# On the structure of multi-agent deliberation dialogues

Eric M. Kok John-Jules Ch. Meyer Henry Prakken Gerard A. W. Vreeswijk

Utrecht University

May 17, 2010

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

2

Universiteit Utrecht

1

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results

Persuasion

Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Persuasion
- Negotiation



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Persuasion
- Negotiation
- Deliberation



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Persuasion
- Negotiation
- Deliberation

► ...

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



•  $a_1$ : We should go to the local pizzeria.



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- $a_1$ : We should go to the local pizzeria.
- ► a<sub>2</sub>: Why should we go there? I propose we go to the nearby bistro instead.

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- $a_1$ : We should go to the local pizzeria.
- ► a<sub>2</sub>: Why should we go there? I propose we go to the nearby bistro instead.
- ► a<sub>1</sub>: Well, the pizzeria serves tasty pizza's. Why should we go to the bistro?

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Result



- ► *a*<sub>1</sub>: We should go to the local pizzeria.
- ► a<sub>2</sub>: Why should we go there? I propose we go to the nearby bistro instead.
- ► a<sub>1</sub>: Well, the pizzeria serves tasty pizza's. Why should we go to the bistro?
- ► a<sub>2</sub>: The toppings at the pizzeria are very dull, while the bistro has the best steaks in town.

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- $a_1$ : We should go to the local pizzeria.
- ► a<sub>2</sub>: Why should we go there? I propose we go to the nearby bistro instead.
- ► a<sub>1</sub>: Well, the pizzeria serves tasty pizza's. Why should we go to the bistro?
- ► a<sub>2</sub>: The toppings at the pizzeria are very dull, while the bistro has the best steaks in town.

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



Universiteit Utrecht

<u>►</u> ...

### Deliberation characteristics

Multi-agent

Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



### Deliberation characteristics

- Multi-agent
- Multiple proposals
  - Single dialogue topic
  - Proposals for action



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



### Deliberation characteristics

- Multi-agent
- Multiple proposals
  - Single dialogue topic
  - Proposals for action
- Cooperative and competitive
  - Mutual goal
  - · Conflicts on beliefs and preferences

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



Framework for deliberation

Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Framework for deliberation
- Fixed communication language



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Framework for deliberation
- Fixed communication language
- Very liberal protocol



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Framework for deliberation
- Fixed communication language
- Very liberal protocol
- No explicit proposal status



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



### Prakken 2005

Framework for persuasion



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Framework for persuasion
- Dialogue game with explicit reply structure



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Framework for persuasion
- Dialogue game with explicit reply structure
- Coherence based on move status



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



► Topic language L<sub>t</sub>



#### Universiteit Utrecht

The deliberation

Formal system

(ロ) (部) (注) (注) (注) (の)

- ► Topic language *L<sub>t</sub>*
- Argumentation logic  $\mathcal{L}$



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Topic language L<sub>t</sub>
- Argumentation logic L
- Communication language L<sub>c</sub>

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Topic language L<sub>t</sub>
- Argumentation logic L
- Communication language L<sub>c</sub>
- Set of agents  $\mathcal{A}$

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Topic language L<sub>t</sub>
- Argumentation logic L
- Communication language L<sub>c</sub>
- Set of agents  $\mathcal{A}$
- Set of moves M, with each  $m \in M$ 
  - identifier id(m)
  - agent player(m)
  - speech act content(m)
  - targeted move target(m)



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Topic language L<sub>t</sub>
- Argumentation logic L
- Communication language L<sub>c</sub>
- Set of agents  $\mathcal{A}$
- Set of moves M, with each  $m \in M$ 
  - identifier id(m)
  - agent player(m)
  - speech act content(m)
  - targeted move target(m)
- Set of dialogues  $M^{\leq \infty}$ , where
  - $d \in M^{<\infty}$  is a single legal finite dialogue
  - $D \subseteq M^{<\infty}$  is a non-empty subset of all legal finite dialogue



#### The deliberation

dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

#### Formal system Status of moves

Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results

### Communication language

### Table: The speech acts of $L_c$

speech act	attacks	surrenders
propose(P)	why-propose(P)	
	reject(P)	
reject(P)	why-reject(P)	
why-propose(P)	$argue(A \Rightarrow p)$	drop-propose(P)
why-reject(P)	$argue(A \Rightarrow \neg p)$	drop-reject(P)
drop-propose(P)		
drop-reject(P)		
prefer(P, Q)		
prefer-equal(P, Q)		
skip		
$argue(A \Rightarrow p)$	$argue(B \Rightarrow q)$ where	concede(p)
	$B \Rightarrow q$ defeats $A \Rightarrow p$	
	$why(q)$ where $q \in A$	$concede(q)$ where $q \in A$
why(p)	$argue(A \Rightarrow p)$	retract(p)
concede(p)		
retract(p)		

