

ABA Learning via ASP

Emanuele De Angelis

IASI-CNR
Rome, Italy
emanuele.deangelis@iasi.cnr.it
0000-0002-7319-8439

Maurizio Proietti

IASI-CNR
Rome, Italy
maurizio.proietti@iasi.cnr.it
0000-0003-3835-4931

Francesca Toni

Department of Computing
Imperial College London, UK
ft@ic.ac.uk
0000-0001-8194-1459

Recently, ABA Learning has been proposed as a form of symbolic machine learning for drawing Assumption-Based Argumentation frameworks from background knowledge and positive and negative examples. We propose a novel method for implementing ABA Learning using Answer Set Programming as a way to help guide Rote Learning and generalisation in ABA Learning.

1 Introduction

Recently, *ABA Learning* has been proposed [12] as a methodology for learning Assumption-Based Argumentation (ABA) frameworks [1, 2] from a background knowledge, in the form of an ABA framework, and positive and negative examples, in the form of sentences in the language of the background knowledge. The goal of ABA Learning is to build a larger ABA framework than the background knowledge from which arguments for all positive examples can be “accepted” and no arguments for any of the negative examples can be “accepted”. In this paper, for a specific form of ABA frameworks corresponding to logic programs [1], we focus on a specific form of “acceptance”, given by cautious (or sceptical) reasoning under the argumentation semantics of stable extensions [1, 2]. We then leverage on the well known correspondence between stable extensions in the logic programming instance of ABA and answer set programs [5] to outline a novel implementation strategy for the form of ABA Learning we consider, pointing out along the way restrictions on ABA Learning enabling the use of Answer Set Programming (ASP).

Related Work Our strategy for ABA Learning differs from other works learning argumentation frameworks, e.g. [3, 11], in that it learns a different type of argumentation frameworks and it uses ASP. ABA can be seen as performing abductive reasoning (as assumptions are hypotheses open for debate). Other approaches combine abductive and inductive learning [13], but they do not learn ABA frameworks. Some approaches learn abductive logic programs [6], which rely upon assumptions, like ABA frameworks. A formal comparison with these methods is left for future work. ABA captures several non-monotonic reasoning formalisms, thus ABA Learning is related to other methods learning non-monotonic formalisms. Some of these methods, e.g. [7, 14, 17], do not make use of ASP. Some others, e.g. [8, 15, 16], do. While our use of ASP to help guide some aspects of ABA Learning (e.g. its Rote Learning transformation rule) is unique, a formal and empirical comparison with these methods is left for future work.

2 Background

ASP In this paper we use *answer set programs* (ASPs) [5] consisting of rules of the form

$$p :- q_1, \dots, q_k, \text{not } q_{k+1}, \dots, \text{not } q_n \quad \text{or} \quad :- q_1, \dots, q_k, \text{not } q_{k+1}, \dots, \text{not } q_m$$

where $p, q_1, \dots, q_n, q_1, \dots, q_m$ are atoms, $k \geq 0, n \geq 0, m \geq 1$, and **not** denotes negation as failure.

Given any ASP program P , by $ans(P)$, called *answer set* of P , we denote the set of ground atoms assigned to P by the answer set semantics. Let $ans_1(P), \dots, ans_l(P)$ be the answer sets of P , for $l \geq 1$ (if $l = 0$, then P is *unsatisfiable*). By $\mathcal{C}(P) = \bigcap_i ans_i(P)$, we denote the set of *cautious* consequences of P .

ABA An *ABA framework* (as originally proposed in [1], but presented here following recent accounts in [4, 18] and [2]) is a tuple $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \bar{\cdot} \rangle$ such that

- $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \rangle$ is a deductive system, where \mathcal{L} is a *language* and \mathcal{R} is a set of (*inference*) *rules* of the form $s_0 \leftarrow s_1, \dots, s_m$ ($m \geq 0, s_i \in \mathcal{L}$, for $1 \leq i \leq m$);
- $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ is a (non-empty) set of *assumptions*;¹
- $\bar{\cdot}$ is a total mapping from \mathcal{A} into \mathcal{L} , where \bar{a} is the *contrary* of a , for $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

Given a rule $s_0 \leftarrow s_1, \dots, s_m$, s_0 is the *head* and s_1, \dots, s_m is the *body*; if $m = 0$ then the body is said to be *empty* (represented as $s_0 \leftarrow$ or $s_0 \leftarrow true$) and the rule is called a *fact*. If assumptions are not heads of rules then the ABA framework is called *flat*. In this paper we focus on flat ABA frameworks. Elements of \mathcal{L} can be any sentences, but in this paper we focus on (flat) ABA frameworks where \mathcal{L} is a set of ground atoms. However, in the spirit of logic programming, we will use *schemata* for rules, assumptions and contraries, using variables to represent compactly all instances over some underlying universe.

