two events that are not actually related*. Thus, the explanation acts as a general gap-filling mechanism that can provide any relevant information that is missing in the original argument.

**Structure.** Tasks like logical fallacy classification involve higher-order relation comprehension that is often based on the structure rather than the content of the argument. In that sense, the semantics of specific entities and concepts in the argument may be misleading to the model. Similarly to [Jin *et al.*, 2022], we hypothesize that focusing on the logical structure of an argument rather than its content is beneficial for the model’s performance [alm, 2004]. An example of a structural simplification of an argument is transforming the input in Table 1 to an abstracted formulation *There was an X with Y therefore I did not do Z*. While this simplification may help the model grasp the case structure more directly, the structure formulation may not detect the implicit causal links between the thunderstorm (X) and the homework (Z).

We extract the enrichment information for a case using a combination of few-shot and zero-shot prompting with two SOTA models: ChatGPT [OpenAI, 2023] and Codex [Chen *et al.*, 2021]. Given a representation strategy  $r$ , we prompt ChatGPT to get the representations for a case for five different examples using one template per representation. For instance, we use the template *Express the goal of the argument {case}* to retrieve the *goals* of the argument *case*. The full list of the templates is provided in Appendix. The five obtained examples per representation are used as demonstrations to prompt Codex in a few-shot manner. For a representation strategy  $r$ , we use the same demonstrations together with each new case  $C$  from our task as input to the Codex model, which yields enrichment information  $I$  per case. In this manner, we combine the strong zero-shot ability of the closed-source ChatGPT model with the few-shot generation strength of the Codex model.

## 4 Experimental Setup

In this section, we describe the evaluation data and metrics, the baselines we compare to, and the implementation details.

**Evaluation Dataset.** We use the two logical fallacy datasets from [Jin *et al.*, 2022], called LOGIC and LOGIC Climate. The LOGIC dataset includes thirteen logical fallacy types about common topics (examples and statistics provided in Appendix). Logical fallacies include: *Ad Hominem*, *Ad Populum*, *Appeal to Emotion*, *Circular Reasoning*, *Equivocation*, *Fallacy of Credibility*, *Fallacy of Extension*, *Fallacy of Logic*, *Fallacy of Relevance*, *False Causality*, *False Dilemma*, *Faulty Generalization*, and *Intentional*.

Table 1: One example of different representations for the case *There was a thunderstorm with rain therefore I did not finish my homework.*

Representation	Transformed Text
<i>Goals</i>	It’s possible that the goal is to explain why the speaker did not finish their homework. The speaker may be trying to convince the listener that they did not finish their homework because of the thunderstorm, or they may be trying to convince the listener that they did not finish their homework because of the rain.
<i>Counterarguments</i>	There are many factors that contribute to a person’s ability to complete their homework, and it’s not fair to suggest that the thunderstorm was the only factor. It’s possible that the person did not finish their homework because they were distracted by the thunderstorm, or because they were tired, or because they were not motivated to complete their homework.
<i>Explanations</i>	It presents a causal relationship between two events that are not actually related. It ignores other possible causes and relies on oversimplification.
<i>Structure</i>	There was an X with Y therefore I did not do Z.

Also, the LOGIC Climate dataset consists of more challenging examples for the same logical fallacy types on the climate change topic. We use LOGIC for in-domain evaluation and LOGIC Climate for out-of-domain evaluation. As these datasets are severely imbalanced, we augment them using two techniques, i.e., back-translation, and substitution of entities in the arguments with their synonymous terms (find a more in-depth discussion of augmentation in Appendix). Note that we do not fine-tune our model on the LOGIC Climate dataset in any of our experiments to evaluate the generalizability of our framework. We model the classification task as a multi-class classification problem and use the customary metrics of weighted precision, recall, and F1-score.

**Baselines.** We consider three different LMs: BERT [Devlin *et al.*, 2018], RoBERTa [Liu *et al.*, 2019], and ELECTRA [Clark *et al.*, 2020a]. We apply our CBR method (§2) on each of these models. As baselines, we use vanilla LMs without a CBR extension. We also compare against Codex in a few-shot setting as another baseline, with the prompt including all the possible classes as well as one example for each class resulting in thirteen labeled examples in the prompt (discussed more in detail in Appendix). Finally, we include the results of a frequency-based predictor that predicts fallacy classes based on the distribution of fallacy types in the training set.

**Implementation details.** We use SimCSE [Gao *et al.*, 2021], a transformer-based retriever that is optimized for capturing overall sentence similarity, to compute the similarity between cases (§2) and also use  $H = 8$  heads for the multi-headed attention component. The depth of our classifier is  $d = 2$ . It uses *gelu* [Hendrycks and Gimpel, 2016] as an activation function. In most of our experiments, we use  $k = 1$  cases, but we compare the model performance with up to five cases. To test the generalization of our model with sparser case databases, we do experiments exploiting various ratios of the case database within the set  $\{0.1, 0.4, 0.7, 1.0\}$ .

## 5 Results

In this section, we measure the effectiveness of CBR for different models and representations of past cases. We further provide ablations that vary the number of similar cases and the size of the CBR case database. Finally, we present a qualitative analysis of the explainability of CBR and a thorough

Table 2: Comparison of the best results of the CBR framework with vanilla LMs and two external baselines on two benchmarks focusing on both in-domain (LOGIC) and out-of-domain (LOGIC Climate) settings. The best results per model are **boldfaced** and the overall best results are underlined.

