

Argumentation for Explainable Workforce Optimisation (with Appendix)

Jennifer Leigh^a, Dimitrios Letsios^b, Alessandro Mella^c, Lucio Machetti^c and Francesca Toni^{a,*}

^aImperial College London, London, United Kingdom

^bKing's College London, London, United Kingdom

^cTerranova, Verona, Italy

Abstract. Workforce management is a complex problem optimising the makespan and travel distance required for a team of operators to complete a set of jobs, using a set of instruments. A crucial challenge in workforce management is accommodating changes at execution time so that explanations are provided to all stakeholders involved. Here, we show that, by understanding workforce management as abstract argumentation in an industrial application, we can accommodate change and obtain faithful explanations. We show, with a user study, that our tool and explanations lead to faster and more accurate problem solving than conventional solutions by hand.

1 Introduction

Workforce management is a complex problem amounting to optimising the makespan and distance required for a team of operators to travel and complete a set of jobs using a set of available instruments. It is a variant of the makespan scheduling problem [19] combined with the travelling salesman problem (TSP) [10], whereby jobs have an associated processing time, location, skill and instrument requirements. To complete these jobs, operators must have a start and end position, the set of skills required to complete the jobs, and any instruments that are needed to complete the jobs. Furthermore, instruments may require the operator to fulfill certain skill criteria. For example, suppose an operator is assigned a job to complete maintenance checks at some site. The job may involve a car (the instrument), which in turn would require a driver's license (the skill) for the operator.

A crucial challenge in workforce management is accommodating changes at execution time so that explanations are provided to all stakeholders involved. For example, an operator may be assigned a job with an instrument that breaks down, or the operator may call in sick, or the job may be cancelled. Any such change may require an update to the overall schedule, with repercussions on other operators, jobs and instruments that need explaining to the stakeholders involved. For example, an operator may be given an extra job or a customer whose job is delayed may want to know why. However, it is not straightforward to provide an explanation that is both faithful and cognitively tractable, as in other optimisation settings [20].

Previous work [20] provide an abstract framework for explainability in the context of scheduling optimisation problems, based on abstract argumentation (AA) [5]. In this paper we develop a novel method for explainability in the context of workforce management

optimisation problems, which is also based on AA. Like in [20], we use arguments to represent assignment decisions, where attacks indicate compatibility or incompatibility in the context of feasibility, efficiency and ability to satisfy additional constraints (*fixed decisions*). However, to accommodate the complexity of workforce management, our method addresses the following additional challenges: (1) to accommodate sequential decisions in addition to assignment decisions, we use new attacks to check feasibility and efficiency of individual operator assignments; (2) to deal with efficiency beyond simply processing time, such as accounting for travel distance differences in our metric space, we use new AA frameworks which proxy travel impact using the triangle inequality, where attacks indicate inefficiencies and local search improvements for vehicle routing problems; (3) instruments are assigned to operators as well as jobs, leading to frameworks to satisfy feasibility; (4) we introduce constraints from skills and instruments, modeled using fixed decisions by [20].

Our novel method is designed to address industrial workforce management problems. Indeed, we have developed the method and a corresponding tool in collaboration with *Terranova*, a leading company in the management of utilities¹, and deployed it on *Terranova's* scheduling problems. A key benefit offered by the tool to logistics operators is monitoring the progress of a business process with jobs executed at different locations by operators and involving vehicle movements. The tool supports these manual modifications with explanations of whether a specific schedule update is good or not and why. With the help of a user study with 28 *Terranova* employees, we provide real evidence for applications of AA with optimisation in an industry setting, including evidence of efficiency and accuracy improvements. To our knowledge, this paper provides the first user study rationalising optimisation using argumentation.

Overall, we make the following contributions: (1) we provide a definition of the workforce management problem; (2) we map this problem onto AA with the aim to extract explanations; (3) we define notions of explanations in this setting, relying upon the mapping onto AA; and (4) we conduct a user study with expert industry players in this field, demonstrating the potential usefulness of our approach.

This pre-print is an extended version of [13], including proofs of some of the formal results in the Appendix.

* Corresponding Author. Email: f.toni@imperial.ac.uk.

¹ <https://www.terranoftware.eu/>

2 Related Work

The workforce management problem shows similarities with the technician routing and scheduling problem (TRSP) [6], however the former introduces the notion of instrument requirement as well as skill, while the latter involves time windows for jobs and a penalty for any left uncompleted. We adapt TRSP to define the additional parameter of instruments, where feasibility behaves similarly to job assignment, and fixed decision constraints similar to skills. The lack of time constraints and penalties lead to a generalised version of TRSP.

While our method's reliance on AA for explainability in optimisation is inspired by [20], several other works use argumentation for explainability in many settings [3], including for ethics, medical informatics and security [18] as well as for recommender systems [15], though these rely upon different forms of argumentation.

Other instances of declarative AI have been used to solve scheduling problems such as the workforce management problem. One such example is Answer Set Programming (ASP), which offers alternative methodology to distribute workforce into teams with various skill constraints [16] and to optimise travel routes [7]. In particular, ASP also proves useful for rescheduling when there are unexpected changes to the original problem at execution time [1, 4]. While the above utilise symbolic AI/KR techniques to solve scheduling problems of various kinds, we only use AA to provide explanatory guidance to users at run time, and rely upon an underlying optimiser for initial solutions to the problem.

User studies are key to understanding the validity and usefulness of explanations. In particular, user studies provide insight into "what makes an explanation *meaningful* to a user" [12]. Various studies have been conducted to qualify the relationship between argumentative explanations and human-generated explanations, e.g. in [14, 17, 2]. However studies such as these tend to be based on hypothetical scenarios rather than real-world applications and have rarely touched on optimisation problems. Our user study is unique on assessing argumentative explanations for an industry problem.

3 Background

We give essential background on AA [5] and its use for explaining makespan scheduling [20].

Definition 1. [5] An AA framework $AF = (Args, \rightsquigarrow)$ is a directed graph where:

- $Args$ is a set of arguments (vertices), and
- \rightsquigarrow is a binary "attack" relation (directed edges) on $Args$ where $a \rightsquigarrow b$ means that a attacks b .

For $A, B \subseteq Args$, $c \in Args$, let: $A \rightsquigarrow c$ iff $\exists d \in A$ such that $d \rightsquigarrow c$ and $A \rightsquigarrow B$ iff $\exists a \in A, b \in B : a \rightsquigarrow b$ (and $A \not\rightsquigarrow B$ means that it is not the case that $A \rightsquigarrow B$). Then, an **extension** $E \subseteq Args$ is

1. **conflict-free** iff $E \not\rightsquigarrow E$,
2. **stable** iff E conflict-free and $E \rightsquigarrow a, \forall a \in Args \setminus E$.