Example 1. *The following is a flat ABA framework with \mathcal{L} a set of atoms.*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R} &= \{ \text{innocent}(X) \leftarrow \text{person}(X), \text{not_guilty}(X), \text{guilty}(X) \leftarrow \text{witness_con}(X, Y), \\ &\quad \text{person}(\text{mary}) \leftarrow, \text{person}(\text{alex}) \leftarrow, \text{witness_con}(\text{mary}, \text{alex}) \leftarrow \} \\ \mathcal{L} &= \{ \text{innocent}(X), \text{person}(X), \text{not_guilty}(X), \text{guilty}(X), \text{witness_con}(X, Y) \mid X, Y \in \{ \text{mary}, \text{alex} \} \} \\ \mathcal{A} &= \{ \text{not_guilty}(\text{mary}) \} \quad \text{where} \quad \overline{\text{not_guilty}(\text{mary})} = \text{guilty}(\text{mary}). \end{aligned}$$

The semantics of flat ABA frameworks is given in terms of “acceptable” extensions, i.e. sets of *arguments* able to “defend” themselves against *attacks*, in some sense, as determined by the chosen semantics. Intuitively, arguments are deductions of claims using rules and supported by assumptions, and attacks are directed at the assumptions in the support of arguments. For illustration, in the case of Example 1, there are, amongst others, arguments $\{ \text{not_guilty}(\text{mary}) \} \vdash_{\{ \rho_1, \phi_1 \}} \text{innocent}(\text{mary})$ (with ρ_1 the first rule in \mathcal{R} and ϕ_1 the fact $\text{person}(\text{mary}) \leftarrow$ in \mathcal{R}) and $\emptyset \vdash_{\{ \rho_2, \phi_3 \}} \text{guilty}(\text{mary})$ (with ρ_2 the second rule in \mathcal{R} and ϕ_3 the fact $\text{witness_con}(\text{mary}, \text{alex}) \leftarrow$ in \mathcal{R}), with the latter argument attacking the former.

Given a flat ABA framework $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \bar{\cdot} \rangle$, let $Args$ be the set of all arguments and $Att = \{ (\alpha, \beta) \in Args \times Args \mid \alpha \text{ attacks } \beta \}$. Then, the notion of “acceptable” extensions we will focus on in this paper is as follows: $\Delta \subseteq Args$ is a *stable extension* iff (i) $\nexists \alpha, \beta \in \Delta$ such that $(\alpha, \beta) \in Att$ (i.e. Δ is *conflict-free*) and (ii) $\forall \beta \in Args \setminus \Delta, \exists \alpha \in \Delta$ such that $(\alpha, \beta) \in Att$ (i.e. Δ “attacks” all arguments it does not contain, thus pre-emptively “defending” itself against potential attacks). We will consider the *cautious* (a.k.a. *sceptical*) consequences of (flat) ABA frameworks $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \bar{\cdot} \rangle$, i.e. the sets of sentences in \mathcal{L} that are claims of arguments in all stable extensions for $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \bar{\cdot} \rangle$. The cautious consequences of the ABA framework in Example 1 include $\text{guilty}(\text{mary})$ and $\text{innocent}(\text{alex})$.

Here we will work with ABA frameworks admitting at least one stable extension. Also, without loss of generality, we will leave the language component of all ABA frameworks implicit, and use, e.g., $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \bar{\cdot} \rangle$ to stand for $\langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \bar{\cdot} \rangle$ where \mathcal{L} is the set of all sentences in \mathcal{R} , \mathcal{A} and in the range of $\bar{\cdot}$. We will also use $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \bar{\cdot} \rangle \models s$ to indicate that $s \in \mathcal{L}$ is a cautious consequence of $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \bar{\cdot} \rangle$.

¹The non-emptiness requirement can always be satisfied by including in \mathcal{A} a *bogus assumption*, with its own contrary, neither occurring elsewhere in the ABA framework. For conciseness, we will leave this assumption and its contrary implicit.