Model	Type	LOGIC			LOGIC Climate		
		P	R	F1	P	R	F1
Freq-based	baseline	0.094	0.094	0.093	0.120	0.079	0.080
Codex	few-shot	0.594	0.422	0.386	0.198	0.093	0.077
ELECTRA	baseline	0.614	0.602	0.599	0.276	0.229	0.217
	CBR	<b>0.663</b>	<b>0.664</b>	<b>0.657</b>	<b>0.355</b>	<b>0.254</b>	<b>0.270</b>
RoBERTa	baseline	0.577	0.561	0.560	0.237	0.211	0.200
	CBR	<b>0.631</b>	<b>0.619</b>	<b>0.619</b>	<b>0.379</b>	<b>0.248</b>	<b>0.245</b>
BERT	baseline	0.585	0.598	0.586	0.166	0.130	0.120
	CBR	<b>0.613</b>	<b>0.616</b>	<b>0.611</b>	<b>0.359</b>	<b>0.204</b>	<b>0.200</b>

discussion about how retrieved cases help reasoning over new ones.

**The Impact of CBR.** The results showing the performance of the CBR framework and the relevant baselines can be found in Table 2. For each model, we present the results achieved using the best case representation per model and using  $k = 1$  while exploiting 10% of the case database that we found to yield the best results among all possible combinations.

Overall, the CBR method brings a consistent and noticeable quantitative improvement in the understanding of logical fallacies by LMs. For each of the three LMs, CBR outperforms the vanilla baselines by 2.5 - 6 absolute F1 points on the in-domain dataset and up to 8 points on the out-of-domain dataset. Furthermore, CBR outperforms Codex, which is utilized in a few-shot setting, despite it being a much larger model. Across the different LMs, ELECTRA is achieving the best score and benefits the most from the CBR framework on the in-domain benchmark, which we attribute to its efficiency of pre-training [Clark *et al.*, 2020a]. The same pattern of the superiority of CBR over vanilla LMs can be observed for the other two models with different pre-training procedures and varying numbers of internal parameters. The CBR method notably and consistently improves the performance of the LMs on the out-of-domain (LOGIC Climate) benchmark

as well, with ELECTRA performing the best and BERT benefiting the most from CBR. We provide detailed per-class results of our method in the Appendix, demonstrating its ability to improve the accuracy of the baseline for each of the thirteen fallacy classes. Especially, we note that our CBR method is able to increase the performance in the classes with the least examples, such as Equivocation ( $0 \rightarrow 0.35$ ) and Fallacy of Extension ( $0.48 \rightarrow 0.75$ ).

We conclude that CBR is a general framework that can be applied to any LM and can generalize well to unseen data and to various fallacy classes. The generalization of CBR is in line with prior work that suggests its strong performance on tasks with data sparsity [Das *et al.*, 2020].

Table 3: Performance of the CBR framework using different case representations. The best results per model are **boldfaced** and the overall best results are underlined.

Model	Representation	LOGIC			LOGIC Climate		
		P	R	F1	P	R	F1
ELECTRA	<i>Text</i>	0.655	0.634	0.635	0.317	0.242	0.242
	<i>Counterarguments</i>	<b>0.663</b>	<b>0.664</b>	<b>0.657</b>	0.355	<b>0.254</b>	<b>0.270</b>
	<i>Goals</i>	0.646	0.622	0.621	<b>0.376</b>	0.217	0.222
	<i>Structure</i>	0.634	0.625	0.618	0.375	0.254	0.269
	<i>Explanations</i>	0.605	0.580	0.578	0.314	0.242	0.237
RoBERTa	<i>Text</i>	<b>0.633</b>	0.613	0.619	0.343	0.236	0.251
	<i>Counterarguments</i>	0.624	0.613	0.615	0.367	0.198	0.216
	<i>Goals</i>	0.632	0.613	0.619	0.351	0.242	<b>0.263</b>
	<i>Structure</i>	0.631	<b>0.619</b>	<b>0.619</b>	<b>0.379</b>	<b>0.248</b>	0.245
	<i>Explanations</i>	0.575	0.558	0.559	0.359	0.192	0.181
BERT	<i>Text</i>	0.595	0.604	0.596	0.311	0.192	0.204
	<i>Counterarguments</i>	0.607	0.613	0.603	0.342	<b>0.217</b>	<b>0.228</b>
	<i>Goals</i>	0.598	0.607	0.596	0.310	0.204	0.203
	<i>Structure</i>	<b>0.613</b>	<b>0.616</b>	<b>0.611</b>	<b>0.359</b>	0.204	0.200
	<i>Explanations</i>	0.540	0.531	0.532	0.274	0.217	0.190

**Effect of Different Representations.** The results in Table 3 confirm our expectation that the case representation plays an important role in the effectiveness of the CBR framework. Depending on the LM used, the performance difference among different case representations ranges from 6 to 8% F1-scores for the in-domain setting, and 4 to 8% F1-scores for the out-of-domain setting. In general, we observe a boost in performance when enhancing the original representation (*text*). *Counterargument* information yields the highest boost, though the impact of the representations varies across models. Using ELECTRA, the enrichment with *counterarguments* helps the most, outperforming the model based on the original *text* and the other enrichment strategies. With RoBERTa, *goals* and *structure* of the arguments perform on par with *text*, while with BERT, including information about *counterarguments* and argument *structure* outperforms the *text* representation. As the LMs have been trained with different data and may optimize for different notions of similarity, it is intuitive that the impact of the case representations varies across models. This finding is in line with theoretical work, which discusses that knowledge transfer is strictly guided by the similarity function of the reasoning model [Holyoak and Thagard, 1996]. Meanwhile, using a generic enrichment with *explanations* performs consistently poorly and harms the model performance, which suggests that the CBR models benefit from more precise case representations.




