

The Effect of Preferences in Abstract Argumentation Under a Claim-Centric View

Michael Bernreiter, Wolfgang Dvořák, Anna Rapberger,
Stefan Woltran

Institute of Logic and Computation, TU Wien, Austria
{mbernrei,dvorak,arapberg,woltran}@dbai.tuwien.ac.at

April 29, 2022

Abstract

In this paper, we study the effect of preferences in abstract argumentation under a claim-centric perspective. Recent work has revealed that semantical and computational properties can change when reasoning is performed on claim-level rather than on the argument-level, while under certain natural restrictions (arguments with the same claims have the same outgoing attacks) these properties are conserved. We now investigate these effects when, in addition, preferences have to be taken into account and consider four prominent reductions to handle preferences between arguments. As we shall see, these reductions give rise to different classes of claim-augmented argumentation frameworks, and behave differently in terms of semantic properties and computational complexity. This strengthens the view that the actual choice for handling preferences has to be taken with care.

1 Introduction

Arguments vary in their plausibility. Research in formal argumentation has taken up this aspect in both quantitative and qualitative terms [Atkinson and Bench-Capon, 2021, Li et al., 2011, Atkinson et al., 2017]. Indeed, preferences are nowadays a standard feature of many structured argumentation formalisms [Prakken and Sartor, 1997, Modgil and Prakken, 2013, Cyras and Toni, 2016, García and Simari, 2014]. In abstract argumentation frameworks [Dung, 1995] in which conflicts are expressed as a binary relation between abstract arguments (*attack relation*), the incorporation of preferences typically results in the deletion or reversion of attacks between arguments of different strength—deciding acceptability of arguments via argumentation semantics is thus implicitly reflected in terms of the modified attack relation [Kaci et al., 2018].

The difference in argument strength and the resulting modification of the attack relation naturally influences the acceptability of the arguments' conclusion (the *claim* of the argument). Claim justification in argumentation systems, i.e., the evaluation of commonly acceptable statements while disregarding their particular justifications, is an integral part of many structured argumentation formalisms [Modgil and Prakken, 2018, Dung et al., 2009]; its relevance is also

expressed in the discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of floating conclusions [Horty, 2002]. Recently, the connection between abstract argumentation and claim-based reasoning has received increasing attention [Baroni and Riveret, 2019, Dvořák and Woltran, 2020]. Claim-augmented Argumentation Frameworks (CAFs) [Dvořák and Woltran, 2020] extend AFs by a function which assigns to each argument a claim, representing its conclusion. CAFs serve as an ideal target formalism for ASPIC+ [Modgil and Prakken, 2018] and other structured argumentation formalisms which utilize abstract argumentation semantics whilst also considering the claims of the arguments in the evaluation; they are equally well-suited for AF instantiations of related formalisms like logic programming which typically require the translation from the constructed arguments into their claims as a final step before the outcome can be compared with the original instance [Caminada et al., 2015]. Semantics for CAFs can be obtained by evaluating the underlying AF before inspecting the claims of the acceptable arguments in the final step (thus simulating the process of instantiation procedures as outlined above).

In contrast to Dung AFs where arguments are unique, claims can appear multiple times as conclusions of different arguments within a single argumentation framework. As a consequence, several properties of AF semantics such as *I-maximality*, i.e., \subseteq -maximality of extensions, cannot be taken for granted when considered in terms of the arguments' claims [Dvořák et al., 2020]. Furthermore, the additional level of claims causes a rise in the computational complexity of standard decision problems (in particular, verification is one level higher in the polynomial hierarchy as for standard AFs), see [Dvořák and Woltran, 2020, Dvořák et al., 2021]. Luckily, these drawbacks can be alleviated by taking fundamental properties of the attack relation into account: the basic observation that attacks typically depend on the claim of the attacking arguments gives rise to the central class of *well-formed CAFs*. CAFs from this class require that arguments with the same claim attack the same arguments, thus modeling – on the abstract level – a very natural behavior of arguments that is common to all leading structured argumentation formalisms and instantiations. Well-formed CAFs have the main advantage that most of the semantics behave ‘as expected’. For instance, they retain the fundamental property of I-maximality, and their computational complexity is located at the same level of the polynomial hierarchy as for AFs. Unfortunately, it turns out that well-formedness cannot be assumed if one deals with preferences in argumentation, as arguments with the same claim are not necessarily equally plausible. Let us have a look on a simple example.