3 Preliminaries: Cautious ABA Learning under Stable Extensions

Here we recap the instance of the ABA Learning method proposed in [12] that we focus on implementing using ASP in this paper, while stating restrictions on ABA Learning required by the implementation.

In [12], the *background knowledge* is any ABA framework $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \overline{} \rangle$. Here, we assume that (i) it is restricted so that each assumptions occurs in the body of at most one rule schema in \mathcal{R} , (ii) for each non-ground $\alpha(X) \in \mathcal{A}$ in the body of any $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$, for X a tuple of variables, for each variable X' in X , there is at least one *non-assumption* (in $\mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{A}$) $p(Y)$ in the body of ρ with X' in Y , and (iii) each fact in \mathcal{R} is ground. Restriction (i) is without loss of generality; the other two derive from the use of schemata.

In [12], *positive/negative examples* are ground atoms of the form $p(c)$, for p a predicate with arity $n \geq 0$ and c a tuple of n constants. Here, we impose that examples are non-assumptions (in the background knowledge $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \overline{} \rangle$). So, for \mathcal{L} as in Example 1, *not_guilty* cannot appear in examples (but contraries, e.g. *guilty(mary)*, can be examples). The exclusion of assumptions from examples is derived from the flatness restriction. We also assume that for each example $p(c)$ and c' in c , $\exists q(d) \leftarrow \in \mathcal{R}$ such that c' is in d . We impose the same restriction on constants c' anywhere in the background knowledge.

Given background knowledge $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \overline{} \rangle$, positive examples \mathcal{E}^+ and negative examples \mathcal{E}^- with $\mathcal{E}^+ \cap \mathcal{E}^- = \emptyset$, the *goal of ABA Learning* is to construct (a flat ABA framework) $\langle \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{A}', \overline{} \rangle$ such that $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{R}'$, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}'$, and $\overline{\alpha} = \overline{\alpha}$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, so that $\langle \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{A}', \overline{} \rangle$ entails $\langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle$, that is:

(Existence) $\langle \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{A}', \overline{} \rangle$ admits at least one stable extension,

(Completeness) for all $e \in \mathcal{E}^+$, $\langle \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{A}', \overline{} \rangle \models e$, and

(Consistency) for all $e \in \mathcal{E}^-$, $\langle \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{A}', \overline{} \rangle \not\models e$.

$\langle \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{A}', \overline{} \rangle$ is called a *solution* of the ABA Learning problem $(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \overline{} \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle)$. The second condition implies, when $\mathcal{E}^+ \neq \emptyset$, that the set of cautious consequences of a solution is non-empty.

In this paper we strive towards what we may call *intensional solutions*, namely such that $\mathcal{R}' \setminus \mathcal{R}$ comprises of *intentional rules* (i.e. non-ground rule schemata), to avoid or limit “lazy” learning of facts covering the positive examples alone and none of the negative examples, leading to poor generalisation.

Example 2. Consider the background knowledge:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R} = & \{ \text{innocent}(X) \leftarrow \text{defendant}(X), \text{not_guilty}(X), \\ & \text{witness_con}(\text{mary}, \text{alex}) \leftarrow, \text{witness_con}(\text{david}, \text{carol}) \leftarrow, \text{witness_con}(\text{john}, \text{carol}) \leftarrow, \\ & \text{defendant}(\text{mary}) \leftarrow, \text{defendant}(\text{david}) \leftarrow, \text{defendant}(\text{john}) \leftarrow, \text{liar}(\text{alex}) \leftarrow, \text{away}(\text{bob}) \leftarrow, \\ & \text{person}(\text{alex}) \leftarrow, \text{person}(\text{bob}) \leftarrow, \text{person}(\text{carol}) \leftarrow, \\ & \text{person}(\text{mary}) \leftarrow, \text{person}(\text{david}) \leftarrow, \text{person}(\text{john}) \leftarrow \} \\ \mathcal{A} = & \{ \text{not_guilty}(X) \mid X \in \{ \text{mary}, \text{david}, \text{john} \} \} \quad \text{where} \quad \overline{\text{not_guilty}(X)} = \text{guilty}(X) \end{aligned}$$

and examples $\mathcal{E}^+ = \{ \text{innocent}(\text{mary}), \text{innocent}(\text{bob}) \}$, $\mathcal{E}^- = \{ \text{innocent}(\text{david}), \text{innocent}(\text{john}) \}$. Then, solutions of $(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \overline{} \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle)$ include ABA frameworks with \mathcal{R}'_1 and \mathcal{R}'_2 whereby

