Compact Argumentation Frameworks[*]

Ringo Baumann and **Hannes Strass**
Leipzig University, Germany

Wolfgang Dvořák
University of Vienna, Austria

Thomas Linsbichler and **Stefan Woltran**
Vienna University of Technology, Austria

Abstract

Abstract argumentation frameworks (AFs) are one of the most studied formalisms in AI. In this work, we introduce a certain subclass of AFs which we call compact. Given an extension-based semantics, the corresponding compact AFs are characterized by the feature that each argument of the AF occurs in at least one extension. This not only guarantees a certain notion of fairness; compact AFs are thus also minimal in the sense that no argument can be removed without changing the outcome. We address the following questions in the paper: (1) How are the classes of compact AFs related for different semantics? (2) Under which circumstances can AFs be transformed into equivalent compact ones? (3) Finally, we show that compact AFs are indeed a non-trivial subclass, since the verification problem remains coNP-hard for certain semantics.

1 Introduction

In recent years, *argumentation* has become a major concept in AI research (Bench-Capon and Dunne 2007; Rahwan and Simari 2009). In particular, Dung's well-studied *abstract argumentation frameworks* (AFs) (Dung 1995) are a simple, yet powerful formalism for modeling and deciding argumentation problems. Over the years, various *semantics* have been proposed, which may yield different results (so called *extensions*) when evaluating an AF (Dung 1995; Verheij 1996; Caminada, Carnielli, and Dunne 2012; Baroni, Caminada, and Giacomin 2011). Also, some subclasses of AFs such as acyclic, symmetric, odd-cycle-free or bipartite AFs, have been considered, where for some of these classes different semantics collapse (Coste-Marquis, Devred, and Marquis 2005; Dunne 2007).

In this work we introduce a further class, which to the best of our knowledge has not received attention in the literature, albeit the idea is simple. We will call an AF *compact* (with respect to a semantics σ), if each of its arguments appears in at least one extension under σ. Thus, compact AFs yield a "semantic" subclass since its definition is based on the notion of extensions. Another example of such a semantic subclass are coherent AFs (Dunne and Bench-Capon 2002); there are further examples in (Baroni and Giacomin 2008; Dvořák et al. 2014).

Importance of compact AFs mainly stems from the following two aspects. First, compact AFs possess a certain fairness behavior in the sense that each argument has the chance to be accepted. This might be a desired feature in some of the application areas such as decision support (Amgoud, Dimopoulos, and Moraitis 2008), where AFs are employed for a comparative evaluation of different options. Given that each argument appears in some extension ensures that the model is well-formed in the sense that it does not contain impossible options. The second and more concrete aspect is the issue of normal-forms of AFs. Indeed, compact AFs are attractive for such a normal-form, since none of the arguments can be removed without changing the extensions.

Following this idea we are interested in the question whether an arbitrary AF can be transformed into a compact AF without changing the outcome under the considered semantics. It is rather easy to see that under the *naive* semantics, which is defined as maximal conflict-free sets, any AF can be transformed into an equivalent compact AF. However, as has already been observed by Dunne et al. (2013), this is not true for other semantics. As an example consider the following AF F_1, where nodes represent arguments and directed edges represent attacks.

The *stable* extensions (conflict-free sets attacking all other arguments) of F_1 are $\{a, b, c\}$, $\{a, b', c'\}$, $\{a', b, c'\}$, $\{a', b', c\}$, $\{a, b, c'\}$, $\{a', b, c\}$, and $\{a, b', c\}$. It was shown in (Dunne et al. 2013) that there is no compact AF (in this case an F_1' not using argument x) which yields the same stable extensions as F_1. By the necessity of conflict-freeness any such compact AF would only allow conflicts between arguments a and a', b and b', and c and c', respectively. Moreover, there must be attacks in both directions for each of these conflicts in order to ensure stability. Hence any compact AF having the same stable extensions as F_1 necessarily yields $\{a', b', c'\}$ in addition. As we will see, all semantics under consideration share certain criteria which guarantee impossibility of a translation to a compact AF.

Like other subclasses, compact AFs decrease complexity of certain decision problems. This is obvious by the defini-

tion for credulous acceptance (does an argument occur in at least one extension). For skeptical acceptance (does an argument a occur in all extensions) in compact AFs this problem reduces to checking whether a is isolated. If yes, it is skeptically accepted; if no, a is connected to at least one further argument which has to be credulously accepted by the definition of compact AFs. But then, it is the case for any semantics which is based on conflict-free sets that a cannot be skeptically accepted, since it will not appear together with b in an extension. However, as we will see, the problem of verification (does a given set of arguments form an extension) remains coNP-hard for certain semantics, hence enumerating all extensions of an AF remains non-trivial.

An exact characterization of the collection of all sets of extensions which can be achieved by a compact AF under a given semantics σ seems rather challenging. We illustrate this on the example of stable semantics. Interestingly, we can provide an exact characterization under the condition that a certain conjecture holds: Given an AF F and two arguments which do not appear jointly in an extension of F, one can always add an attack between these two arguments (and potentially adapt other attacks in the AF) without changing the stable extensions. This conjecture is important for our work, but also an interesting question in and of itself.

To summarize, the main contributions of our work are:

- We define the classes of compact AFs for some of the most prominent semantics (namely naive, stable, stage, semistable and preferred) and provide a full picture of the relations between these classes. Then we show that the verification problem is still intractable for stage, semi-stable and preferred semantics.

- Moreover we use and extend recent results on maximal numbers of extensions (Baumann and Strass 2014) to give some impossibility-results for *compact realizability*. That is, we provide conditions under which for an AF with a certain number of extensions no translation to an equivalent (in terms of extensions) compact AF exists.

- Finally, we study *signatures* (Dunne et al. 2014) for compact AFs exemplified on the stable semantics. An exact characterization relies on the open explicit-conflict conjecture mentioned above. However, we give some sufficient conditions for an extension-set to be expressed as a stable-compact AF. For example, it holds that any AF with at most three stable extensions possesses an equivalent compact AF.

2 Preliminaries

In what follows, we recall the necessary background on abstract argumentation. For an excellent overview, we refer to (Baroni, Caminada, and Giacomin 2011).

Throughout the paper we assume a countably infinite domain $\mathfrak{A}$ of arguments. An *argumentation framework* (AF) is a pair $F = (A, R)$ where $A \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ is a non-empty, finite set of arguments and $R \subseteq A \times A$ is the attack relation. The collection of all AFs is given as $AF_{\mathfrak{A}}$. For an AF $F = (B, S)$ we use A_F and R_F to refer to B and S, respectively. We write $a \mapsto_F b$ for $(a, b) \in R_F$ and $S \mapsto_F a$ (resp. $a \mapsto_F S$)

if $\exists s \in S$ such that $s \mapsto_F a$ (resp. $a \mapsto_F s$). For $S \subseteq A$, the *range* of S (wrt. F), denoted S_F^+, is the set $S \cup \{b \mid S \mapsto_F b\}$.

Given $F = (A, R)$, an argument $a \in A$ is *defended* (in F) by $S \subseteq A$ if for each $b \in A$, such that $b \mapsto_F a$, also $S \mapsto_F b$. A set T of arguments is defended (in F) by S if each $a \in T$ is defended by S (in F). A set $S \subseteq A$ is *conflict-free* (in F), if there are no arguments $a, b \in S$, such that $(a, b) \in R$. $cf(F)$ denotes the set of all conflict-free sets in F. $S \in cf(F)$ is called *admissible* (in F) if S defends itself. $adm(F)$ denotes the set of admissible sets in F.

The semantics we study in this work are the naive, stable, preferred, stage, and semi-stable extensions. Given $F = (A, R)$ they are defined as subsets of $cf(F)$ as follows:

- $S \in naive(F)$, if there is no $T \in cf(F)$ with $T \supset S$

- $S \in stb(F)$, if $S \mapsto_F a$ for all $a \in A \setminus S$

- $S \in pref(F)$, if $S \in adm(F)$ and $\nexists T \in adm(F)$ s.t. $T \supset S$

- $S \in stage(F)$, if $\nexists T \in cf(F)$ with $T_F^+ \supset S_F^+$

- $S \in sem(F)$, if $S \in adm(F)$ and $\nexists T \in adm(F)$ s.t. $T_F^+ \supset S_F^+$

We will make frequent use of the following concepts.

Definition 1. Given $\mathbb{S} \subseteq 2^{\mathfrak{A}}$, $Arg_{\mathbb{S}}$ denotes $\bigcup_{S \in \mathbb{S}} S$ and $Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}$ denotes $\{(a, b) \mid \exists S \in \mathbb{S} : \{a, b\} \subseteq S\}$. $\mathbb{S}$ is called an *extension-set* (over $\mathfrak{A}$) if $Arg_{\mathbb{S}}$ is finite.

As is easily observed, for all considered semantics σ, $\sigma(F)$ is an extension-set for any AF F.