Figure 2: Performance of the CBR framework using different ratios of the case database (left) and different numbers of cases (right). The baseline is outlined as the dotted line.

**Effect of the Case Database Size.** Next, we investigate the sensitivity of the best-performing CBR model based on ELECTRA to the size of the case database. Figure 2 (left) depicts the performance of this model with different percentage ratios of the case database. The figure shows that the CBR framework consistently outperforms the vanilla LM baseline (with 0% of cases) on in- and out-of-domain settings. This trend stands regardless of the size of the case database, which indicates the low sensitivity of the CBR model to the case database size. However, we note that using 10% of the case database yields the best performance, which indicates that a limited case database offers a better potential of abstraction to CBR. Moreover, comparing the performance of the model using different ratios of the case database, we observe a continuous decrease in the performance using higher percentages of the case database. Having access to too much data makes the model dependent and sensitive to the unnecessary and insignificant details of similar cases retrieved. These observations point us to the data efficiency properties of the CBR framework [Das *et al.*, 2020].

**Effect of Different Number of Cases.** The performance of the best CBR model that uses ELECTRA with different numbers of cases are illustrated in Figure 2 (right). In both in-domain and out-of-domain settings, we observe a consistent pattern of performance decrease when more cases are taken into account in the reasoning process. The CBR framework reaches its peak performance using only one similar case while once more outperforming the vanilla LM (with 0 cases) in all the settings. This indicates that the models get easily overwhelmed with past information when considering a new case. While intuitively one would expect that a larger number of cases should help the model understand a new case better, the reasoner should have the capacity to process all of these past cases. Otherwise, as observed in this experiment, including more cases can have an adverse effect on the reasoner by distracting it rather than helping it.

**Case Study on Explainability.** A key promise of the CBR framework is its native explainability by cases since its retrieval of similar cases and reasoning over them are integrated into the CBR process. We perform a qualitative analysis of the cases retrieved by CBR to develop a better intuition about its reasoning process. Table 4 illustrates four example cases that the vanilla LM classifies incorrectly. For each case, we show two CBR representations: one leading to a correct pre-

Table 4: Four examples from different classes in which the CBR model predicts the correct class. For each example, we show a representation that leads to a correct prediction and a representation that still leads to predicting the wrong class. We also show the corresponding wrong class predicted by the second variation of the model.

Input Sentence	Enriched Representation for Correct Prediction (representation)	Enriched Representation for Wrong Prediction (representation) (predicted class)	Class
People who don't support the proposed minimum wage increase hate the poor.	There are often multiple perspectives on an issue. It's possible to have a nuanced or balanced view that doesn't align with any side completely. ( <i>Counterargument</i> )	That candidate wants to raise the minimum wage, but they aren't even smart enough to run a business. ( <i>Text</i> ) ( <i>Ad Hominem</i> )	<i>Fallacy of Extension</i>
The house is white; therefore it must be big.	X is y; therefore, it is z. ( <i>Structure</i> )	The sentence "People who drive big cars probably hate the environment" presents a generalization about a group of people without sufficient evidence. it relies on oversimplification and ignores the diversity within the group. ( <i>Explanations</i> ) ( <i>Faulty Generalization</i> )	<i>Fallacy of Logic</i>
Student: You didn't teach us this; we never learned this. Teacher: So, you're either lazy or unwilling to learn is that right?	It's possible that the goal of the argument "It's possible to pass the class without attending regularly. so, you will pass even if you don't attend regularly." is to convince the listener that they will pass the class even if they don't attend regularly. The speaker may be trying to persuade the listener to skip class by appealing to their desire to pass the class. ( <i>Goals</i> )	The sentence "Teacher: You are receiving a zero because you didn't do your homework. Students: Are you serious? You gave me a zero because you hate me?" attacks the person making the argument rather than the argument itself. It is important to be aware of and avoid this type of reasoning when thinking critically. ( <i>Explanations</i> ) ( <i>Fallacy of Extension</i> )	<i>False Dilemma</i>
One day, Megan wore a Donald Duck t-shirt, and she got an A on her Chemistry test. Now she wears a Donald Duck t-shirt every day to Chemistry class.	There are many factors that contribute to a student's grade, and it's not fair to suggest that the student's past grades are the only factor. It's possible that the student failed the test because they didn't study, or because they were sick, or because they were distracted. ( <i>Counterargument</i> )	The sentence "Eating five candy bars and drinking two sodas before a test helps me get better grades. I did that and got an A on my last test in history" presents a causal relationship between two events without sufficient evidence to support the claim. it ignores other possible causes and relies on oversimplification. ( <i>Explanations</i> ) ( <i>Fallacy of Relevance</i> )	<i>False Causality</i>

diction and one leading to an incorrect one.