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

#### Formal system

Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



• Dialogue purpose to reach a decision on a course of action  $P \in L_t$ 

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

#### Formal system

Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Dialogue purpose to reach a decision on a course of action  $P \in L_t$
- Mutual goal  $g_d \in L_t$  as deliberation context



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Result



- Dialogue purpose to reach a decision on a course of action  $P \in L_t$
- Mutual goal  $g_d \in L_t$  as deliberation context
- Protocol  $\mathcal{P}: D \times L_t \longrightarrow Pow(M)$

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

#### Formal system

Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Result



- Dialogue purpose to reach a decision on a course of action  $P \in L_t$
- Mutual goal  $g_d \in L_t$  as deliberation context
- Protocol  $\mathcal{P}: D \times L_t \longrightarrow Pow(M)$
- A turntaking function  $\mathcal{T}: D \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

#### Formal system

Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Result



- Dialogue purpose to reach a decision on a course of action  $P \in L_t$
- Mutual goal  $g_d \in L_t$  as deliberation context
- Protocol  $\mathcal{P}: D \times L_t \longrightarrow Pow(M)$
- A turntaking function  $\mathcal{T}: D \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$
- A deliberation outcome function  $\mathcal{O}: D \times L_t \longrightarrow L_t$

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

#### Formal system

Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



### An example





### Dialogical status of a move

A move *m* is *in* iff:

1. *m* is surrendered in *d* by every agent  $a \in A$ ; or else,

2. *m* has no attacking replies that are *in*.

Otherwise it is out.

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



### Dialogical status of a move

A move *m* is *in* iff:

1. *m* is surrendered in *d* by every agent  $a \in A$ ; or else,

2. *m* has no attacking replies that are *in*. Otherwise it is *out*.

A move m is surrendered by some agent a iff:

- 1. *m* is an argue move  $A \Rightarrow p$  and *a* has made a reply *m'* to *m* that has content(*m'*) = concede(*p*); or else
- 2. a has made a surrendering reply to m.

Otherwise it is out.

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results







 $\mathcal{A} = \{ \textit{a}_1, \textit{a}_2, \textit{a}_3 \}$  with dialogue goal  $\textit{g}_d$ 





Universiteit Utrecht

The deliberation

Status of moves





 $\mathcal{A} = \{ \textit{a}_1, \textit{a}_2, \textit{a}_3 \}$  with dialogue goal  $\textit{g}_d$ 





Universiteit Utrecht

The deliberation

Status of moves





 $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$  with dialogue goal  $g_d$ The deliberation  $m_1(a_1): propose(D(c))$  $m_2(a_2)$ : why-propose(D(c)) Status of moves  $m_3(a_1): argue(\mathsf{G}(g_d), p, (c \land p \rightsquigarrow g_d) \Rightarrow \mathsf{D}(c))$  $m_6(a_2)$ :  $argue(\mathbf{G}(g_d), (c \not \rightarrow g_d) \Rightarrow \neg \mathbf{D}(c))$  $m_4(a_2): why(p)$  $m_5(a_3)$ : retract(p)



 $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\} \text{ with dialogue goal } g_d$   $[m_1(a_1) : propose(\mathsf{D}(c))]$   $[m_2(a_2) : why - propose(\mathsf{D}(c))]$   $[m_3(a_1) : argue(\mathsf{G}(g_d), p, (c \land p \rightsquigarrow g_d) \Rightarrow \mathsf{D}(c))]$   $[m_4(a_2) : why(p)]$   $[m_6(a_2) : argue(\mathsf{G}(g_d), (c \not\sim g_d) \Rightarrow \neg \mathsf{D}(c))]$   $[m_5(a_3) : retract(p)]$   $[m_7(a_1) : argue(\mathsf{G}(g_d), (c \not\sim g_d) \Rightarrow \neg \mathsf{D}(c))]$   $[m_7(a_2) : why(p)]$   $[m_7(a_2) : why(p)]$   $[m_7(a_2) : why(p)]$   $[m_7(a_2) : retract(p)]$   $[m_7(a_2) : why(p)]$   $[m_$ 



Agents can only reply to moves of others

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcom

Results



- Agents can only reply to moves of others
- Every attacking or surrendering move must be relevant

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcom

Results



- Agents can only reply to moves of others
- Every attacking or surrendering move must be relevant
- A turn can contain at most one proposal move

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcom

Results



- Agents can only reply to moves of others
- Every attacking or surrendering move must be relevant
- A turn can contain at most one proposal move
- A proposal must be unique in the dialogue