3 Compact Argumentation Frameworks

Definition 2. Given a semantics σ the set of *compact argumentation frameworks* under σ is defined as $CAF_{\sigma} = \{F \in AF_{\mathfrak{A}} \mid Arg_{\sigma(F)} = A_F\}$. We call an AF $F \in CAF_{\sigma}$ just σ-compact.

Of course the contents of CAF_{σ} differ with respect to the semantics σ. Concerning relations between the classes of compact AFs note that if for two semantics σ and θ it holds that $\sigma(F) \subseteq \theta(F)$ for any AF F, then also $CAF_{\sigma} \subseteq CAF_{\theta}$. Our first important result provides a full picture of the relations between classes of compact AFs under the semantics we consider.

Proposition 1. *1. $CAF_{sem} \subset CAF_{pref}$;*

2. $CAF_{stb} \subset CAF_{\sigma} \subset CAF_{naive}$ for $\sigma \in \{pref, sem, stage\}$;

3. $CAF_{\theta} \not\subseteq CAF_{stage}$ and $CAF_{stage} \not\subseteq CAF_{\theta}$ for $\theta \in \{pref, sem\}$.

Proof. (1) $CAF_{sem} \subseteq CAF_{pref}$ is by the fact that, in any AF F, $sem(F) \subseteq pref(F)$. Properness follows from the AF F' in Figure 1 (including the dotted part)[1]. Here $pref(F') = \{\{z\}, \{x_1, a_1\}, \{x_2, a_2\}, \{x_3, a_3\}, \{y_1, b_1\}, \{y_2, b_2\}, \{y_3, b_3\}\}$, but $sem(F') = (pref(F') \setminus \{\{z\}\})$, hence $F' \in CAF_{pref}$, but $F' \notin CAF_{sem}$.
(2) Let $\sigma \in \{pref, sem, stage\}$. The $\subseteq$-relations follow from the fact that, in any AF F, $stb(F) \subseteq \sigma(F)$ and each σ-extension is, by being conflict-free, part of some naive extension. The AF $(\{a, b\}, \{(a, b)\})$, which is compact under

---

[1] The construct in the lower part of the figure represents symmetric attacks between each pair of arguments.

Figure 1: AFs illustrating the relations between various semantics.

naive but not under σ, and AF F from Figure 1 (now without the dotted part), which is compact under σ but not under stable, show that the relations are proper.

(3) The fact that F' from Figure 1 (again including the dotted part) is also not *stage*-compact shows $CAF_{pref} \nsubseteq CAF_{stage}$. Likewise, the AF G depicted below is *sem*-compact, but not *stage*-compact.

The reason for this is that argument a does not occur in any stage extension. Although $\{a, u_1, x_5\}$, $\{a, u_2, x_6\}$, $\{a, u_3, x_7\} \in sem(G)$, the range of any conflict-free set containing a is a proper subset of the range of every stable extension of G. $stage(G) = \{\{c, u_i, x_4\} \mid i \in \{1, 2, 3\}\} \cup \{\{b, u_i, s_j, x_{i+4}\} \mid i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}\} \cup \{\{t_i, u_j, s_i, x_i\} \mid i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}\}$. Hence $CAF_{sem} \nsubseteq CAF_{stage}$.
Finally, the AF $(\{a, b, c\}, \{(a, b), (b, c), (c, a)\})$ shows $CAF_{stage} \nsubseteq CAF_\theta$ for $\theta \in \{pref, sem\}$. □

Considering compact AFs obviously has effects on the computational complexity of reasoning. While credulous and skeptical acceptance are now easy (as discussed in the introduction) the next theorem shows that verifying extensions is still as hard as in general AFs.

Theorem 2. *For $\sigma \in \{pref, sem, stage\}$, AF $F = (A, R) \in CAF_\sigma$ and $E \subseteq A$, it is* coNP-*complete to decide whether $E \in \sigma(F)$.*

Proof. For all three semantics the problem is known to be in coNP (Caminada, Carnielli, and Dunne 2012; Dimopoulos and Torres 1996; Dvořák and Woltran 2011). For hardness we only give a (prototypical) proof for *pref*. We use a standard reduction from CNF formulas $\varphi(X) = \bigwedge_{c \in C} c$ with each clause $c \in C$ a disjunction of literals from X to an AF F_φ with arguments $A_\varphi = \{\varphi, \bar{\varphi}_1, \bar{\varphi}_2, \bar{\varphi}_3\} \cup C \cup X \cup \bar{X}$ and attacks (i) $\{(c, \varphi) \mid c \in C\}$, (ii) $\{(x, \bar{x}), (\bar{x}, x) \mid x \in X\}$, (iii) $\{(x, c) \mid x \text{ occurs in } c\} \cup \{(\bar{x}, c) \mid \neg x \text{ occurs in } c\}$, (iv) $\{(\varphi, \bar{\varphi}_1), (\bar{\varphi}_1, \bar{\varphi}_2), (\bar{\varphi}_2, \bar{\varphi}_3), (\bar{\varphi}_3, \bar{\varphi}_1)\}$, and (v) $\{(\bar{\varphi}_1, x), (\bar{\varphi}_1, \bar{x}) \mid x \in X\}$. It holds that φ is satisfiable iff there is an $S \neq \emptyset$ in $\sigma_1(F_\varphi)$ (Dimopoulos and Torres 1996). We extend F_φ with four new arguments $\{t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4\}$ and

the following attacks: (a) $\{(t_i, t_j), (t_j, t_i) \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq 4\}$, (b) $\{(t_1, c) \mid c \in C\}$, (c) $\{(t_2, c), (t_2, \bar{\varphi}_2) \mid c \in C\}$ and (d) $\{(t_3, \bar{\varphi}_3)\}$. This extended AF is in CAF_{pref} and moreover $\{t_4\}$ is a preferred extension thereof iff $pref(F_\varphi) = \{\emptyset\}$ iff φ is unsatisfiable. □

4 Limits of Compact AFs

Extension-sets obtained from compact AFs satisfy certain structural properties. Knowing these properties can help us decide whether – given an extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ – there is a compact AF F such that $\mathbb{S}$ is exactly the set of extensions of F for a semantics σ. This is also known as *realizability*: A set $\mathbb{S} \subseteq 2^{\mathfrak{A}}$ is called *compactly realizable* under semantics σ iff there is a compact AF F with $\sigma(F) = \mathbb{S}$.

Among the most basic properties that are necessary for compact realizability, we find numerical aspects like possible numbers of σ-extensions.

Example 1. Consider the following AF F_2:

Let us determine the stable extensions of F_2. Clearly, taking one a_i, one b_i and one c_i yields a conflict-free set that is also stable as long as it attacks z. Thus from the $3 \cdot 2 \cdot 3 = 18$ combinations, only one (the set $\{a_1, b_1, c_2\}$) is not stable, whence F_2 has $18 - 1 = 17$ stable extensions. We note that this AF is not compact since z occurs in none of the extensions. Is there an equivalent stable-compact AF? The results of this section will provide us with a negative answer.

In (Baumann and Strass 2014) it was shown that there is a correspondence between the maximal number of stable extensions in argumentation frameworks and the maximal number of maximal independent sets in undirected graphs (Moon and Moser 1965). Recently, the result was generalized to further semantics (Dunne et al. 2014) and is stated below.[2] For any natural number n we define:

$$\sigma_{max}(n) = \max \{|\sigma(F)| \mid F \in AF_n\}$$

$\sigma_{max}(n)$ returns the maximal number of σ-extensions among all AFs with n arguments. Surprisingly, there is a closed expression for σ_{max}.

Theorem 3. *The function $\sigma_{max}(n) : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is given by*

$$\sigma_{max}(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } n = 0 \text{ or } n = 1, \\ 3^s, & \text{if } n \geq 2 \text{ and } n = 3s, \\ 4 \cdot 3^{s-1}, & \text{if } n \geq 2 \text{ and } n = 3s + 1, \\ 2 \cdot 3^s, & \text{if } n \geq 2 \text{ and } n = 3s + 2. \end{cases}$$

What about the maximal number of σ-extensions on connected graphs? Does this number coincide with $\sigma_{max}(n)$?

---

[2] In this section, unless stated otherwise we use σ as a placeholder for stable, semi-stable, preferred, stage and naive semantics.

The next theorem provides a negative answer to this question and thus, gives space for impossibility results as we will see. For a natural number n define

$$\sigma_{\max}^{\mathrm{con}}(n) = \max\{|\sigma(F)| \mid F \in \mathrm{AF}_n, F \text{ connected}\}$$

$\sigma_{\max}^{\mathrm{con}}(n)$ returns the maximal number of σ-extensions among all *connected* AFs with n arguments. Again, a closed expression exists.

