

Set Contribution Functions for Quantitative Bipolar Argumentation and their Principles

Filip Naudot, Andreas Brännström, Vicenç Torra, Timotheus Kampik

Umeå University, Sweden

Abstract

We present functions that quantify the contribution of a set of arguments in quantitative bipolar argumentation graphs to (the final strength of) an argument of interest—a so-called *topic*. Our *set contribution functions* are generalizations of existing functions that quantify the contribution of a single contributing argument to a topic. Accordingly, we generalize existing contribution function principles for set contribution functions and provide a corresponding principle-based analysis. We introduce new principles specific to set-based functions that focus on properties pertaining to the interaction of arguments within a set. Finally, we sketch how the principles play out across different set contribution functions given a recommendation system application scenario.

Key words: Quantitative Argumentation, Explainable AI, Automated Reasoning

1. Introduction

Computational Argumentation (CA) refers to a collection of graph-based approaches for reasoning about potentially conflicting knowledge. In CA, arguments are typically modeled as nodes in a graph and the relationships between arguments are modeled by one or several binary relations on the arguments, typically representing *attack* or *support* between nodes. In recent years, the study of CA has received increasing attention due to its potential to provide a somewhat intuitive bridge between human and machine reasoning, as well as between symbolic and subsymbolic inference [1, 2]. Especially in the latter case, a frequently studied CA approach is quantitative bipolar argumentation, in which arguments with numeric weights—so called initial strengths—are related via support and attack relations. The graphs are called *Quantitative Bipolar Argumentation Graphs* (QBAGs). Initial strengths and graph topology are used by so-called *gradual semantics* for drawing inferences by updating the initial strengths of the arguments to *final* strengths [3, 4]. Several applications and fundamental methods that draw inferences using QBAGs rely on meta-reasoning functions to quantify how much one argument (called *contributor*) contributes to the final strengths of another argument

Email addresses: filipn@cs.umu.se (Filip Naudot), andreasb@cs.umu.se (Andreas Brännström), vtorra@cs.umu.se (Vicenç Torra), tkampik@cs.umu.se (Timotheus Kampik)

(called *topic*) [5, 6, 7]. Accordingly, such functions are sometimes called *contribution functions*.

Scenarios for QBAG contribution functions are, for example, the following:

Scenario 1. Quantify how much a marginal change to an initial strength of one of several contributors affects the final strength of a topic to identify somewhat *small* changes that, when applied, achieve a change of the topic’s final strength in the desired direction.

Scenario 2. Quantify how much the presence of a contributor affects the final strength of a topic.

Scenario 3. Quantify how contributions to the final strength of a topic are distributed among several contributors.

Note that often, the focus of contribution function principles is on *acyclic* QBAGs, as this restriction simplifies practical computation, as well as theoretical analysis, and is pragmatic in many use-cases (e.g., [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13]). Accordingly, our analysis focuses on the acyclic case as well.

Clearly, the three scenarios sketched above require different contribution functions. Accordingly, several contribution functions have been defined in the literature, and contribution function *principles* have been established that allow to distinguish between contribution functions in a rigorous manner [14, 15, 6, 7].



However, existing contribution functions cover the quantification of the contribution of a *single* argument to a topic, which means in the above scenarios, they leave some questions unanswered.

- In Scenario 1, one typically wants to find the most impactful contribution that a marginal change of any of several contributors can achieve, to then adjust the initial strength of this most impactful contributor accordingly.
- In Scenario 2, one may as well be interested in the effect the presence of several contributors has on a topic.
- In Scenario 3, one may want to group several contributors, for example all arguments that have been advanced by a specific agent, such that they are evaluated jointly.

To address these issues, this paper introduces and analyzes *set contribution functions* that can quantify the contribution of a set of arguments to a topic (Section 3). Our new functions generalize (single argument) contribution functions, in that the latter are covered by a special case (set contributor with cardinality of one) of the former (Section 4). With this, we address Scenario 1 by introducing an abstract *gradient* set contribution function Sctrb^{∂} that aggregates several single-argument gradient contributions; from this, we then instantiate a function $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial^{\max}}$ that determines the maximal gradient and thus most effective positive change. We address Scenarios 2 by introducing the *removal-based* set contribution function $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$ that determines the delta between a topic’s initial strength with and without the set contributor. A second variant—the *intrinsic* removal-based set contribution function $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}^{\dagger}}$ —controls for

indirect effects on the set contributors. Finally, a Shapley-value based set contribution function $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$, which can be further generalized to determine contributions across an arbitrary *partition* of the set of arguments, address Scenario 3. To clarify the impact of this generalization, let us provide an illustrative example.

Example 1.1. Consider the QBAG displayed in Subfigure 1.1, with topic argument a and contributing arguments d and f. When assessed individually (using QE semantics σ), both d and f have a negative removal-based ($\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$) effect on the final strength of a. However, when the two are considered together as a *set contributor* $\{d, f\}$, their joint contribution to a becomes positive. This sign inconsistency is illustrated in Subfigure 1.2, and shows that set contributions can exhibit effects that would be difficult to measure using single-argument contributions alone. In other words, while single-argument contribution functions allow us to understand how each argument individually affects the topic, only set contribution functions can reveal how combinations of arguments interact in a way that fundamentally alters their overall impact.



1.1: A QBAG G (Example 1.1). A node labelled $x: (\tau(x))$ represents argument x with initial strength $\tau(x)$ and final strength $\sigma(x)$. Edges labelled $+$ and $-$, respectively, represent support and attack relations.

1.2: Sign map for removal-based set contribution of $\{d\}$, $\{f\}$, and $\{d, f\}$ to topic a.

Figure 1: Example: the sign of the contributions of individual arguments to a topic may be inconsistent with the sign of the set contribution given the set of exactly these arguments.

Having introduced set contribution functions, we define principles for them, some of which are generalizations of single-argument contribution function principles, and some of which are novel (Section 5). The principles based on the single-argument setting adapt established principles to sets: i) *Contribution existence* stipulates that if a topic's final strength does not equal its initial strength, a non-zero set contributor must exist; ii) *Quantitative contribution existence* requires that for all partitions of a set of arguments, the sum of the set contributions to a topic, given the partitions, must add up to the delta between the topic's final and initial strengths; iii) *Directionality* stipulates

that if a set contributor cannot reach a topic, the contribution to the topic must be zero; iv) finally, *counterfactuality* requires that a set contribution matches the inverted sign of the effect on a topics’ final strength when removing the set contributor, or in the stricter *quantitative* case, equals the delta between a topic’s final strength with set contributor present and its final strength without.

We also introduce entirely new principles based on intuitions about desired behaviors, given several set contributors and interactions between them: i) *Weak quantitative contribution existence* stipulates that a partition of the arguments must exist for which the sum of the contributions of the partition to a topic adds up to the delta between the topics final and initial strengths; ii) *Consistency* requires that if two sets’ contributions to the same topic have the same sign, then the contribution of the sets’ union (to the same topic) must have the corresponding sign as well; iii) Finally, *monotonicity* stipulates that when one set contributor is a superset of (or equal to) another one, the contribution of the former must be at least as large as the latter (to the same topic).

Based on both groups of principles, we execute a principle-based analysis of the set contribution functions with respect to several gradual semantics (Section 6), whose results are summarized in Tables 1 and Tables 2. Finally, we sketch an application scenario of set contribution functions, based on a QBAG use-case from the literature (Section 7), before we conclude the paper by a brief discussion of related and potential future work (Section 8). An implementation of our contribution functions is, alongside documentation and examples, available at <https://github.com/TimKam/Quantitative-Bipolar-Argumentation>.

2. Preliminaries

Before we present the paper’s contributions, let us introduce the necessary preliminaries: first of QBAG fundamentals and then of QBAG (single-argument) contribution functions and their principles.

2.1. QBAGs and Gradual Semantics

We use \mathbb{I} to denote *strength values*. Here, we assume a real interval, and more specifically $\mathbb{I} = [0, 1]$. A QBAG is a set of elements, called *arguments*, on which two disjoint binary relations, called *support* and *attack*, are established. An initial strength function maps arguments to values in \mathbb{I} .

Definition 2.1 (Quantitative Bipolar Argumentation Graph (QBAG) [16, 3]). A *Quantitative Bipolar Argumentation Graph (QBAG)* is a quadruple $(Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$, where $Args$ is a set of arguments, $Att \subseteq Args \times Args$ is called an *attack* relation, $Supp \subseteq Args \times Args$ is called a *support* relation, $Att \cap Supp = \emptyset$ holds, and $\tau : Args \rightarrow \mathbb{I}$ is an *initial strength function*.

Henceforth, we assume a QBAG $G = (Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$ s.t. $Args$ is finite, τ is total, and $(Args, Att \cup Supp)$ is acyclic. We also assume that $a, b, x, y \in Args$ and $S \subseteq Args$. If $(a, b) \in Att$ we say that “a attacks b (in G)” or “a is an attacker of b (in G)”. If $(a, b) \in Supp$ we say that “a supports b (in G)” or “a is a supporter of b (in G)”. We say

Table 1: Satisfaction and violation of set contribution function principles (cf. Section 6), given a semantics σ (cf. Section 2) and a set contribution function Sctrb (cf. Section 3). All set contribution function principles in this table are generalizations of contribution function principles introduced in [14].

Sctrb / σ	QE	DFQuAD	SD-DFQuAD	EB	EBT
Contribution Existence					
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{R}}	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{R}'}	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{D}}	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{D}_{\max}}	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗
Quantitative Contribution Existence					
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{R}}	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{R}'}	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{D}}	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{D}_{\max}}	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Directionality					
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{R}}	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{R}'}	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{D}}	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{D}_{\max}}	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
(Quantitative) Counterfactuality					
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{R}}	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{R}'}	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{D}}	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Sctrb ^{\mathcal{D}_{\max}}	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗

Table 2: Satisfaction and violation of set contribution function principles, given a semantics σ and a set contribution function Sctrb . The set contribution function principles in this table are not generalizations of existing contribution function principles.

Sctrb / σ	QE	DFQuAD	SD-DFQuAD	EB	EBT
Weak Quantitative Contribution Existence					
$\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
$\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}'}$	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
$\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{F}}$	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
$\text{Sctrb}^{\delta_{\max}}$	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Consistency					
$\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
$\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}'}$	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
$\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{F}}$	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
$\text{Sctrb}^{\delta_{\max}}$	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Monotonicity					
$\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
$\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}'}$	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
$\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{F}}$	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
$\text{Sctrb}^{\delta_{\max}}$	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

that “a can reach b (in G)” iff there is a directed path from a to b in $(\text{Args}, \text{Att} \cup \text{Supp})$ or $a = b$. We may drop the reference to G where the context is clear.

We define the *restriction* of G to S, denoted by $G \downarrow_S$, as follows: $G \downarrow_S := (S, \tau \cap (S \times \mathbb{I}), \text{Att} \cap (S \times S), \text{Supp} \cap (S \times S))$. Somewhat analogously, we define the *initial strength modification* of G w.r.t. $x \in \text{Args}$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}$, denoted by $G \downarrow_{\tau(x) \leftarrow \varepsilon}$ as follows: $G \downarrow_{\tau(x) \leftarrow \varepsilon} := (\text{Args}, \tau', \text{Att}, \text{Supp})$, where $\tau'(x) = \varepsilon$ and $\tau'(y) = \tau(y)$ for all other $y \in \text{Args} \setminus \{x\}$.