Čyras et al. [20] show how a variant of the makespan scheduling problem can be mapped to an AF as a route to explanation. In the problem, we have n independent jobs $\mathcal{J} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ to be executed by m operators $\mathcal{O} = \{1, \dots, m\}$ and the aim is to minimise the total length of time any operator is working to complete their assigned jobs [9, 19]. Solutions to the makespan scheduling problem (i.e. optimal schedules), can be characterised by assignments of 1 or 0 to variables $x_{i,j}$, which represent the execution of job $j \in \mathcal{J}$ by

operator $i \in \mathcal{O}$ with processing time p_j . We refer to any such solution as a matrix $(x_{i,j})$. For each operator, the sum of all processing times is the associated *cost*, where $C_{\max} = \max_{i \in \mathcal{O}} \{C_i\}$ is the time for all operators to complete all jobs for a given solution.

Solutions need to be *feasible* i.e. every job is assigned to exactly one operator, and *efficient* i.e. the makespan cannot be reduced by moving jobs to another operator or swapping jobs between operators. The variant of the makespan scheduling problem considered in [20] introduces predetermined *fixed decisions* to describe specific constraints a realistic problem may have:

Definition 2. [20] Let $D^- \subseteq \mathcal{J} \times \mathcal{O}$ and $D^+ \subseteq \mathcal{J} \times \mathcal{O}$ be, respectively, sets of **negative** and **positive fixed decisions**. Then, a solution $(x_{i,j})$ satisfies fixed decisions, iff, for any $i \in \mathcal{O}, j \in \mathcal{J}$:

$$(i, j) \in D^- \implies x_{i,j} = 0, \quad (i, j) \in D^+ \implies x_{i,j} = 1.$$

Below, we recap these AFs.

Definition 3. [20] The **feasibility AF** is $AF_F = (Args_F, \rightsquigarrow_F)$ with

- $Args_F = \{a_{i,j} : i \in \mathcal{O}, j \in \mathcal{J}\}$,
- $a_{i,j} \rightsquigarrow_F a_{k,l} \iff i \neq k, j = l$.

The **optimality AF** is $(Args_S, \rightsquigarrow_S)$ with $Args_S = Args_F$ and:

- $\rightsquigarrow_S = (\rightsquigarrow_F \setminus \{(a_{i,j}, a_{i',j'}) : C_i = C_{\max}, x_{i,j} = 1, C_i > C_{i'} + p_j\}) \cup \{(a_{i',j'}, a_{i,j}) : C_i = C_{\max}, x_{i,j} = 1, x_{i',j'} = 1, i \neq i', j \neq j', p_j > p_{j'}, C_i + p_{j'} > C_{i'} + p_j\}$.

For fixed decisions $D = (D^-, D^+)$, the **fixed decision AF** is $(Args_D, \rightsquigarrow_D)$ with $Args_D = Args_F$ and:

- $\rightsquigarrow_D = (\rightsquigarrow_F \cup \{(a_{i,j}, a_{i,j}) : (i, j) \in D^-\}) \setminus \{(a_{k,l}, a_{i,j}) : (i, j) \in D^+, (k, l) \in \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{J}\}$.

The feasibility AF ensures jobs are assigned exactly once. The optimality AF identifies violations of the single exchange property (where moving one job to another operator will reduce the total maximum processing time of any operator) and pairwise exchange property (where swapping two jobs between two operators will reduce the total maximum processing time). The fixed decision AF enforces any additional constraints – self-attacks signify a violation of negative fixed decisions, while non-attacks are due to positive fixed decisions.

Čyras et al. [20] prove that all three AFs can be constructed in $O(nm^2)$ time and verification of whether an extension is stable in each of these AFs requires up to $O(n^2m^2)$ time. Furthermore, stable extensions in each of these AFs correspond to schedules with the intended properties in the makespan scheduling problem, and can be used as a basis for explanation. For a schedule S , we use $E \approx S$ to refer to the corresponding extension.

4 Workforce Management Problem

A problem instance is a triple $(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I})$, where \mathcal{O} is a set of operators, \mathcal{J} is a set of jobs, and \mathcal{I} is a set of instruments. Each job $j \in \mathcal{J}$ corresponds to a task (e.g. equipment maintenance or process control) that needs to be implemented at a specific location (e.g. manufacturing site or customer location) by exactly one operator. The goal is to decide (1) an assignment of jobs to operators and (2) a sequence of the jobs assigned to each operator subject to requirements:

- **Makespan Objective.** Operator $i \in \mathcal{O}$ needs $p_{i,j}$ units of time to complete job $j \in \mathcal{J}$. Also, $d_{j,j'}$ is the distance between the locations of jobs $j, j' \in \mathcal{J}$. The *makespan*, i.e. the total processing and traveling distance of each operator, should be minimised.

- **Restricted Assignments.** Implementing job $j \in \mathcal{J}$ requires using a subset $\mathcal{I}_j^{\mathcal{J}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ of instruments. Operator $i \in \mathcal{O}$ is qualified to use a subset $\mathcal{I}_i^{\mathcal{O}}$ of the available instruments. Job $j \in \mathcal{J}$ can be assigned to operator $i \in \mathcal{O}$ only if $\mathcal{I}_i^{\mathcal{O}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_j^{\mathcal{J}}$.

The problem is defined in terms of three sets: *jobs* \mathcal{J} (with $n = |\mathcal{J}|$), *operators* \mathcal{O} (with $m = |\mathcal{O}|$) and *instruments* \mathcal{I} (with $t = |\mathcal{I}|$). These sets are characterised by the following quantities:

Definition 4. Define $x_{i,j,k} = 1$ iff job $j \in \mathcal{J}$ is the k th job allocated to operator $i \in \mathcal{O}$, and 0 otherwise. Similarly, $z_{i,\tau} = 1$ iff instrument $\tau \in \mathcal{I}$ is allocated to operator $i \in \mathcal{O}$, and 0 otherwise.

Let z_j indicate if job is processed last by some operator. Then $z_j = 1$ iff $\exists i \in \mathcal{O}, j \in \mathcal{J}, k \in [n-1] : x_{i,j,k} = 1, \sum_{j'} x_{i,j',k+1} = 0$ and 0 otherwise.

Definition 5. $P \in M_{m,n}(\mathbb{R})$ is the $m \times n$ **processing times matrix** for \mathcal{J} and \mathcal{O} . For $i \in \mathcal{O}$ and $j \in \mathcal{J}$, $p_{i,j}$ is the time taken for operator i to complete job j .

Definition 6. Let $d_{j,j'}$ be the distance between $j, j' \in \mathcal{J}$. $d_{j,0}$ is the distance between the origin $(0,0,0)$ and job j .

We take d to be Euclidean distance and the start/end point as $(0,0)$.

Definition 7. Let $i \in \mathcal{O}$ be an operator and $j, j' \in \mathcal{J}$ be two jobs. Define $y_{i,j,j'} = 1$ iff both j and j' are assigned to i , and j' should be completed immediately after j (with $y_{i,j,j'} = 0$ otherwise).