Theorem 4. *The function $\sigma_{max}^{con}(n) : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is given by*

$$\sigma_{max}^{con}(n) = \begin{cases} n, & \text{if } n \leq 5, \\ 2 \cdot 3^{s-1} + 2^{s-1}, & \text{if } n \geq 6 \text{ and } n = 3s, \\ 3^s + 2^{s-1}, & \text{if } n \geq 6 \text{ and } n = 3s+1, \\ 4 \cdot 3^{s-1} + 3 \cdot 2^{s-2}, & \text{if } n \geq 6 \text{ and } n = 3s+2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. First some notations: for an AF $F = (A, R)$, denote its irreflexive version by $irr(F) = (A, R \setminus \{(a,a) \mid a \in A\})$; denote its symmetric version by $sym(F) = (A, R \cup \{(b,a) \mid (a,b) \in R\})$. Now for the proof. ($\leq$) Assume given a connected AF F. Obviously, $naive(F) \subseteq naive(sym(irr(F)))$. Thus, $|naive(F)| \leq |naive(sym(irr(F)))|$. Note that for any symmetric and irreflexive F, $naive(F) = MIS(und(F))$. Consequently, $|naive(F)| \leq |MIS(und(sym(irr(F))))|$. Fortunately, due to Theorem 2 in (Griggs, Grinstead, and Guichard 1988) the maximal number of maximal independent sets in connected n-graphs are exactly given by the claimed value range of $\sigma_{\max}^{\mathrm{con}}(n)$. ($\geq$) Stable-realizing AFs can be derived by the extremal graphs w.r.t. MIS in connected graphs (consider Fig. 1 in (Griggs, Grinstead, and Guichard 1988)). Replacing undirected edges by symmetric directed attacks accounts for this.
In consideration of $stb \subseteq stage \subseteq naive$ we obtain: $\sigma_{\max}^{\mathrm{con}}(n)$ provides a tight upper bound for $\sigma \in \{stb, stage, naive\}$. Finally, using $stb \subseteq sem \subseteq pref$, $pref(F) \subseteq pref(sym(irr(F)))$ and $pref(sym(irr(F))) = stb(sym(irr(F)))$ (compare Corollary 1 in (Baroni and Giacomin 2008)) we obtain that $\sigma_{\max}^{\mathrm{con}}(n)$ even serves for $\sigma \in \{sem, pref\}$. □

A further interesting question concerning arbitrary AFs is whether all natural numbers less than $\sigma_{\max}(n)$ are compactly realizable.[3] The following theorem shows that there is a serious gap between the maximal and second largest number. For any positive natural n define

$$\sigma_{\max}^2(n) = \max\left(\{|\sigma(F)| \mid F \in \mathrm{AF}_n\} \setminus \{\sigma_{\max}(n)\}\right)$$

$\sigma_{\max}^2(n)$ returns the second largest number of σ-extensions among all AFs with n arguments. Graph theory provides us with an expression.

Theorem 5. *Function $\sigma_{max}^2(n) : \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{N}$ is given by*

$$\sigma_{max}^2(n) = \begin{cases} \sigma_{max}(n) - 1, & \text{if } 1 \leq n \leq 7, \\ \sigma_{max}(n) \cdot \frac{11}{12}, & \text{if } n \geq 8 \text{ and } n = 3s+1, \\ \sigma_{max}(n) \cdot \frac{8}{9}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

---

[3]We sometimes speak about realizing a natural number n and mean realizing an extension-set with n extensions.

Proof. ($\geq$) σ-realizing AFs can be derived by the extremal graphs w.r.t. the second largest number of MIS (consider Theorem 2.4 in (Jin and Li 2008)). Replacing undirected edges by symmetric directed attacks accounts for this. This means, the second largest number of σ-extensions is at least as large as the claimed value range.
($\leq$) If $n \leq 7$, there is nothing to prove. Given $F \in \mathrm{AF}_n$ s.t. $n \geq 8$. Suppose, towards a contradiction, that $\sigma_{\max}^2(n) < |\sigma(F)| < \sigma_{\max}(n)$. It is easy to see that for any symmetric and irreflexive F, $\sigma(F) = MIS(und(F))$. Furthermore, due to Theorem 2.4 in (Jin and Li 2008) the second largest numbers of maximal independent sets in n-graphs are exactly given by the claimed value range of $\sigma_{\max}^2(n)$. Consequently, F cannot be symmetric and self-loop-free simultaneously. Hence, $|\sigma(F)| < |\sigma(sym(irr(F)))| = \sigma_{\max}(n)$. Note that up to isomorphisms the extremal graphs are uniquely determined (cf. Theorem 1 in (Griggs, Grinstead, and Guichard 1988)). Depending on the remainder of n on division by 3 we have K_3's for $n \equiv 0$, either one K_4 or two K_2's and the rest are K_3's in case of $n \equiv 1$ and one K_2 plus K_3's for $n \equiv 2$. Consequently, depending on the remainder we may thus estimate $|\sigma(F)| \leq k \cdot \sigma_{\max}(n)$ where $k \in \{\frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{2}\}$. Since ($\geq$) is already shown we finally state $l \cdot \sigma_{\max}(n) \leq \sigma_{\max}^2(n) < |\sigma(F)| \leq \frac{3}{4} \cdot \sigma_{\max}(n)$ where $l \in \{\frac{11}{12}, \frac{8}{9}\}$. This is a clear contradiction concluding the proof. □

To showcase the intended usage of these theorems, we now prove that the AF F_2 seen earlier indeed has no equivalent compact AF.

Example 2. Recall that the (non-compact) AF F_2 we discussed previously had the extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ with $|\mathbb{S}| = 17$ and $|Arg_{\mathbb{S}}| = 8$. Is there a stable-compact AF with the same extensions? Firstly, nothing definitive can be said by Theorem 3 since $17 \leq 18 = \sigma_{\max}(8)$. Furthermore, in accordance with Theorem 4 the set $\mathbb{S}$ cannot be compactly σ-realized by a connected AF since $17 > 15 = \sigma_{\max}^{\mathrm{con}}(8)$. Finally, using Theorem 5 we infer that the set $\mathbb{S}$ is not compactly σ-realizable because $\sigma_{\max}^2(8) = 16 < 17 < 18 = \sigma_{\max}(8)$.

The compactness property is instrumental here, since Theorem 5 has no counterpart in non-compact AFs. More generally, allowing additional arguments as long as they do not occur in extensions enables us to realize any number of stable extensions up to the maximal one.

Proposition 6. *Let n be a natural number. For each $k \leq \sigma_{max}(n)$, there is an AF F with $|Arg_{stb(F)}| = n$ and $|stb(F)| = k$.*

Proof. To realize k stable extensions with n arguments, we start with the construction for the maximal number from Theorem 3. We then subtract extensions as follows: We choose $\sigma_{\max}(n) - k$ arbitrary distinct stable extensions of the AF realizing the maximal number. To exclude them, we use the construction of Def. 9 in (Dunne et al. 2014). □

Now we are prepared to provide possible short cuts when deciding realizability of a given extension-set by initially simply counting the extensions. First some formal definitions.

Definition 3. Given an AF $F = (A, R)$, the component-structure $\mathcal{K}(F) = \{K_1, \ldots, K_n\}$ of F is the set of sets of arguments, where each K_i coincides with the arguments of a weakly connected component of the underlying graph; $\mathcal{K}_{\geq 2}(F) = \{K \in \mathcal{K}(F) \mid |K| \geq 2\}$.

Example 3. The AF $F = (\{a, b, c\}, \{(a, b)\})$ has component-structure $\mathcal{K}(F) = \{\{a, b\}, \{c\}\}$.

The component-structure $\mathcal{K}(F)$ gives information about the number n of components of F as well as the size $|K_i|$ of each component. Knowing the components of an AF, computing the σ-extensions can be reduced to computing the σ-extensions of each component and building the cross-product. The AF resulting from restricting F to component K_i is given by $F{\downarrow}_{K_i} = (K_i, R_F \cap K_i \times K_i)$.

Lemma 7. *Given an AF F with component-structure $\mathcal{K}(F) = \{K_1, \ldots, K_n\}$ it holds that the extensions in $\sigma(F)$ and the tuples in $\sigma(F{\downarrow}_{K_1}) \times \cdots \times \sigma(F{\downarrow}_{K_n})$ are in one-to-one correspondence.*

Given an extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ we want to decide whether $\mathbb{S}$ is realizable by a compact AF under semantics σ. For an AF $F = (A, R)$ with $\sigma(F) = \mathbb{S}$ we know that there cannot be a conflict between any pair of arguments in $Pairs_\mathbb{S}$, hence $R \subseteq \overline{Pairs_\mathbb{S}} = (A \times A) \setminus Pairs_\mathbb{S}$. In the next section, we will show that it is highly non-trivial to decide which of the attacks in $\overline{Pairs_\mathbb{S}}$ can be and should be used to realize $\mathbb{S}$. For now, the next proposition implicitly shows that for argument-pairs $(a, b) \notin Pairs_\mathbb{S}$, although there is not necessarily a direct conflict between a and b, they are definitely in the same component.