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}'_1 \setminus \mathcal{R} = & \{ \text{innocent}(\text{bob}) \leftarrow, \text{guilty}(\text{david}) \leftarrow, \text{guilty}(\text{john}) \leftarrow \} \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{R}'_2 \setminus \mathcal{R} = & \{ \text{innocent}(X) \leftarrow \text{away}(X), \text{guilty}(X) \leftarrow \text{witness_con}(X, Y), \text{person}(Y), a(X, Y), \\ & c_a(X, Y) \leftarrow \text{defendant}(X), \text{liar}(Y) \}. \end{aligned}$$

The latter can be deemed to be *intensional*, whereas the former is not.

In the remainder, as in [12], we will represent ground facts $p(t) \leftarrow$ as $p(X) \leftarrow X = t$. We will also use $\text{vars}(A)$ to denote the set of all variables occurring in assumption, rule or rule body A .

4 Learning ABA Frameworks via Transformation Rules and ASP Solving

In order to learn ABA frameworks from examples, we follow the approach based on *transformation rules* presented in [12], but only consider a subset of those rules: *Rote Learning*, *Folding*, *Assumption Introduction*, and (a special case of) *Subsumption* (thus ignoring *Equality Removal*). Some rules (Folding and Subsumption) are borrowed from logic program transformation [10], while others (Rote Learning and Assumption Introduction) are specific for ABA. Given an ABA framework $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle$, a transformation rule constructs a new ABA framework $\langle \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{A}', \neg \rangle$ (in the remainder, we will mention explicitly only the modified components). The application of the transformation rules is guided by the *ASP-ABALearn* strategy (see Figure 1), a variant of the strategy in [12] amenable to be implemented via an ASP solver, towards the goal of deriving an intensional solution of the given ABA Learning problem.

Strategy ASP-ABALearn. Input: An ABA Learning problem $(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle)$;
 $RoLe(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle)$; $GEN(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle)$.

Procedure $RoLe(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle)$.

$P := ASP^*(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle, \mathcal{A})$;

if P is unsatisfiable **then** fail;

for all $c_a(t) \in \mathcal{C}(P) \setminus \mathcal{C}(ASP(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle))$, where $c_a(t) = \overline{\alpha(t)}$ for some $\alpha(t) \in \mathcal{A}$ **do**

 apply *Rote Learning* and get $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{R} \cup \{c_a(X) \leftarrow X = t\}$;

for all $p(u) \in \mathcal{E}^+$ such that $p(u) \notin \mathcal{C}(ASP(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle))$ **do**

 apply *Rote Learning* and get $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{R} \cup \{p(X) \leftarrow X = u\}$;

if $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle$ does not entail $\langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle$ **then** fail;

Procedure $GEN(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle)$.

while there exists a non-intensional rule $\rho_1 \in \mathcal{R}_{learn}$ **do**

// Folding:

$\rho_2 := fold_all(\rho_1)$; $\mathcal{R} := (\mathcal{R} \setminus \{\rho_1\}) \cup \{\rho_2\}$;

// Assumption Introduction:

if $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle$ does not entail $\langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle$ **then**

 let ρ_2 be of the form $H \leftarrow B$; apply *Assumption Introduction* and get $\rho_3: H \leftarrow B, \alpha(X)$

 where α is a new predicate symbol and $X = vars(H \leftarrow B)$;

$\mathcal{R} := (\mathcal{R} \setminus \{\rho_2\}) \cup \{\rho_3\}$; $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A} \cup \{\alpha(X)\}$, with: $\overline{\alpha(X)} = c_a(X)$;

// Rote Learning:

for all $c_a(t) \in \mathcal{C}(ASP^+(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle, \{\alpha(X)\}))$ **do**

 apply *Rote Learning* and get $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{R} \cup \{c_a(X) \leftarrow X = t\}$;

if $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle$ does not entail $\langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle$ **then** fail;

// Subsumption:

for all $\rho: p(X) \leftarrow X = t \in \mathcal{R}_{learn}$ **do**

if $p(t) \in \mathcal{C}(ASP(\langle \mathcal{R} \setminus \{\rho\}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle))$ **then** apply *Subsumption* and delete ρ : $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{R} \setminus \{\rho\}$.