The first example shows the scenario where the original *text* of a retrieved case does not suffice for the CBR framework to reason correctly, despite its topical surface similarity to the input case. In other words, the high surface similarity of similar cases is confusing the model and forcing it to incorrectly predict the same class that is associated with the retrieved similar case. However, we see that enriching the case with its *counterargument* helps the CBR model, even though the counterargument is phrased in an abstract manner and is not similar to the new case on the surface. We observe a similar situation with the *explanations* enrichment in the third example, having high surface similarity between the retrieved case and the new one, where analyzing the argument *goals* instead helps the model. In the second example, the *structure* of the argument and the logical depiction of the past cases help the most, while in the fourth example, the *counterarguments* assist the reasoning of CBR. From the second and the fourth example, we observe that enriching arguments with cases that are semantically far from the new case is confusing for the CBR model, even if their reasoning would be helpful.

In summary, the presented examples show that the retrieved cases help the CBR framework rather indirectly, by providing CBR with information such as high-level information (first example), a symbolic abstraction (second example),

Table 5: Overlap of retrieved cases' labels with true labels and predictions of the best CBR model (ELECTRA). We highlight the highest overlaps in **bold**.

Representation	LOGIC		LOGIC Climate	
	overlaps with ground truth	overlaps with predictions	overlaps with ground truth	overlaps with predictions
<i>Text</i>	0.184	0.232	<b>0.136</b>	0.173
<i>Counterarguments</i>	0.208	0.220	0.062	0.068
<i>Goals</i>	0.178	0.196	0.130	0.124
<i>Structure</i>	0.238	0.250	0.105	0.242
<i>Explanations</i>	<b>0.277</b>	<b>0.447</b>	0.086	<b>0.478</b>

an extensive analysis of the writer's goal (third example), and alternative possibilities (fourth example). This brings up a natural question: does the CBR performance correlate to the class overlap between the current case and the retrieved similar cases? To answer this question, we compute the overlap of the classes of retrieved cases with both the true and the predicted classes for different case representations (Table 5). We observe a low overlap of a maximum of 27.7% between the classes of the retrieved cases and the true classes, which is only slightly better than a frequency-based prediction. Also, centering on the direct effect of retrieved cases on the CBR predictions, the model with the highest class overlap between the retrieved cases and the predicted classes also has the low-

est performance (*explanations*). Meanwhile, the best CBR variants (e.g., *counterarguments*) do not directly reuse the labels of the retrieved cases. We conclude that, while retrieving similar cases provides the CBR models with useful information, this additional evidence influences the model reasoning indirectly, and may have adverse effects if the class label is used directly instead. We believe that these findings open exciting future research directions that investigate the relationship between case similarity and the CBR performance.

## 6 Related Work

In this section, we present prior research on logical fallacy classification, CBR, and methods that prompt very large LMs.

**Logical Fallacy.** Prior computational work on logical fallacies has mostly focused on formal fallacies using rule-based systems and theoretical frameworks [Yaskorska *et al.*, 2013; Nakpith and Santini, 2020]. Nevertheless, recent work has switched attention to informal logical fallacies. Jin *et al.* propose the task of logical fallacy classification, considering thirteen informal fallacy types and two benchmarks. The authors gather a rich set of arguments containing various logical fallacies from online resources and evaluate the capabilities of large LMs in classifying logical fallacies both in in-domain and out-of-domain settings. Similarly, Goffredo *et al.* present a dataset of political debates from U.S. Presidential Campaigns and use it to evaluate Transformer LMs. Processing different parts of arguments such as the context of the dialogues, they create separate expert models for each part of the arguments and train all the models together, from which they report the importance of discussion context in argument understanding. Although LMs have been used to classify logical fallacies, both independently and in an ensemble setting, to our knowledge, no prior work has tried to improve LMs’ capabilities to reason over previous cases of logical fallacies encountering a new case nor experimented with enriching the argument representation. We fill this gap by employing CBR with LMs to reason over similar past cases to classify logical fallacies in new cases.

**Case-Based Reasoning.** Case-Based Reasoning [Daelemans and van den Bosch, 2005] has been a cornerstone of interpretable models in many areas. For instance, researchers have successfully applied CBR over past experiences in mechanical engineering [QIN and REGLI, 2003] and medical applications [Oyelade and Ezugwu, 2020]. Case-Based Reasoning has been also used in education, particularly to teach students to recognize fallacies [Spensberger *et al.*, 2022]. Exploiting its interpretable properties, Walia *et al.* use Case-Based Reasoning as a transparent model for Word Sense Disambiguation, Brüninghaus and Ashley use Case-Based Reasoning for predicting legal cases using an interpretable procedure, while Ford *et al.* use Case-Based Reasoning to enhance the transparency of classifications made on the written digits of the MNIST dataset [Lecun *et al.*, 1998]. Inspired by its advantages, we couple Case-Based Reasoning with neural LMs, leading to an enhanced accuracy and explainability of classifying logical fallacies. To our knowledge, this is the first work that combines CBR with LMs for complex tasks like logical fallacy detection.