Proposition 8. *Given an extension-set $\mathbb{S}$, the component-structure $\mathcal{K}(F)$ of any AF F compactly realizing $\mathbb{S}$ under semantics σ ($F \in CAF_\sigma$, $\sigma(F) = \mathbb{S}$) is given by the equivalence classes of the transitive closure of $\overline{Pairs_\mathbb{S}}$, $\left(\overline{Pairs_\mathbb{S}}\right)^*$.*

Proof. Consider some extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ together with an AF $F \in CAF_\sigma$ with $\sigma(F) = \mathbb{S}$. We have to show that for any pair of arguments $a, b \in Arg_\mathbb{S}$ it holds that $(a, b) \in \left(\overline{Pairs_\mathbb{S}}\right)^*$ iff a and b are connected in the graph underlying F.

If a and b are connected in F, this means that there is a sequence $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ such that $a = s_1$, $b = s_n$, and $(s_1, s_2), \ldots, (s_{n-1}, s_n) \notin Pairs_\mathbb{S}$, hence $(a, b) \in \left(\overline{Pairs_\mathbb{S}}\right)^*$.

If $(a, b) \in \left(\overline{Pairs_\mathbb{S}}\right)^*$ then also there is a sequence $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ such that $a = s_1$, $b = s_n$, and $(s_1, s_2), \ldots, (s_{n-1}, s_n) \in \overline{Pairs_\mathbb{S}}$. Consider some $(s_i, s_{i+1}) \in \overline{Pairs_\mathbb{S}}$ and assume, towards a contradiction, that s_i occurs in another component of F than s_{i+1}. Recall that $F \in CAF_\sigma$, so each of s_i and s_{i+1} occur in some extension and $\sigma(F) \neq \emptyset$. Hence, by Lemma 7, there is some σ-extension $E \supseteq \{s_i, s_{i+1}\}$ of F, meaning that $(s_i, s_{i+1}) \in Pairs_\mathbb{S}$, a contradiction. Hence all s_i and s_{i+1} for $1 \leq i < n$ occur in the same component of F, proving that also a and b do so. $\qquad\square$

We will denote the component-structure induced by an extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ as $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$. Note that, by Proposition 8, $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{K}(F)$ for every $F \in CAF_\sigma$ with $\sigma(F) = \mathbb{S}$.

Given $\mathbb{S}$, the computation of $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$ can be done in polynomial time. With this we can use results from graph theory together with number-theoretical considerations in order to get impossibility results for compact realizability.

Recall that for a single connected component with n arguments the maximal number of stable extensions is denoted by $\sigma_{\max}^{con}(n)$ and its values are given by Theorem 4. In the compact setting it further holds for a connected AF F with at least 2 arguments that $\sigma(F) \geq 2$.

Proposition 9. *Given an extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ where $|\mathbb{S}|$ is odd, it holds that if $\exists K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S}) : |K| = 2$ then $\mathbb{S}$ is not compactly realizable under semantics σ.*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that there is an $F \in CAF_\sigma$ with $\sigma(F) = \mathbb{S}$. We know that $\mathcal{K}(F) = \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$. By assumption there is a $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$ with $|K| = 2$, whence $|\sigma(K)| = 2$. Thus by Lemma 7 the total number of σ-extensions is even. Contradiction. $\qquad\square$

Example 4. Consider the extension-set $\mathbb{S} = \{\{a, b, c\}, \{a, b', c'\}, \{a', b, c'\}, \{a', b', c\}, \{a, b, c'\}, \{a', b, c\}, \{a, b', c\}\} = stb(F_1)$ where F_1 is the non-compact AF from the introduction. There, it took us some effort to argue that $\mathbb{S}$ is not compactly *stb*-realizable. Proposition 9 now gives an easier justification: $Pairs_\mathbb{S}$ yields $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S}) = \{\{a, a'\}, \{b, b'\}, \{c, c'\}\}$. Thus $\mathbb{S}$ with $|\mathbb{S}| = 7$ cannot be realized.

We denote the set of possible numbers of σ-extensions of a compact AF with n arguments as $\mathcal{P}(n)$; likewise we denote the set of possible numbers of σ-extensions of a compact and *connected* AF with n arguments as $\mathcal{P}^c(n)$. Although we know that $p \in \mathcal{P}(n)$ implies $p \leq \sigma_{\max}(n)$, there may be $q \leq \sigma_{\max}(n)$ which are not realizable by a compact AF under σ; likewise for $q \in \mathcal{P}^c(n)$.

Clearly, any $p \leq n$ is possible by building an undirected graph with p arguments where every argument attacks all other arguments, a K_p, and filling up with k isolated arguments (k distinct copies of K_1) such that $k + p = n$. This construction obviously breaks down if we want to realize more extensions than we have arguments, that is, $p > n$. In this case, we have to use Lemma 7 and further graph-theoretic gadgets for addition and even a limited form of subtraction. Space does not permit us to go into too much detail, but let us show how for $n = 7$ any number of extensions up to the maximal number 12 is realizable. For $12 = 3 \cdot 4$, Theorem 3 yields the realization, a disjoint union of a K_3 and a K_4 (△ ⧓). For the remaining numbers, we have that $8 = 2 \cdot 4 \cdot 1$ and so we can combine a K_2, a K_4 and a K_1 (↪ ⧓ •). Likewise, $9 = 3 \cdot 3 \cdot 1$ (△ △ •); $10 = 3 \cdot 3 + 1$ (⧓⧓) and finally $11 = 3 \cdot 4 - 1$ (△ ⧓). These small examples already show that $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}^c$ are closely intertwined and let us deduce some general corollaries: Firstly, $\mathcal{P}^c(n) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(n)$ since connected AFs are a subclass of AFs. Next, $\mathcal{P}(n) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(n+1)$ as in the step from △ △ to △ △ •. We even know that $\mathcal{P}(n) \subsetneq \mathcal{P}(n + 1)$ since $\sigma_{\max}(n + 1) \in \mathcal{P}(n + 1) \setminus \mathcal{P}(n)$. Furthermore, whenever $p \in \mathcal{P}(n)$, then $p + 1 \in \mathcal{P}^c(n + 1)$, as in the step from △ △ to ⧓⧓. The construction that goes from 12 to

11 above obviously only works if there are two weakly connected components overall, which underlines the importance of the component structure of the realizing AF. Indeed, multiplication of extension numbers of single components is our only chance to achieve overall numbers that are substantially larger than the number of arguments. This is what we will turn to next. Having to leave the exact contents of $\mathcal{P}(n)$ and $\mathcal{P}^c(n)$ open, we can still state the following result:

Proposition 10. *Let $\mathbb{S}$ be an extension-set that is compactly realizable under semantics σ where $\mathcal{K}_{\geq 2}(\mathbb{S}) = \{K_1, \ldots, K_n\}$. Then for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ there is a $p_i \in \mathcal{P}^c(|K_i|)$ such that $|\mathbb{S}| = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i$.*

Proof. First note that components of size 1 can be ignored since they have no impact on the number of σ-extensions. Lemma 7 also implies that the number of σ-extensions of an AF with multiple components is the product of the number of σ-extensions of each component. Since the factor of any component K_i must be in $\mathcal{P}^c(|K_i|)$ the result follows. $\square$

Example 5. Consider the extension-set $\mathbb{S}' = \{\{a,b,c\}, \{a,b',c'\}, \{a',b,c'\}, \{a',b',c\}\}$. (In fact there exists a (non-compact) AF F with $stb(F) = \mathbb{S}'$). We have the same component-structure $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S}') = \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})$ as in Example 4, but since now $|\mathbb{S}'| = 4$ we cannot use Proposition 9 to show impossibility of realization in terms of a compact AF. But with Proposition 10 at hand we can argue in the following way: $\mathcal{P}^c(2) = \{2\}$ and since $\forall K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S}') : |K| = 2$ it must hold that $|\mathbb{S}| = 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 2 = 8$, which is obviously not the case.

In particular, we have a straightforward non-realizability criterion whenever $|\mathbb{S}|$ is prime: the AF (if any) must have at most one weakly connected component of size greater than two. Theorem 4 gives us the maximal number of σ-extensions in a single weakly connected component. Thus whenever the number of desired extensions is larger than that number and prime, it cannot be realized.

Corollary 11. *Let extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ with $|Arg_{\mathbb{S}}| = n$ be compactly realizable under σ. If $|\mathbb{S}|$ is a prime number, then $|\mathbb{S}| \leq \sigma_{max}^{con}(n)$.*

Example 6. Let $\mathbb{S}$ be an extension-set with $|Arg_{\mathbb{S}}| = 9$ and $|\mathbb{S}| = 23$. We find that $\sigma_{max}^{con}(9) = 2 \cdot 3^2 + 2^2 = 22 < 23 = |\mathbb{S}|$ and thus $\mathbb{S}$ is not compactly realizable under semantics σ.

We can also make use of the derived component structure of an extension-set $\mathbb{S}$. Since the total number of extensions of an AF is the product of these numbers for its weakly connected components (Lemma 7), each non-trivial component contributes a non-trivial amount to the total. Hence if there are more components than the factorization of $|\mathbb{S}|$ has primes in it, then $\mathbb{S}$ cannot be realized.