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Result



- Agents can only reply to moves of others
- Every attacking or surrendering move must be relevant
- A turn can contain at most one proposal move
- A proposal must be unique in the dialogue
- Prefer moves must maintain an agent's transitivity and antisymmetry in the option ordering

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves **Protocol** Dialogue outcome

Results



- Agents can only reply to moves of others
- Every attacking or surrendering move must be relevant
- A turn can contain at most one proposal move
- A proposal must be unique in the dialogue
- Prefer moves must maintain an agent's transitivity and antisymmetry in the option ordering
- Every argue replying to a why-propose(D(P)) contains an argument for D(P) with premise g<sub>d</sub>

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Agents can only reply to moves of others
- Every attacking or surrendering move must be relevant
- A turn can contain at most one proposal move
- A proposal must be unique in the dialogue
- Prefer moves must maintain an agent's transitivity and antisymmetry in the option ordering
- Every argue replying to a why-propose(D(P)) contains an argument for D(P) with premise g<sub>d</sub>
- ► Every argue replying to a why-reject(D(P)) contains an argument for ¬D(P) with premise ¬g<sub>d</sub>

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



### Options

Dialogue options are defined by

• Options function  $O: D \longrightarrow Pow(L_t)$ 



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



### Options

Dialogue options are defined by

- Options function  $O: D \longrightarrow Pow(L_t)$
- Where  $O(d) = \{o | o = content(m) \text{ for each proposal move } m \in d\}$ 
  - $\texttt{move}(o) \in O(d)$  refers to m

An option  $o \in O(d)$  for any dialogue d is:

- justifiable iff move(o) is in
- invalid iff player(move(o)) played a move m such that target(m) = move(o) and content(m) = drop-propose(o),
- otherwise it is *defensible*.

#### Universiteit Utrecht

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

#### Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results

## An option preference relation $\leq$ is a partial order of O, giving $o_i \prec o_j$ (strictly preferred) and $o_i \approx o_j$ (equally preferred)

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Result



An option preference relation  $\leq$  is a partial order of O, giving  $o_i \prec o_j$  (strictly preferred) and  $o_i \approx o_j$  (equally preferred)

This can be use to create

- A single total preliminary ordering  $\leq_p$  over O
- ▶ For every agent a partial agent ordering  $\leq_a$  over O

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Result



An option preference relation  $\leq$  is a partial order of O, giving  $o_i \prec o_j$  (strictly preferred) and  $o_i \approx o_j$  (equally preferred)

This can be use to create

- A single total preliminary ordering  $\leq_p$  over O
- ► For every agent a partial agent ordering  $\leq_a$  over *O* To be aggregated to select a final dialogue outcome

The deliberation

dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Result



### Conclusions

- Extended Prakken 2005's framework
  - Multiple proposals
  - Dialogical status for deliberation relevance

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



### Conclusions

- Extended Prakken 2005's framework
  - Multiple proposals
  - Dialogical status for deliberation relevance
- ► Formalises McBurney et al. 2007's framework
  - Explicit reply structure
  - Classification on proposed options



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Extended Prakken 2005's framework
  - Multiple proposals
  - Dialogical status for deliberation relevance
- ► Formalises McBurney et al. 2007's framework
  - Explicit reply structure
  - Classification on proposed options
- McBurney et al. 2002's desiderata for argumentation protocols

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



Formal properties



#### Universiteit Utrecht

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results

17

- Formal properties
- Preference-based argumentation



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Formal properties
- Preference-based argumentation
- Value-based argumentation

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Formal properties
- Preference-based argumentation
- Value-based argumentation
- Deliberation strategies



The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- Formal properties
- Preference-based argumentation
- Value-based argumentation
- Deliberation strategies
- Testing argumentation dialogues

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

Results



- McBurney, P., Hitchcock, D., Parsons, S.: The eightfold way of the deliberation dialogue. International Journal of Intelligent Systems 22(1), 95132 (2007)
- Prakken, H.: Coherence and Flexibility in Dialogue Games for Argumentation. Journal of Logic and Computation 15(6), 10091040 (2005)
- McBurney, P., Parsons, S., Wooldridge, M.: Desiderata for agent argumentation protocols. In: Proceedings of the first international joint conference on Autonomous agents and multiagent systems. pp. 402409. Bologna, Italy (2002)
- Web: http://people.cs.uu.nl/erickok/
- E-mail: erickok@cs.uu.nl

#### Introduction

The deliberation dialogue Existing work

#### Deliberation framework

Formal system Status of moves Protocol Dialogue outcome

#### Results