**Prompting LMs.** The behavior of LMs is strictly dependent on the quality of the input they are prompted with. Aiming to create more comprehensive and all-embracing inputs for LMs and assist them to do more complex reasoning, researchers have attempted to transfer knowledge from very large LMs to smaller ones in a variety of settings. Shwartz *et al.* show that LMs can discover facts useful for language understanding by seeking information related to the context of the question they are trying to answer from another LM. Wang *et al.* propose an LM pipeline that learns to faithfully reason over prompt-based extracted rationales. Wei *et al.* explore how generating a series of intermediate reasoning steps using prompting can equip LMs with complex reasoning skills. Inspired by the ability of large LMs to provide relevant information for novel inputs, as well as prior work that performs knowledge distillation from large to smaller LMs [West *et al.*, 2021], we use prompting to enrich the arguments containing logical fallacies. According to [Barker, 1965], logical fallacies are created by a loophole in the transition from premises to conclusions or in the validity of the premises presented, and we try to enrich the arguments using prompting to cover these loopholes.

## 7 Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper, we presented a novel method that uses Case-Based Reasoning with language models to classify logical fallacies. The CBR method reasons over new cases by utilizing past experiences. To do so, the method retrieves the most relevant past cases, adapts them to meet the needs of a new case, and finally classifies the new case using the adjusted information from past cases. We devised four auxiliary case representations that enrich the cases with implicit information about their counterarguments, goals, structure, and explanations. Our results showed that CBR can classify logical fallacies and can leverage past experiences to fill the gaps in LMs. CBR outperformed the LM baselines in all settings and across all thirteen logical fallacy classes. CBR was able to generalize well and transfer its knowledge to out-of-domain settings. The representation of its cases played a key role: enriching cases with counterarguments helped the most, while adding generic explanations harmed the model performance. Furthermore, CBR models performed best when a small number of cases are provided, but showed low sensitivity to the size of the case database. Finally, our qualitative analysis confirmed the expected value of CBR as an interpretable framework that benefits from past similar cases indirectly.

Since our experiments showed that similar cases assist CBR indirectly, future research should further qualify the relationship between the information provided by the retrieved cases and the performance of the model. Moreover, future work should focus on evaluating CBR on other natural language tasks that require abstraction, such as propaganda detection and dialogue modeling. The application of CBR on such tasks might inspire additional case enrichment strategies, e.g., that describe the causal relation between text chunks, and point to additional knowledge gaps that CBR needs to fill. We make our code and data available to support such future research directions.

## Acknowledgements

Zhivar Sourati has been supported by armasuisse Science and Technology, Switzerland under contract No. 8003532866, and NSF under Contract No. IIS-2153546, while Filip Ilievski is sponsored by the DARPA MCS program under Contract No. N660011924033 with the US Office Of Naval Research.

## References

- [Aamodt and Plaza, 1994] Agnar Aamodt and Enric Plaza. Case-based reasoning: Foundational issues, methodological variations, and system approaches. *AI Communications*, 7:39–59, 1994. 1.
- [Allcott *et al.*, 2019] Hunt Allcott, Matthew Gentzkow, and Chuan Yu. Trends in the diffusion of misinformation on social media. *Research & Politics*, 6(2):2053168019848554, 2019.
- [alm, 2004] *Handbook of the history of logic / edited by Dov M. Gabbay and John Woods*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands ;, 2004.
- [Aristotle, 1989] Aristotle. *On sophistical refutations: On Comin to be passing away - on the cosmos v. 3*. Loeb Classical Library. LOEB, London, England, July 1989.
- [Banarescu *et al.*, 2012] Laura Banarescu, Claire Bonial, Shu Cai, Madalina Georgescu, Kira Griffitt, Ulf Hermjakob, Kevin Knight, Philipp Koehn, Martha Palmer, and Nathan Schneider. Abstract meaning representation (amr) 1.0 specification. In *Parsing on Freebase from Question-Answer Pairs. In Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. Seattle: ACL*, pages 1533–1544, 2012.
- [Barker, 1965] Stephen Francis Barker. *The Elements of Logic*. New York: Mcgraw-Hill, 1965.
- [Barrón-Cedeno *et al.*, 2019] Alberto Barrón-Cedeno, Israa Jaradat, Giovanni Da San Martino, and Preslav Nakov. Propopy: Organizing the news based on their propagandistic content. *Information Processing & Management*, 56(5):1849–1864, 2019.
- [Brüninghaus and Ashley, 2006] Stefanie Brüninghaus and Kevin D Ashley. Progress in textual case-based reasoning: predicting the outcome of legal cases from text. In *AAAI*, pages 1577–1580, 2006.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2021] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. Evaluating large language models trained on code, 2021.
- [Clark *et al.*, 2020a] Kevin Clark, Minh-Thang Luong, Quoc V. Le, and Christopher D. Manning. ELECTRA: Pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators. In *ICLR*, 2020.
- [Clark *et al.*, 2020b] Peter Clark, Oyvind Tafjord, and Kyle Richardson. Transformers as soft reasoners over language, 2020.
- [Da San Martino *et al.*, 2019] Giovanni Da San Martino, Seunghak Yu, Alberto Barrón-Cedeno, Rostislav Petrov, and Preslav Nakov. Fine-grained analysis of propaganda in news article. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing and the 9th international joint conference on natural language processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 5636–5646, 2019.
- [Daelemans and van den Bosch, 2005] Walter Daelemans and Antal van den Bosch. *Memory-Based Language Processing*. Studies in Natural Language Processing. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [Das *et al.*, 2020] Rajarshi Das, Ameya Godbole, Shehzaad Dhuliawala, Manzil Zaheer, and Andrew McCallum. A simple approach to case-based reasoning in knowledge bases, 2020.
- [Das *et al.*, 2022] Rajarshi Das, Ameya Godbole, Ankita Naik, Elliot Tower, Manzil Zaheer, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Robin Jia, and Andrew McCallum. Knowledge base question answering by case-based reasoning over subgraphs. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4777–4793. PMLR, 2022.
- [Devlin *et al.*, 2018] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [Ford *et al.*, 2020] Courtney Ford, Eoin M. Kenny, and Mark T. Keane. Play mnist for me! user studies on the effects of post-hoc, example-based explanations & error rates on debugging a deep learning, black-box classifier. 2020.
- [Gao *et al.*, 2021] Tianyu Gao, Xingcheng Yao, and Danqi Chen. Simcse: Simple contrastive learning of sentence embeddings, 2021.
- [Goffredo *et al.*, 2022] Pierpaolo Goffredo, Shohreh Haddadan, Vorakit Vorakitphan, Elena Cabrio, and Serena Villata. Fallacious argument classification in political debates. In *Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence {IJCAI-22}*, pages 4143–4149. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 2022.
- [Hansen, 2020] Hans Hansen. Fallacies. In Edward N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Summer 2020 edition, 2020.