Corollary 12. *Let extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ be compactly realizable under σ and $f_1^{z_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot f_m^{z_m}$ be the integer factorization of $|\mathbb{S}|$, where $f_1, \ldots, f_m$ are prime numbers. Then $z_1 + \ldots + z_m \geq |\mathcal{K}_{\geq 2}(\mathbb{S})|$.*

Example 7. Consider an extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ containing 21 extensions and $|\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{S})| = 3$. Since $21 = 3^1 * 7^1$ and further $1 + 1 < 3$, $\mathbb{S}$ is not compactly realizable under semantics σ.

5 Capabilities of Compact AFs

The results in the previous section made clear that the restriction to compact AFs entails certain limits in terms of compact realizability. Here we provide some results approaching an exact characterization of the capabilities of compact AFs with a focus on stable semantics.

5.1 C-Signatures

The *signature* of a semantics σ is defined as $\Sigma_{\sigma} = \{\sigma(F) \mid F \in AF_{\mathfrak{A}}\}$ and contains all possible sets of extensions an AF can possess under σ (see (Dunne et al. 2014) for characterizations of such signatures). We first provide alternative, yet equivalent, characterizations of the signatures of some the semantics under consideration. Then we strengthen the concept of signatures to "compact" signatures (c-signatures), which contain all extension-sets realizable with compact AFs.

The most central concept when structurally analyzing extension-sets is captured by the *Pairs*-relation from Definition 1. Whenever two arguments a and b occur jointly in some element S of extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ (i.e. $(a,b) \in Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}$) there cannot be a conflict between those arguments in an AF having $\mathbb{S}$ as solution under any standard semantics. $(a,b) \in Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}$ can be read as "evidence of no conflict" between a and b in $\mathbb{S}$. Hence, the *Pairs*-relation gives rise to sets of arguments that are conflict-free in any AF realizing $\mathbb{S}$.

Definition 4. Given an extension-set $\mathbb{S}$, we define

- $\mathbb{S}^{cf} = \{S \subseteq Arg_{\mathbb{S}} \mid \forall a, b \in S : (a,b) \in Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}\}$;
- $\mathbb{S}^+ = \max_{\subseteq} \mathbb{S}^{cf}$.

To show that the characterizations of signatures in Proposition 13 below are indeed equivalent to the ones given in (Dunne et al. 2014) we first recall some definitions from there.

Definition 5. For an extension-set $\mathbb{S} \subseteq 2^{\mathfrak{A}}$, the *downward-closure* of $\mathbb{S}$ is defined as $dcl(\mathbb{S}) = \{S' \subseteq S \mid S \in \mathbb{S}\}$. Moreover, $\mathbb{S}$ is called

- *incomparable*, if for all $S, S' \in \mathbb{S}$, $S \subseteq S'$ implies $S = S'$,
- *tight* if for all $S \in \mathbb{S}$ and $a \in Arg_{\mathbb{S}}$ it holds that if $(S \cup \{a\}) \notin \mathbb{S}$ then there exists an $s \in S$ such that $(a,s) \notin Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}$.

Proposition 13. $\Sigma_{naive} = \{\mathbb{S} \neq \emptyset \mid \mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}^+\}$; $\Sigma_{stb} = \{\mathbb{S} \mid \mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^+\}$; $\Sigma_{stage} = \{\mathbb{S} \neq \emptyset \mid \mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^+\}$.

Proof. Being aware of Theorem 1 from (Dunne et al. 2014) we have to show that, given an extension-set $\mathbb{S} \subseteq 2^{\mathfrak{A}}$ the following hold:

1. $\mathbb{S}$ is incomparable and tight iff $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^+$,
2. $\mathbb{S}$ is incomparable and $dcl(\mathbb{S})$ is tight iff $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}^+$.

$(1) \Rightarrow$: Consider an incomparable and tight extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ and assume that $\mathbb{S} \not\subseteq \mathbb{S}^+$. To this end let $S \in \mathbb{S}$ with $S \notin \mathbb{S}^+$. Since $S \in \mathbb{S}^{cf}$ by definition, there must be some $S' \supset S$ with $S' \in \mathbb{S}^+$. $S' \notin \mathbb{S}$ holds by incomparability of $\mathbb{S}$. But $S' \in \mathbb{S}^+$ means that there is some $a \in (S' \setminus S)$ such that $\forall s \in S : (a,s) \in Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}$, a contradiction to the assumption that $\mathbb{S}$ is tight.

$\Leftarrow$: Let $\mathbb{S}$ be an extension-set such that $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^+$. Incomparability is clear. Now assume, towards a contradiction, that are some $S \in \mathbb{S}$ and $a \in Arg_{\mathbb{S}}$ such that $(S \cup \{a\}) \notin \mathbb{S}$ and $\forall s \in S : (a, s) \in Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}$. Then there is some $S' \supseteq (S \cup \{a\})$ with $S' \in \mathbb{S}^+$, a contradiction to $S \in \mathbb{S}^+$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$: Consider an incomparable extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ where $dcl(\mathbb{S})$ is tight and assume that $\mathbb{S} \neq \mathbb{S}^+$. Note that $Pairs_{\mathbb{S}} = Pairs_{dcl(\mathbb{S})}$. Since $dcl(\mathbb{S})$ being tight implies that $\mathbb{S}$ is tight (cf. Lemma 2.1 in (Dunne et al. 2014)), $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^+$ follows by (1). Now assume there is some $S \in \mathbb{S}^+$ with $S \notin \mathbb{S}$. Note that $|S| \geq 3$. Now let $S' \subset S$ and $a \in (S \setminus S')$ such that $S' \in dcl(\mathbb{S})$ and $(S' \cup \{a\}) \notin dcl(\mathbb{S})$. Such an S' exists since for each pair of arguments $a, b \in S'$, $(a, b) \in Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}$ holds as $S \in \mathbb{S}^+$. Since also $\forall s \in S' : (a, s) \in Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}$, we get a contradiction to the assumption that $dcl(\mathbb{S})$ is tight.

$\Leftarrow$: Consider an extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ with $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}^+$. Incomparability is straight by definition. Now assume, towards a contradiction, that are some $S \in dcl(\mathbb{S})$ and $a \in Arg_{\mathbb{S}}$ such that $(S \cup \{a\}) \notin dcl(\mathbb{S})$ and $\forall s \in S : (a, s) \in Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}$. Then $(S \cup \{a\}) \in \mathbb{S}^{cf}$, and moreover there is some $S' \supseteq (S \cup \{a\})$ with $S' \in \mathbb{S}^+$ and $S' \notin \mathbb{S}$, a contradiction to $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}^+$. $\square$

Let us now turn to signatures for compact AFs.

Definition 6. The *c-signature* Σ_σ^c of a semantics σ is defined as
$$\Sigma_\sigma^c = \{\sigma(F) \mid F \in CAF_\sigma\}.$$

It is clear that $\Sigma_\sigma^c \subseteq \Sigma_\sigma$ holds for any semantics. The following result is mainly by the fact that the canonical AF
$$F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf} = (A_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf}, R_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf}) = (Arg_{\mathbb{S}}, (Arg_{\mathbb{S}} \times Arg_{\mathbb{S}}) \setminus Pairs_{\mathbb{S}})$$
has $\mathbb{S}^+$ as extensions under all semantics under consideration and by extension-sets obtained from non-compact AFs which definitely cannot be transformed to equivalent compact AFs.

The following technical lemma makes this clearer.

Lemma 14. *Given a non-empty extension-set $\mathbb{S}$, it holds that $\sigma(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf}) = \mathbb{S}^+$ where $\sigma \in \{naive, stb, stage, pref, sem\}$.*

Proof. naive: The set $naive(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf})$ contains the $\subseteq$-maximal elements of $cf(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf})$ just as $\mathbb{S}^+$ does of $\mathbb{S}^{cf}$. Therefore $naive(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf}) = \mathbb{S}^+$ follows directly from the obvious fact that $cf(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf}) = \mathbb{S}^{cf}$.

stb, stage, pref, sem: Follow from the fact that for the symmetric AF $F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf}$, $naive(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf}) = stb(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf}) = stage(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf}) = pref(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf}) = sem(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf})$ (Coste-Marquis, Devred, and Marquis 2005). $\square$

Proposition 15. *It holds that (1) $\Sigma_{naive}^c = \Sigma_{naive}$; and (2) $\Sigma_\sigma^c \subseteq \Sigma_\sigma$ for $\sigma \in \{stb, stage, sem, pref\}$.*

Proof. $\Sigma_{naive}^c = \Sigma_{naive}$ follows directly from the facts that $naive(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf}) = \mathbb{S}^+$ (cf. Lemma 14) and $F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf} \in CAF_{naive}$.