Figure 1: F (left) and F' (right) from Example 1.

Example 1. Consider two arguments a, a' with claim α , and another argument b having claim β . Without specifying the particular formalism, we may assume that each argument has a support which entails its claim: the claim α is entailed by $\neg\beta$ (in argument a) and by γ (in argument a'); and β is entailed by $\neg\alpha$. The corresponding CAF F is depicted in Figure 1 (left); as usual, an

argument a attacks another argument b if the claim of a contradicts the support of b . Note that F is well-formed. The unique acceptable claim-set w.r.t. stable semantics (cf. Definition 2) is $\{\alpha\}$ (obtained from the stable extension $\{a, a'\}$ of the underlying AF).

Now assume that b is preferred over a' (for example, if assumptions in the support of b are stronger than assumptions made by a'). A common method to integrate such information on argument rankings is to delete attacks from arguments that attack preferred arguments. In this case, we delete the attack from a' to b (cf. CAF F' in Figure 1). Observe that the resulting CAF is not well-formed. Moreover, we obtain that I-maximality is violated since both claim-sets $\{\alpha\}$, $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ are acceptable w.r.t. stable semantics.

As preferences or argument rankings are a standard feature of many argumentation systems it is often the case that the resulting CAF violates the property of well-formedness. Nevertheless, this does not imply arbitrary behavior of the resulting CAF: on the one hand, preferences conform to a certain type of ordering (e.g., strict, partial, or total orders) over the set of arguments; on the other hand, it is evident that the deletion, reversion, and other types of attack manipulation impose certain restrictions on the structure of the resulting CAF. Combining both aspects, we obtain that, assuming well-formedness of the initial framework, it is unlikely that preference incorporation results in arbitrary behavior. An easy example which supports this hypothesis is given by self-attacking arguments: assuming a reasonable preference ordering, it is clear that self-attacking arguments are not affected by commonly used attack modifications since an argument cannot be preferred to itself. The key motivation of this paper is thus to identify and exploit structural properties of preferential argumentation in the scope of claim justification. The aforementioned restrictions suggest beneficial impact on both the computational complexity as well as in terms of desired semantical properties.

In this paper, we tackle this question by considering four commonly used methods, so-called reductions, to integrate preference orderings into the attack relation: the most common modification is the deletion of attacks in case the attacking argument is less preferred than its target (cf. Example 1). This method is typically utilized to transform preference-based argumentation frameworks (PAFs) [Amgoud and Cayrol, 1998] into AFs but is also used in many structured argumentation formalisms such as ASPIC+. This reduction has been criticized due to several problematic side-effects, e.g., it can be the case that two conflicting arguments are jointly acceptable, and has been accordingly adapted in [Amgoud and Vesic, 2014]; two other reductions have been introduced in [Kaci et al., 2018]. We apply these four preference reductions to well-formed CAFs with preferences. In particular, our main contributions are as follows:

- For each of the four preference reductions, we characterize the possible structure of CAFs that are obtained by applying the reduction to a well-formed CAF and a preference relation. This results in four novel CAF classes, each of which constitutes a proper extension of well-formed CAFs but does not retain the full expressiveness of general CAFs. Moreover, we investigate the relationship between these classes.
- We study I-maximality of stable, preferred, semi-stable, stage, and naive semantics of the novel CAF classes. Our results highlight a significant

advantage of a particular reduction: we show that, for admissible-based semantics, this modification preserves I-maximality. The other reductions fail to preserve I-maximality; moreover, for naive and stage semantics, I-maximality cannot be guaranteed for any of the four reductions.