Figure 1: *ASP-ABALearn* strategy. By \mathcal{R}_{learn} we denote the subset of the rules in \mathcal{R} that do not belong to the original background knowledge. The function *fold-all*, given a non-intensional rule ρ_1 , returns an intensional rule ρ_2 obtained by applying once or more times the Folding rule to ρ_1 using rules in \mathcal{R} .

-
- (a) Each rule in \mathcal{R} is rewritten in the ASP syntax (e.g. $innocent(X) \leftarrow defendant(X), not_guilty(X)$ in Ex. 2 becomes $innocent(X) :- defendant(X), not_guilty(X)$). In the following, we use the teletype font for the ASP translation of the rules.
- (b.1) Each $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{A}$ occurring in the body of $H \leftarrow B, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathcal{R}$ is encoded as the following ASP rule, where $c_ \alpha_i$ is an ASP atom encoding $\overline{\alpha_i}$, and $vars(\alpha_i) \subseteq X$:
- $$\alpha_i :- dom(X), not\ c_ \alpha_i.$$
- (b.2) Each $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{K}$ occurring in the body of $H \leftarrow B, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathcal{R}$ is encoded as the following pair of ASP rules:
- $$c_ \alpha_i :- dom(X), not\ \alpha_i. \quad :- \alpha_i, c_ \alpha_i.$$
- (c) Each $e \in \mathcal{E}^+$ is encoded as the ASP rule $:- not\ e$.
- (d) Each $e \in \mathcal{E}^-$ is encoded as the ASP rule $:- e$.
- (e) Each atom $p(X) \in \mathcal{E}^+ \cup \mathcal{E}^-$ such that $p(X)$ is not the contrary of any assumption in \mathcal{A} is additionally encoded as the following triple of ASP rules, where neg_p is a new predicate name:
- $$p(X) :- dom(X), not\ neg_p(X). \quad neg_p(X) :- dom(X), not\ p(X). \quad :- p(X), neg_p(X).$$

Figure 2: ASP-encodings for a given ABA Learning problem $(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle)$ and a set $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ of assumptions. Here, dom is chosen so that $dom(X)$ holds for all X encoding tuples of constants of \mathcal{L} . Note that, without loss of generality, in (b.1)-(b.2) we can assume $vars(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \subseteq vars(B)$. So, we could replace $dom(X)$ by any subset of B that contains all variables of α_i and dom may already occur in $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle$ (this is an optimisation, as fewer ground instances of the rule may be given by the ASP solver). Also, in (e) dom may already occur in $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle$.

The *ASP-ABALearn* strategy is the composition of two procedures: (1) *RoLe*, which has the goal of adding suitable facts to the initial background knowledge $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle$ so that the new ABA framework $\langle \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{A}', \neg' \rangle$ is a (non-intensional) solution of the learning problem $(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle)$ given in input, and (2) *GEN*, which has the objective of transforming $\langle \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{A}', \neg' \rangle$ into an intensional solution. In general, it is not obvious which fact should be added to \mathcal{R} in *RoLe* and how to generalise a non-intensional solution to obtain an intentional one in *GEN*. For these purposes, we use various encodings into ASP defined in Fig.2 to obtain the following sets of ASP rules:

- The set of ASP rules at points (a) and (b.1) of Fig. 2 is denoted by $ASP(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle)$. For a claim $s \in \mathcal{L}$, we can check that $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle \models s$ (i.e., s is a cautious consequence of $\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle$ under stable extensions) by checking that $s \in \mathcal{C}(ASP(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle))$.
- The set of ASP rules at points (a)–(d) is denoted $ASP^+(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle, \mathcal{K})$. By computing $\mathcal{C}(ASP^+(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle, \mathcal{K}))$ we generate facts, if at all possible, for contraries of assumptions in \mathcal{K} that, when added to \mathcal{R} , enable the entailment of the examples in $\langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle$.
- The set of ASP rules at points (a)–(e) is denoted $ASP^*(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle, \mathcal{K})$. It can be used similarly to $ASP^+(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle, \mathcal{K})$, but also generates facts for positive examples that cannot be obtained by $ASP^+(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle, \mathcal{K})$.

