

# Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence 3366

Edited by J. G. Carbonell and J. Siekmann

Subseries of Lecture Notes in Computer Science

Iyad Rahwan   Pavlos Moraitis  
Chris Reed (Eds.)

# Argumentation in Multi-Agent Systems

First International Workshop, ArgMAS 2004  
New York, NY, USA, July 19, 2004  
Revised Selected and Invited Papers

## Series Editors

Jaime G. Carbonell, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA  
Jörg Siekmann, University of Saarland, Saarbrücken, Germany

## Volume Editors

Iyad Rahwan

The British University in Dubai, Institute of Informatics

P.O. Box 502216, Dubai, United Arab Emirates

E-mail: irahwan@acm.org

University of Melbourne, Dept. of Information Systems

E-mail: i.rahwan@pgrad.unimelb.edu.au

Pavlos Moraitis

University of Cyprus, Dept. of Computer Science

75 Kallipoleos Str., 1678 Nicosia, Cyprus

E-mail: moraitis@cs.ucy.ac.cy

Chris Reed

University of Dundee, Division of Applied Computing

Dundee DD1 4HN, Scotland, UK

E-mail: chris@computing.dundee.ac.uk

Library of Congress Control Number: 2004118426

CR Subject Classification (1998): I.2.11, I.2, C.2.4, H.5.2-3

ISSN 0302-9743

ISBN 3-540-24526-X Springer Berlin Heidelberg New York

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, re-use of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other way, and storage in data banks. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the German Copyright Law of September 9, 1965, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Violations are liable to prosecution under the German Copyright Law.

Springer is a part of Springer Science+Business Media

springeronline.com

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2005

Printed in Germany

Typesetting: Camera-ready by author, data conversion by Scientific Publishing Services, Chennai, India

Printed on acid-free paper SPIN: 11384885 06/3142 5 4 3 2 1 0

# Preface

The theory of argumentation is a rich, interdisciplinary area of research lying across philosophy, communication studies, linguistics, and psychology (at least). Its techniques and results have found a wide range of applications in both theoretical and practical branches of artificial intelligence and computer science. Several theories of argumentation with various semantics have been proposed in the literature. Multi-agent systems theory has picked up argument-inspired approaches and specifically argumentation-theoretic results from many different areas.

The community of researchers in argumentation and multi-agent systems is currently presented with a unique opportunity to integrate the various understandings of argument into a coherent and core part of the functioning of autonomous computational systems. The benefits range from extended semantics of arguments construed as relationships between epistemic atoms, through conversation protocols for argumentation with serendipitous information exchange, to models of dialectical practical reasoning, both intra- and inter-agent (and a mixture of the two). In all these cases argumentation is used to structure knowledge representation, reasoning and agent interaction, and offers a potential means of better integrating these disparate problems.

In recognition of this increasing interest, the 1st International Workshop on Argumentation in Multi-agent Systems (ArgMAS) was conceived. The workshop was the first forum that brought together researchers interested in applying argumentation to problems faced by the Autonomous Agents and Multi-agent Systems (AAMAS) community. Hence, the workshop was held in conjunction with the 3rd International AAMAS Conference, in July 2004 at Columbia University, New York. The workshop received 20 full-paper submissions and 2 position statements, which was a very encouraging sign for a new workshop. After a thorough reviewing process by at least 2 anonymous referees per paper, 13 full papers were selected for presentation at the workshop. The workshop also included an invited talk by Prof. Jonathan Adler from the Faculty of Philosophy, City University of New York. In this volume, we included revised and expanded versions of the 13 workshop papers. In addition, we included 4 invited contributions, which range from relevant papers that appeared at the main AAMAS conference to contributions from prominent researchers in the field who did not make it to the workshop. Invited contributions were also fully refereed, either by the AAMAS or ArgMAS reviewers. As a result, the book provides a strong representation of the state of the art in the emerging field. Papers range from specific technical contributions to discussions of overarching issues in the area.