Definition 8. The **workforce management optimisation problem** is:

$$\min_{C_{\max}, C_i, x_{i,j,k}, y_{i,j,j'}} C_{\max}$$

subject to

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\max} &\geq C_i, & i \in \mathcal{O} \\ C_i &= \alpha \sum_{j,k} x_{i,j,k} p_{i,j} + \beta \left(\sum_{j,j'} y_{i,j,j'} d_{j,j'} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_j x_{i,j,0} d_{j,0} + \sum_j z_j d_{j,0} \right), & i \in \mathcal{O} \\ y_{i,j,j'} &\geq x_{i,j,k} + x_{i,j,k+1}, & i \in \mathcal{O}, \\ & & j, j' \in \mathcal{J}, \\ & & k \in [n-1] \\ \sum_{i,k} x_{i,j,k} &= 1, & j \in \mathcal{J} \\ \sum_j x_{i,j,k+1} &\leq \sum_j x_{i,j,k}, & i \in \mathcal{O}, \\ & & k \in [n-1] \\ \sum_j x_{i,j,k} &\leq 1, & i \in \mathcal{O}, k \in [n] \\ z_j &\geq x_{i,j,k} - \sum_{j'} x_{i,j',k+1} & i \in \mathcal{O}, \\ & & k \in [n-1] \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{\max} = \max_{i \in \mathcal{O}} \{C_i\}$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ take arbitrary values such that $\alpha + \beta = 1$. (In this study, we use $\alpha = \beta = 0.5$.)

The first two equations describe the objective function: to minimise the maximum cost of each operator. Cost, as defined in the third equation, is the sum of all processing times for each operator and the sum of distances for each operator to travel between jobs. α and β reflect the weighting of these cost quantities. The fourth equation indicates the distance between two jobs should only be included in the cost function if these jobs are sequential and assigned to the same operator. The notation $y_{i,j,j'}$ follows from problems such as TSP [8, 10]. The fifth equation indicates that every job must be assigned to exactly one operator in exactly one position. The sixth equation denotes a constraint on position-dependent formulation, ensuring an operator's jobs must be sequential. Finally, the last equation indicates every operator's schedule can have at most one job in each position (e.g. an operator cannot do two jobs simultaneously).

Example 1. Consider operator i starts and ends at $(0,0)$. Let the coordinates of job j be $(3,4)$ and $p_{i,j} = 3$. Then $x_{i,j,1} p_{i,j} = 3$. Suppose $x_{i,j,1} = 1$ and $x_{i,j',k} = 0, \forall j' \neq j, k \neq 1$. Then $\sum y_{i,j,j'} d_{j,j'} = 0$. Lastly, we have $d_{i,0} = d_{i,N} = \sqrt{3^2 + 4^2} = 5$. Putting this together with $\alpha = \beta = 0.5$, $C_i = 0.5(3) + 0.5(5+5) = 6.5$.

Example 2. Consider the workforce management optimisation problem consisting of three jobs, with locations $(3,4)$, $(5,12)$ and $(5,12)$ respectively, and two operators, both beginning and ending their shifts at the origin $(0,0)$. Let $p_{i,j}$ and schedule S be:

$$p_{i,j} = \begin{pmatrix} 120 & 60 & 30 \\ 120 & 60 & 60 \end{pmatrix}_{i,j}, \quad S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

To calculate the maximum cost of the problem, C_{\max} , we must calculate the cost of each operator. We have $C_1 = 0.5(120 + 30) + 0.5(5 + \sqrt{68 + 13}) \approx 88.12$, $C_2 = 0.5(60) + 0.5(13 + 13) = 43$. So $C_{\max} = C_1 \approx 88.12$. This means operator 1 has the highest cost and thus this is the total cost of the solution. Any changes to reduce the total cost must be applied to operator 1.

We will refer to a solution of the workforce management optimisation problem as an *optimal schedule wrt extended cost*.

5 Argumentative Workforce Management

Inspired by [20], we map our problem onto AFs. Differently from [20], we accommodate travel distance, impacting how we define efficient solutions (Subsection 5.1). We consider if the order of jobs assigned to each operator can be optimised to minimise the total distance travelled (Subsection 5.2). Finally, we consider the impact of skills and instruments on fixed decisions (i.e. what operator-job-instrument combinations are impossible) (Subsections 5.3 and 5.4).

To accommodate job sequencing, we use AA to check efficiency, compared to both other operators and variations of the same operator's schedule. We do not use AA methods for sequence feasibility checks (i.e. all jobs assigned to exactly one place in the sequence, and each place in a sequence has an assigned job).

5.1 Extended Cost & Efficiency

We first define suitable notions of exchange properties to deal with fixed decisions, when focusing on efficiency of solutions.

Definition 9. Consider a schedule S and critical operator $i \in \mathcal{O}$, i.e. $C_i = C_{\max}$. Given $j \in \mathcal{J}$ executed by i at position k , we define:

1. Extended Single Exchange Property (SEP+):

$$\forall i' \in \mathcal{O}, j', j'^+ \in \mathcal{J}, x_{i',j',k'} = x_{i',j'^+,k'+1} = 1: C_i - C_{i'} \leq \alpha p_{i',j} + \beta [d_{j,j'} + d_{j,j'^+}] - \beta d_{j',j'^+}$$

2. Extended Pairwise Exchange Property (PEP+):

$$\forall j^-, j^+, j'^-, j'^+ \in \mathcal{J} : x_{i,j^-,k-1} = x_{i,j^+,k+1} = x_{i',j'^-,k'-1} = x_{i',j'^+,k'+1} = 1 : \beta ([d_{j^-,j^+}] - [d_{j'^-,j'^+} + d_{j',j'^+}]) > \alpha [p_{i',j'} - p_{i,j}] \implies C_i - C_{i'} \leq \alpha [p_{i',j} - p_{i',j'}] + \beta (d_{j',j} + d_{j,j'^+}) - [d_{j',j'} + d_{j',j'^+}].$$

S is **extended cost efficient** if S is feasible, satisfies SEP+ and PEP+.

Intuitively, S satisfies SEP+ if the cost C_{\max} cannot be decreased by moving a job j from critical operator i to non-critical operator i' . Also, S satisfies PEP+ if C_{\max} cannot be decreased by swapping the assigned operator and position of j, j' where $x_{i,j,k} = x_{i',j',k'} = 1$.

Lemma 3. Every optimal schedule wrt extended cost satisfies SEP+ and PEP+.

The proof of this result can be found in the Appendix. We then adapt the definition of optimality AF in [20], applying attacks where arguments violate the SEP+ and PEP+ conditions.