The *RoLe* procedure repeatedly applies Rote Learning, which adds a fact $\rho : p(X) \leftarrow X = t$, where t is a tuple of constants, to \mathcal{R} (thus, $\mathcal{R}' = \mathcal{R} \cup \{\rho\}$). We illustrate with the *innocent* running example.

Example 3. Let us consider the learning problem $(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle)$ of Example 2. In this case, $ASP^*(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle, \mathcal{A})$ consists of \mathcal{R} rewritten in ASP syntax and of the following ASP rules:

```

not_guilty(X) :- person(X), not guilty(X).           :- not innocent(mary).
guilty(X) :- person(X), not not_guilty(X).           :- not innocent(bob).
:- not_guilty(X), guilty(X).                         :- innocent(john).
innocent(X) :- person(X), not neg_innocent(X).       :- innocent(david).
neg_innocent(X) :- person(X), not innocent(X).
:- innocent(X), neg_innocent(X).

```

In this example, $\mathcal{C}(ASP^*(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle, \mathcal{A})) \setminus \mathcal{C}(ASP(\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle))$ includes `innocent(bob)`, `guilty(david)`, `guilty(john)`, and by Rote Learning, we obtain:

$$\mathcal{R}_1 = \mathcal{R} \cup \{ \text{innocent}(X) \leftarrow X = \text{bob}, \text{guilty}(X) \leftarrow X = \text{david}, \text{guilty}(X) \leftarrow X = \text{john} \}$$

$\langle \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle$ is a (non-intensional, due to the added ground facts) solution of our ABA Learning problem.

Now, the ASP-ABALearn learning strategy proceeds by applying the GEN procedure, for transforming a non-intensional rule into an intensional one. First, GEN applies (once or more times) Folding, which, given rules $\rho_1: H \leftarrow Eqs_1, B_1, B_2$ and $\rho_2: K \leftarrow Eqs_1, Eqs_2, B_1$ in \mathcal{R} , replaces ρ_1 by $\rho_3: H \leftarrow Eqs_2, K, B_2$ (hence, $\mathcal{R}' = (\mathcal{R} \setminus \{\rho_1\}) \cup \{\rho_3\}$). Folding is a form of *inverse resolution* [9], which generalises a rule by replacing some atoms in its body with their ‘consequence’ using a rule in \mathcal{R} .

Example 4. By applying Folding to `innocent(X) ← X = bob` and `guilty(X) ← X = david`, using `away(X) ← X = bob`, `witness_con(X, Y) ← X = david`, `Y = carol`, and `person(Y) ← Y = carol` in \mathcal{R}_1 , we get:

$$\mathcal{R}_2 = \mathcal{R} \cup \{ \text{innocent}(X) \leftarrow \text{away}(X), \text{guilty}(X) \leftarrow \text{witness_con}(X, Y), \text{person}(Y), \\ \text{guilty}(X) \leftarrow X = \text{john} \}.$$

The ABA framework $\langle \mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle$, though, is not a solution, as it does no longer entail `innocent(mary)`.

If the effect of Folding a rule is that the resulting ABA framework is no longer a solution of the given learning problem, GEN applies Assumption Introduction and Rote Learning with the goal of deriving a new ABA framework which is again a (non-intensional) solution. Assumption Introduction replaces a rule $\rho_1: H \leftarrow B$ in \mathcal{R} by $\rho_2: H \leftarrow B, \alpha(X)$, where $X = \text{vars}(H) \cup \text{vars}(B)$ and $\alpha(X)$ is a new assumption with contrary $c\text{-}\alpha(X)$ (thus, $\mathcal{R}' = (\mathcal{R} \setminus \{\rho_1\}) \cup \{\rho_2\}$, $\mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A} \cup \{\alpha(X)\}$, $\overline{\alpha(X)}' = c\text{-}\alpha(X)$, and $\overline{\beta}' = \overline{\beta}$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$). New facts for $c\text{-}\alpha(X)$ are learnt by Rote Learning by using $ASP^+(\langle \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{A}', \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle, \{\alpha(X)\})$. The facts for $c\text{-}\alpha(X)$ can be seen as the *exceptions* to the *defeasible* rule ρ_2 .