stb, stage: Consider the extension-set $\mathbb{S} = \{\{a, b, c\}, \{a, b, c'\}, \{a, b', c\}, \{a, b', c'\}, \{a', b, c\}, \{a', b, c'\}, \{a', b', c\}\}$ from the example in the introduction. It is easy to verify that $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^+$, thus $\mathbb{S} \in \Sigma_{stb}$ and $\mathbb{S} \in \Sigma_{stage}$. The AF realizing $\mathbb{S}$ under *stb* and *stage* is F_1 from the introduction. We now show that there is no AF $F = (Arg_{\mathbb{S}}, R)$

Figure 2: AF compactly realizing an extension-set $\mathbb{S} \not\subseteq \mathbb{S}^+$ under *pref*.

such that $stb(F) = \mathbb{S}$ or $stage(F) = \mathbb{S}$. First, given that the sets in $\mathbb{S}$ must be conflict-free the only possible attacks in R are (a, a'), (a', a), (b, b'), (b', b), (c, c'), (c', c). We next argue that all of them must be in R. First consider the case of *stb*. As $\{a, b, c\} \in stb(F)$ it attacks a' and the only chance to do so is $(a, a') \in R$ and similar as $\{a', b, c\} \in stb(F)$ it attacks a and the only chance to do so is $(a', a) \in R$. By symmetry we obtain $\{(b, b'), (b', b), (c, c'), (c', c)\} \subseteq R$. Now let us consider the case of *stage*. As $\{a, b, c\} \in stage(F) \subseteq naive(F)$ either $(a, a') \in R$ or $(a', a) \in R$. Consider $(a, a') \notin R$ then $\{a', b, c\}_F^+ \supset \{a, b, c\}_F^+$, contradicting that $\{a, b, c\}$ is a stage extension. The same holds for pairs (b, b') and (c, c'); thus for both cases we obtain $R = \{(a, a'), (a', a), (b, b'), (b', b), (c, c'), (c', c)\}$. However, for the resulting framework $F = (A, R)$, we have that $\{a', b', c'\} \in stb(F) = stage(F)$, but $\{a', b', c'\} \notin \mathbb{S}$. Hence we know that $\mathbb{S} \notin \Sigma_{stb}^c$.

pref, sem: Let $\sigma \in \{pref, sem\}$ and consider $\mathbb{S} = \{\{a, b\}, \{a, c, e\}, \{b, d, e\}\}$. The figure below shows an AF (with additional arguments) realizing $\mathbb{S}$ under *pref* and *sem*. Hence $\mathbb{S} \in \Sigma_\sigma$ holds.

Now suppose there exists an AF $F = (Arg_{\mathbb{S}}, R)$ such that $\sigma(F) = \mathbb{S}$. Since $\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d, e\} \in \mathbb{S}$, it is clear that R must not contain an edge involving e. But then, e is contained in each $E \in \sigma(F)$. It follows that $\sigma(F) \neq \mathbb{S}$. $\square$

For ordinary signatures it holds that $\Sigma_{naive} \subset \Sigma_{stage} = (\Sigma_{stb} \setminus \{\emptyset\}) \subset \Sigma_{sem} = \Sigma_{pref}$ (Dunne et al. 2014). This picture changes when considering the relationship of c-signatures.

**Proposition 16.** $\Sigma_{pref}^c \not\subseteq \Sigma_{stb}^c$; $\Sigma_{pref}^c \not\subseteq \Sigma_{stage}^c$; $\Sigma_{pref}^c \not\subseteq \Sigma_{sem}^c$; $\Sigma_{naive}^c \subset \Sigma_\sigma^c$ for $\sigma \in \{stb, stage, sem\}$; $\Sigma_{stb}^c \subseteq \Sigma_{sem}^c$; $\Sigma_{stb}^c \subseteq \Sigma_{stage}^c$.

Proof. $\Sigma_{pref}^c \not\subseteq \Sigma_{stb}^c$, $\Sigma_{pref}^c \not\subseteq \Sigma_{stage}^c$: For the extension-set $\mathbb{S} = \{\{a, b\}, \{a, x_1, s_1\}, \{a, y_1, s_2\}, \{a, z_1, s_3\}, \{b, x_2, s_1\}, \{b, y_2, s_2\}, \{b, z_2, s_3\}\}$ it does not hold that $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^+$ (as $\{a, b, s_1\}, \{a, b, s_2\}, \{a, b, s_3\} \in \mathbb{S}^{cf}$, hence $\{a, b\} \notin \mathbb{S}^+$), but there is a compact AF F realizing $\mathbb{S}$ under the preferred semantics, namely the one depicted in Figure 2. Hence $\Sigma_{pref}^c \not\subseteq \Sigma_{stb}^c$ and $\Sigma_{pref}^c \not\subseteq \Sigma_{stage}^c$.

$\Sigma_{pref}^c \not\subseteq \Sigma_{sem}^c$: Let $\mathbb{T} = (\mathbb{S} \cup \{\{x_1, x_2, s_1\}, \{y_1, y_2, s_2\}, \{z_1, z_2, s_3\}\})$ and assume there is some $F = (Arg_{\mathbb{T}}, R)$

compactly realizing $\mathbb{T}$ under the semi-stable semantics. Consider the extensions $S = \{a, x_1, s_1\}$ and $T = \{x_1, x_2, s_1\}$. There must be a conflict between a and x_2, otherwise $(S \cup T) \in sem(F)$. If $(a, x_2) \in R$ then, since T must defend itself and $(s_1, a), (x_1, a) \in Pairs_{\mathbb{T}}$, also $(x_2, a) \in R$. On the other hand if $(x_2, a) \in R$ then, since $\{a, b\}$ must defend itself and $(b, x_2) \in Pairs_{\mathbb{T}}$, also $(a, x_2) \in R$. Hence, by all symmetric cases we get $\{(a, \alpha_1), (\alpha_1, a), (b, \alpha_2), (\alpha_2, b) \mid \alpha \in \{x, y, z\}\} \subseteq R$. Now as $U = \{a, b\} \in \mathbb{T}$ and U must not be in conflict with any of s_1, s_2, and s_3, each s_i must have an attacker which is not attacked by any a, b, or s_i. Hence wlog. $\{(s_1, s_2), (s_2, s_3), (s_3, s_1)\} \subseteq R$. Again consider extension S and observe that s_1 must be defended from s_3, hence $(x_1, s_3) \in R$. We know that $S_F^+ \supseteq (Arg_{\mathbb{T}} \setminus \{y_1, z_1\})$. Now we observe that S has to attack both y_1 and z_1 since otherwise either S would not defend itself or y_1 (resp. z_1) would have to be part of S. But this leads us to a contradiction because $S_F^+ = Arg_{\mathbb{T}}$, but $U_F^+ \subset Arg_{\mathbb{T}}$, meaning that U cannot be a semi-stable extension of F. $\Sigma_{pref}^c \not\subseteq \Sigma_{sem}^c$ now follows from the fact that $pref(F') = \mathbb{T}$ for $F' = (A_F, R_F \setminus \{(\alpha_1, \alpha_2), (\alpha_2, \alpha_1) \mid \alpha \in \{x, y, z\}\})$ where F is the AF depicted in Figure 2.

$\Sigma_{naive}^c \subset \Sigma_\sigma^c$ for $\sigma \in \{stb, stage, sem\}$: First of all note that any extensions-set compactly realizable under *naive* is compactly realizable under σ (by making the AF symmetric). Now consider the extension-set $\mathbb{S} = \{\{a_1, b_2, b_3\}, \{a_2, b_1, b_3\}, \{a_3, b_1, b_2\}\}$. $\mathbb{S} \neq \mathbb{S}^+$ since $\{b_1, b_2, b_3\} \in \mathbb{S}^+$, hence $\mathbb{S} \notin \Sigma_{naive}^c$. $\Sigma_{naive}^c \subset \Sigma_\sigma^c$ follows from the fact that the AF below compactly realizes $\mathbb{S}$ under σ.

$\Sigma_{stb}^c \subseteq \Sigma_{sem}^c$, $\Sigma_{stb}^c \subseteq \Sigma_{stage}^c$: Follow from the fact that $stage(F) = sem(F) = stb(F)$ for any $F \in CAF_{stb}$ (Caminada, Carnielli, and Dunne 2012). $\square$

5.2 The Explicit-Conflict Conjecture

So far we only have exactly characterized c-signatures for the naive semantics (Proposition 15). Deciding membership of an extension-set in the c-signature of the other semantics is more involved. In what follows we focus on stable semantics in order to illustrate difficulties and subtleties in this endeavor.

Although there are, as Proposition 1 showed, more compact AFs for *naive* than for *stb*, one can express a greater diversity of outcomes with the stable semantics, i.e. $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}^+$ does not necessarily hold. Consider some AF F with $\mathbb{S} = stb(F)$. By Proposition 13 we know that $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^+$ must hold. Now we want to compactly realize extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ under *stb*. If $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}^+$, then we can obviously find a compact AF realizing $\mathbb{S}$ under *stb*, since $F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf}$ will do so. On the other hand, if $\mathbb{S} \neq \mathbb{S}^+$ we have to find a way to handle the argument-sets in $\mathbb{S}^- = \mathbb{S}^+ \setminus \mathbb{S}$. In words, each $S \in \mathbb{S}^-$ is a $\subseteq$-maximal set with evidence of no conflict, which is not contained in $\mathbb{S}$.