Gradual semantics update the initial strengths of arguments in a QBAG to *final* strengths, considering the QBAG’s topology, thus giving rise to *final strength functions*.

Definition 2.2 (Gradual Semantics and Strength Functions [3, 16]). A *gradual semantics* σ defines a (possibly partial) *strength function* $\sigma_G : \text{Args} \rightarrow \mathbb{I} \cup \{\perp\}$ that assigns the *final strength* $\sigma_G(x)$ to each $x \in \text{Args}$, where \perp is a reserved symbol for “undefined”.

Again, we may drop G where the context is clear.

A commonly studied class of gradual semantics are so-called *modular semantics* [17]. In order to draw inferences from QBAGs, modular semantics update arguments’ initial strengths to final strengths by traversing the graph in topological order and updating a given argument’s final strength by first *aggregating* the final strengths of its attackers and supporters to then determine the *influence* of the aggregation result on the argument’s initial strength. Below, we describe how modular semantics work based on [14]. Initially, we let $(x_1, \dots, x_{|\text{Args}|})$ be a fixed total order of the arguments in Args that is consistent with the topological ordering of the (acyclic) QBAG; we then define a vector $s^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\text{Args}|}$ of initial strengths of these arguments, i.e., $s_i^{(0)} := \tau(x_i)$

for $1 \leq i \leq |Args|$. The initial strengths are then iteratively updated to final strengths in two steps, at a given iteration step i :

Aggregation. An aggregation function α aggregates the current strength values of x_i 's supporters and attackers given $s^{(i)}$ to a single value. For representing attack and support, or lack thereof, to a given argument, we utilize a vector $v \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^n$, where -1 , 1 , and 0 represent attack, support, and neither, respectively.

Influence. An influence function ι determines a new strength value for x_i , based on the aggregation result and x_i 's initial strength $w := \tau(x_i)$.

The execution of aggregation and influence function for all arguments yields a new vector $s^{(i+1)}$; this update is executed until we reach $s^{(|Args|)}$. Table 3 lists aggregation and influence functions from the literature, and Table 4 lists some modular semantics that make use of these functions.

Aggregation Functions		
Sum	$\alpha_v^\Sigma : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$	$\alpha_v^\Sigma(s) = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \times s_i$
Product	$\alpha_v^\Pi : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow [-1, 1]$	$\alpha_v^\Pi(s) = \prod_{i:v_i=-1} (1 - s_i) - \prod_{i:v_i=1} (1 - s_i)$
Top	$\alpha_v^{max} : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow [-1, 1]$	$\alpha_v^{max}(s) = M_v(s) - M_{-v}(s)$, where $M_v(s) = \max\{0, v_1 \times s_1, \dots, v_n \times s_n\}$
Influence Functions		
Linear(k)	$\iota_w^l : [-k, k] \rightarrow [0, 1]$	$\iota_w^l(s) = w - \frac{w}{k} \times \max\{0, -s\} + \frac{1-w}{k} \times \max\{0, s\}$
Euler-based	$\iota_w^e : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [w^2, 1]$	$\iota_w^e(s) = 1 - \frac{1-w^2}{1+w \times e^s}$
p-Max(k)	$\iota_w^p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$	$\iota_w^p(s) = w - w \times h(-\frac{s}{k}) + (1-w) \times h(\frac{s}{k})$, where $h(x) = \frac{\max\{0, x\}^p}{1 + \max\{0, x\}^p}$
	for $p \in \mathbb{N}$	

Table 3: Some aggregation α and influence ι functions [16, pp. 1724 Table 1] for modular semantics. $s \in [0, 1]^n$ is a strength vector (associating each argument with its current strength); $v \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^n$ is a relationship vector indicating which arguments attack (-1), support (1) or are in no relationship to (0) the argument of interest; w is an initial strength.

Semantics	Aggregation	Influence
QuadraticEnergyModel (QE)	Sum	2-Max(1)
DFQuADModel (DFQuAD)	Product	Linear(1)
SquaredDFQuADModel (SD-DFQuAD)	Product	1-Max(1)
EulerBasedModel (EB)	Sum	EulerBased
EulerBasedTopModel (EBT)	Top	EulerBased

Table 4: Examples of modular (gradual) semantics.

To support the analysis of gradual semantics, *principles* have been defined that describe desired semantics behavior. While most of our observations do not require indirection via principles, we use the *stability* principle [18] for some results with respect to *contribution existence*. Stability stipulates that in absence of attackers and supporters, an argument's final strength equals its initial strength. As a prerequisite we denote, given $a \in Args$, all attackers of a by $\mathcal{R}_G^-(a)$ and all supporters of a by $\mathcal{R}_G^+(a)$.

Principle 2.1 (Stability). A gradual semantics σ satisfies the *stability* principle iff $\mathcal{R}_G^-(a) = \mathcal{R}_G^+(a) = \emptyset$ implies that $\sigma(a) = \tau(a)$.

2.2. Single-Argument Contribution Functions and their Principles

In this paper, we generalize (single-argument) contribution functions that determine the contribution of one argument—the so-called *contributor*—to another one (the *topic*). Henceforth, we assume a gradual semantics σ .

Definition 2.3 ((Single-Argument) Contribution Function). A contribution function

$$\text{Ctrb}_{\sigma, G, a} : \text{Args} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \perp$$

with respect to $G = (\text{Args}, \tau, \text{Att}, \text{Supp})$, σ , and $a \in \text{Args}$ takes an argument $x \in \text{Args}$ and returns a real number or *undefined* (\perp), quantifying the *contribution of (contributor) x to (topic) a* .

We may drop any of the subscripts σ , G , and a where the context is clear.

A simple and intuitive contribution function computes the difference between the topic's final strength given the original QBAG and its final strength in absence of the contributor.

Definition 2.4 (Removal-based Contribution Function [14]). We define the removal-based contribution function $\text{Ctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}} : \text{Args} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \perp$ as follows:

$$\text{Ctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}}(x) := \sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus \{x\}}}(a).$$

One may argue that the removal-based contribution function does not determine the *intrinsic* contribution of the contributor to the topic's final strength, as it also measures the impact of the contributor's contributors. In order to avoid this, one can remove incoming attack and support edges to the contributor, thus ignoring effects other arguments have on the contributor's final strength (given reasonable assumptions about the applied semantics).

Definition 2.5 (Intrinsic Removal-based Contribution Function [14]). We define the intrinsic removal-based contribution function $\text{Ctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}'} : \text{Args} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \perp$ as follows:

$$\text{Ctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}'}(x) := \sigma_{(\text{Args}, \tau, \text{Att} \setminus \{(y,x) \mid (y,x) \in \text{Att}\}, \text{Supp} \setminus \{(y,x) \mid (y,x) \in \text{Supp}\})}(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus \{x\}}}(a).$$

Yet differently, we can apply Shapley values for a principle-based game theoretical assessment of contributions to the final strength of a topic, where contributors are seen as agents forming coalitions in cooperative games.

Definition 2.6 (Shapley Value-based Contribution Function [14]). We define the Shapley value-based contribution function $\text{Ctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}} : \text{Args} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \perp$ as follows:

$$\text{Ctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(x) := \sum_{S \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{x, a\}} \frac{|S|! \cdot (|\text{Args} \setminus \{a\}| - |S| - 1)!}{|\text{Args} \setminus \{a\}|!} \left(\sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus S}}(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus (S \cup \{x\})}}(a) \right).$$

Finally, we can measure the contribution of the effect of a marginal change to the initial strength of a contributor on the final strengths of a topic.

Definition 2.7 (Gradient-based Contribution Function [14]). We define the gradient-based contribution function $\text{Ctrb}_a^\partial : \text{Args} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \perp$ as follows:

$$\text{Ctrb}_a^\partial(x) := \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \tau(x)}(\tau(x_1), \dots, \tau(x_n)),$$

where x_1, \dots, x_n are all arguments from which there is a path to a in the graph $(\text{Args}, \text{Att} \cup \text{Supp})$ and f is a composition of aggregation function α and influence function ι .

For contribution functions, *principles* have been defined that formalize desiderata of function behavior and can be used to select contribution functions for a given use-case. Principle satisfaction typically depends on the behavior of the applied gradual semantics. Below, we list and briefly explain some principles that have been defined in previous work. Henceforth, we assume a generic contribution function Ctrb .

The *contribution existence* principle stipulates that each (topic) argument whose final strength does not equal its initial strength should have a contributor with a non-zero contribution.

Principle 2.2 (Contribution Existence [14]). Ctrb satisfies the *contribution existence principle* w.r.t. a gradual semantics σ iff $\sigma(a) \neq \tau(a)$ implies that $\exists x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ with $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) \neq 0$.

Quantitative contribution existence is a stricter principle, requiring that the sum of all contributors' contribution must add up to the difference between final and initial strengths of the topic.

Principle 2.3 (Quantitative Contribution Existence [14]). Ctrb satisfies the *quantitative contribution existence principle* w.r.t. a gradual semantics σ iff it holds that $\sum_{x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}} \text{Ctrb}_a(x) = \sigma(a) - \tau(a)$.

Directionality stipulates that contributors that cannot reach a topic must have a contribution of zero, following the intuition that contributions cannot propagate against a QBAG's topological order.

Principle 2.4 (Directionality [15]¹). Ctrb satisfies the *directionality principle* w.r.t. a gradual semantics σ iff whenever there is no directed path in G from $x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ to a , then $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) = 0$.

Counterfactuality requires that the direction of the contribution is consistent with direction of the difference between a topic's final strength in the original QBAG and its final strength in absence of the contributor.

Principle 2.5 (Counterfactuality [14]). Ctrb satisfies the *counterfactuality principle* w.r.t. a gradual semantics σ iff for every $x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ ² the following statements hold:

¹We adjusted this principle for the case that $x = a$, as above we assume that an argument can reach itself.

²As a minor technical fix of the definition in [14], we explicitly require $x \neq a$ (same for the *quantitative* case).

- If $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) < 0$, then $\sigma_G(a) < \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus \{x\}}}(a)$;
- If $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) = 0$, then $\sigma_G(a) = \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus \{x\}}}(a)$;
- If $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) > 0$, then $\sigma_G(a) > \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus \{x\}}}(a)$.

Finally, quantitative counterfactuality is a stricter principle, stipulating that a contribution must equal the difference between a topic's final strength in the original QBAG and its final strength in absence of the contributor.

Principle 2.6 (Quantitative Counterfactuality [14]). Ctrb satisfies the *quantitative counterfactuality principle* w.r.t. a gradual semantics σ iff for every $x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ it holds that $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) = \sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus \{x\}}}(a)$.

3. Set Contribution Functions

A set contribution function takes a subset of a QBAG's arguments in order to quantify these arguments' contribution to a topic.

Definition 3.1 (Set Contribution Function). A set contribution function

$$\text{Sctrb}_{\sigma, G, a} : 2^{\text{Args}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \perp$$

with respect to $G = (\text{Args}, \tau, \text{Att}, \text{Supp})$, σ , and $a \in \text{Args}$ takes a set of arguments $X \subseteq \text{Args}$ and returns a real number or *undefined* (\perp), quantifying the *contribution of (set contributor) X to (topic) a*.