Example 5. By Assumption Introduction, we get:

$$\mathcal{R}_3 = \mathcal{R} \cup \{ \text{innocent}(X) \leftarrow \text{away}(X), \text{guilty}(X) \leftarrow \text{witness_con}(X, Y), \text{person}(Y), a(X, Y), \\ \text{guilty}(X) \leftarrow X = \text{john} \}$$

with $\mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A} \cup \{ a(X, Y) \mid X, Y \in \{ \text{alex}, \text{bob}, \text{carol}, \text{david}, \text{john}, \text{mary} \} \}$ and $\overline{a(X, Y)}' = c\text{-}a(X, Y)$. To determine the facts for $c\text{-}a(X, Y)$, we use $ASP^+(\langle \mathcal{R}_3, \mathcal{A}', \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle, \{ a(X, Y) \})$ (we omit the encoding of the background knowledge \mathcal{R}):

```

innocent(X) :- away(X).                               :- not innocent(mary).
guilty(X) :- X=john.                                  :- not innocent(bob).
guilty(X) :- witness_con(X, Y), person(Y), alpha1(X, Y). :- innocent(david).
alpha1(X, Y) :- witness_con(X, Y), not c_alpha1(X, Y).  :- innocent(john).
c_alpha1(X, Y) :- witness_con(X, Y), not alpha1(X, Y).
:- alpha1(X, Y), c_alpha1(X, Y).

```

$\mathcal{C}(ASP^+(\langle \mathcal{R}_3, \mathcal{A}, \neg \rangle, \langle \mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^- \rangle, \{a(X, Y)\}))$ contains the atom `c_alpha1(mary, alex)` and thus, by Rote Learning, we obtain again a (non-intensional) solution, by adding a fact for predicate `c_a(X, Y)`:

$$\mathcal{R}_4 = \mathcal{R}_3 \cup \{c_a(X, Y) \leftarrow X = mary, Y = alex\}$$

GEN proceeds by applying the Subsumption rule, which gets rid of redundant facts. Indeed, suppose that \mathcal{R} contains $\rho : p(X) \leftarrow X = t$ and let $\mathcal{R}' = \mathcal{R} \setminus \{\rho\}$. If $\langle \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{A}', \neg' \rangle \models p(t)$, then, by Subsumption, ρ can be deleted from \mathcal{R} . Subsumption is applicable if $p(t) \in \mathcal{C}(ASP(\langle \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{A}', \neg' \rangle))$.

Example 6. The rule $\rho = guilty(X) \leftarrow X = john$ can be deleted, as $guilty(john) \in \mathcal{C}(ASP(\langle \mathcal{R}_4 \setminus \{\rho\} \rangle))$.

ASP-ABALearn halts when *GEN* generates no new contrary, as Folding yields an intensional solution.

Example 7. By two final applications of the Folding rule, *GEN* gets:

$$\mathcal{R}_5 = \mathcal{R} \cup \{innocent(X) \leftarrow away(X), \quad guilty(X) \leftarrow witness_con(X, Y), person(Y), a(X, Y), \\ c_a(X, Y) \leftarrow defendant(X), liar(Y)\}$$

Now, $\langle \mathcal{R}_5, \mathcal{A}', \neg' \rangle$ is an intensional solution of the given learning problem.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

We have revisited a strategy recently proposed for learning ABA frameworks based on transformation rules [12], and we have shown that, in the case of the stable extension semantics, many of the reasoning tasks used by that strategy can be implemented through an ASP solver.

A proof-of-concept implementation of our *ASP-ABALearn* strategy is ongoing using SWI-Prolog (v. 9.0.4) and the Clingo ASP solver (v. 5.6.2). It consists of two Prolog modules implementing *RoLe* and *GEN* and two further modules implementing (i) the *ASP*, *ASP⁺*, and *ASP** encodings, and (ii) the API to invoke Clingo from SWI-Prolog and collect the cautious consequences to be used by *RoLe* and *GEN*. The most critical issue for implementing *GEN* is that the application of Folding is non-deterministic, as there may be different choices for the rules to be used for applying that transformation. Currently, we simply make use of a bound to limit the number of alternatives. The design of more sophisticated mechanisms to control Folding, e.g., based on the notion of *information gain*[17], is left as future work.

In addition to refining the implementation, we also plan to perform an experimental comparison to non-monotonic ILP systems (such as Fold [17] and ILASP [8]). On the theoretical side, further work is needed to investigate conditions under which *ASP-ABALearn* is complete, in the sense that it terminates and finds a solution if it exists. A simple way of guaranteeing termination is based on a mechanism for avoiding the generation of contraries that are “equivalent” to previously generated ones. However, the solution obtained in this way is not guaranteed to be intensional.