- [Harvey, 1999] Gordon Harvey. Counterargument - state college area school district, 1999.
- [Hendrycks and Gimpel, 2016] Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. Gaussian error linear units (gelus), 2016.
- [Holyoak and Thagard, 1996] Keith J Holyoak and Paul Thagard. *Mental leaps: Analogy in creative thought*. MIT press, 1996.
- [Jin *et al.*, 2022] Zhijing Jin, Abhinav Lalwani, Tejas Vaidhya, Xiaoyu Shen, Yiwen Ding, Zhiheng Lyu, Mrinmaya Sachan, Rada Mihalcea, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Logical fallacy detection, 2022.
- [Lawrence and Reed, 2020] John Lawrence and Chris Reed. Argument Mining: A Survey. *Computational Linguistics*, 45(4):765–818, 01 2020.
- [Leake, 2001] D.B. Leake. Problem solving and reasoning: Case-based. In Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes, editors, *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, pages 12117–12120. Pergamon, Oxford, 2001.
- [Lecun *et al.*, 1998] Y. Lecun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2019] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach, 2019.
- [Martin, 1989] N. G. Martin. Proceedings of the second international conference on quantitative genetics, edited by b.s. weir, e.j. eisen, m.m. goodman, and g. namkoong, sunderland, ma: Sinauer associates inc., 1988, xii + 724 pages, \$60.00 (cloth), \$38.50 (paper). *Genetic Epidemiology*, 6(2):389–390, 1989.
- [Nakpib and Santini, 2020] Callistus Ireneous Nakpib and Simone Santini. Automated discovery of logical fallacies in legal argumentation. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence & Applications*, 11(2):37–48, mar 2020.
- [OpenAI, 2023] OpenAI. Chatgpt: Optimizing language models for dialogue, Jan 2023.
- [Oyelade and Ezugwu, 2020] Olaide N. Oyelade and Absalom E. Ezugwu. A case-based reasoning framework for early detection and diagnosis of novel coronavirus. *Informatics in Medicine Unlocked*, 20:100395, 2020.
- [QIN and REGLI, 2003] XIAOLI QIN and WILLIAM C. REGLI. A study in applying case-based reasoning to engineering design: Mechanical bearing design. *Artificial Intelligence for Engineering Design, Analysis and Manufacturing*, 17(3):235–252, 2003.
- [Renkl, 2014] Alexander Renkl. Toward an instructionally oriented theory of example-based learning. *Cognitive Science*, 38(1):1–37, 2014.
- [Saha *et al.*, 2021] Swarnadeep Saha, Prateek Yadav, Lisa Bauer, and Mohit Bansal. ExplaGraphs: An explanation graph generation task for structured commonsense reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7716–7740, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Shwartz *et al.*, 2020] Vered Shwartz, Peter West, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. Unsupervised commonsense question answering with self-talk, 2020.
- [Spensberger *et al.*, 2022] Florian Spensberger, Ingo Kollar, and Sabine Pankofer. Effects of worked examples and external scripts on fallacy recognition skills: a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 58(4):622–639, 2022.
- [Tracy, 2013] Karen Tracy. *Understanding face-to-face interaction: Issues linking goals and discourse*. Routledge, 2013.
- [Vaswani *et al.*, 2017] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need, 2017.
- [Vijayaraghavan and Vosoughi, 2022] Prashanth Vijayaraghavan and Soroush Vosoughi. TWEETSPIN: Fine-grained Propaganda Detection in Social Media Using Multi-View Representations. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3433–3448, Seattle, United States, July 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Walia *et al.*, 2019] Himdweep Walia, Ajay Rana, and Vineet Kansal. Case based interpretation model for word sense disambiguation in gurmukhi. In *2019 9th International Conference on Cloud Computing, Data Science & Engineering (Confluence)*, pages 359–364, 2019.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2022] Peifeng Wang, Aaron Chan, Filip Ilievski, Muhao Chen, and Xiang Ren. Pinto: Faithful language reasoning using prompt-generated rationales, 2022.
- [Wei *et al.*, 2022] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models, 2022.
- [West *et al.*, 2021] Peter West, Chandra Bhagavatula, Jack Hessel, Jena D. Hwang, Liwei Jiang, Ronan Le Bras, Ximing Lu, Sean Welleck, and Yejin Choi. Symbolic knowledge distillation: from general language models to commonsense models, 2021.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2019] Liang Wu, Fred Morstatter, Kathleen M. Carley, and Huan Liu. Misinformation in social media: Definition, manipulation, and detection. *SIGKDD Explor. Newsl.*, 21(2):80–90, nov 2019.
- [Yaskorska *et al.*, 2013] Olena Yaskorska, Katarzyna Budzynska, and Magdalena Kacprzak. Proving propositional tautologies in a natural dialogue. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 128:239–253, 2013. 1-2.