Given $\text{Sctrb}_a(X)$, we call a *topic* and X *set contributor*. Given a contribution function $\text{Sctrb}_{\sigma, G, a}$, we drop the subscripts σ, G, a where the context is clear. Below, we assume a QBAG G , a topic argument $a \in \text{Args}$, a set contributor $X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$, and a strength function σ , if not specified otherwise.

The following definitions are based on those presented in [14], and have been generalized to quantify the contribution of a set of arguments, rather than a single contributing argument.

The removal-based set contribution function determines the delta between the topic's final strength in the original graph and its final strength in the restriction of the graph from which the set contributor has been removed.

Definition 3.2 (Removal-Based Set Contribution Function). The removal-based set contribution function $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}} : 2^{\text{Args}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \perp$ is defined as:

$$\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}}(X) := \sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus X}}(a) \quad (1)$$

Intuitively, the *intrinsic* variant of the removal-based set contribution function removes all incoming attacks and supports to the set contributor before determining the final strength of the topic, and is otherwise analogous to the removal-based set contribution function. The idea is to control for indirect contributions that come through attackers or supporters of the set contributor.

Definition 3.3 (Intrinsic Removal-Based Set Contribution Function). The intrinsic removal-based set contribution function $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}} : 2^{Args} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \perp$ is defined as:

$$\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}}(X) := \sigma_{(Args, \tau, Att \setminus \{(y,x) \in Att \mid y \notin X, x \in X\}, Supp \setminus \{(y,x) \in Supp \mid y \notin X, x \in X\})}(\mathbf{a}) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus X}}(\mathbf{a})$$

Gradient set-based contribution functions determine and then aggregate the effects of marginal changes to the initial strengths of arguments in the set contributor. Accordingly, we first define an *abstract* gradient-based set contribution function that we can later instantiate given a specific aggregation function.

Definition 3.4 (Gradient-Based Set Contribution Function (Abstract)). Let $a \in Args$ and let $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in Args$ be the arguments that have a directed path to a in G , with corresponding initial strengths $(\tau(y_1), \dots, \tau(y_n))$. Now, let $\psi: \mathbb{R}^{|X|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an aggregation function that maps a set of $|X|$ real numbers to a single real value. The gradient-based set contribution function $\text{Sctrb}^\partial : 2^{Args} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \perp$ is then defined as:

$$\text{Sctrb}_a^\partial(X) := \psi \left(\left\{ \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \tau(x)}(\tau(y_1), \dots, \tau(y_n)) \mid x \in X \right\} \right).$$

Intuitively, a suitable aggregation function is max, as it helps us answer the question how to affect the maximal (positive) change, assuming a maximization objective.

Definition 3.5 (Gradient-Based Set Contribution Function (Max)). Let $a \in Args$ and let $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in Args$ be the arguments that have a directed path to a in G , with corresponding initial strengths $(\tau(y_1), \dots, \tau(y_n))$. The max gradient-based set contribution function $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial \max} : 2^{Args} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \perp$ is now defined as:

$$\text{Sctrb}_a^{\partial \max}(X) := \max_{x \in X} \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \tau(x)}(\tau(y_1), \dots, \tau(y_n)).$$

This function captures the maximum gradient-based contribution of any argument in X to the topic argument a .

Note that similarly, one could use min, in case our objective is to minimize the topic's final strength, or the the max of the gradients' absolutes, in case we are interested in how "stable" (in some sense) the topic's final strength is, given marginal changes to the initial strength of an argument in the set contributor. Still, for the sake of conciseness, we limit ourselves to max.

Finally, we introduce the Shapley value-based set contribution function that utilizes the well-known power index for fairly distributing the contributions among arguments and sets thereof. We can first provide a general definition that assumes a specific partition P of $Args \setminus \{a\}$ and then determines the contribution of $X \in P$.

Definition 3.6 (Shapley Value-Based Set-Partition Contribution Function). Let P be a partition of $Args \setminus \{a\}$ and $X \in P$. the Shapley value-based set-partition contribution function is defined as:

$$\text{Pctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(X, P) := \sum_{P' \subseteq P \setminus \{X\}} \frac{|P'|! \cdot (|P| - |P'| - 1)!}{|P'|!} \left(\sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus P'_j}}(\mathbf{a}) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus (P'_j \cup X)}}(\mathbf{a}) \right),$$

where $P'_U = \bigcup_{S \in P'} S$.

Clearly, the function above is not a set contribution function, as it depends—in addition to the set contributor—on a specific partition. Hence, we also provide a specialized set contribution function variant that intuitively partitions $Args \setminus \{a\}$ into the set contributor X and sets of single arguments. However, the set-partition contribution function above can potentially be useful due to its increased expressivity.

Definition 3.7 (Shapley Value-Based Set Contribution Function). The Shapley value-based set contribution function $Sctrb^{\mathcal{S}} : 2^{Args} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \perp$ is defined as:

$$Sctrb_a^{\mathcal{S}}(X) := \sum_{S \subseteq Args \setminus (X \cup \{a\})} \frac{|S|! \cdot (|Args \setminus (\{a\} \cup X)| - |S|)!}{(|Args \setminus (\{a\} \cup X)| + 1)!} \left(\sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus S}}(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus (S \cup X)}}(a) \right).$$

4. Generalization of Single-Argument Contribution Functions

The set contribution functions that we have introduced in the previous section are supposed to generalize the single-argument contribution functions as presented in [14]. Intuitively, a set contribution function generalizes a single-argument contribution function only if it generally holds that a contributor’s single-argument contribution to a topic is the same as the corresponding set contribution to that topic, given a set that only contains the aforementioned contributor.

Principle 4.1 (Ctrb-Generalization). A set contribution function $Sctrb$ generalizes a contribution function $Ctrb$ iff $Ctrb_a(x) = Sctrb_a(\{x\})$.

We can show that our set contribution functions indeed generalize their single-argument counterparts.

Proposition 4.1. $Sctrb^{\mathcal{R}}$ generalizes $Ctrb^{\mathcal{R}}$, $Sctrb^{\mathcal{R}'}$ generalizes $Ctrb^{\mathcal{R}'}$, $Sctrb^{\mathcal{S}}$ generalizes $Ctrb^{\mathcal{S}}$, and $Sctrb^{\partial \max}$ generalizes $Ctrb^{\partial}$.

Proof. For every set contribution function $Sctrb \in \{Sctrb^{\mathcal{R}}, Sctrb^{\mathcal{R}'}, Sctrb^{\mathcal{S}}, Sctrb^{\partial \max}\}$, we replace X by $\{x\}$ in the corresponding definition (Definitions 3.2, 3.3, 3.7, and 3.5, respectively).

Removal-based. This yields $\sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{x\}}}(a) = Ctrb_a^{\mathcal{R}}(x)$ (Definition 2.4).

Intrinsic removal-based. This yields $\sigma_{(Args, \tau, Att \setminus \{(y,x) | (y,x) \in Att\}, Supp \setminus \{(y,x) | (y,x) \in Supp\})}(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{x\}}}(a) = Ctrb_a^{\mathcal{R}'}(x)$ (Definition 2.5). Note that we can drop the “ $y \notin \{x\}$ ” constraints of Definition 3.3, as we assume that G is acyclic.

Shapley value-based. This yields:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{S \subseteq Args \setminus (\{x\} \cup \{a\})} \frac{|S|! \cdot (|Args \setminus (\{a\} \cup \{x\})| - |S|)!}{(|Args \setminus (\{a\} \cup \{x\})| + 1)!} \left(\sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus S}}(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus (S \cup \{x\})}}(a) \right) \\ &= \sum_{S \subseteq Args \setminus \{x,a\}} \frac{|S|! \cdot (|Args \setminus \{a\}| - |S| - 1)!}{|Args \setminus \{a\}|!} \left(\sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus S}}(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus (S \cup \{x\})}}(a) \right) \\ &= Ctrb_a^{\mathcal{S}}(x) \text{ (Definition 2.6).} \end{aligned}$$

Gradient-based. This yields: $\max_{x \in X} \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \tau(x)} (\tau(y_1), \dots, \tau(y_n)) =$
 $\max_{x \in \{x\}} \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \tau(x)} (\tau(y_1), \dots, \tau(y_n)) = \text{Ctrb}_a^\partial(x)$ (Definition 2.7).

□

5. Principles

For the set contribution functions as introduced in the previous section, we introduce contribution function principles that reflect expected behaviors of these functions, and that are either satisfied or violated given a set contribution function and a gradual semantics. First, we introduce principles that reflect the single-argument contribution function principles from the preliminaries. We then formally show how these new set contribution function principles relate to their single-argument counterparts. Finally, we introduce entirely new principles that reflect desiderata of function behavior given set partitions and other interactions between contributor sets.

Contribution existence stipulates that if a topic's final strength does not equal its initial strength, there must exist a set contributor with a non-zero contribution.

Principle 5.1 (Contribution Existence). A set contribution function Sctrb satisfies *contribution existence* w.r.t. a gradual semantics σ iff $\sigma(a) \neq \tau(a)$ implies that $\exists X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ with $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) \neq 0$.

Quantitative contribution existence requires that for all partitions of $\text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$, the sum of the set contributions of the elements in the partition must amount to the delta between the topic's final and initial strengths.

Principle 5.2 (Quantitative Contribution Existence). A set contribution function Sctrb satisfies *quantitative contribution existence* w.r.t. a gradual semantics σ iff for all partitions P of $\text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ it holds that $\sum_{X \in P} \text{Sctrb}_a(X) = \sigma(a) - \tau(a)$.

Directionality stipulates that a set contributor must have a contribution of zero if non of its arguments can reach the topic.

Principle 5.3 (Directionality). A set contribution function Sctrb satisfies *directionality* w.r.t. a gradual semantics σ iff for every $X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ it holds that $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) = 0$ whenever $\forall x \in X$ it holds that x cannot reach a (in G).

Principle 5.4 (Counterfactuality). A set contribution function Sctrb satisfies *counterfactuality* w.r.t. a gradual semantics σ iff for every $X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ the following statements hold:

- If $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) < 0$, then $\sigma_G(a) < \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus X}}(a)$.
- If $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) = 0$, then $\sigma_G(a) = \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus X}}(a)$.
- If $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) > 0$, then $\sigma_G(a) > \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus X}}(a)$.

Principle 5.5 (Quantitative Counterfactuality). A set contribution function Sctrb satisfies *quantitative counterfactuality* w.r.t. a gradual semantics σ iff for every $X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ it holds that $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) = \sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus X}}(a)$.

Intuitively, one would expect that set contribution principles as specified above can be formally related to single-argument contribution function principles. We can achieve this by introducing notions of *principle generalization*, stipulating that principle satisfaction by a single argument contribution function implies satisfaction of its generalizations or vice versa. As a prerequisite to formalizing this, we denote a generic single-argument contribution function principle by p (i.e., $p : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \{true, false\}$), where \mathcal{C} is the class of all single-argument contribution functions, and a generic set contribution function principle by p' (i.e., $p' : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \{true, false\}$), where \mathcal{S} is the class of all set contribution functions; in both cases \mathcal{L} is the class of all gradual semantics.

Definition 5.1 (\uparrow and \downarrow Principle Generalization). Let p' be a set contribution function principle. Iff for every gradual semantics σ , for every single-argument contribution function Ctrb , and for every set contribution function Sctrb s.t. Sctrb generalizes Ctrb it holds that:

- if Ctrb satisfies p w.r.t. σ then Sctrb satisfies p' w.r.t. σ , then we say that “ p' \uparrow -generalizes p ”;
- if Sctrb satisfies p' w.r.t. σ then Ctrb satisfies p w.r.t. σ , then we say that “ p' \downarrow -generalizes p ”.