Now consider some AF $F' \in CAF_{stb}$ having $\mathbb{S} \subsetneq \mathbb{S}^+$ as its stable extensions. Further take some $S \in \mathbb{S}^-$. There cannot be a conflict within S in F', hence we must be able to map S to some argument $t \in (Arg_{\mathbb{S}} \setminus S)$ not attacked by S in F'. Still, the collection of these mappings must fulfill certain conditions in order to preserve a justification for all $S \in \mathbb{S}$ to be a stable extension and not to give rise to other stable extensions. We make these things more formal.

Definition 7. Given an extension-set $\mathbb{S}$, an *exclusion-mapping* is the set

$$\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{S}} = \bigcup_{S \in \mathbb{S}^-} \{(s, \mathfrak{f}_{\mathbb{S}}(S)) \mid s \in S \text{ s.t. } (s, \mathfrak{f}_{\mathbb{S}}(S)) \notin Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}\}$$

where $\mathfrak{f}_{\mathbb{S}} : \mathbb{S}^- \to Arg_{\mathbb{S}}$ is a function with $\mathfrak{f}_{\mathbb{S}}(S) \in (Arg_{\mathbb{S}} \setminus S)$.

Definition 8. A set $\mathbb{S} \subseteq 2^{\mathfrak{A}}$ is called *independent* if there exists an antisymmetric exclusion-mapping $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{S}}$ such that it holds that

$$\forall S \in \mathbb{S} \forall a \in (Arg_{\mathbb{S}} \setminus S) : \exists s \in S : (s, a) \notin (\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{S}} \cup Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}).$$

The concept of independence suggests that the more separate the elements of some extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ are, the less critical is $\mathbb{S}^-$. An independent $\mathbb{S}$ allows to find the required orientation of attacks to exclude sets from $\mathbb{S}^-$ from the stable extensions without interferences.

Theorem 17. *For every independent extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ with $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^+$ it holds that $\mathbb{S} \in \Sigma_{stb}^c$.*

Proof. Consider, given an independent extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ and an antisymmetric exclusion-mapping $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{S}}$ fulfilling the independence-condition (cf. Definition 8), the AF $F_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb} = (Args_{\mathbb{S}}, R_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb})$ with $R_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb} = (R_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf} \setminus \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{S}})$. We show that $stb(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb}) = \mathbb{S}$. First note that $stb(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf}) = \mathbb{S}^+ \supseteq \mathbb{S}$. As $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{S}}$ is antisymmetric, one direction of each symmetric attack of $F_{\mathbb{S}}^{cf}$ is still in $F_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb}$. Hence $stb(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb}) \subseteq \mathbb{S}^+$.

$stb(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb}) \subseteq \mathbb{S}$: Consider some $S \in stb(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb})$ and assume that $S \notin \mathbb{S}$, i.e. $S \in \mathbb{S}^-$. Since $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{S}}$ is an exclusion-mapping fulfilling the independence-condition by assumption, there is an argument $\mathfrak{f}_{\mathbb{S}}(S) \in (Arg_{\mathbb{S}} \setminus S)$ such that $\{(s, \mathfrak{f}_{\mathbb{S}}(S)) \mid s \in S, (s, \mathfrak{f}_{\mathbb{S}}(S)) \notin Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}\} \subseteq \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{S}}$. But then, by construction of $F_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb}$, there is no $a \in S$ such that $(a, \mathfrak{f}_{\mathbb{S}}(S)) \in R_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb}$, a contradiction to $S \in stb(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb})$.

$stb(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb}) \supseteq \mathbb{S}$: Consider some $S \in \mathbb{S}$ and assume that $S \notin stb(F_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb})$. We know that S is conflict-free in $F_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb}$. Therefore there must be some $t \in (Arg_{\mathbb{S}} \setminus S)$ with $S \not\mapsto_{F_{\mathbb{S}}^{stb}} t$. Hence $\forall s \in S : (s, t) \in (Pairs_{\mathbb{S}} \cup \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{S}})$, a contradiction to the assumption that $\mathbb{S}$ is independent. $\square$

Corollary 18. *For every $\mathbb{S} \in \Sigma_{stb}$, with $|\mathbb{S}| \leq 3$, $\mathbb{S} \in \Sigma_{stb}^c$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that for an extension-set $\mathbb{S}$ with $|\mathbb{S}| \leq 3$ it holds that $|\mathbb{S}^-| \leq 1$. If $\mathbb{S}^- = \emptyset$ we are done; if $\mathbb{S}^- = \{S\}$ observe that by $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^+$ for each $T \in \mathbb{S}$ there is some $t \in T$ with $t \notin S$. Hence choosing arbitrary $T \in \mathbb{S}$ and $t \in T$ with $t \notin S$ yields the antisymmetric exclusion-mapping $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{S}} = \{(s, t) \mid s \in S \text{ s.t. } (s, t) \notin Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}\}$ which fulfills the independence-condition from Definition 8. $\square$

Theorem 17 gives a sufficient condition for an extension-set to be contained in Σ_{stb}^c. Section 4 provided necessary conditions with respect to number of extensions. As these conditions do not match, we have not arrived at an exact characterization of the c-signature for stable semantics yet. In what follows, we identify the missing step which we have to leave open but, as we will see, results in an interesting problem of its own. Let us first define a further class of frameworks.

Definition 9. We call an AF $F = (A, R)$ conflict-explicit under semantics σ iff for each $a, b \in A$ such that $(a, b) \notin Pairs_{\sigma(F)}$, we find $(a, b) \in R$ or $(b, a) \in R$ (or both).

In words, a framework is conflict-explicit under σ if any two arguments of the framework which do not occur together in any σ-extension are explicitly conflicting, i.e. they are linked via the attack relation.

As a simple example consider the AF $F = (\{a, b, c, d\}, \{(a, b), (b, a), (a, c), (b, d)\})$ which has $\mathbb{S} = stb(F) = \{\{a, d\}, \{b, c\}\}$. Note that $(c, d) \notin Pairs_{\mathbb{S}}$ but $(c, d) \notin R$ as well as $(d, c) \notin R$. Thus F is not conflict-explicit under stable semantics. However, if we add attacks (c, d) or (d, c) we obtain an equivalent (under stable semantics) conflict-explicit (under stable semantics) AF.

Theorem 19. *For each compact AF F which is conflict-explicit under stb, it holds that $stb(F)$ is independent.*

Proof. Consider some $F \in CAF_{stb}$ which is conflict-explicit under *stb* and let $\mathbb{E} = stb(F)$. Observe that $\mathbb{E} \subseteq \mathbb{E}^+$. We have to show that there exists an antisymmetric exclusion-mapping $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{S}}$ fulfilling the independence-condition from Definition 8. Let $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{E}} = \{(b, a) \notin R \mid (a, b) \in R\}$ and consider the AF $F^s = (A_F, R_F \cup \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{E}})$ being the symmetric version of F. Now let $E \in \mathbb{E}^-$. Note that $E \in cf(F) = cf(F^s)$. But as $E \notin \mathbb{E}$ there must be some $t \in (A \setminus E)$ such that for all $e \in E$, $(e, t) \notin R_F$. For all such $e \in E$ with $(e, t) \notin Pairs_{\mathbb{E}}$ it holds, as F is conflict-explicit under *stb*, that $(t, e) \in R_F$, hence $(e, t) \in \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{E}}$, showing that $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{E}}$ is an exclusion-mapping.

It remains to show that $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{E}}$ is antisymmetric and $\forall E \in \mathbb{E} \forall a \in Arg_{\mathbb{S}} \setminus E : \exists e \in E : (e, a) \notin (\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{E}} \cup Pairs_{\mathbb{E}})$ holds. As some pair (b, a) is in $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{E}}$ iff $(a, b) \in R$ and $(b, a) \notin R$, $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{E}}$ is antisymmetric. Finally consider some $E \in \mathbb{E}$ and $a \in Arg_{\mathbb{S}} \setminus E$ and assume that $\forall e \in E : (e, a) \in \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbb{E}} \vee (e, a) \in Pairs_{\mathbb{E}}$. This means that $e \not\mapsto_F a$, a contradiction to E being a stable extension of F. $\square$

Since our characterizations of signatures completely abstract away from the actual structure of AFs but only focus on the set of extensions, our problem would be solved if the following was true.

EC-Conjecture. For each AF $F = (A, R)$ there exists an AF $F' = (A, R')$ which is conflict-explicit under the stable semantics such that $stb(F) = stb(F')$.

Note that the EC-conjecture implies that for each compact AF, there exists a stable-equivalent conflict-explicit (under stable) AF.