## A Dataset

We start with the dataset from [Jin *et al.*, 2022] that is further revised and cleaned by the authors<sup>2</sup>. It consists of thirteen fallacy types presented in Table 6.

Due to the imbalance issue with different types of fallacies (see Table 7), we augment the dataset using common text augmentation techniques to have 281 arguments for each fallacy type. We tried back-translation, and substitution of entities in the arguments with their synonymous terms, but finally given more coherent samples created using substitution, we used substitution with synonymous terms using transformer embeddings. In this setting, we use transformer embeddings extracted from RoBERTa [Liu *et al.*, 2019] to replace words with their most similar candidates based on the extracted embeddings.

## B Prompts

We use prompting in two scenarios: to predict the fallacy type for an argument using Codex in a few-shot setting, and to extract the case representations using both ChatGPT and Codex combining zero-shot and few-shot prompting.

**Extracting Fallacy Types.** We use Codex in a few-shot setting to predict fallacy types for arguments and use these predictions as a baseline in our experiments. We do not run the same experiment using ChatGPT due to the limits imposed on its usage. The prompt we use to extract predictions from Codex contains all the thirteen possible classes of fallacies shown as a *Python List* followed by one example with its correct prediction per class as shown below.

```
classes = ['fallacy of logic', 'circular reasoning',  
'appeal to emotion', 'intentional',  
'faulty generalization', 'fallacy of extension',  
'false dilemma', 'ad populum', 'ad hominem',  
'false causality', 'equivocation',  
'fallacy of relevance', 'fallacy of credibility']
```

```
(  
    plain text of the argument  
    correct fallacy type  
    ###  
) × 13  
plain text of the argument
```

**Extracting Case Representations.** We use prompting to get case representations in two steps: first, to get limited high-quality case representations, we use ChatGPT in a zero-shot manner; second, to extract case representations in high volume for all the arguments in our dataset, we prompt Codex in a few-shot setting including the sample responses extracted from ChatGPT.

To get the representations from ChatGPT, we use the prompts shown in Table 8. We proofread the representations manually to verify their correct structure and soundness of the representation. Since we include these responses in the prompt we use in the second pass, we make sure they do not

contain any statement about the logical fallacy that an argument contains. The described procedure is done for *counterarguments*, *explanations*, and *goals*. However, for the *structure* of the arguments, we manually write down the *structure* of five sample arguments to be included in the prompt for the next step. We define the *structure* of the argument as a statement in which the content words are replaced with symbols to serve as an abstraction from the plain text. In this representation, the same entities must have the same symbols, and also the named entities and content words that are not helping the model to recognize an argument as a logical fallacy are also replaced with symbols. For instance, the argument *People either like coffee or hate it* will have a *structure* as *People either like x or hate x*.

Having five samples from different arguments with their *counterarguments*, *explanations*, *structure*, and *goals*, to get representations for the rest of the arguments we create a prompt filling it in with five samples developed in the previous stage and prompt Codex in the following way:

```
(  
    prompt:  
    response  
    ###  
) × 5  
prompt with a new argument:
```

Note that the *prompt* is the same prompt we used for ChatGPT in Table 8 and the *responses* are the high-quality responses we extracted from ChatGPT.

## C Additional Analysis

**Effect of Different Representations.** To develop a better intuition into the difference between the case representations, we perform a per-class analysis using different representations. The results of this per-class analysis are shown in Table 7. We observe different rankings of case representations within different fallacy types. In five out of thirteen classes, namely, *Ad Hominem*, *Circular Reasoning*, *Equivocation*, *Fallacy of Extension*, and *Faulty Generalization*, the plain *text* of the arguments outperforms the other representations. In these classes, the additional information from external representations is not perceived as useful and is rather distracting to the model, although still helps CBR to outperform vanilla language models. In *Ad Populum*, *Appeal to Emotion*, *Fallacy of Credibility*, *Fallacy of Logic*, and *False Causality*, *counterarguments* turn out to be more effective which signifies the importance of considering *counterarguments* when approaching these fallacies. On the other hand, *structure* of the arguments are helping CBR the most in *Fallacy of Relevance*, *False Dilemma*, and *Intentional* fallacies. This observation aligns well with the fact that these fallacies have a distinguishable look if one looks at them from a more abstract perspective. Although in none of the fallacy types, the *goals* of the arguments nor *explanations* about them can outperform other representations, they are not always the last in the ranking and can outperform the *text* or *counterarguments* that are most helpful in general.

Alluding to the complexity of fallacy types and the fact that

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/tmakesense/logical-fallacy/tree/main/dataset-fixed>

Table 6: Examples for fallacious arguments belonging to different classes covered in our work.