We can show that the set contribution function principles that we have introduced so far all either \uparrow -generalize or \downarrow -generalize single-argument contribution function principles. Contribution existence is a \uparrow -generalization.

Proposition 5.1. *The set contribution function principle contribution existence \uparrow -generalizes its equally named single-argument contribution principle-counterpart.*

Proof. Assume a contribution function Sctrb that generalizes a contribution function Ctrb . Then, it holds that $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) = \text{Sctrb}_a(\{x\})$ (Definition 4.1). We can assume $\sigma(a) \neq \tau(a)$ and need to show that if $\exists x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ with $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) \neq 0$ (Principle 2.2) then $\exists X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ with $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) \neq 0$ (Principle 5.1). Because $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) = \text{Sctrb}_a(\{x\})$ holds, we know this is the case for every $x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ s.t. $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) \neq 0$ (which must exist, due to the satisfaction of Principle 2.2). \square

In contrast, quantitative contribution existence, directionality, counterfactuality, and quantitative counterfactuality are \downarrow -generalizations.

Proposition 5.2. *The following set contribution function principles \downarrow -generalize their equally named single-argument contribution principle-counterparts: quantitative contribution existence, directionality, counterfactuality, and quantitative counterfactuality.*

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 5.1, assume a set contribution function Sctrb that generalizes a contribution function Ctrb . Then, it holds that $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) = \text{Sctrb}_a(\{x\})$ (Definition 4.1).

Quantitative contribution existence. We need to show that if for all partitions P of $\text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ it holds that $\sum_{X \in P} \text{Sctrb}_a(X) = \sigma(a) - \tau(a)$ (Principle 5.2) then it

also holds that $\sum_{x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}} \text{Ctrb}_a(x) = \sigma(a) - \tau(a)$ (Principle 2.3). Because we can assume that $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) = \text{Sctrb}_a(\{x\})$ holds, we can re-write Principle 5.2 as follows: for the partition P' of $\text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ such that $|P'| = |\text{Args} \setminus \{a\}|$ the following statement holds:

$$\sum_{\{x\} \in P'} \text{Sctrb}_a(\{x\}) = \sigma(a) - \tau(a).$$

This corresponds to Principle 5.2, thus proving the proposition.

Directionality. We need to show that if $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) = 0$ whenever $\forall x \in X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ we have that x cannot reach a (in G) (Principle 5.3) then $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) = 0$ whenever x cannot reach a (in G , Principle 2.4). Because $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) = \text{Sctrb}_a(\{x\})$, the following must hold:

if $\forall x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ s.t. x cannot reach a it holds that $\text{Sctrb}_a(\{x\}) = 0$

then $\forall x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ s.t. x cannot reach a it holds that $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) = 0$.

This proves the proposition.

Counterfactuality. We need to show that if for any $X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$, the following statements hold (Principle 5.4):

(i).a If $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) < 0$, then $\sigma_G(a) < \sigma_{G \downarrow \text{Args} \setminus X}(a)$;

(ii).a If $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) = 0$, then $\sigma_G(a) = \sigma_{G \downarrow \text{Args} \setminus X}(a)$;

(iii).a If $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) > 0$, then $\sigma_G(a) > \sigma_{G \downarrow \text{Args} \setminus X}(a)$,

then the following statements hold for $x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ (Principle 2.5):

(i).b If $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) < 0$, then $\sigma_G(a) < \sigma_{G \downarrow \text{Args} \setminus \{x\}}(a)$;

(ii).b If $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) = 0$, then $\sigma_G(a) = \sigma_{G \downarrow \text{Args} \setminus \{x\}}(a)$;

(iii).b If $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) > 0$, then $\sigma_G(a) > \sigma_{G \downarrow \text{Args} \setminus \{x\}}(a)$.

Because $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) = \text{Sctrb}_a(\{x\})$ holds, we can simply replace $\text{Ctrb}_a(x)$ by $\text{Sctrb}_a(\{x\})$ in (i).b - (iii).b. Then, we see that (i).b, (ii).b and (iii).b are special cases of (i).a, (ii).a and (iii).a, respectively.

Quantitative counterfactuality. We need to show that if for every $X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ it holds that $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) = \sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow \text{Args} \setminus X}(a)$ (Principle 5.5) then it also holds for every $x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ that $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) = \sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow \text{Args} \setminus \{x\}}(a)$ (Principle 2.6). Because $\text{Ctrb}_a(x) = \text{Sctrb}_a(\{x\})$ holds, we can replace $\text{Ctrb}_a(x)$ in Principle 2.6 by $\text{Sctrb}_a(\{x\})$. This yields the following statement ($\forall x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$):

$$\text{Sctrb}_a(\{x\}) = \sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow \text{Args} \setminus \{x\}}(a),$$

which clearly is a special case of Principle 5.5, thus proving the proposition. \square

Let us speculate that it may be difficult or impossible to generalize principles in *both* directions at once. Intuitively, a single-argument contribution function principles such as contribution existence can be \uparrow -generalized because expanding the “search space” from $x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ to $X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ allows us to find more cases for which the principle’s condition holds, and finding *some* (i.e., a single) case given the search space of Args is sufficient for satisfaction. In contrast, other principles such as directionality require that a condition holds for *every* $x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ (single-argument case) and $X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ (set case), which makes principle satisfaction more difficult for the latter case.

Now that we have shown that all of the above specified set contribution function principles have single-argument contribution function principles that they either \uparrow -generalize or \downarrow -generalize, we can move on and define entirely novel set contribution principles that depend on the interactions between several sets and hence are only relevant for the set (and not for the single-argument) case.

What follows are set contribution functions that are not directly based on single-argument contribution counterparts.

Weak quantitative contribution existence stipulates that $\text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ must be partition-able such that the sum of the partitions’ contributions amounts to the difference between the topic’s final and initial strengths.

Principle 5.6 (Weak Quantitative Contribution Existence). A set contribution function Sctrb satisfies *weak quantitative contribution existence* w.r.t. a gradual semantics σ iff there exists a partition P of $\text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ for which it holds that $\sum_{X \in P} \text{Sctrb}_a(X) = \sigma(a) - \tau(a)$.

One may speculate whether *additivity*, stipulating that given disjoint $X, Y \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ it must generally hold that $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(X) + \text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(Y) = \text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(X \cup Y)$, is satisfied as well. However, if we take the Shapley value-based set contribution function $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ and determine the contribution of two disjoint sets $X, Y \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ on a topic, $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(X) + \text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(Y) = \text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(X \cup Y)$ may *not* hold. This is because if it does not hold that $|X| = |Y| = 1$, $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ partitions $\text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ differently when computing $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(X)$ than when computing $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(Y)$ and—independently of the aforementioned condition—yet again differently when computing $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(X \cup Y)$. This means that, from the perspective of Shapley values, we actually compare the results of different coalitional games. Counterexamples can be easily found and are provided in the notebook (code) that contains all examples; for the sake of brevity, we omit them from the paper.

As the below principles describe function behavior given two set contributors, we (again) assume $X, Y \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$. *Consistency* stipulates that if the signs of two set contributions are the same, then the contribution of the union of the corresponding set contributors should also have the same sign as the two separate contributions.

Principle 5.7 (Consistency). A set contribution function Sctrb satisfies *consistency* w.r.t. a gradual semantics σ iff the following statements hold true:

- If $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) \leq 0$ and $\text{Sctrb}_a(Y) \leq 0$ then $\text{Sctrb}_a(X \cup Y) \leq 0$;
- If $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) \geq 0$ and $\text{Sctrb}_a(Y) \geq 0$ then $\text{Sctrb}_a(X \cup Y) \geq 0$.

Finally, *monotonicity* requires (intuitively) that the contribution of a set contributor increases weakly monotonically when adding arguments to the set.

Principle 5.8 (Monotonicity). A set contribution function Sctrb satisfies *monotonicity* w.r.t. a gradual semantics σ iff $X \subseteq Y$ implies that $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) \leq \text{Sctrb}_a(Y)$.

6. Principle-based Analysis

We proceed by providing a comprehensive analysis of principle satisfaction and violation for our four set contribution functions, covering all principles from the previous sections, as well as the five semantics—QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, and EBT semantics—from Table 4. Recall that Tables 1 and 2 provide an overview of the results. The code used to compute exact values for all counterexamples in this analysis is available at <https://github.com/TimKam/Quantitative-Bipolar-Argumentation/tree/main/analysis>.

6.1. (Quantitative) Contribution Existence

$\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$, $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}'}$, and $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ all satisfy contribution existence w.r.t. all of the surveyed gradual semantics. These contributions are all based on some sort of removal-based modification of a given QBAG. Intuitively, we can always remove all arguments that can reach a topic, excluding the topic itself. This set of contributors then fully accounts for the difference between the topic’s initial and final strengths.

Proposition 6.1. *For every $\text{Sctrb} \in \{\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}, \text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}'}, \text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}\}$, for every gradual semantics σ among QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, and EBT semantics it holds that $\exists X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ s.t. $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) = \sigma(a) - \tau(a)$.*

Proof. Consider the set $X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ that contains exactly the arguments that can reach a except a itself. Given any of our semantics σ it clearly holds that (consider *stability*, i.e., Principle 2.1):

- i) **Removal-based.** $\sigma_{\text{G}\downarrow_{\text{Args}\setminus X}}(a) = \tau(a)$ and hence $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}}(X) = \sigma(a) - \tau(a)$;
- ii) **Intrinsic removal-based.** $(\text{Args}, \tau, \text{Att} \setminus \{(y, x) \in \text{Att} \mid y \notin X, x \in X\}, \text{Supp} \setminus \{(y, x) \in \text{Supp} \mid y \notin X, x \in X\}) = \text{G}$ and hence it follows from *i*) that $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}'}(X) = \sigma(a) - \tau(a)$;
- iii) **Shapley value-based.** $\forall S \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus (X \cup \{a\})$ it holds that $\sigma_{\text{G}\downarrow_{\text{Args}\setminus S}}(a) = \sigma(a)$ and $\sigma_{\text{G}\downarrow_{\text{Args}\setminus (S \cup X)}}(a) = \tau(a)$, and hence $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(X) = \sigma(a) - \tau(a)$.

□

Note that if we constrained our set contributor X to have a cardinality of 1, we could no longer satisfy this property in some cases. Notably, when applying the *Top* aggregation function or p -Max(k) influence functions in modular semantics, removing any single argument may not have any effect on the final strength of a topic. This explains why, in the case of set contributions, contribution existence is satisfied for more functions/semantics than for single-argument contributions (compare Table 1 with Table 1 in [14]).

Corollary 6.2. $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$, $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}'}$, and $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ satisfy the contribution existence principle w.r.t. QE , $DFQuAD$, $SD-DFQuAD$, EB , and EBT semantics σ .

Proof. The proof follows directly from Proposition 6.1: for $\text{Sctrb} \in \{\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}, \text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}'}, \text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}\}$ there must exist an $X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ s.t. $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) = \sigma(a) - \tau(a)$ and hence, if a topic’s initial strength is not equal its final strength we have $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) \neq 0$, thus satisfying contribution existence. \square

$\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ satisfies the contribution existence principle with respect to just *some* of our semantics, specifically the ones for which Ctrb^{∂} satisfies the single-argument version of the principle: QE and EB semantics [14].