The papers were roughly divided into the following main themes:

- Foundations of dialogues
- Belief revision
- Persuasion and deliberation

- Negotiation
- Strategic issues

Although these topics are not completely distinct, they indicate some main directions of research. We have therefore arranged the papers in the book according to these themes.

The first five papers (Part I) address foundational issues in argumentation-based multi-agent dialogues. The first paper (by *Simon Parsons*, *Peter McBurney* and *Michael Wooldridge*) sets down some preliminary but important steps towards a meta-theory of inter-agent dialogues by examining different classes of protocols and how they may lead to different interaction outcomes. The next paper (by *Chris Reed* and *Doug Walton*) looks at formalizing and implementing argumentation schemes, a form of non-deductive reasoning. This is followed by another paper (by *Simon Wells* and *Chris Reed*) which explores the specification of formal dialectic Hamblin-type systems, and presents an implemented system that makes use of the formal framework. The fourth paper (by *Jamal Bentahar*, *Bernard Moulin*, *John-Jules Ch. Meyer* and *Brahim Chaib-draa*) provides an approach based on modal logic for providing semantics for commitments during argumentation dialogues. This paper was invited after being accepted for presentation at the main conference. The last paper in Part I (by *Antonis Kakas*, *Nicolas Maudet* and *Pavlos Moraitis*) explores the interplay between dialogue protocols and agent internal strategies, and analyzes these within a single theoretical framework.

Part II focuses on the use of argumentation as a reasoning mechanism for revising beliefs in the context of a changing environment. The first paper in this section (by *Fabio Paglieri* and *Cristiano Castelfranchi*) provides the reader with a good scoping of the research field of the workshop. In particular, it argues that belief revision and argumentation are complementary components of belief change in multi-agent systems. Next, a specific model for argumentation-based belief revision is presented in a separate paper by *Marcela Capobianco*, *Carlos I. Chesñevar* and *Guillermo R. Simari*. The final paper in this section is an invited contribution (by *Gerard Vreeswijk*) on the relationship between argumentation-based reasoning and Bayesian probabilistic inference. This contribution promises to open up new avenues of research to bridge the gap between the symbolic and probabilistic views of communication.

Part III of this volume presents three contributions to multi-agent persuasion and deliberation dialogues. The first paper (by *Jamal Bentahar*, *Bernard Moulin* and *Brahim Chaib-draa*) presents a persuasion dialogue game protocol and studies the dynamics of the commitments of agents using the protocol. The following two papers contribute to deliberation dialogues, interactions where participants jointly decide on a course of action. The first of those (by *Katie Atkinson*, *Trevor Bench-Capon* and *Peter McBurney*) presents a dialogue game protocol for deliberation dialogues. This is followed by another paper (by *Peter McBurney* and *Simon Parsons*) which proposes a denotational semantics for deliberation dialogues, based on mathematical category theory.

Part IV concentrates on argumentation-based negotiation dialogues, an area receiving increasing interest in the multi-agent systems community. The first paper (by *Iyad Rahwan*, *Liz Sonenberg* and *Peter McBurney*) discusses the difference between argumentation-based negotiation and traditional bargaining, in which agents simply exchange offers. This is followed by a paper by *Leila Amgoud* and *Souhila Kaci*, who present an argumentation-based approach to generate desires and goals. This approach has potential benefit for negotiation dialogues as it provides a means for allowing agents to influence each others' preferences during negotiation. The third paper in this part (by *Sabyasachi Saha* and *Sandip Sen*) presents an approach for argumentation-based negotiation based on Bayesian networks. This is a slightly different treatment from that presented in the paper by *Gerard Vreeswijk* in Part II, since it uses Bayesian networks in order to model the negotiation opponent's behavior. The last paper, by *Fernando A. Tohmé* and *Guillermo R. Simari*, presents a framework for negotiation based on defeasible logic programming (DeLP) augmented with utility functions.

Finally, Part V contains papers that explore various issues related to agent decision-making in dialogues, i.e., their strategies. The first paper (by *Nishan C. Karunatillake* and *Nicholas R. Jennings*) uses empirical simulation to investigate whether and when argumentation improves negotiation. They demonstrate that argumentation is useful when resources are relatively scarce, but provide marginal benefit when resources are abundant. The second paper (by *Elizabeth Sklar*, *Simon Parsons* and *Mathew Davies*) explores the issue of lying in multi-agent dialogues and shows that lying can be useful, and even acceptable, in certain circumstances.