- Finally, we investigate the complexity of reasoning for CAFs with preferences with respect to the five semantics mentioned above plus conflict-free, admissible, and complete semantics. We show that for three of the four reductions, the verification problem drops by one level in the polynomial hierarchy for almost all considered semantics and is thus not harder than for well-formed CAFs (which in turn has the same complexity as the corresponding problems for AFs). Complete semantics are the only exception, remaining hard for all but one preference reduction. On the other hand, it turns out that verification for the most commonly used reduction, i.e., deleting attacks from weaker arguments, remains as hard as for general CAFs.

2 Preliminaries

We first define (abstract) argumentation frameworks [Dung, 1995]. U denotes a countable infinite domain of arguments.

Definition 1. *An argumentation framework (AF) is a tuple $F = (A, R)$ where $A \subseteq U$ is a finite set of arguments and $R \subseteq A \times A$ is an attack relation between arguments. Let $E \subseteq A$. We say E attacks b (in F) if $(a, b) \in R$ for some $a \in E$; $E_F^+ = \{b \in A \mid \exists a \in E : (a, b) \in R\}$ denotes the set of arguments attacked by E . $E_F^\oplus = E \cup E_F^+$ is the range of E in F . An argument $a \in A$ is defended (in F) by E if $b \in E_F^+$ for each b with $(b, a) \in R$.*

Given an AF $F = (A, R)$ it can be convenient to write $a \in F$ for $a \in A$ and $(a, b) \in F$ for $(a, b) \in R$. Semantics for AFs are defined as functions σ which assign to each AF $F = (A, R)$ a set $\sigma(F) \subseteq 2^A$ of extensions. We consider for σ the functions *cf*, *adm*, *com*, *naive*, *stb*, *prf*, *sem*, and *stg* which stand for conflict-free, admissible, complete, naive, stable, preferred, semi-stable, and stage, respectively [Baroni et al., 2018].

Definition 2. *Let $F = (A, R)$ be an AF. A set $S \subseteq A$ is conflict-free (in F), if there are no $a, b \in S$, such that $(a, b) \in R$. $cf(F)$ denotes the collection of conflict-free sets of F . For a conflict-free set $S \in cf(F)$, it holds that*

- $S \in adm(F)$ if each $a \in S$ is defended by S in F ;
- $S \in com(F)$ if $S \in adm(F)$ and each $a \in A$ defended by S in F is contained in S ;
- $S \in naive(F)$ if there is no $T \in cf(F)$ with $S \subset T$;
- $S \in stb(F)$ if each $a \in A \setminus S$ is attacked by S in F ;
- $S \in prf(F)$ if $S \in adm(F)$ and there is no $T \in adm(F)$ with $S \subset T$;
- $S \in sem(F)$ if $S \in adm(F)$ and there is no $T \in adm(F)$ with $S_F^\oplus \subset T_F^\oplus$;

	$naive_c$	stb_c	prf_c	sem_c	stg_c
CAF	x	x	x	x	x
$wfCAF$	x	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 1: I-maximality of CAFs.

- $S \in stg(F)$ if there is no $T \in cf(F)$ with $S_F^\oplus \subset T_F^\oplus$.

Example 2. Consider the AF $F = (\{a, a', b\}, \{(a, b), (a', b), (b, a)\})$ depicted in Figure 1 (ignoring claims α and β). It can be checked that $cf(F) = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{a'\}, \{b\}, \{a, a'\}\}$, $adm(F) = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{a'\}, \{a, a'\}\}$, $naive(F) = \{\{b\}, \{a, a'\}\}$, and $\sigma(F) = \{\{a, a'\}\}$ for $\sigma \in \{com, stb, prf, sem, stg\}$.