Proposition 6.3. $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ satisfies the contribution existence principle w.r.t. QE and EB semantics σ .

Proof. Clearly, $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ satisfies (set) contribution existence w.r.t. a gradual semantics σ if Ctrb^{∂} satisfies (single-argument) contribution existence w.r.t. σ : if there exists an argument $x \in \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ such that $\text{Ctrb}_a^{\partial}(x) \neq 0$ then $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\partial_{\max}}(\{x\}) \neq 0$. As Ctrb^{∂} indeed satisfies contribution existence w.r.t. QE and EB (Proposition 5.7 in [14]; note that QE ’s and EB ’s satisfaction of *stability*—Principle 2.1—is crucial), the proposition must hold. \square

For the other semantics, i.e., $DFQuAD$, $SD-DFQuAD$, and EBT , contribution existence is violated by $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$. Intuitively, the fact that we aggregate the gradient of single arguments leads to analogous issues as for single-argument contribution functions, notably in some cases where we have several arguments with maximum final strengths attacking our topic, as seen in Figure 2.

Proposition 6.4. $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ violates the contribution existence principle w.r.t. $DFQuAD$, $SD-DFQuAD$, and EBT semantics σ .

Proof. Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 2, which we denote by $G = (\text{Args}, \tau, \text{Att}, \text{Supp})$. Given $DFQuAD$, $SD-DFQuAD$, and EBT semantics σ , we have $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\partial_{\max}}(\{b\}) = \text{Sctrb}_a^{\partial_{\max}}(\{c\}) = 0$. Hence, it should hold that $\sigma_G(a) = \tau(a)$. However, we observe that $\sigma_G(a) < \tau(a) = 0.5$ which proves the violation of the contribution existence principle for $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$. \square




Figure 2: $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ violates the contribution existence principle w.r.t. $DFQuAD$, $SD-DFQuAD$, and EBT semantics σ .

While contribution existence is satisfied by most set contribution functions with respect to most semantics, *quantitative* contribution existence is violated. Figure 2 provides the counterexample for $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$, $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}'}$, and $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ (with respect to all of the studied semantics).

Proposition 6.5. $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}, \text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}'}, \text{and } \text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ violate the quantitative contribution existence principle w.r.t. $QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, \text{ and } EBT$ semantics σ .

Proof. Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 2, which we denote by $G = (Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$. Given $QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, \text{ and } EBT$ semantics σ we find that for all $\text{Sctrb} \in \{\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}, \text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}'}, \text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}\}$, it holds that $\text{Sctrb}_a(\{b\}) + \text{Sctrb}_a(\{c\}) \neq \sigma_G(a) - \tau(a)$. This proves the violation of quantitative contribution existence for these set contribution functions. \square

An alternative to the above proof by counterexample could be provided by observing that quantitative contribution existence for set contribution functions \downarrow -generalizes the corresponding single argument contribution function principle (Proposition 5.2). As the three single-argument contribution functions violate quantitative contribution existence (Table 1 in [14]), this must then also be the case for their \downarrow -generalizations. A somewhat analogous proof is provided for Proposition 6.9.

$\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ violates quantitative contribution existence as well. Intuitively, one may expect satisfaction, as the principle closely resembles the *efficiency* property of the Shapley value. However, when applying $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ to compute set contributions of two disjoint set contributors of the same QBAG, this may lead to the formation of different coalitional games, from a Shapley value perspective. For example, given a set of arguments $\{a, b, c, d\}$, computing the set contribution of $\{a, b\}$ to d forms a game with players $\{a, b\}$ and $\{c\}$, whereas computing the set contribution of $\{c\}$ to d forms a game with the players $\{a\}, \{b\}, \text{ and } \{c\}$. Across different games, the property does not hold; i.e., quantitative contribution existence is then no longer guaranteed.

Proposition 6.6. $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ violates the quantitative contribution existence principle w.r.t. $QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, \text{ and } EBT$ semantics σ .

Proof. Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 3, which we denote by $G = (Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$. Given $QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, \text{ and } EBT$ semantics σ we observe that $\text{Sctrb}_a(\{b, c\}) + \text{Sctrb}_a(\{d\}) \neq \tau(a) - \sigma_G(a)$. The definition of the quantitative contribution existence principle states that for all partitions P of $Args \setminus \{a\}$ it must hold that $\sum_{X \in P} \text{Sctrb}_a(X) = \sigma(a) - \tau(a)$. Hence, observing a single partition where this is not the case proves the violation of quantitative contribution existence for $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$. \square




Figure 3: $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ violates the quantitative contribution existence principle w.r.t. $QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, \text{ and } EBT$ semantics σ .

6.2. Directionality

Intuitively, all of our set contribution functions satisfy directionality given any of the surveyed gradual semantics. This is because given a modular semantics, the final

strength of a (topic) argument depends only on its initial strength and the final strengths of its attackers and supporters—a property that is sometimes referred to as *stability* [19, 14]. All of the introduced set contribution functions determine the set contribution to a topic by either removing contributors or changing their initial strengths. This has no effect if the contributors cannot reach the topic.

Proposition 6.7. $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}, \text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}'}, \text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}},$ and $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial^{\max}}$ satisfy the directionality principle w.r.t. $QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB,$ and EBT semantics σ .

Proof. Observe that given a gradual semantics σ that is either $QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB,$ or EBT semantics, for every $X \subseteq \text{Args}$ s.t. $\forall x \in X$ we have that x cannot reach $a \in \text{Args}$ the following holds:

- i) $\sigma_G(a) = \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus X}}(a)$;
- ii) $\sigma_G(a) = \sigma_{(\text{Args}, \tau, \text{Att} \setminus \{(y, x) \in \text{Att} \mid y \notin X, x \in X\}), \text{Supp} \setminus \{(y, x) \in \text{Supp} \mid y \notin X, x \in X\})}(a)$;
- iii) $\forall S \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus (X \cup \{a\})$ it holds that $\sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus S}}(a) = \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus (S \cup X)}}(a)$;
- iv) $\forall x \in X$, for $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}$ it holds that $\sigma_G(a) = \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\tau(x) \leftarrow \varepsilon}}(a)$.

From *i*) it follows that $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$ satisfies directionality; from *i*) and *ii*) it follows that $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}'}$ satisfies directionality; from *iii*) it follows that $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ satisfies directionality; from *iv*) it follows that $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial^{\max}}$ satisfies directionality (in all cases w.r.t. all of the above semantics). \square

6.3. (Quantitative) Counterfactuality

Quantitative counterfactuality and counterfactuality are trivially satisfied for the removal-based set contribution function. Its contributions amount to what is exactly expected given *quantitative counterfactuality*, and *counterfactuality* is a weaker case of the former principle.

Proposition 6.8. $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}}$ satisfies the counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality principles w.r.t. $QE, DFQuAD,$ and $SD-DFQuAD, EB,$ and EBT semantics σ .

Proof. Quantitative counterfactuality requires that $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}}(X) = \sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus X}}(a)$. This holds by definition (Definition 3.2), which stipulates that $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}}(X) = \sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus X}}(a)$. Counterfactuality is a weaker principle, requiring that the sign of $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}}(X)$ must be consistent with the sign of $\sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus X}}(a)$ (incl. for the case of a 0-contribution, i.e., in the case of $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}}(X) = 0$ whenever $\sigma_G(a) = \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus X}}(a)$), which again is obviously the case because $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{R}}(X) = \sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus X}}(a)$. \square

All other set contribution functions violate counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality w.r.t. the surveyed semantics: this must be the case because the two principles \downarrow -generalize the corresponding single-argument contribution function principles and the latter principles are violated by the single-argument contribution function counterparts of intrinsic removal-based, Shapley value-based, and gradient-based set contribution functions, as observed in [14].

Proposition 6.9. $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$, $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$, and $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ violate the counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality principles w.r.t. QE , $DFQuAD$, $SD-DFQuAD$, EB , and EBT semantics σ .

Proof. We have shown that $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$, $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ and $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ generalize $\text{Ctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$, Ctrb^{∂} and $\text{Ctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$, respectively (Proposition 4.1) and that the set contribution function principles *counterfactuality* and *quantitative counterfactuality* \downarrow -generalize the respective single-argument contribution function principles (Proposition 5.2). This means that if any of the set contribution functions satisfies one of these principles, the corresponding single-argument contribution functions must satisfy the (single-argument version of the) principle as well. However, $\text{Ctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$, $\text{Ctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$, and Ctrb^{∂} violate both the counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality principles w.r.t. QE , $DFQuAD$, $SD-DFQuAD$, EB , and EBT semantics σ [14] (Table 1, analysis in Subsection 5.4). This means that $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$, $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$, and $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ cannot possibly satisfy the counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality principles, as this would then contradict the above observation. \square

Indeed, we claim that quantitative counterfactuality is uniquely satisfied only by the removal-based set contribution function, as the desired behavior as specified by the principle amounts to the function’s entire behavior. In the appendix, we provide further counterexamples that may help readers gain better intuitions for cases when the principles are violated.

Intuitively, the intrinsic removal-based set contribution functions violates counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality because it controls for “external” influence on a set contributor, which leads to a misalignment with the idea underlying the principles. Similarly, Shapley violates counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality because it assigns each player (i.e., single argument or set of arguments) its average marginal contribution over all coalitions, so any effect realized with others gets split across the coalition, and the contributor’s value need not match the removal effect. Gradient violates the principles because it measures *sensitivity* at the current point, not the effect of deleting, which again leads to misalignment with the idea underlying the principles.

6.4. Weak Quantitative Contribution Existence

In Subsection 6.1, we have shown that quantitative contribution existence is violated by all four set contribution functions with respect to all five semantics. However, the *weak* quantitative contribution existence principle is satisfied by $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$, $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$, and $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$; intuitively, we can always take as set contributor the set of all arguments that can reach the topic (excluding the topic itself), whose contribution then amounts to the delta between the topic’s final and initial strengths, whereas all other arguments’ contributions are zero.

Proposition 6.10. $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$, $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$, and $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ satisfy the weak quantitative contribution existence principle w.r.t. QE , $DFQuAD$, $SD-DFQuAD$, EB , and EBT semantics σ .

Proof. Consider a set contribution function Sctrb among $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$, $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}'}$, and $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ and a gradual semantics σ among QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, and EBT semantics. From Proposition 6.1, we know that $\exists X \subseteq \text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ s.t. $\text{Sctrb}_a(X) = \sigma(a) - \tau(a)$; in the proof of Proposition 6.1, we have observed that this holds for X when X is the set of all arguments that can reach a (except a itself). Because Sctrb satisfies directionality w.r.t. σ (Proposition 6.7), we know that for $Y = \text{Args} \setminus (X \cup \{a\})$ it must hold that $\text{Sctrb}_a(Y) = 0$. Accordingly, we have partitioned $\text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$ into $P = \{X, Y\}$ and for P it holds that $\sum_{X' \in P} \text{Sctrb}_a(X') = \sigma(a) - \tau(a)$, which proves the satisfaction of weak quantitative contribution existence (Principle 5.6). \square

In contrast, $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial \max}$ violates even the weak quantitative contribution existence principle. Intuitively, the contribution function quantifies the effect and direction of the maximal marginal change to a contributor's initial strength on the topic's final strength; this is incompatible with the idea of fully accounting for the difference between a topic's final and initial strengths.