Together the papers in the five parts capture the current landscape of uses of argumentation in multi-agent systems. As a young and dynamic field of research, fresh with vitality, advances are being made extremely rapidly, but nevertheless there are some few trends that are worth identifying in trying to understand where the research is heading. Perhaps the first and most striking is that there is an increasing appeal from more informal areas of argumentation theory. Thus rhetoric, with its focus on audiences, values and context-dependence, is becoming more visible as agents become more sophisticated in their communication structures and reasoning capabilities. The more complex such capabilities become, the more susceptible those systems become to rhetorical techniques. Similarly, argumentation schemes, which encompass a wide range of humanistic reasoning techniques, are being harnessed for internal agent reasoning and inter-agent communication. As the structure of agent knowledge bases becomes more refined, the reasoning techniques that can be leveraged become more detailed and more specific.

Another clear trend is the emergence of the need for objective comparisons between systems. In some cases, such evaluation can be carried out using tools from earlier multi-agent systems research or distributed computing. Yet, much more commonly, the tools for evaluation simply do not exist and need building from scratch. As the range of argumentation-based techniques for reasoning and

communicating expands, benchmarking and evaluation will become an increasingly important requirement in comparing and assessing those techniques.

A very important research trend, which we are only beginning to see glimpses of, is the integration of argumentation-theoretic and economic-theoretic conceptions of rationality. Attempts to integrate notions of economic preference (e.g., via the notion of *utility*) into argumentation systems is an important step towards integration.

Finally, and looking to the longer term, we foresee the emergence of richer argumentation models such as those that move away from the so-called “standard treatment” (such as formalizations of Toulmin’s model). These will be driven by the limitations of expressivity identified in dialectical models (e.g., refutations versus negations; distinctions between undercutting and rebutting; and distinctions between warrants and implications). As agent reasoning becomes more sophisticated, the limits of the propositional model come ever more to the fore. Perhaps it is the ArgMAS community that will be at the vanguard of engineering solutions that tackle induction, categorical syllogism, the interrogative and imperative, and a whole host of Aristotelian basic concepts that might yield concrete computational gains in implemented agent systems.

We conclude this preface by extending our gratitude to the members of the steering committee, members of the program committee, and the auxiliary reviewers, who together helped make the ArgMAS workshop a success. We also thank the authors for their enthusiasm in submitting papers to the workshop, and for revising their papers on time for inclusion in this book.

October 2004

Iyad Rahwan, Pavlos Moraitis, and Chris Reed  
Program Chairs  
ArgMAS 2004

# Organization

## Program Chairs

|                 |                                                                            |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Iyad Rahwan     | University of Melbourne, Australia<br>The British University in Dubai, UAE |
| Pavlos Moraitis | University of Cyprus, Cyprus                                               |
| Chris Reed      | University of Dundee, UK                                                   |

## ArgMAS Steering Committee

|                 |                                    |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| Antonis Kakas   | University of Cyprus, Cyprus       |
| Nicolas Maudet  | Université Paris Dauphine, France  |
| Peter McBurney  | University of Liverpool, UK        |
| Pavlos Moraitis | University of Cyprus, Cyprus       |
| Simon Parsons   | City University of New York, USA   |
| Iyad Rahwan     | University of Melbourne, Australia |
| Chris Reed      | University of Dundee, UK           |