CAFs are AFs in which each argument is assigned a claim, and thus constitute a straightforward generalization of AFs [Dvořák and Woltran, 2020].

Definition 3. A claim-augmented argumentation framework (CAF) is a triple $(A, R, claim)$ where (A, R) is an AF and $claim: A \rightarrow Claims$ is a function that maps arguments to claims. The claim-function can be extended to sets of arguments, i.e., $claim(E) = \{claim(a) \mid a \in E\}$. A well-formed CAF (wfCAF) is a CAF $(A, R, claim)$ in which all arguments with the same claim attack the same arguments, i.e., for all $a, b \in A$ with $claim(a) = claim(b)$ we have that $\{c \mid (a, c) \in R\} = \{c \mid (b, c) \in R\}$.

The semantics of CAFs are based on those of AFs.

Definition 4. Let $F = (A, R, claim)$ be a CAF. The claim-based variant of a semantics σ is defined as $\sigma_c(F) = \{claim(S) \mid S \in \sigma((A, R))\}$.

Example 3. Consider the CAF F shown on the left in Figure 1. Formally, $F = (A, R, claim)$ with $A = \{a, a', b\}$, $R = \{(a, b), (a', b), (b, a)\}$, $claim(a) = claim(a') = \alpha$, and $claim(b) = \beta$. F is well-formed and the underlying AF of F was investigated in Example 2. From there we can infer that, e.g., $cf_c(F) = \{\emptyset, \{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}\}$, $adm_c(F) = \{\emptyset, \{\alpha\}\}$, $naive_c(F) = \{\{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}\}$, and $stb_c(F) = \{\{\alpha\}\}$.

Well-known basic relations between different AF semantics σ also hold for σ_c : $stb_c(F) \subseteq sem_c(F) \subseteq prf_c(F) \subseteq adm_c(F)$ as well as $stb_c(F) \subseteq stg_c(F) \subseteq naive_c(F) \subseteq cf_c(F)$ [Dvořák et al., 2020].

Note that the semantics $\sigma \in \{naive, stb, prf, sem, stg\}$ employ argument maximization and result in incomparable extensions on regular AFs: for all $S, T \in \sigma(F)$, $S \subseteq T$ implies $S = T$. This property is referred to as I-maximality, and is defined analogously for CAFs:

Definition 5. σ_c is I-maximal for a class \mathcal{C} of CAFs if, for all CAFs $F \in \mathcal{C}$ and all $S, T \in \sigma_c(F)$, $S \subseteq T$ implies $S = T$.

Table 1 shows I-maximality properties of CAFs [Dvořák et al., 2020], revealing an important property of wfCAF compared to general CAFs: I-maximality is preserved in all semantics except $naive_c$, implying natural behavior of these maximization-based semantics analogous to regular AFs; see, e.g., [van der Torre and Vesic, 2017] for a general discussion of such properties.

Regarding computational complexity, we consider the following standard decision problems pertaining to CAF-semantics σ_c :

σ	$Cred_{\sigma}^{\Delta}$	$Skept_{\sigma}^{\Delta}$	Ver_{σ}^{CAF}	Ver_{σ}^{wfCAF}
<i>cf</i>	in P	trivial	NP-c	in P
<i>adm</i>	NP-c	trivial	NP-c	in P
<i>com</i>	NP-c	P-c	NP-c	in P
<i>naive</i>	in P	coNP-c	NP-c	in P
<i>stb</i>	NP-c	coNP-c	NP-c	in P
<i>prf</i>	NP-c	Π_2^P -c	Σ_2^P -c	coNP-c
<i>sem/stg</i>	Σ_2^P -c	Π_2^P -c	Σ_2^P -c	coNP-c

Table 2: Complexity of CAFs ($\Delta \in \{CAF, wfCAF\}$).