Proposition 6.11. $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial \max}$ violates the weak contribution existence principle w.r.t. QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, and EBT semantics σ .

Proof. Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 4. According to the definition of the weak contribution existence principle, the total contribution of at least one of the argument partitions P of $\text{Args} \setminus \{a\}$, i.e., $[\{b\}, \{c\}]$ and $[\{b, c\}]$ needs to equal the difference in initial strength and final strength, $\sigma(a) - \tau(a)$, of the topic argument a . However, this is not the case, proving the violation of the principle. \square




Figure 4: $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial \max}$ violates the weak contribution existence principle w.r.t. QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, and EBT semantics σ .

6.5. Consistency

Intuitively, one may expect that consistency is satisfied by all four contribution functions, given the five semantics. After all, considering more positive/negative contributors in a set contributor should always lead to an increased/decreased contribution. However, this is not the case. As observed in [14], one argument's initial strength may have a somewhat *nonmonotonic* effect on its initial strength. E.g., given an initial strength value of 0.3 of an argument x , marginally increasing this value leads to a positive change in argument y 's final strength, but given an initial strength value of 0.6, such marginal increase leads to a negative change. Similarly, the effects of two arguments may interact, as we can see in Figure 5 (also consider the sign map in Figure 1.2).

Proposition 6.12. $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}'}$ violate the consistency principle w.r.t. QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, EBT semantics σ .

Proof. Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 5, which we denote by $G = (Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$. Consider the following sets of initial strength values:

- $\tau_{QE} = \{(a, 0.3), (b, 0.8), (c, 0.1), (d, 0.55), (e, 0.45), (f, 0.6)\}$,
- $\tau_{DFQuAD} = \{(a, 0.3), (b, 0.8), (c, 0.1), (d, 0.8), (e, 0.6), (f, 0.8)\}$,
- $\tau_{SD-DFQuAD} = \{(a, 0.3), (b, 0.8), (c, 0.1), (d, 0.25), (e, 0.2), (f, 0.2)\}$,
- $\tau_{EB} = \{(a, 0.3), (b, 0.8), (c, 0.9), (d, 0.9), (e, 0.9), (f, 0.8)\}$,
- $\tau_{EBT} = \{(a, 0.3), (b, 0.1), (c, 0.1), (d, 0.5), (e, 0.1), (f, 0.5)\}$.

Let a be the topic argument. By definition of the consistency principle, if both $\{x\}$ and $\{y\}$ contribute negatively to the topic argument's final strength, then $\{x\} \cup \{y\}$ must also contribute negatively. However, computing σ_a on G for $Sctrb \in \{Sctrb^{\mathcal{Q}}, Sctrb^{\mathcal{D}}, Sctrb^{\mathcal{S}}\}$ with the given initial strength values $\tau_{QE}, \tau_{DFQuAD}, \tau_{SD-DFQuAD}, \tau_{EB}$, and τ_{EBT} yields situations where both $Sctrb_a(\{d\})$ and $Sctrb_a(\{f\})$ are non-positive (or non-negative), while their joint set contribution $Sctrb_a(\{d, f\})$ is strictly of the opposite sign. Hence, two single argument contributions that agree in direction combine into a set contribution that points in the other direction, thus contradicting the principle. \square




Figure 5: $Sctrb^{\mathcal{Q}}, Sctrb^{\mathcal{D}},$ and $Sctrb^{\mathcal{S}}$ violate the consistency principle w.r.t. $QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB,$ and EBT semantics σ .

A similar counter-example can be provided for the Shapley value-based set contribution function.

Proposition 6.13. $Sctrb^{\mathcal{S}}$ violates the consistency principle w.r.t. $QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, EBT$ semantics σ .

Proof. Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 5, which we denote by $G = (Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$. Consider the following sets of initial strength values:

- $\tau_{QE} = \{(a, 0.3), (b, 0.8), (c, 0.2), (d, 0.7), (e, 0.6), (f, 0.7)\}$,

- $\tau_{DFQuAD} = \{(a, 0.3), (b, 0.8), (c, 0.2), (d, 0.5), (e, 0.4), (f, 0.5)\}$,
- $\tau_{SD-DFQuAD} = \{(a, 0.3), (b, 0.1), (c, 0.9), (d, 0.3), (e, 0.9), (f, 0.3)\}$,
- $\tau_{EB} = \{(a, 0.3), (b, 0.6), (c, 0.8), (d, 0.8), (e, 0.5), (f, 0.7)\}$,
- $\tau_{EBT} = \{(a, 0.3), (b, 0.6), (c, 0.2), (d, 0.8), (e, 0.4), (f, 0.7)\}$.

Let a be the topic argument. By definition of the consistency principle, if both $\{x\}$ and $\{y\}$ contribute negatively to the topic argument's final strength, then $\{x\} \cup \{y\}$ must also contribute negatively. However, computing σ_a on G with the given initial strength values τ_{QE} , τ_{DFQuAD} , $\tau_{SD-DFQuAD}$, τ_{EB} , and τ_{EBT} yields situations where both $Sctrb_a(\{d\})$ and $Sctrb_a(\{f\})$ are non-positive (or non-negative), while their joint set contribution $Sctrb_a(\{d, f\})$ is strictly of the opposite sign. Hence, two single argument contributions that agree in direction combine into a set contribution that points in the other direction, thus contradicting the principle. \square

We may speculate that there could be special cases for which consistency is not violated, given QBAGs in which the “effect” (e.g., in the sense of the removal-based or gradient-based contribution) of a given single argument to a topic always has the same sign, irrespective of initial strength assignments; we leave a more precise investigation of this issue for future work.

As $Sctrb^{\partial \max}$ takes the maximum of single-argument contributions, it satisfies the consistency principle.

Proposition 6.14. $Sctrb^{\partial \max}$ satisfies the consistency principle w.r.t. QE , $DFQuAD$, $SD-DFQuAD$, EB , and EBT semantics σ .

Proof. $Sctrb^{\partial \max}$ is defined as the maximal gradient of a single argument in a set of contributors. For the sake of simplicity, let us denote this by $Sctrb_a^{\partial \max}(X) := \max_{x \in X} g(x)$. Clearly, the following holds:

- If $\max_{x \in X} g(x) \leq 0$ and $\max_{y \in Y} g(y) \leq 0$ then $\max_{x \in X \cup Y} g(x) \leq 0$ (proving that the first condition of Principle 5.7 holds);
- If $\max_{x \in X} g(x) \geq 0$ and $\max_{y \in Y} g(y) \geq 0$ then $\max_{x \in X \cup Y} g(x) \geq 0$ (proving that the second condition of Principle 5.7 holds).

\square

6.6. Monotonicity

$Sctrb^{\mathcal{R}}$, $Sctrb^{\mathcal{R}'}$, and $Sctrb^{\mathcal{S}}$ clearly violate monotonicity. Intuitively, when the set contributor is expanded with arguments whose presence has a negative effect on the topic's final strength, this can lead to a decrease of the set contribution.

Proposition 6.15. $Sctrb^{\mathcal{R}}$, $Sctrb^{\mathcal{R}'}$, and $Sctrb^{\mathcal{S}}$ violate the monotonicity principle w.r.t. QE , $DFQuAD$, $SD-DFQuAD$, EB , and EBT semantics σ .

Proof. Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 6. Given QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, and EBT semantics σ , we find that for all $\text{Sctrb} \in \{\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{Q}}, \text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{D}}, \text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}\}$, it holds that $\text{Sctrb}_a(\{c, b\}) = 0$. Hence, according to the definition of the monotonicity principle, we would expect $\text{Sctrb}_a(\{c\}) \leq 0$. However, we observe that $\text{Sctrb}_a(\{c\}) > 0$, which proves the violation of the monotonicity principle. \square




Figure 6: $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{Q}}, \text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{D}}, \text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ violate the monotonicity principle w.r.t. QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, and EBT semantics σ .

As $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ takes the maximum of a set of single-argument gradient-based contributions, it increases weakly monotonically when expanding the set contributor, and thus satisfies monotonicity.

Proposition 6.16. *$\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ satisfies the monotonicity principle w.r.t. QE, DFQuAD, SD-DFQuAD, EB, and EBT semantics σ .*

Proof. Analogously to the proof of Proposition 6.14, we observe that $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ is the maximal gradient of a single argument in a set of contributors, and we again simplify notation by denoting $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\partial_{\max}}(X)$ by $\max_{x \in X} g(x)$. Clearly if $X \subseteq Y$, it holds that $\max_{x \in X} g(x) \leq \max_{y \in Y} g(y)$, and thus monotonicity (Principle 5.8) is satisfied. \square

Clearly, applying other aggregation functions than max for computing gradient-based set contributions may have an effect on monotonicity. For example, when using min instead, monotonicity would be violated, but an analogous principle requiring a monotonic *decrease* of the set contribution function would be satisfied. Applying the maximal *absolute* as an aggregation function would satisfy monotonicity.

7. Illustrative Application

In this section, we sketch an application scenario illustrating how set contribution functions can be applied. The scenario helps us highlight differences between single-argument and set contribution functions, as well as the relevance of some of the differences between set contribution functions that principles give rise to. The application is based on [20], which incorporates Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques into QBAG-based classification. We apply our approach to an example QBAG reflecting one that has been reported in the above work. However, the approach is applicable to generic scenarios and [20] links to open-source code that can be used for QBAG instantiation from data (in contrast, we manually specify the initial QBAG for the sake of simplicity).

We apply set contribution functions to a QBAG representing reviews and gradual acceptance/rejection recommendations for scientific papers. Note that the use-case is purely illustrative and we do not recommend an immediate application to the scenario

at hand, which requires more comprehensive evaluations and a careful consideration of social/human aspects. Consider the QBAGs displayed in Subfigure 7.2, depicting a two-layered QBAG. The topic argument in the “bottom” layer represents the review recommendation, which can be discretized, i.e. (roughly), mapped to recommendations from *strong reject* to *strong accept*. Its initial strength is 0.5 (which would reflect a *borderline* evaluation if interpreted as a final strength). The layer above represents *aspects* that the review may cover, which are provided as a generic meta-model for this use-case: *appropriateness*, *clarity*, *novelty*, *empirical* and *theoretical soundness*, *meaningful comparison*, *substance*, and *impact*, abbreviated as APR, CLA, NOV, EMP, CMP, SUB, and IMP, respectively. These arguments are also initiated with a strength of 0.5 each. Finally, a third layer, depicted in Subfigure 7.1, presents three text arguments representing sentences and their sentiment strengths, which, including final strengths and alongside the support and attack relationships to the *aspect* layer, are mined—in the aforementioned paper—using NLP approaches. Each aspect argument attacks or supports the decision argument, depending on whether its final strength is above or below 0.5 (respectively). This means we first compute the final strengths of the aspects arguments before determining their relationships with the decision argument. Also, before the computation of the decision argument’s final strength, the final strengths of the aspect arguments are normalized to a strength value in $(0, 1]$ based on the distance to the initial value of 0.5. Strengths are updated using DF-QuAD semantics.