Definition 10. For feasibility AF ($Args_F, \rightsquigarrow_F$) and schedule S , the **extended cost efficiency AF** ($Args_{S+}, \rightsquigarrow_{S+}$) is defined as:

- $Args_{S+} = Args_F$,
- $\rightsquigarrow_{S+} = (\rightsquigarrow_F \setminus \{(a_{i,j}, a_{i',j}) : C_i = C_{\max}, x_{i,j,k} = 1 : \exists j' \neq j, x_{i',j'} = 1 : C_i - C_{i'} > p_{i',j} + \beta([d_{j',j} + d_{j,j'+}] - \beta d_{j',j'+})\} \cup \{(a_{i',j'}, a_{i,j}) : C_i = C_{\max}, x_{i,j,k} = x_{i',j',k'} = 1, i \neq i', j \neq j', \beta([d_{j-,j} + d_{j,j+}] - [d_{j-,j'} + d_{j',j+}]) > p_{i,j'} - p_{i,j}, C_i - C_{i'} > p_{i',j} - p_{i,j'} + \beta([d_{j'-,j} + d_{j,j'+}] - [d_{j'-,j'} + d_{j',j+}])\})$.

In other words: (i) if an argument $a_{i,j} \in E$ violates SEP+ due to $a_{i',j}$, remove any attacks from $a_{i,j}$ to $a_{i',j}$; (ii) if arguments $a_{i,j}, a_{i',j'} \in E$ cause a violation of PEP+, add an attack from $a_{i',j'}$ to $a_{i,j}$. Note the criteria for self-attacks is SEP+ and the criteria for attacks between two different arguments is PEP+, both as defined in Definition 9. With an abuse of notation, we will refer to the extended cost efficiency AF simply as ($Args_S, \rightsquigarrow_S$) for ease.

Theorem 4. For a schedule S and $S \approx E$, E is stable in ($Args_S, \rightsquigarrow_S$) iff S is feasible and satisfies SEP+ and PEP+.

The proof of this result can be found in the Appendix.

Example 5. Consider the workforce management optimisation problem in Example 2. We can do the following checks to build our extended cost efficiency AF:

- Move job 1 from operator 1 to 2 at start: $C_1 - C_2 = 44.85 - 35.6 = 9.25$, $p_{i',j} + [d_{j',j} + d_{j,j'+}] - \beta d_{j',j'+} = 12.9 + [5 + \sqrt{68}] - 13 \approx 13.15$. Then, $9.25 < 13.15 \implies$ satisfies SEP+.
- Move job 1 from operator 1 to 2 after job 2: same as above.
- Move job 3 from operator 1 to 2 at start: $p_{i',j} + [d_{j',j} + d_{j,j'+}] - \beta d_{j',j'+} = 8.7 + [13 + 0] - 13 = 8.7$. Then, $C_1 - C_2 = 9.25 > 8.7 \implies$ violates SEP+.
- Swap jobs 1 and 2: $p_{i,j'} - p_{i,j} = 0$, $\beta([d_{j-,j} + d_{j,j+}] - [d_{j-,j'} + d_{j',j+}]) = [5 + \sqrt{68}] - [13 + 0] \approx 0.246 > 0$, $C_i - C_{i'} = 9.25$, $p_{i',j} - p_{i,j'} + \beta([d_{j'-,j} + d_{j,j'+}] - [d_{j'-,j'} + d_{j',j+}]) = 12.9 - 9.6 + ([5 + 5] - [13 + 13]) = -12.7 < 9.25 \implies$ violates PEP+.
- Swap jobs 3 and 2: $p_{i,j'} - p_{i,j} = 9.6 - 5.7 = 3.9$, $\beta([d_{j-,j} + d_{j,j+}] - [d_{j-,j'} + d_{j',j+}]) = [\sqrt{68} + 13] - [\sqrt{68} + 13] = 0 < 3.9 \implies$ satisfies PEP+.

The corresponding efficiency AF is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Efficiency AF for Example 5

Lemma 6. The extended cost efficiency AF ($Args_S, \rightsquigarrow_S$) can be constructed in $O(m^2 n^2)$ time. Given a schedule S , verifying whether extension $E \approx S$ is stable can be done in $O(m^2 n^2)$ time.

The proof of this result can be found in the Appendix.

5.2 Individual Efficiency

When considering distance in the workforce management problem, the order of jobs assigned to an operator should also be optimised. Consider three jobs, where jobs 1 and 2 occur at the same location and job 3 at a separate location. Logically, completing the first two jobs sequentially, then the third, would be more efficient than completing job 1, then job 3, then job 2.

Definition 11. Let d be the distance metric. For $x_{i,j,k} = x_{i,j',k'} = 1$, we define the following properties $\forall j \neq j', k \neq k'$:

1. **Individual Single Exchange Property (ISEP):** $\forall x_{i,j-,k-1} = x_{i,j+,k+1} = x_{i,j'+,k'+1} = 1$: $d_{j',j} + d_{j,j'+} - d_{j',j'+} \geq d_{j-,j} + d_{j,j+} - d_{j-,j+}$
2. **Individual Pairwise Exchange Property (IPEP):** $\forall x_{i,j-,k-1} = x_{i,j+,k+1} = x_{i,j'-,k'-1} = x_{i,j'+,k'+1} = 1$: $d_{j'-,j} + d_{j,j'+} + d_{j-,j'} + d_{j',j+} \geq d_{j'-,j'} + d_{j',j'+} + d_{j-,j} + d_{j,j+}$.

We say S is **individual cost efficient** iff S is feasible and satisfies both ISEP and IPEP.

Lemma 7. Every optimal schedule with respect to individual cost satisfies ISEP and IPEP.

The proof follows the same approach as Lemma 3.

Example 8. Consider an operator i with 3 jobs at locations $1(3, 4)$, $2(5, 12)$ and $3(5, 12)$, and the operator beginning and ending its shift at $(0, 0)$. Suppose the individual schedule order is $\{2, 1, 3\}$. We can then check the following (not a conclusive list):

- Move job 1 to start: $d_{j',j} + d_{j,j'+} - d_{j',j'+} = 5 + \sqrt{68} - 13 \approx 0.246$, $d_{j-,j} + d_{j,j+} - d_{j-,j+} = 13 + 13 - 0 = 26 > 0.246 \implies$ violates ISEP.
- Swap jobs 2 and 3 ($j' = 2, j = 3$): $d_{j'-,j} + d_{j,j'+} + d_{j-,j'} + d_{j',j+} = 13 + \sqrt{68} + \sqrt{68} + 13 \approx 42.49$, $d_{j'-,j'} + d_{j',j'+} + d_{j-,j} + d_{j,j+} = 13 + \sqrt{68} + \sqrt{68} + 13 \approx 42.49 \implies$ satisfies IPEP.
- Swap jobs 1 and 3 ($j' = 1, j = 3$): $d_{j'-,j} + d_{j,j'+} + d_{j-,j'} + d_{j',j+} = 0 + 0 + 0 + 5 = 5$, $d_{j'-,j'} + d_{j',j'+} + d_{j-,j} + d_{j,j+} = \sqrt{68} + \sqrt{68} + \sqrt{68} + 13 \approx 37.74 > 5 \implies$ violates IPEP.