- *Credulous Acceptance* ($Cred_{\sigma}^{CAF}$): Given a CAF F and claim α , is α contained in some $S \in \sigma_c(F)$?
- *Skeptical Acceptance* ($Skept_{\sigma}^{CAF}$): Given a CAF F and claim α , is α contained in each $S \in \sigma_c(F)$?
- *Verification* (Ver_{σ}^{CAF}): Given a CAF F and a set of claims S , is $S \in \sigma_c(F)$?

We furthermore consider these reasoning problems restricted to wfCAFs and denote them by $Cred_{\sigma}^{wfCAF}$, $Skept_{\sigma}^{wfCAF}$, and Ver_{σ}^{wfCAF} . Table 2 shows the complexity of these problems [Dvořák and Woltran, 2020, Dvořák et al., 2021]. Here we see that the complexity of the verification problem drops by one level in the polynomial hierarchy when comparing general CAFs to wfCAFs. This is an important advantage of wfCAFs, as a lower complexity in the verification problem allows for a more efficient enumeration of claim-extensions (cf. [Dvořák and Woltran, 2020]).

3 Preference-based CAFs

As discussed in the previous sections, wfCAFs are a natural subclass of CAFs with advantageous properties in terms of I-maximality and computational complexity. However, when resolving preferences among arguments the resulting CAFs are typically no longer well-formed (cf. Example 1). In order to study preferences under a claim-centric view we introduce preference-based CAFs. These frameworks enrich the notion of wfCAFs with the concept of argument strength in terms of preferences. Our main goals are then to understand the effect of resolved preferences on the structure of the underlying wfCAF on the one hand, and to determine whether the advantages of wfCAFs are maintained on the other hand. Given this motivation, it is reasonable to consider the impact of preferences on *well-formed* CAFs only.

Definition 6. A *preference-based claim-augmented argumentation framework (PCAF)* is a quadruple $F = (A, R, \text{claim}, \succ)$ where (A, R, claim) is a well-formed CAF and \succ is an asymmetric preference relation over A .

Note that preferences in PCAFs are not required to be transitive. While transitivity of preferences is often assumed in argumentation [Amgoud and Vesic, 2014, Kaci et al., 2018], it cannot always be guaranteed in practice [Kaci




Figure 2: Effect of the four reductions on the attack relation between two arguments.

et al., 2021]. However, we will consider the effect of transitive orderings when applicable.

If a and b are arguments and $a \succ b$ holds then we say that a is stronger than b . But what effect should this ordering have? How should this influence, e.g., the set of admissible arguments? One possibility is to remove all attacks from weaker to stronger arguments in our PCAF, and to then determine the set of admissible arguments in the resulting CAF. This altering of attacks in a PCAF based on its preference-ordering is called a reduction. The literature describes four such reductions for regular AFs [Kaci et al., 2018, Amgoud and Cayrol, 2002, Amgoud and Vesic, 2014]. Following [Kaci et al., 2018] we next recall these reductions.

Definition 7. Given a PCAF $F = (A, R, \text{claim}, \succ)$, a corresponding CAF $\mathcal{R}_i(F) = (A, R', \text{claim})$ is constructed via Reduction i , where $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, as follows:

- $i = 1$: $\forall a, b \in A : (a, b) \in R' \Leftrightarrow (a, b) \in R, b \not\succeq a$
- $i = 2$: $\forall a, b \in A : (a, b) \in R' \Leftrightarrow ((a, b) \in R, b \not\succeq a) \vee ((b, a) \in R, (a, b) \notin R, a \succ b)$
- $i = 3$: $\forall a, b \in A : (a, b) \in R' \Leftrightarrow ((a, b) \in R, b \not\succeq a) \vee ((a, b) \in R, (b, a) \notin R)$
- $i = 4$: $\forall a, b \in A : (a, b) \in R' \Leftrightarrow ((a, b) \in R, b \not\succeq a) \vee ((b, a) \in R, (a, b) \notin R, a \succ b) \vee ((a, b) \in R, (b, a) \notin R)$

Figure 2 visualizes the above reductions. Intuitively, Reduction 1 removes attacks that contradict the preference ordering while Reduction 2 reverts such attacks. Reduction 3 removes attacks that contradict the preference ordering, but only if the weaker argument is attacked by the stronger argument also. Reduction 4 can be seen as a combination of Reductions 2 and 3. Observe that all four reductions are polynomial time computable with respect to the input PCAF.