As the computation process is broken down into two steps that, when combined, do not correspond to the application of a gradual semantics to a QBAG, we focus on the contribution quantification within the second step, i.e., determining the contribution of aspect arguments to the decision (Subfigure 7.2). For the combined approach, we could practically still apply the contribution functions, but the application would break the frame of our analytical results with respect to principle satisfaction. Table 5 displays the results of computing the different set contributions of the set $\{ \text{NOV}, \text{IMP} \}$ on the topic, as well as the single-argument contributions of NOV and IMP (separated) and their sum. We observe that the contributions distributed to the players $\{ \text{NOV}, \text{IMP} \}$, CMP, and APR by the Shapley value approximately account for the difference between our topic argument’s final and initial strengths, as expected.

Table 5: Contributions to the topic argument D from $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$, $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{I}}$, and $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ (rounded to three decimals).

Contributors	$\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{R}}$	$\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{I}}$	$\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$
$\{\text{NOV}, \text{IMP}\}$	0.045	0.048	0.200
NOV	0.120	0.210	0.200
IMP	-0.075	-0.163	-0.150
CMP	-0.175	-0.263	-0.250
APR	0.120	0.210	0.200
$\text{CMP} + \text{APR} + \{\text{NOV}, \text{IMP}\}$	-0.010	-0.005	0.150

From a use-case perspective, the idea is to focus on novelty and impact, as their assessment may be rather subjective. We drop the *intrinsic removal*-based set contribution function here, as its contributions clearly coincide with the ones of the removal-

based variant. Note that an application example where the difference between intrinsic removal and removal-based contributions matter is presented for the single-argument case in [14]. As we can see, set contributions differ meaningfully from the single argument contributions and their sum-based aggregations. However, the gradient set contribution ($Sctrb^{\partial \max}$) of $\{ NOV, IMP \}$ on the topic equals the single-argument contribution of 0.2 (as expected).



7.1: Initial QBAG before aspect-decision relationships are determined. No relations were extracted for the CLA, EMP, and SUB aspects. 7.2: QBAG after aspect normalization and relationship determination.

Figure 7: QBAG construction in a recommendation systems example.

Overall, these results indicate that there is a meaningful difference between set contribution and single-argument contribution functions. Between set contribution functions, we see different purposes and effects:

- The removal-based contribution of 0.045 describes what would happen if we were to ignore novelty and impact assessment, reflecting the principle of strong counterfactualty: we can see that the absence of these aspects would decrease the final strengths of the topic argument accordingly. In our use-case this means that the paper, whose score corresponds to a somewhat *weak borderline* recommendation, would be further weakened in absence of these rather subjective aspects, which may help a meta-reviewer interpret the review as being more on the “reject side” of the scale.
- The Shapley value-based contribution of 0.048 indicates how much novelty and impact assessments contribute, as a “group” to the overall score, relative to the contributions of the other aspects, which are each grouped separately. The soundness of the contribution is reflected by the weak quantitative contribution existence principle. However, if we want to compare the contribution relative to another set of several aspects, we would need to make use of the partition contribution function ($Pctrb^{\mathcal{S}}$). In our example, Shapley-based contribution and removal-based contribution support the same narrative: the two somewhat opinionated aspects *novelty* and *impact* positively affect the score.

- The gradient-based contribution function (yielding a contribution of 0.2) quantifies the effectiveness of applying a change to the aspect among { NOV, IMP } that has a locally greater effect. For this, we would expect behavior that amounts to monotonicity. For the opposite direction (how to best affect a lower score), we would need to use min as our aggregation function of the gradient.

The corresponding implementation of this example can be found at <https://github.com/TimKam/Quantitative-Bipolar-Argumentation/tree/main/analysis>.

8. Discussion and Conclusion

Our work can be considered a contribution to *argumentative explainability* that encompasses both the application of formal argumentation in order to facilitate explainability and the theoretical study of explanations in formal argumentation [21, 22]. Our results contribute primarily to the latter line of research, although our application examples provide some indication of potential usefulness to the former. Over the past years, contribution functions for argumentation-based inference—sometimes instead called *attribution explanations* [6] or *impact measures* [7]—have been the subject of substantial studies. Several recent works study *principles* for such functions. Perhaps most notably, [7] does so for bipolar gradual argumentation given initially unweighted graphs, whereas [14] focuses on acyclic QBAGs. To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first comprehensive work focusing on contributions of sets of arguments to a topic argument. Given our results, we argue that studying the more general set contribution functions in addition to the already well-studied single argument contribution functions is interesting: not only are set contribution function more general than single-argument contribution functions; also, there are nontrivial differences between the single-argument and set contributor case that warrant the study of both.

We can see this when providing intuitive *generalizations* of single-argument contribution function principles for the set contribution function case. Notably, the *contribution existence* principle is, when satisfied for the set contribution cases, often violated by single-argument specializations of the corresponding contribution functions. Also, we have introduced new principles that focus on interactions between sets and thus only apply to set contribution functions; these principles can meaningfully distinguish between most set contribution functions. Beyond that, our studies have unearthed the potential for further generalization, namely in the form of *partition contribution functions* that determine set contributions relative to a partition of the set of all arguments except the topic.

Note that we did not cover some of the single-argument contribution functions that have been proposed in previous works; examples are: i) *language independence* [7], intuitively: changing the symbols used for arguments while retaining their relationships and initial strengths does not affect their final strengths; ii) *faithfulness* [14], roughly and in different variants: the effect of (small) changes to a contributor’s initial strength have an effect on the topic’s final strength that is somewhat consistent with the computed contribution score. This is motivated by the need to keep the scope manageable while maintaining somewhat interesting results. Clearly, language independence is

trivially satisfied by all of our contribution functions, and based on what we know from the results in [14], faithfulness is primarily interesting for the gradient-based contribution function case. Still, we hope that the study of principles in the literature that we do not cover can reveal further interesting results in the future. Also, we admit that some of the results we have obtained, in particular with respect to directionality, are rather mundane; let us claim that some mundane results are difficult to avoid when carrying out comprehensive principle-based analyses.

More broadly, our work can be considered a contribution to the *principle-based* study of formal argumentation, somewhat analogous to for example [23, 3], which focus on principles for abstract and gradual semantics, respectively. Also, like most works focusing formal aspects of argumentative explainability, we examine the effects of how changes to argumentation graphs affect the inferences we draw from them; accordingly, our results contribute to the study of *argumentation dynamics* (cf. [24] for a survey).

Future work may extend our results in different directions. For example, one may provide a principle-based analysis that also considers the case of cyclic QBAGs, or one could define and study additional partition contribution functions that determine relative contributions of disjoint sets of arguments and are based on power indices other than the Shapley value (for which we have defined such function).

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program (WASP) funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation.

References

- [1] F. Leofante, H. Ayoobi, A. Dejl, G. Freedman, D. Gorur, J. Jiang, G. Paulino-Passos, A. Rago, A. Rapberger, F. Russo, X. Yin, D. Zhang, F. Toni, Contestable AI needs computational argumentation (2024). *doi:10.24963/KR.2024/83*.
URL <https://doi.org/10.24963/kr.2024/83>
- [2] E. Dietz, A. C. Kakas, L. Michael, Argumentation: A calculus for human-centric AI, *Frontiers Artif. Intell.* 5. *doi:10.3389/FRAI.2022.955579*.
URL <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2022.955579>
- [3] P. Baroni, A. Rago, F. Toni, From Fine-Grained Properties to Broad Principles for Gradual Argumentation: A Principled Spectrum, *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 105 (2019) 252–286. *doi:10.1016/j.ijar.2018.11.019*.
- [4] L. Amgoud, J. Ben-Naim, Evaluation of arguments in weighted bipolar graphs, *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 99 (2018) 39–55. *doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2018.05.004*.
- [5] X. Yin, N. Potyka, F. Toni, CE-QArg: Counterfactual Explanations for Quantitative Bipolar Argumentation Frameworks, in: *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, 2024*, pp. 697–707. *doi:10.24963/kr.2024/66*.
URL <https://doi.org/10.24963/kr.2024/66>
- [6] X. Yin, N. Potyka, F. Toni, Argument attribution explanations in quantitative bipolar argumentation frameworks, in: K. Gal, A. Nowé, G. J. Nalepa, R. Fairstein, R. Radulescu (Eds.), *ECAI 2023 - 26th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, September 30 - October 4, 2023, Kraków, Poland - Including 12th Conference on Prestigious Applications of Intelligent Systems (PAIS 2023)*, Vol. 372 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, IOS Press, 2023, pp. 2898–2905. *doi:10.3233/FAIA230603*.
URL <https://doi.org/10.3233/FAIA230603>
- [7] C. A. Anaissy, J. Delobelle, S. Vesic, B. Yun, Impact measures for gradual argumentation semantics, in: S. Das, A. Nowé, Y. Vorobeychik (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, AAMAS 2025, Detroit, MI, USA, May 19-23, 2025, International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems / ACM, 2025*, pp. 69–77. *doi:10.5555/3709347.3743518*.
URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/3709347.3743518>
- [8] N. Kotonya, F. Toni, Gradual argumentation evaluation for stance aggregation in automated fake news detection, in: *6th Workshop on Argument Mining, 2019*, pp. 156–166.
- [9] O. Cocarascu, A. Rago, F. Toni, Extracting dialogical explanations for review aggregations with argumentative dialogical agents, in: E. Elkind, M. Veloso, N. Agmon, M. E. Taylor (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems, AAMAS '19, Montreal, QC, Canada, May 13-17, 2019, International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2019*, pp. 1261–1269.
URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3331830>
- [10] P. Li, D. Gabbay, X. Chi, Y. Cheng, Decision making with weighted quantitative argumentation based on regression, *Logics for New-Generation AI (2022)* 59–71.

- [11] H. Chi, Y. Lu, B. Liao, L. Xu, Y. Liu, An optimized quantitative argumentation debate model for fraud detection in e-commerce transactions, *IEEE Intelligent Systems* 36 (2) (2021) 52–63.
- [12] N. Potyka, X. Yin, F. Toni, Explaining random forests using bipolar argumentation and markov networks, in: B. Williams, Y. Chen, J. Neville (Eds.), *Thirty-Seventh AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2023, Thirty-Fifth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2023, Thirteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2023*, Washington, DC, USA, February 7-14, 2023, AAAI Press, 2023, pp. 9453–9460.
- [13] H. Ayoobi, N. Potyka, F. Toni, Sparx: Sparse argumentative explanations for neural networks, in: K. Gal, A. Nowé, G. J. Nalepa, R. Fairstein, R. Radulescu (Eds.), *ECAI 2023 - 26th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, September 30 - October 4, 2023, Kraków, Poland - Including 12th Conference on Prestigious Applications of Intelligent Systems (PAIS 2023), Vol. 372 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, IOS Press, 2023, pp. 149–156.
- [14] T. Kampik, N. Potyka, X. Yin, K. Cyras, F. Toni, Contribution functions for quantitative bipolar argumentation graphs: A principle-based analysis, *Int. J. Approx. Reason.* 173 (2024) 109255. *doi:10.1016/J.IJAR.2024.109255*.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2024.109255>
- [15] K. Čyras, T. Kampik, Q. Weng, Dispute trees as explanations in quantitative (bipolar) argumentation, in: K. Čyras, T. Kampik, O. Cocarascu, A. Rago (Eds.), *1st International Workshop on Argumentation for eXplainable AI co-located with 9th International Conference on Computational Models of Argument (COMMA 2022)*, Cardiff, Wales, September 12, 2022, Vol. 3209 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, CEUR-WS.org, 2022, pp. 1–12.
URL <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3209/0872.pdf>
- [16] N. Potyka, Extending Modular Semantics for Bipolar Weighted Argumentation, in: N. Agmon, E. Elkind, M. E. Taylor, M. Veloso (Eds.), *18th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems, IFAAMAS*, Montreal, 2019, pp. 1722–1730.
- [17] T. Mossakowski, F. Neuhaus, Modular semantics and characteristics for bipolar weighted argumentation graphs, *CoRR abs/1807.06685*. *arXiv:1807.06685*.
URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1807.06685>
- [18] L. Amgoud, J. Ben-Naim, Evaluation of arguments in weighted bipolar graphs, *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 99 (2018) 39–55.
- [19] N. Potyka, Continuous dynamical systems for weighted bipolar argumentation, in: M. Thielscher, F. Toni, F. Wolter (Eds.), *Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning: Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference, KR 2018*, Tempe, Arizona, 30 October - 2 November 2018, AAAI Press, 2018, pp. 148–157.
URL <https://aaai.org/ocs/index.php/KR/KR18/paper/view/17985>
- [20] P. Sukpanichnant, A. Rapberger, F. Toni, Peerarg: Argumentative peer review with llms (2025). *arXiv:2409.16813*.
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.16813>
- [21] K. Čyras, A. Rago, E. Albini, P. Baroni, F. Toni, Argumentative XAI: A Survey, in: Z.-H. Zhou (Ed.), *30th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI*, Montreal, 2021, pp. 4392–4399. *arXiv:2105.11266*, *doi:10.24963/ijcai.2021/600*.