Figure 3: Orientation of non-explicit conflicts matters.

Theorem 20. *Under the assumption that the EC-conjecture holds,*

$$\Sigma_{stb}^c = \{\mathbb{S} \mid \mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^+ \wedge \mathbb{S} \text{ is independent}\}.$$

Unfortunately, the question whether an equivalent conflict-explicit AF exists is not as simple as the example above suggests. We provide a few examples showing that proving the conjecture includes some subtle issues. Our first example shows that for adding missing attacks, the orientation of the attack needs to be carefully chosen.

Example 8. Consider the AF F in Figure 3 and observe $stb(F) = \{\{a_1, a_2, x_3\}, \{a_1, a_3, x_2\}, \{a_2, a_3, x_1\}, \{s, y\}\}$.
$Pairs_{stb(F)}$ yields one pair of arguments a_1 and s whose conflict is not explicit by F, i.e. $(a_1, s) \notin Pairs_{stb(F)}$, but $(a_1, s), (s, a_1) \notin R_F$. Now adding the attack $a_1 \mapsto_F s$ to F would reveal the additional stable extension $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\} \in (stb(F))^+$. On the other hand by adding the attack $s \mapsto_F a_1$ we get the conflict-explicit AF F' with $stb(F) = stb(F')$.

Finally recall the role of the arguments x_1, x_2, and x_3. Each of these arguments enforces exactly one extension (being itself part of it) by attacking (and being attacked by) all arguments not in this extension. We will make use of this construction-concept in Example 9.

Even worse, it is sometimes necessary to not only add the missing conflicts but also change the orientation of existing attacks such that the missing attack "fits well".

Example 9. Let $X = \{x_{s,t,i}, x_{s,u,i}, x_{t,u,i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq 3\} \cup \{x_{a,1,2}, x_{a,1,3}, x_{a,2,3}\}$ and $\mathbb{S} = \{\{s_i, t_i, x_{s,t,i}\}, \{s_i, u_i, x_{s,u,i}\}, \{t_i, u_i, x_{t,u,i}\} \mid i \in \{1, 2, 3\}\} \cup \{\{a_1, a_2, x_{a,1,2}\}, \{a_1, a_3, x_{a,1,3}\}, \{a_2, a_3, x_{a,2,3}\}\}$. Consider the AF $F = (A' \cup X, R' \cup \bigcup_{x \in X}\{(x, b), (b, x) \mid b \in (A' \setminus \mathbb{S}_x)\} \cup \{(x, x') \mid x, x' \in X, x \neq x'\})$, where the essential part (A', R') is depicted in Figure 4 and $\mathbb{S}_x$ is the unique set $X \in \mathbb{S}$ with $x \in X$. We have $stb(F) = \mathbb{S}$. Observe that F contains three non-explicit conflicts under the stable semantics, namely the argument-pairs (a_1, s_1), (a_2, s_2), and (a_3, s_3). Adding any of (s_i, a_i) to R_F would turn $\{s_i, t_i, u_i\}$ into a stable extension; adding all (a_i, s_i) to R_F would yield $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ as additional stable extension. Hence there is no way of making the conflicts explicit without changing other parts of F and still getting a stable-equivalent AF. Still, we can realize $stb(F)$ by a compact and conflict-explicit AF, for example by $G = (A_F, (R_F \cup \{(a_1, s_1), (a_2, s_2), (a_3, s_3)\}) \setminus \{(a_1, x_{a,2,3}), (a_2, x_{a,1,3}), (a_3, x_{a,1,2})\})$.

This is another indicator, yet far from a proof, that the EC-conjecture holds and by that Theorem 20 describes the exact characterization of the c-signature under stable semantics.

Figure 4: Guessing the orientation of non-explicit conflicts is not enough.

6   Discussion

We introduced and studied the novel class of σ-compact argumentation frameworks for σ among naive, stable, stage, semi-stable and preferred semantics. We provided the full relationships between these classes, and showed that the extension verification problem is still coNP-hard for stage, semi-stable and preferred semantics. We next addressed the question of compact realizability: Given a set of extensions, is there a compact AF with this set of extensions under semantics σ? Towards this end, we first used and extended recent results on maximal numbers of extensions to provide shortcuts for showing non-realizability. Lastly we studied signatures, sets of compactly realizable extension-sets, and provided sufficient conditions for compact realizability. This culminated in the explicit-conflict conjecture, a deep and interesting question in its own right: Given an AF, can all implicit conflicts be made explicit?

Our work bears considerable potential for further research. First and foremost, the explicit-conflict conjecture is an interesting research question. But the EC-conjecture (and compact AFs in general) should not be mistaken for a mere theoretical exercise. There is a fundamental computational significance to compactness: When searching for extensions, arguments span the search space, since extensions are to be found among the subsets of the set of all arguments. Hence the more arguments, the larger the search space. Compact AFs are argument-minimal since none of the arguments can be removed without changing the outcome, thus leading to a minimal search space. The explicit-conflict conjecture plays a further important role in this game: implicit conflicts are something that AF solvers have to deduce on their own, paying mostly with computation time. If there are no implicit conflicts in the sense that all of them have been made explicit, solvers have maximal information to guide search.

References

[Amgoud, Dimopoulos, and Moraitis 2008] Amgoud, L.; Dimopoulos, Y.; and Moraitis, P. 2008. Making decisions through preference-based argumentation. In *KR*, 113–123.

[Baroni and Giacomin 2008] Baroni, P., and Giacomin, M. 2008. A systematic classification of argumentation frameworks where semantics agree. In *COMMA*, volume 172 of *FAIA*, 37–48.

[Baroni, Caminada, and Giacomin 2011] Baroni, P.; Caminada, M.; and Giacomin, M. 2011. An introduction to argumentation semantics. *KER* 26(4):365–410.

[Baumann and Strass 2014] Baumann, R., and Strass, H. 2014. On the Maximal and Average Numbers of Stable Extensions. In *TAFA 2013*, volume 8306 of *LNAI*, 111–126.

[Bench-Capon and Dunne 2007] Bench-Capon, T. J. M., and Dunne, P. E. 2007. Argumentation in artificial intelligence. *AIJ* 171(10-15):619–641.

[Caminada, Carnielli, and Dunne 2012] Caminada, M.; Carnielli, W. A.; and Dunne, P. E. 2012. Semi-stable semantics. *JLC* 22(5):1207–1254.

[Coste-Marquis, Devred, and Marquis 2005] Coste-Marquis, S.; Devred, C.; and Marquis, P. 2005. Symmetric argumentation frameworks. In *ECSQARU*, volume 3571 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 317–328.

[Dimopoulos and Torres 1996] Dimopoulos, Y., and Torres, A. 1996. Graph theoretical structures in logic programs and default theories. *Theoretical Computer Science* 170(1-2):209–244.

[Dung 1995] Dung, P. M. 1995. On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games. *AIJ* 77(2):321–357.

[Dunne and Bench-Capon 2002] Dunne, P. E., and Bench-Capon, T. J. M. 2002. Coherence in finite argument systems. *AIJ* 141(1/2):187–203.

[Dunne et al. 2013] Dunne, P. E.; Dvořák, W.; Linsbichler, T.; and Woltran, S. 2013. Characteristics of multiple viewpoints in abstract argumentation. In *Proc. DKB*, 16–30. Available under http://www.dbai.tuwien.ac.at/staff/linsbich/pubs/dkb_2013.pdf.

[Dunne et al. 2014] Dunne, P. E.; Dvořák, W.; Linsbichler, T.; and Woltran, S. 2014. Characteristics of multiple viewpoints in abstract argumentation. In *KR*.

[Dunne 2007] Dunne, P. E. 2007. Computational properties of argument systems satisfying graph-theoretic constraints. *AIJ* 171(10–15):701–729.

[Dvořák and Woltran 2011] Dvořák, W., and Woltran, S. 2011. On the intertranslatability of argumentation semantics. *JAIR* 41:445–475.

[Dvořák et al. 2014] Dvořák, W.; Järvisalo, M.; Wallner, J. P.; and Woltran, S. 2014. Complexity-sensitive decision procedures for abstract argumentation. *AIJ* 206:53–78.

[Griggs, Grinstead, and Guichard 1988] Griggs, J. R.; Grinstead, C. M.; and Guichard, D. R. 1988. The number of maximal independent sets in a connected graph. *Discrete Mathematics* 68(23):211–220.

[Jin and Li 2008] Jin, Z., and Li, X. 2008. Graphs with the second largest number of maximal independent sets. *Discrete Mathematics* 308(23):5864–5870.

[Moon and Moser 1965] Moon, J. W., and Moser, L. 1965. On cliques in graphs. *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 23–28.

[Rahwan and Simari 2009] Rahwan, I., and Simari, G. R., eds. 2009. *Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence*.

[Verheij 1996] Verheij, B. 1996. Two approaches to dialectical argumentation: admissible sets and argumentation stages. In *Proc. NAIC*, 357–368.