The semantics for PCAFs can now be defined in a straightforward way: first, one of the four reductions is applied to the given PCAF; then, CAF-semantics are applied to the resulting CAF.

Definition 8. Let F be a PCAF and let $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. The preference-claim-based variant of a semantics σ relative to Reduction i is defined as $\sigma_p^i(F) = \sigma_c(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$.

Example 4. Let $F = (A, R, \text{claim}, \succ)$ be the PCAF where $A = \{a, a', b\}$, $R = \{(a, b), (a', b), (b, a)\}$, $\text{claim}(a) = \text{claim}(a') = \alpha$, $\text{claim}(b) = \beta$, and $b \succ a'$. The underlying CAF (A, R, claim) of F was examined in Example 3.

$\mathcal{R}_1(F) = (A, R', \text{claim})$ with $R' = \{(a, b), (b, a)\}$. $\mathcal{R}_1(F)$ is depicted on the right in Figure 1. It can be verified that, e.g., $\text{adm}_p^1(F) = \text{adm}_c(\mathcal{R}_1(F)) = \{\emptyset, \{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}, \{\alpha, \beta\}\}$ and $\text{stb}_p^1(F) = \{\{\alpha\}, \{\alpha, \beta\}\}$.

Indeed, the choice of reduction can influence the extensions of a PCAF. For example, $\mathcal{R}_2(F) = (A, R'', \text{claim})$ with $R'' = \{(a, b), (b, a), (b, a')\}$, $\text{adm}_p^2(F) = \{\emptyset, \{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}\}$, and $\text{stb}_p^2(F) = \{\{\alpha\}, \{\beta\}\}$.

It is easy to see that basic relations between semantics carry over from CAFs, as, if we have $\sigma_c(F) \subseteq \tau_c(F)$ for two semantics σ, τ and all CAFs F , then also $\sigma_p^i(F) \subseteq \tau_p^i(F)$ for all PCAFs F . It thus holds that for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\text{stb}_p^i(F) \subseteq \text{sem}_p^i(F) \subseteq \text{prf}_p^i(F) \subseteq \text{adm}_p^i(F)$ as well as $\text{stb}_p^i(F) \subseteq \text{stg}_p^i(F) \subseteq \text{naive}_p^i(F) \subseteq \text{cf}_p^i(F)$.

Remark. In this paper we require the underlying CAF of a PCAF to be well-formed. The reason for this is that we are interested in whether the benefits of well-formed CAFs are preserved when preferences have to be taken into account. Even from a technical perspective, admitting PCAFs with a non-well-formed underlying CAF is not very interesting with respect to the questions addressed in this paper. Indeed, any CAF could be obtained from such general PCAFs, regardless of which preference reduction we are using, by simply specifying the desired CAF and an empty preference relation. Thus, such general PCAFs have the same properties regarding I-maximality and complexity as general CAFs.

4 Resulting CAF Classes

Our first step towards understanding the effect of preferences on wfCAFs is to examine the impact of resolving preferences on the structure of the underlying CAF. To this end, we consider four new CAF classes which are obtained from applying the reductions of Definition 7 to PCAFs.

Definition 9. \mathcal{R}_i -CAF denotes the set of CAFs that can be obtained by applying Reduction i to PCAFs, i.e., $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF} = \{\mathcal{R}_i(F) \mid F \text{ is a PCAF}\}$.