- [22] A. Vassiliades, N. Bassiliades, T. Patkos, Argumentation and explainable artificial intelligence: a survey, *The Knowledge Engineering Review* 36 (2021) e5. $\mathcal{P}doi:10.1017/S0269888921000011$.
- [23] L. van der Torre, S. Vesic, The principle-based approach to abstract argumentation semantics, *IfCoLog Journal of Logics and Their Applications* 4 (8).
- [24] S. Doutre, J.-G. Mailly, Constraints and changes: A survey of abstract argumentation dynamics, *Argument & Computation* 9 (2018) 223–248. $\mathcal{P}doi:10.3233/AAC-180425$.

A. Appendix: Counterexamples for (Quantitative) Counterfactuality

Counterexample A.1 ((Quantitative) Counterfactuality; $Sctrb_a^{\mathcal{R}'}$ w.r.t. QE, DFQuAD, and SD-DFQuAD). Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 8, which we denote by $G = (Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$. Given QE, DFQuAD, and SD-DFQuAD semantics σ , we observe that $\sigma_G(a) < \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{b\}}}(a)$. According to the definition of the counterfactuality principle, under these conditions $Sctrb_a^{\mathcal{R}'}(\{b\}) > 0$ must hold for the principle to be satisfied. However, we have $Sctrb_a^{\mathcal{R}'}(\{b\}) = 0$, demonstrating the violation of the counterfactuality principle. Similarly, for quantitative counterfactuality to be satisfied under these conditions, $Sctrb_a^{\mathcal{R}'}(\{b\}) = \sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{b\}}}(a)$ must hold. However, this is not the case, thus demonstrating the violation of the counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality principles.




Figure 8: $Sctrb_a^{\mathcal{R}'}$ violates (quantitative) counterfactuality w.r.t. QE, DFQuAD, and SD-DFQuAD semantics σ .

Counterexample A.2 ((Quantitative) Counterfactuality; $Sctrb_a^{\mathcal{R}'}$ w.r.t. EB). Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 9, which we denote by $G = (Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$. Given EB semantics, we observe that $Sctrb_a^{\mathcal{R}'}(\{e\}) \approx 3.5431 \times 10^{-6}$ (i.e. $Sctrb_a^{\mathcal{R}'}(\{e\}) > 0$). Hence, according to the definition of the counterfactuality principle, we would expect $\sigma_G(a) > \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{e\}}}(a)$. However, this does not hold, thus demonstrating the violation of the counterfactuality principle. Similarly, for quantitative counterfactuality we would expect $\sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{e\}}}(a) \approx 3.5431 \times 10^{-6}$, which is not the case, thus demonstrating the violation of the counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality principles.

Counterexample A.3 ((Quantitative) Counterfactuality; $Sctrb_a^{\mathcal{R}'}$ w.r.t. EBT). Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 10, which we denote by $G = (Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$. Given EBT semantics, we observe that $Sctrb_a^{\mathcal{R}'}(\{b\}) = 0$. According to the definition of the counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality principles, we would expect $\sigma_G(a) = \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{b\}}}(a)$. However, this does not hold, thus illustrating the violation of the counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality principles.




Figure 9: $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ violates (quantitative) counterfactualty w.r.t. EB semantics σ .




Figure 10: $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ violates (quantitative) counterfactualty w.r.t. EBT semantics σ .

Counterexample A.4 ((Quantitative) Counterfactualty; $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ w.r.t. QE). Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 11, which we denote by $G = (Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$. Given QE semantics, we observe that $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(\{e\}) \approx 4.9326 \times 10^{-5}$. According to the definition of counterfactualty we must have $\sigma_G(a) > \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{e\}}}(a)$, which does not hold. This illustrates the violation of the counterfactualty principle. For the quantitative counterfactualty principle, we observe $\sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{e\}}}(a) \approx -0.0149$, thus demonstrating the violation of the counterfactualty and quantitative counterfactualty principles.




Figure 11: $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ violates (quantitative) counterfactualty w.r.t. QE semantics σ .

Counterexample A.5 ((Quantitative) Counterfactualty; $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ w.r.t. DFQuAD). Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 12, which we denote by $G = (Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$. Given DFQuAD

semantics, we observe that $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{J}}(\{e\}) \approx 0.0027$. According to the definition of counterfactuality we must have $\sigma_G(a) > \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus \{e\}}}(a)$, which does not hold. This proves the violation of the counterfactuality principle. For the quantitative counterfactuality principle, we observe $\sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus \{e\}}}(a) \approx -0.0049$, thus illustrating the violation of the counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality principles.




Figure 12: $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{J}}$ violates (quantitative) counterfactuality w.r.t. DFQuAD semantics σ .

Counterexample A.6 ((Quantitative) Counterfactuality; $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{J}}$ w.r.t. SD-DFQuAD). Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 13, which we denote by $G = (\text{Args}, \tau, \text{Att}, \text{Supp})$. Given SD-DFQuAD semantics, we observe that $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{J}}(\{e\}) \approx 0.0022$. According to the definition of counterfactuality we must have $\sigma_G(a) > \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus \{e\}}}(a)$, which does not hold. This illustrates the violation of the counterfactuality principle. For the quantitative counterfactuality principle, we observe $\sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus \{e\}}}(a) \approx -0.0109$, thus demonstrating the violation of the counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality principles.




Figure 13: $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{J}}$ violates (quantitative) counterfactuality w.r.t. SD-DFQuAD semantics σ .

Counterexample A.7 ((Quantitative) Counterfactualty; $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ w.r.t. EB). Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 14, which we denote by $G = (Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$. Given EB semantics, we observe that $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(\{f\}) \approx 3.4380 \times 10^{-6}$. According to the definition of counterfactualty we must have $\sigma_G(a) > \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{f\}}}(a)$, which does not hold. This illustrates the violation of the counterfactualty principle. For the quantitative counterfactualty principle, we observe $\sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{f\}}}(a) \approx -7.8369 \times 10^{-5}$, thus demonstrating the violation of the counterfactualty and quantitative counterfactualty principles.




Figure 14: $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ violates (quantitative) counterfactualty w.r.t. EB semantics σ .

Counterexample A.8 ((Quantitative) Counterfactualty; $\text{Sctrb}^{\mathcal{S}}$ w.r.t. EBT). Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 15, which we denote by $G = (Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$. Given EBT semantics, we observe that $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(\{f\}) \approx -2.7043 \times 10^{-5}$. According to the definition of counterfactualty we must have $\sigma_G(a) < \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{f\}}}(a)$, which does not hold. This illustrates the violation of the counterfactualty principle. For the quantitative counterfactualty principle, we observe $\sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{f\}}}(a) \approx 7.3331 \times 10^{-5}$, thus demonstrating the violation of the counterfactualty and quantitative counterfactualty principles.

Counterexample A.9 ((Quantitative) Counterfactualty; $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial \max}$ w.r.t. QE). Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 16, which we denote by $G = (Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$. Given QE semantics, it holds that $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\mathcal{S}}(\{d\}) = 0.0$. According to the definition of counterfactualty we must have $\sigma_G(a) = \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{d\}}}(a)$, which does not hold (we observe $\sigma_G(a) < \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{d\}}}(a)$), providing a violation of the counterfactualty and quantitative counterfactualty principles.

Counterexample A.10 ((Quantitative) Counterfactualty; $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial \max}$ w.r.t. DFQuAD). Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 17, which we denote by $G = (Args, \tau, Att, Supp)$. Given DFQuAD semantics, we observe that $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\partial \max}(\{e\}) \approx 7.4506 \times 10^{-9}$. According to the definition of counterfactualty we must have $\sigma_G(a) > \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{e\}}}(a)$, which does not hold. This illustrates the violation of the counterfactualty principle. For the quantitative counterfactualty principle, we observe $\sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{Args \setminus \{e\}}}(a) = -0.125$, thus demonstrating the violation of the counterfactualty and quantitative counterfactualty principles.




Figure 15: $\text{Sctrb}^{\varnothing}$ violates (quantitative) counterfactualty w.r.t. EBT semantics σ .




Figure 16: $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ violates (quantitative) counterfactualty w.r.t. QE semantics σ .




Figure 17: $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ violates (quantitative) counterfactualty w.r.t. DFQuAD semantics σ .

Counterexample A.11 ((Quantitative) Counterfactualty; $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial_{\max}}$ w.r.t. SD-DFQuAD). Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 18, which we denote by $G = (\text{Args}, \tau, \text{Att}, \text{Supp})$. Given SD-DFQuAD semantics, we observe that $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\partial_{\max}}(\{b\}) = -0.25$. According to the definition of counterfactualty we must have $\sigma_G(a) < \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus \{b\}}}(a)$, which does not hold. This illustrates the violation of the counterfactualty principle. For the quantitative counterfactualty principle,

we observe $\sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus \{b\}}}(a) = 0$, thus demonstrating the violation of the counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality principles.




Figure 18: $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial \max}$ violates (quantitative) counterfactuality w.r.t. SD-DFQuAD semantics σ .

Counterexample A.12 ((Quantitative) Counterfactuality; $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial \max}$ w.r.t. EB and EBT). Consider the QBAG displayed in Figure 19, which we denote by $G = (\text{Args}, \tau, \text{Att}, \text{Supp})$. Given EB and EBT semantics, we observe that $\text{Sctrb}_a^{\partial \max}(\{b\}) \approx -0.4530$. According to the definition of counterfactuality we must have $\sigma_G(a) < \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus \{b\}}}(a)$, which does not hold. This illustrates the violation of the counterfactuality principle. For the quantitative counterfactuality principle, we observe $\sigma_G(a) - \sigma_{G \downarrow_{\text{Args} \setminus \{b\}}}(a) = 0$, thus demonstrating the violation of the counterfactuality and quantitative counterfactuality principles.




Figure 19: $\text{Sctrb}^{\partial \max}$ violates the (quantitative) counterfactuality principle w.r.t. EB and EBT semantics σ .