<b>Fallacy Type</b>	<b>Example</b>
<i>Ad Hominem</i>	I don't know how Professor Resnick can be such a hard grader. He's always late for class.
<i>Ad Populum</i>	An increasing number of people are keeping ferrets as pets, so they must make wonderful companion animals.
<i>Appeal to Emotion</i>	If you don't buy the warranty for your chromebook, you could find yourself without one for the rest of the schoolyear and having to pay thousands of dollars in expensive repairs.
<i>Fallacy of Extension</i>	Scientist: Evolution explains how animals developed, adapted and diversified over millions of years. Opponent: If we evolved from monkeys, why are there still monkeys? And why don't we have three arms? Wouldn't that give me a competitive advantage?
<i>Fallacy of Relevance</i>	Grading this exam on a curve would be the most fair thing to do. After all, classes go more smoothly when the students and the professor are getting along well.
<i>Intentional</i>	A woman decides to visit a certain doctor after only asking advice on the best doctors from ONE friend.
<i>False Causality</i>	Joan is scratched by a cat while visiting her friend. Two days later she comes down with a fever. Joan concludes that the cat's scratch must be the cause of her illness.
<i>False Dilemma</i>	Eat great food at our restaurant, or eat sad, boring meals at home.
<i>Faulty Generalization</i>	ALL teenagers are irresponsible.
<i>Fallacy of Credibility</i>	I hold a doctorate in theology, have written 12 books, and personally met the Pope. Therefore, when I say that Jesus' favorite snack was raisins dipped in wine, you should believe me.
<i>Fallacy of Logic</i>	If the state can require car seats for small children and infants, they can just as easily require mothers to breast-feed instead of using formula.
<i>Circular Reasoning</i>	George Bush is a good communicator because he speaks effectively.
<i>Equivocation</i>	I don't understand why you're saying I broke a promise. I said I'd never speak again to my ex-girlfriend. And I didn't. I just sent her a quick text.

classifying logical fallacies even for great philosophers has always been a challenge culminating in different taxonomies of fallacies [Aristotle, 1989; Barker, 1965; Nakpih and Santini, 2020], it is natural that it is impossible to approach all fallacies using only one point of view or representation. Instead, depending on the fallacy type and the type of logical error that we are dealing with, different perspectives are needed, which we provide using different representations of the arguments.

Table 7: Per-class analysis of the performance of the CBR framework using different case representations. The last two columns are the number of test data points, and training data points before augmentation.

Fallacy Type	<i>Counterarguments</i>	<i>Explanations</i>	<i>Goals</i>	<i>Structure</i>	<i>Text</i>	baseline	# test	# train
<i>Ad Hominem</i>	0.781	0.732	0.759	0.756	<b>0.825</b>	0.596	39	185
<i>Ad Populum</i>	<b>0.900</b>	0.875	0.857	0.870	0.852	0.812	31	144
<i>Appeal to Emotion</i>	<b>0.723</b>	0.612	0.680	0.608	0.596	0.426	23	109
<i>Circular Reasoning</i>	0.739	0.730	0.750	0.760	<b>0.800</b>	0.524	23	110
<i>Equivocation</i>	0.285	0.333	0.307	0.333	<b>0.352</b>	0.000	7	32
<i>Fallacy of Credibility</i>	<b>0.666</b>	0.562	0.600	0.606	0.571	0.400	19	89
<i>Fallacy of Extension</i>	0.705	0.702	0.666	0.666	<b>0.750</b>	0.482	18	80
<i>Fallacy of Logic</i>	<b>0.714</b>	0.604	0.666	0.666	0.708	0.322	22	101
<i>Fallacy of Relevance</i>	0.634	0.590	0.590	<b>0.651</b>	0.553	0.512	22	102
<i>False Causality</i>	<b>0.827</b>	0.763	0.769	0.771	0.792	0.596	28	132
<i>False Dilemma</i>	0.882	0.769	0.829	<b>0.894</b>	0.857	0.800	19	87
<i>Faulty Generalization</i>	0.699	0.598	0.656	0.666	<b>0.702</b>	0.656	60	281
<i>Intentional</i>	0.628	0.545	0.578	<b>0.648</b>	0.550	0.482	20	92

Table 8: Prompts applied on ChatGPT to extract different representations for each argument (The fixed part of the prompt is underlined).

Representation	Prompt	Sample Answer
<i>Explanations</i>	Analyze the argument " <u>guys are messy and unclean, but are really hard workers</u> "	It's not appropriate to make generalizations about people based on their gender. The argument "guys are messy and unclean, but are really hard workers" suggests that all men are messy and unclean, which is not true. Additionally, the argument implies that being messy and unclean is at odds with being a hard worker, which is also not necessarily true. It's important to remember that every person is an individual with their own unique characteristics, and it's not fair to stereotype people or make assumptions about them based on their gender.
<i>Goals</i>	Express the goal of the argument " <u>The two courses I took at UWI were not very interesting. I don't think its a good university.</u> "	It's possible that the goal of the sentence "The two courses I took at UWI were not very interesting. I don't think its a good university." is to express the speaker's personal feelings and opinions about their academic experience at The University of the West Indies (UWI). The sentence could be communicating the speaker's dissatisfaction with UWI to someone else, or it may simply be a way for the speaker to process their own thoughts and feelings.
<i>Counterarguments</i>	Represent the counterargument to the argument " <u>four out of five dentists agree that brushing your teeth makes your life meaningful</u> "	There is no evidence to support the claim that brushing your teeth makes your life meaningful. In fact, there are many other factors that contribute to a meaningful life, and it's not fair to suggest that brushing your teeth is a necessary or important factor.