Definition 12. For feasibility AF ($Args_F, \rightsquigarrow_F$) and schedule S , the **individual cost efficiency AF** ($Args_{IS}, \rightsquigarrow_{IS}$) is defined as:

- $Args_{IS} = Args_F$,
- $\rightsquigarrow_{IS} = \rightsquigarrow_F \cup \{(a_{i,j}, a_{i,j}) : \exists w \neq j, x_{i,w} = 1 : d_{j',j} + d_{j,j'+} - d_{j',j'+} < d_{j-,j} + d_{j,j+} - d_{j-,j+}\} \cup \{(a_{i,j'}, a_{i,j}) : x_{i,j} = x_{i,j'} = 1, j \neq j', d_{j'-,j} + d_{j,j'+} + d_{j-,j'} + d_{j',j+} < d_{j'-,j'} + d_{j',j'+} + d_{j-,j} + d_{j,j+}\}$.

Example 9. Figure 2 gives the final AF for Example 8. Note that $a_{1,1} \rightsquigarrow a_{1,1}$ due to ISEP violations and $a_{1,1} \rightsquigarrow a_{1,2}$, $a_{1,2} \rightsquigarrow a_{1,1}$, $a_{1,1} \rightsquigarrow a_{1,3}$, $a_{1,3} \rightsquigarrow a_{1,1}$ due to IPEP violations.

Lemma 10. The individual cost efficiency AF ($Args_{IS}, \rightsquigarrow_{IS}$) can be constructed in $O(nm(n+m))$ time. Given a schedule S , verifying whether extension $E \approx S$ is stable can be done in $O(m^2 n^2)$ time.

The proof follows the same approach as Lemma 6.




Figure 2. Individual cost efficiency AF for Example 9

5.3 Skill Constraints to Fixed Decisions

In workforce management, often not every operator is equipped to complete every job. Some jobs may require more skills than others – for example, an engineer may have a different set of skills to a van driver. In the next two subsections, we consider three types of fixed decisions that should be fulfilled: the first is meeting the skills requirements to complete a given job.

Definition 13. Let \mathcal{K} be a set of skills, $\mathcal{K} = \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_K\}$ where $|\mathcal{K}| = K$. Then the set of **skill prerequisites** is $\mathcal{K}_j \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ for a job $j \in \mathcal{J}$ and the set of **operator skills** is $\mathcal{K}_i \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ for an operator $i \in \mathcal{O}$. By definition, any operator i assigned a job j must fulfill all skill criteria. In other words, a feasible (with relation to fixed decisions) schedule S must satisfy $\mathcal{K}_j \subseteq \mathcal{K}_i \forall i \in \mathcal{O}, j \in \mathcal{J}$.

$\mathcal{I}_j \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ is the set of instrument requirements for job $j \in \mathcal{J}$.

Definition 14 (Based on Čyras et al.'s [20] Fixed Decision AF). The **skill constraints AF** ($Args_{DS}, \rightsquigarrow_{DS}$) is defined as:

- $Args_{DS} = Args_F$,
- $\rightsquigarrow_{DS} = (\rightsquigarrow_F \cup \{(a_{i,j}, a_{i,j}) : \exists k \in \mathcal{K}_j, k \notin \mathcal{K}_i\})$.

Using Definitions 2, 13 and 14, it follows that:

Lemma 11. Violating skill requirements are negative fixed decisions. In other words: $\exists k \in \mathcal{K}_j : k \notin \mathcal{K}_i \implies (i, j) \in D^-$.

Example 12. Consider a problem consisting of 3 operators and 3 jobs. Let operator 1 have skills (A, B, C), operator 2 have skills (A, C) and operator 3 have skills (B, C). Similarly, let the skill requirements for jobs be job 1 (A), job 2 (B) and job 3 (B, C). So




Figure 3. Skill requirement AF for Example 12

$D^- = \{(2,2), (2,3), (3,1)\}$. Figure 3 shows the corresponding skill requirements (fixed decision) AF.

Lemma 13. Given a set of job skill prerequisites and a set of operator skills, the skill constraints AF can be constructed in $O(mnK + nm^2)$ time. Given a schedule S , verifying whether an extension $E \approx S$ is stable for AF_S can be done in $O(n^2m^2)$ time.

The proof is similar to those of earlier lemmas.

5.4 Instrument Allocations

Some jobs may require additional instruments to complete a job, like a toolkit or a van. Instruments may even require additional skills, such as a driver's license. Like jobs, instruments must be allocated to exactly one operator, assuming the operator has the correct skills.

Definition 15. \mathcal{I} is the set of instruments. $\mathcal{K}_\tau \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ is the set of skill requirements for instrument $\tau \in \mathcal{I}$.

Lemma 14. Instrument allocation can be modelled as in [20], without optimality/efficiency AF.

Proof. From Definition 15, rule 1 can be modelled by the feasibility AF by its definition. Rule 2 can be modelled by mapping skill requirements to negative fixed decisions by Lemma 11. \square

Example 15. Consider two operators with skills: (1) X Y Z, (2) Z, and instruments I0–I3. Let I1 have skill requirements {X, Z}, and all other instruments be requirement-free. Let

$$SI = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad SI' = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then SI is a feasible and valid instrument assignment, but SI' is not since it violates the skill constraints for I1.

Definition 16. For n jobs and t instruments, we define $\zeta \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times t}$ as the job-instrument constraint matrix, such that $\zeta_{j,\tau}$ is the element in the j th column and τ th row of ζ . We define $\zeta_{j,\tau} = 1$ if instrument τ is a requirement for job j , and 0 otherwise.

Definition 17. For n jobs and t instruments, consider job allocation schedule S and instrument allocation schedule SI . Let S_i, SI_i be the sets of jobs and instruments assigned to operator $i \in \mathcal{O}$ respectively. Then, the **job-instrument assignment AF** ($Args_{JI}, \rightsquigarrow_{JI}$) has:

- $Args_{JI} = \{a_{j,\tau} : j \in \mathcal{O}, \tau \in \mathcal{I}\}$,
- $\rightsquigarrow_{JI} = \{(a_{j,\tau}, a_{j,\tau}) : \tau \in SI_i, j \notin S_i, i \in \mathcal{O}\}$.

Example 16. Continuing from Example 15, suppose we also have jobs 1-4 with the following schedule assignment S and job-instrument constraint matrix ζ :

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \zeta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Using SI from Example 15, Figure 4 shows the job-instrument assignment AF with ζ highlighted in blue where $\zeta_{j,\tau} = 1$. There is a violation since $a_{1,I2} \rightsquigarrow a_{1,I2}$; I2 is an instrument requirement for job 1, however they are allocated to different operators.