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}$, with $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, contains all wfCAFs (we can simply specify the desired wfCAF and an empty preference relation). However, not all CAFs are contained in $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}$. For example, $F = (\{a, b\}, \{(a, b), (b, a)\}, \text{claim})$ with $\text{claim}(a) = \text{claim}(b)$ can not be obtained from a PCAF F' : such F' would need to contain either (a, b) or (b, a) . But then, since the underlying CAF of a PCAF must be well-formed, F' would have to contain a self-attack which can not be removed by any of the reductions. This is enough to conclude that the four new classes are located in-between wfCAFs and general CAFs:

Proposition 1. Let CAF be the set of all CAFs and wfCAF the set of all wfCAFs. For all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ it holds that $\text{wfCAF} \subset \mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF} \subset \text{CAF}$.

Furthermore, the new classes are all distinct from each other, i.e., we are indeed dealing with four new CAF classes:

Proposition 2. For all $i \in \{1, 2, 4\}$ and all $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ such that $i \neq j$ it holds that $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF} \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF}$ and $\mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF} \subset \mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}$.




Figure 3: CAFs contained only in \mathcal{R}_1 -CAF, \mathcal{R}_2 -CAF, and \mathcal{R}_4 -CAF respectively. Solid arrows are attacks, dashed arrows indicate where attacks are missing for the CAF to be well-formed.

Proof sketch. Figure 3 shows CAFs that are in only one of \mathcal{R}_1 -CAF, \mathcal{R}_2 -CAF, and \mathcal{R}_4 -CAF. Consider the PCAF $F = (\{a, b\}, \{(a, b), (b, b)\}, \text{claim}, \succ)$ with $\text{claim}(a) = \text{claim}(b) = \alpha$ and $b \succ a$. Then $\mathcal{R}_1(F)$, $\mathcal{R}_2(F)$, and $\mathcal{R}_4(F)$ are the CAFs of Figure 3. Since self-attacks are not removed or introduced by any reduction, and the underlying CAF must be well-formed, F is the only PCAF from which $\mathcal{R}_1(F)$, $\mathcal{R}_2(F)$, and $\mathcal{R}_4(F)$ can be obtained. Note that $\mathcal{R}_3(F)$ is simply the underlying CAF of F . \mathcal{R}_3 -CAF $\subset \mathcal{R}_i$ -CAF follows by the fact that if an attack (a, b) is removed by Reduction 3 from some PCAF G , then $(b, a) \in G$. In this case, all reductions behave in the same way (cf. Definition 7 or Figure 2). \square

While the classes \mathcal{R}_1 -CAF, \mathcal{R}_2 -CAF, and \mathcal{R}_4 -CAF are incomparable we observe \mathcal{R}_3 -CAF $\subset \mathcal{R}_i$ -CAF which reflects that Reduction 3 is the most conservative of the four reductions, removing attacks only when there is a counter-attack from the stronger argument.

We now know that applying preferences to wfCAFs results in four distinct CAF-classes that lie in-between wfCAFs and general CAFs. It is still unclear, however, how to determine whether some CAF belongs to one of these classes or not. Especially for \mathcal{R}_2 -CAF and \mathcal{R}_4 -CAF this is not straightforward, since Reductions 2 and 4 not only remove but also introduce attacks and therefore allow for many possibilities to obtain a particular CAF as result. We tackle this problem by characterizing the new classes via the so-called wf-problematic part of a CAF.

Definition 10. A pair of arguments (a, b) is wf-problematic in a given CAF $F = (A, R, \text{claim})$ if $a, b \in A$, $(a, b) \notin R$, and there is $a' \in A$ with $\text{claim}(a') = \text{claim}(a)$ and $(a', b) \in R$. $\text{wfp}(F) = \{(a, b) \mid (a, b) \text{ is wf-problematic in } F\}$ is called the wf-problematic part of F .