Acknowledgments

We thank support from the Royal Society, UK (IEC\R2\222045 - International Exchanges 2022). De Angelis and Proietti are members of the INDAM-GNCS research group; they were partially supported by the PNRR MUR project PE0000013-FAIR, Italy. Toni was partially funded by the ERC under the EU’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 101020934) and by J.P. Morgan and the Royal Academy of Engineering, UK, under the Research Chairs and Senior Research Fellowships scheme.

References

- [1] A. Bondarenko, P.M. Dung, R.A. Kowalski & F. Toni (1997): *An Abstract, Argumentation-Theoretic Approach to Default Reasoning*. *Artif. Intell.* 93, pp. 63–101, doi:10.1016/S0004-3702(97)00015-5.
- [2] K. Cyras, X. Fan, C. Schulz & F. Toni (2017): *Assumption-based Argumentation: Disputes, Explanations, Preferences*. *FLAP* 4(8).
- [3] Y. Dimopoulos & A. C. Kakas (1995): *Learning Non-Monotonic Logic Programs: Learning Exceptions*. In: *ECML 1995*, pp. 122–137, doi:10.1007/3-540-59286-5_53.
- [4] P.M. Dung, R.A. Kowalski & F. Toni (2009): *Assumption-Based Argumentation*. In: *Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence*, Springer, pp. 199–218, doi:10.1007/978-0-387-98197-0_10.
- [5] M. Gelfond & V. Lifschitz (1991): *Classical negation in logic programs and disjunctive databases*. *New Generation Computing* 9, pp. 365–385, doi:10.1007/BF03037169.
- [6] K. Inoue & H. Haneda (2000): *Learning Abductive and Nonmonotonic Logic Programs*. In: *Abduction and Induction: Essays on their Relation and Integration*, Kluwer Academic, pp. 213–231, doi:10.1007/978-94-017-0606-3_14.
- [7] K. Inoue & Y. Kudoh (1997): *Learning Extended Logic Programs*. In: *IJCAI*, Morgan Kaufmann, pp. 176–181.
- [8] M. Law, A. Russo & K. Broda (2014): *Inductive Learning of Answer Set Programs*. In: *JELIA 2014*, LNCS 8761, pp. 311–325, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-11558-0_22.
- [9] S. Muggleton (1995): *Inverse entailment and Progol*. *New generation computing* 13(3-4), pp. 245–286, doi:10.1007/BF03037227.
- [10] A. Pettorossi & M. Proietti (1994): *Transformation of Logic Programs: Foundations and Techniques*. *J. Log. Program.* 19/20, pp. 261–320, doi:10.1016/0743-1066(94)90028-0.
- [11] N. Prentzas, A. Gavrieliidou, M. Neofytou & A. C. Kakas (2022): *Argumentation-based Explainable Machine Learning (ArgEML): A Real-life Use Case on Gynecological Cancer*. In: *ArgML 2022*, CEUR Workshop Proceedings, 3208, pp. 1–13.
- [12] M. Proietti & F. Toni (2023): *Learning Assumption-based Argumentation Frameworks*. *CoRR*, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2305.15921. To appear in Proc. ILP '22, LNCS, Springer.
- [13] O. Ray (2009): *Nonmonotonic abductive inductive learning*. *J. Appl. Log.* 7(3), pp. 329–340, doi:10.1016/j.jal.2008.10.007.
- [14] C. Sakama (2000): *Inverse Entailment in Nonmonotonic Logic Programs*. In: *Proc. ILP 2000*, doi:10.1007/3-540-44960-4_13.
- [15] C. Sakama (2005): *Induction from answer sets in nonmonotonic logic programs*. *ACM TOCL* 6(2), pp. 203–231, doi:10.1145/1055686.1055687.
- [16] C. Sakama & K. Inoue (2009): *Brave induction: A logical framework for learning from incomplete information*. *Mach. Learn.* 76(1), pp. 3–35, doi:10.1007/s10994-009-5113-y.
- [17] F. Shakerin, E. Salazar & G. Gupta (2017): *A new algorithm to automate inductive learning of default theories*. *TPLP* 17(5-6), pp. 1010–1026, doi:10.1017/S1471068417000333.
- [18] F. Toni (2014): *A tutorial on Assumption-based Argumentation*. *Argument & Computation* 5(1), pp. 89–117, doi:10.1080/19462166.2013.869878.