Figure 4. Job-instrument assignment AF for Example 16

Lemma 17. Given job and instrument assignment schedules S, SI and job-instrument constraint ζ , the job-instrument constraint AF can be constructed in $O(mnt)$ time, for t the number of instruments.

The proof follows the same approach as Lemmas 6 and 10.

6 Explanations

We bring together the different argumentation frameworks to give comprehensive explanations for the validity of schedules. We extend [20] to include two efficiency AFs (extended cost efficiency and individual schedule efficiency) and specify a subset of fixed decisions (skill requirements). We additionally define an AF relating to fixed decisions for job-instrument allocation.

Definition 18. For a given schedule S and set of skills \mathcal{K} , let $E \approx S$ and $(Args, \rightsquigarrow)$ be any of $(Args_F, \rightsquigarrow_F)$, $(Args_{S+}, \rightsquigarrow_{S+})$, $(Args_{D_S}, \rightsquigarrow_{D_S})$, $(Args_{IS}, \rightsquigarrow_{IS})$. For an attack $a \rightsquigarrow b$ with $a, b \in E$:

- $(a, b) \in \rightsquigarrow_F \implies S$ is not feasible,
- $(a, b) \in \rightsquigarrow_{S+} \setminus \rightsquigarrow_F \implies S$ is not extended cost efficient,
- $(a, b) \in \rightsquigarrow_{D_S} \setminus \rightsquigarrow_F \implies S$ violates skill requirements,
- $(a, b) \in \rightsquigarrow_{IS} \setminus \rightsquigarrow_F \implies S$ is not individual cost efficient.

For a non-attack $E \not\rightsquigarrow b, b \notin E$:

- $\rightsquigarrow = \rightsquigarrow_F \implies S$ not feasible,
- $\rightsquigarrow = \rightsquigarrow_{S+}$ and $b \rightsquigarrow_{S+} E \implies S$ not efficient.

Non-attacks are not possible for $(Args_{D_S}, \rightsquigarrow_{D_S})$, $(Args_{IS}, \rightsquigarrow_{IS})$ by definition.

Definition 19. For a given job-instrument constraint matrix ζ , $E \approx \zeta$, $(Args, \rightsquigarrow) \in (Args_{JI}, \rightsquigarrow_{JI})$, for an attack $a \rightsquigarrow a, a \in E$: $(a, a) \in \rightsquigarrow_{JI} \implies$ job-instrument requirements are violated.

SI and instrument-skills fixed decisions are derived from [20].

Theorem 18. Given $\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{I}$, schedules S, SI and job-instrument constraint ζ , the total time taken to construct the AFs for the problem is $O(mn(mn + K + t))$. Verifying explanations for the relevant extensions can be done in $O(m(mn^2 + t))$.

The proof can be found in the Appendix.

7 Evaluation

After optimal schedules are computed, they may need to be modified over time to respond to last-minute changes. For example, workers could call in sick one day, or tasks may take longer than anticipated, causing a backlog. In these cases, people must change the schedules in real time and coordinators must make manual changes, however they may not be aware of how this impacts other areas of the schedule. They also need to be able to explain how proposed modifications will lead to a new optimal schedule to ensure trust in the schedule. We conducted a user study with the goal to compare how well the user is able to update an initial schedule, with and without our purpose-built tool, utilising our explanation approach.

Specifically, a user is given a schedule that needs modification because it is suboptimal and/or infeasible; they are then tasked to produce an updated schedule. In this process, we evaluate the user's speed and accuracy, that is, the amount of time that they need for producing the new schedule and the quality of the schedule they produce. The main finding is that our tool supports *Terranova* employees in obtaining modified schedules faster and of better quality, with respect to not using our tool.

Outline The user study used a proof-of-concept tool, implementing the methodology from Sections 5 and 6 (see Figure 5). The basis for the tool was the prototype by Karamlou [11]. Participants completed half of questions by hand and half aided by the tool. Participants were randomly assigned one of four question sets, removing bias from the relative difficulty of questions and offering insight into how the question format impacted performance.

We compare performance across three key metrics: **schedule accuracy** (marked as correct if a user submitted a revised schedule which passed all feasibility and optimality checks from the tool, and incorrect otherwise), **cost accuracy** (marked as correct if a user's new calculated maximal cost across all operators matched that determined by the tool), and **completion time** (time taken for a user to complete a task, from the time the question was opened until the time an answer was submitted).

Method The study was conducted with 28 employees of *Terranova*. The user study consisted of four groups, given two sets of questions with four distinct question orders:

- Red (set 1 by hand; tool introduced; set 2 using tool),
- Yellow (set 2 by hand; tool introduced; set 1 using tool),
- Green (alternating questions from both sets with tool introduced at start; set 1 by hand, set 2 using tool),
- Blue (alternating questions from both sets with tool introduced at start; set 2 by hand, set 1 using tool).




Figure 5. Tool makespan interface adapting [11]

Questions ranged from optimising makespan or distance to optimising both, alongside instruments and skills constraints. For example, respondents were given the coordinates of jobs A(6,2), B(5,5), C(0,7), D(3,2). They were shown the schedule in Figure 6, where operator 1 completes job B, and operator 2 completes the remaining jobs in the order C, D, A. Participants were then asked to optimise the schedules and give the correct cost, using the tool or by hand. A correct solution here would be to move C to operator 1.

The tool offered participants maximum flexibility to amend the inputs (through text boxes and sliders) and select different optimisation suggestions from the tool's output. Visuals charting travel distance and processing time allowed participants to visualise the impact of schedule changes, before selecting from the list the tool provided.

There was significant positive correlation between engagement rate (number of questions answered, compared to those left blank) and total accuracy (all schedule and cost questions answered correctly) of respondents, $r(26) = -.37, p = .026$. Figure 7 shows that accuracy was mostly consistent across survey groups; retention rate dropped for the last, with only half of respondents reaching the end.

Schedule accuracy Respondents were asked to provide an improved schedule for each problem (or, for question 4, respondents




Figure 6. Sample question from study




Figure 7. Overall accuracy distribution by survey group

should pick the optimal schedule from the options given). For questions 1-3 and 5-6, respondents also included the maximum distance or makespan (depending on the question) for their optimised schedule. This was omitted from question 4 for obvious reasons, and omitted from question 7 since it utilised a combination of distance and time (making the question ambiguous).

The accuracy here is calculated as the number of correct responses out of all users that give a response. The following was assumed: (1) schedules were counted as correct if the tool identifies them as feasible, efficient, individually efficient and all fixed decisions are met; (2) the maximum cost for any operator was correct (regardless of whether the tool said the schedule given is efficient or not); (3) for questions involving instrument allocation, we assumed (where not given) the respondent found a correct instrument allocation, if one existed. Figure 8 shows the proportion of correct answers for




Figure 8. Schedule accuracy for question sets 1 and 2

each schedule question, split into respondents who answered by hand versus those who used the tool.