## Program Committee

|                  |                                    |
|------------------|------------------------------------|
| Leila Amgoud     | IRIT, France                       |
| Frank Dignum     | Utrecht University, Netherlands    |
| Rogier van Eijk  | Utrecht University, Netherlands    |
| Antonis Kakas    | University of Cyprus, Cyprus       |
| Nicolas Maudet   | Université Paris Dauphine, France  |
| Peter McBurney   | University of Liverpool, UK        |
| Pavlos Moraitis  | University of Cyprus, Cyprus       |
| Xavier Parent    | King's College, London, UK         |
| Simon Parsons    | City University of New York, USA   |
| Henry Prakken    | Utrecht University, Netherlands    |
| Iyad Rahwan      | University of Melbourne, Australia |
| Chris Reed       | University of Dundee, UK           |
| Carles Sierra    | IIIA, Spain                        |
| Paolo Torroni    | Università di Bologna, Italy       |
| Bart Verheij     | Maastricht University, Netherlands |
| Gerard Vreeswijk | Utrecht University, Netherlands    |
| Mike Wooldridge  | University of Liverpool, UK        |



## **Auxiliary Referees**

Evelina Lamma

Paola Mello

# Table of Contents

## Part I: Foundations of Dialogues

Some Preliminary Steps Towards a Meta-theory for Formal Inter-agent Dialogues

*Simon Parsons, Peter McBurney, Michael Wooldridge* . . . . . 1

Towards a Formal and Implemented Model of Argumentation Schemes in Agent Communication

*Chris Reed, Doug Walton* . . . . . 19

Formal Dialectic Specification

*Simon Wells, Chris Reed* . . . . . 31

A Modal Semantics for an Argumentation-Based Pragmatics for Agent Communication

*Jamal Bentahar, Bernard Moulin, John-Jules Ch. Meyer, Brahim Chaib-draa* . . . . . 44

Layered Strategies and Protocols for Argumentation-Based Agent Interaction

*Antonis Kakas, Nicolas Maudet, Pavlos Moraitis* . . . . . 64

## Part II: Belief Revision

Revising Beliefs Through Arguments: Bridging the Gap Between Argumentation and Belief Revision in MAS

*Fabio Paglieri, Cristiano Castelfranchi* . . . . . 78

An Argument-Based Framework to Model an Agent's Beliefs in a Dynamic Environment

*Marcela Capobianco, Carlos I. Chesñevar, Guillermo R. Simari* . . . . . 95

Argumentation in Bayesian Belief Networks

*Gerard A. W. Vreeswijk* . . . . . 111

## Part III: Persuasion & Deliberation

Specifying and Implementing a Persuasion Dialogue Game Using Commitments and Arguments

*Jamal Bentahar, Bernard Moulin, Brahim Chaib-draa* . . . . . 130

|                                                                                |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| A Dialogue Game Protocol for Multi-agent Argument over Proposals<br>for Action |     |
| <i>Katie Atkinson, Trevor Bench-Capon, Peter McBurney</i> . . . . .            | 149 |

|                                                     |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----|
| A Denotational Semantics for Deliberation Dialogues |     |
| <i>Peter McBurney, Simon Parsons</i> . . . . .      | 162 |

## Part IV: Negotiation

|                                                                                    |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Bargaining and Argument-Based Negotiation: <i>Some Preliminary<br/>Comparisons</i> |     |
| <i>Iyad Rahwan, Liz Sonenberg, Peter McBurney</i> . . . . .                        | 176 |

|                                                                          |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| On the Generation of Bipolar Goals in Argumentation-Based<br>Negotiation |     |
| <i>Leila Amgoud, Souhila Kaci</i> . . . . .                              | 192 |

|                                                         |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| A Bayes Net Approach to Argumentation Based Negotiation |     |
| <i>Sabyasachi Saha, Sandip Sen</i> . . . . .            | 208 |

|                                                         |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Negotiation Among DDeLP Agents                          |     |
| <i>Fernando A. Tohmé, Guillermo R. Simari</i> . . . . . | 223 |

## Part V: Strategic Issues

|                                                               |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Is It Worth Arguing?                                          |     |
| <i>Nishan C. Karunatilake, Nicholas R. Jennings</i> . . . . . | 234 |

|                                                                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| When Is It Okay to Lie? A Simple Model of Contradiction in<br>Agent-Based Dialogues |     |
| <i>Elizabeth Sklar, Simon Parsons, Mathew Davies</i> . . . . .                      | 251 |

|                               |     |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Author Index</b> . . . . . | 263 |
|-------------------------------|-----|