We observed that, in general, respondents who used the tool were more likely to get a question correct, except for (1) Set 1, Q4 (Choice of Schedule): it is unclear why respondents struggled to use the tool to answer this question – possibly, having multiple schedules to download and compare may have caused some confusion, as the answer was relatively easy to deduce by analysing the three schedules (route optimisation/distance) visually; (2) Set 2, Q6 (Distance with Instruments): this problem introduced instrument assignments and constraints leading to the tool creating a loop (job F required

instruments I1 and I0, but these were allocated to different operators, so moving the job did not help in solving the problem) - the correct answer here was to move one of two instruments, so that both instrument requirements for job F were met, then optimise. This was the worst answered question out of all those in the user study, with just 29% of respondents giving a correct schedule.




Figure 9. Accuracy of maximum cost responses

Cost accuracy Figure 9 shows the proportion of correct answers for each question with numerical input (max cost, for distance and processing time problems), split into respondents who answered by hand versus by tool. Note that, for these questions, we only accepted the true optimal value (i.e. a lowest max cost given, where the schedule answer provided passed all tests by the tool and gave the same cost value). We observed that results were generally much more variable than the schedule questions: this was likely due to the tool's sub-optimal algorithm, meaning some solutions found by hand were better than solutions immediately found by the tool. There were some anomalies. (1) Set 1, Q1 (Distance): despite the tool giving the KPIs, a significant proportion of respondents using the tool put "13" for the distance instead of "26" for the distance travelled (not counting the return journey); regardless, these respondents gave a correct schedule solution. (2) Set 2, Q3 (Time): as discussed above, this was a question where the tool recommended a schedule that was sub-optimal. It is worth noting that every respondent here gave a makespan answer which was optimal by the tool's standards. (3) Set 2, Q6 (Distance with Instruments): as with the schedule response, this question had a low success rate with the tool due to lack of understanding applying changes to the instrument allocation.

Still, for the remaining questions, the accuracy rate using the tool was greater than that completing the questions by hand. Across all questions, the accuracy rate was 54% by hand, compared to 74% for questions answered with aid of the tool. There was significant improvement in accuracy when respondents were able to use the tool, $\chi^2(1, N = 608) = 24.95, p < 10^{-4}$.

Completion Time The average completion time for the full user study was 2 hours and 23 minutes. Despite minor variations in time completion depending on which question set was completed by hand versus using the tool (2 hours 29 minutes vs 2 hours 19 minutes), respondents who alternated generally took longer (2 hours 51 minutes compared to 1 hour 57 minutes). This difference may be due to respondents not becoming sufficiently used to completing questions with the tool or by hand, due to constant switching between the two.

Figure 10 shows the average time users spent on each question. We omit all values where the user did not submit a response (as we cannot tell whether users attempted the question before skipping it). We observe: (1) the first question in both problem sets had a high average completion time, likely due to lack of familiarity with the format of questions and/or tool; (2) Q2 from both sets were simple makespan problems, while Q3 used much larger examples (around double the number of jobs); this was reflected in higher completion times, par-




Figure 10. Average time completion (seconds) per question

ticularly for those completing the problems by hand; (3) remaining questions were intended as medium difficulty (albeit challenging to solve by hand), with the exception of Q7, which was solved quickly by respondents using our tool, likely due to users now being familiar with the tool and survey format; unlike previous questions, this also contained no constraints (skills/instruments).

On average, the median time taken for users to complete questions by hand was more than 4 times slower than with aid of the tool (368 seconds vs 71 seconds). There is very strong positive correlation indicating that a question could be solved faster using the tool ($M = 135.8, SD = 187.5$), compared to by hand ($M = 527.5, SD = 557.2, t(354) = 9.04, p < 10^{-17}$).

8 Conclusions

We have introduced a methodology for equipping workforce management optimisation with explanations and tested the methodology with a user study showing clear improvements in accuracy and efficiency in an industry setting. This shows promise in effectiveness with identifying and revising solutions to the problem. As future work, we plan to accommodate argumentation for sequencing of jobs as well as to conduct further, more extensive, user studies.

References

- [1] M. Cardellini, C. Dodaro, G. Galatà, A. Giardini, M. Maratea, N. Nisopoli, and I. Porro. Rescheduling rehabilitation sessions with answer set programming. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 33(4): 837–863, 2023.
- [2] F. Cerutti, M. Cramer, M. Guillaume, E. Hadoux, A. Hunter, and S. Polberg. Empirical cognitive studies about formal argumentation. *Handbook of Formal Argumentation*, 2021.
- [3] K. Čyras, A. Rago, E. Albini, P. Baroni, and F. Toni. Argumentative xai: a survey. Preprint arXiv:2105.11266, 2021.
- [4] C. Dodaro, G. Galatà, M. K. Khan, M. Maratea, and I. Porro. Operating room (re) scheduling with bed management via asp. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming*, 22(2):229–253, 2022.
- [5] P. M. Dung. On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games. *Artificial Intelligence*, 77(2):321–357, 1995.
- [6] M. Gamst and D. Pisinger. Decision support for the technician routing and scheduling problem. *Networks*, 83(1):169–196, 2024.
- [7] M. Gebser, P. Obermeier, T. Schaub, M. Ratsch-Heitmman, and M. Runge. Routing driverless transport vehicles in car assembly with answer set programming. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming*, 18(3-4):520–534, 2018.
- [8] L. Gouveia, M. Leitner, and M. Ruthmair. Extended formulations and branch-and-cut algorithms for the black-and-white traveling salesman problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 262(3):908–928, 2017.
- [9] R. L. Graham. Bounds on multiprocessing timing anomalies. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 17(2):416–429, 1969.
- [10] G. Gutin and A. P. Punnen. *The traveling salesman problem and its variations*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002.
- [11] A. Karamlou. Interactive schedule explainer for nurse rostering. <https://github.com/AminKaramlou/AESWebApp>, 2020.
- [12] J. Kim, H. Maathuis, and D. Sent. Human-centered evaluation of explainable ai applications: a systematic review. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 7:1456486, 2024.
- [13] J. Leigh, D. Letsios, A. Mella, L. Machetti, and F. Toni. Argumentation for explainable workforce optimisation. In *PAIS*, 2025.
- [14] S. Naveed, T. Donkers, and J. Ziegler. Argumentation-based explanations in recommender systems: Conceptual framework and empirical results. In *Proceedings of the 26th Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization (UMAP)*, pages 293–298, 2018.
- [15] A. Rago, O. Cocarascu, C. Bechlivanidis, D. Lagnado, and F. Toni. Argumentative explanations for interactive recommendations. *Artificial Intelligence*, 296:103506, 2021.
- [16] F. Ricca, G. Grasso, M. Alviano, M. Manna, V. Lio, S. Iiritano, and N. Leone. Team-building with answer set programming in the gioiatauro seaport. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming*, 12(3):361–381, 2012.
- [17] E. I. Sklar and M. Q. Azhar. Explanation through argumentation. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Human-Agent Interaction (HAI)*, pages 277–285, 2018.
- [18] A. Vassiliades, N. Bassiliades, and T. Patkos. Argumentation and explainable artificial intelligence: a survey. *The Knowledge Engineering Review*, 36:e5, 2021.
- [19] D. M. Warner and J. Prawda. A mathematical programming model for scheduling nursing personnel in a hospital. *Management Science*, 19: 411–422, 1972.
- [20] K. Čyras, D. Letsios, R. Misener, and F. Toni. Argumentation for explainable scheduling. In *Proceedings of the 33rd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, 2019.

Argumentation for Explainable Workforce Optimisation: Appendix

Proof of Lemma 3 Let S be the original optimal schedule. SEP+ (the proof for PEP+ is similar): Consider the schedule S^* obtained by moving job j from machine i to i' , placed directly after a given job j' , keeping the remaining job assignments and orders as in S (i.e. $x_{i',j,k'+1} = 1$). Then $C_i(S^*) = C_i(S) - p_{i,j} - \beta[d_{j^-,j} + d_{j,j^+}] + \beta d_{j^-,j^+}$ and $C_{i'}(S^*) = C_{i'}(S) + p_{i',j} + \beta[d_{j',j} + d_{j,j'+}] - \beta d_{j',j'+}$. Note $C_{i''}(S^*) = C_{i''}(S)$ for all $i'' \neq i, i'$. Since job j is critical, $C_i(S) \geq C_{i'}(S)$, and since S is optimal, $C_{i'}(S^*) \geq C_i(S)$ since S^* cannot obtain a lower extended cost. Putting this together: $C_{i'}(S^*) \geq C_i(S)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies C_{i'}(S) + p_{i',j} + \beta[d_{j',j} + d_{j,j'+}] - \beta d_{j',j'+} \geq C_i(S) \\ &\implies C_i(S) - C_{i'}(S) \leq p_{i',j} + \beta[d_{j',j} + d_{j,j'+}] - \beta d_{j',j'+} \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 4 This proof is derived from Theorem 4.3 from [20]. Let E be stable in $(Args_{S^+}, \rightsquigarrow_{S^+})$. We know E is conflict-free in $(Args_F, \rightsquigarrow_F)$ since attacks removed for SEP+ only make asymmetric attacks symmetric and attacks added for PEP+ are between arguments that do not already attack each other in $(Args_F, \rightsquigarrow_F)$ (since $i \neq i'$). So S is feasible by Theorem 4.1 in [20].

As E is stable for all $j \in \mathcal{J}, a_{i,j} \in E$, it follows that $a_{i,j} \rightsquigarrow_{S^+} a_{i',j}$ where $i' \neq i$. So we do not need to remove attacks from \rightsquigarrow_F to get to \rightsquigarrow_{S^+} , so $\forall i \neq i', j \neq j', x_{i,j,k} = x_{i',j',k'} = 1 : C_i - C_{i'} > p_{i',j} + \beta[d_{j',j} + d_{j,j'+}] - \beta d_{j',j'+}$ cannot hold for any (i, i', j, j') , leading to SEP+ being satisfied.

For PEP+, since E is conflict-free, $\forall i \neq i', j \neq j', x_{i,j,k} = x_{i',j',k'} = 1$,

$$\beta([d_{j^-,j} + d_{j,j^+}] - [d_{j^-,j'} + d_{j',j^+}]) > [p_{i,j'} - p_{i,j}],$$

$C_i - C_{i'} > [p_{i',j} - p_{i',j'}] + \beta([d_{j',j} + d_{j,j'+}] - [d_{j',j'} + d_{j',j'+}])$ cannot hold for any (i, i', j, j') so S satisfies PEP+.

As in Theorem 4.3 from [20], since S is feasible, E is stable in $(Args_F, \rightsquigarrow_F)$. S also satisfies SEP+ and PEP+ so $\rightsquigarrow_{S^+} = \rightsquigarrow_F$. So S feasible, satisfies SEP+, PEP+ $\implies E$ stable in $(Args_{S^+}, \rightsquigarrow_{S^+})$.

Proof of Lemma 6 Recall that there may be multiple $i \in \mathcal{O}$ that satisfy $C_{max} = C_i$. Recall from Lemma 4.2 in [20] the construction of the feasibility AF takes $O(nm^2)$. To remove attacks, we must first identify the critical operators, taking $O(m)$. Then, for each critical operator (of which there are a maximum of m), to iterate over $i \in \mathcal{O}, j, j' \in \mathcal{J}$ and check $j \neq j', x_{i,j,k} = x_{i',j',k'} = 1$ takes $O(mn^2)$. For each of these, calculating the distance metrics and the inequality comparisons take $O(1)$. So, in total, removing attacks takes $O(m^2n^2)$. To add attacks, we iterate over $i \in \mathcal{O}, j, j' \in \mathcal{J}$ for each critical operator and check $x_{i,j,k} = x_{i',j',k'} = 1, i \neq i', j \neq j'$ which takes $O(m^2n^2)$. Calculating distances ($O(1)$) and checking inequalities ($O(1)$) means the addition of attacks takes $O(m^2n^2)$. As with Lemma 4.2 in [20], we determine if $E \subseteq Args_{S^+}$ is stable by checking if E is conflict-free, taking $O(m^2n^2)$, and if E attacks every argument in $Args_{S^+} \setminus E$, also taking $O(m^2n^2)$.

Proof of Lemma 7 ISEP: Let $D_i(S)$ be the objective distance function for a schedule S , where

$$D_i = \sum_{j,j' \in \mathcal{J}} y_{i,j,j'} d_{j,j'} + d_{i,0} + d_{i,N}.$$

Let S^* be an optimal schedule. If we move job j from its position between j^- and j^+ to a new position between w and w^+ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_i(S) = D_i(S^*) - [d_{j^-,j} + d_{j,j^+}] + d_{j^-,j^+} \\ + [d_{j',j} + d_{j,j'+}] - d_{j',j'+}. \end{aligned}$$

Since S^* is optimal, any other schedule route will be longer and such $D_i(S) \geq D_i(S^*)$. The proof for IPEP is similar.

Proof of Theorem 18 For S , Lemmas 4.2 in [20], 6, 13, 10 and 17 give all constructions/explanations relating to job assignment. For SI , Lemmas 4.2 in [20] and 13 give constructions relating to instrument assignment. In Lemma 17, checking for self-attacks can be done in $O(nt)$ time. Checking stability for the remaining AFs, the theorem follows.