Intuitively, the wf-problematic part of a CAF F consists of those attacks that are missing for F to be well-formed (cf. Figure 3). Indeed, F is a wfCAF if and only if $\text{wfp}(F) = \emptyset$. The four new classes can be characterized as follows:

Proposition 3. Let $F = (A, R, \text{claim})$ be a CAF. Then

- $F \in \mathcal{R}_1$ -CAF iff $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$ implies $(b, a) \notin \text{wfp}(F)$;
- $F \in \mathcal{R}_2$ -CAF iff there are no arguments a, a', b, b' in F with $\text{claim}(a) = \text{claim}(a')$ and $\text{claim}(b) = \text{claim}(b')$ such that $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$, $(b, a) \notin R$, $(a', b) \in R$, and either $(b, a') \in R$ or $((a', b') \notin R$ and $(b', a') \notin R)$;
- $F \in \mathcal{R}_3$ -CAF iff $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$ implies $(b, a) \in R$;
- $F \in \mathcal{R}_4$ -CAF iff there are no arguments a, a', b, b' in F with $\text{claim}(a) = \text{claim}(a')$ and $\text{claim}(b) = \text{claim}(b')$ such that $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$, $(b, a) \notin R$, $(a', b) \in R$, and either $(b, a') \notin R$ or $((a', b') \notin R$ and $(b', a') \notin R)$.

Proof sketch. Regarding $\mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}$, observe that Reduction 1 can only delete but not introduce attacks. If $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$ implies $(b, a) \notin \text{wfp}(F)$ then we can construct a PCAF F' with $R' = R \cup \{(a, b) \mid (a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)\}$ and $b \succ a$ iff $(a, b) \in R' \setminus R$. Observe that \succ is asymmetric. Conversely, a CAF G with arguments a, b such that $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(G)$ and $(b, a) \in \text{wfp}(G)$ can not be obtained via Reduction 1 from a PCAF G' , since G' would have to contain both the attacks $(a, b), (b, a)$ as well as the preferences $b \succ a, a \succ b$. The argument for $\mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF}$ is similar.

For $\mathcal{R}_2\text{-CAF}$, suppose there are a, a', b with $\text{claim}(a) = \text{claim}(a')$, $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$, $(b, a) \notin R$, and $(a', b) \in R$. Assume there is a PCAF $F' = (A, R', \text{claim}, \succ)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_2(F') = F$. Since Reduction 2 can not completely remove conflicts, $(a, b) \notin R'$ and $(b, a) \notin R'$. If $(b, a') \in R$, then $(a', b) \in R'$ and $(b, a') \in R'$ since Reduction 2 can not introduce symmetric attacks. But then (A, R', claim) is not well-formed. Now suppose $(b, a') \notin R$, but there is some b' with $\text{claim}(b) = \text{claim}(b')$, $(a', b') \notin R$, and $(b', a') \notin R$. Then also $(a', b') \notin R'$ and $(b', a') \notin R'$. But since $(a', b) \in R$ we have either $(a', b) \in R'$ or $(b, a') \in R'$, which means that (A, R', claim) is not well-formed. In all other cases we can construct a PCAF $F'' = (A, R'', \text{claim}, \succ)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_2(F'') = F$: first revert all attacks (a', b) in F for which there is some a with $\text{claim}(a) = \text{claim}(a')$ and $(a, b) \notin R$, $(b, a) \notin R$; then, add all remaining pairs (a, b) that are still wf-problematic as attacks. Define $b \succ a$ iff $(a, b) \in R'' \setminus R$. It can be verified that (A, R'', claim) is well-formed, \succ is asymmetric, and $\mathcal{R}_2(F'') = F$. The argument for $\mathcal{R}_4\text{-CAF}$ is similar. \square

The above characterizations give us some insights into the effect of the various reductions on wfCAFs. Indeed, the similarity between the characterizations of $\mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}$ and $\mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF}$, resp. $\mathcal{R}_2\text{-CAF}$ and $\mathcal{R}_4\text{-CAF}$, can intuitively be explained by the fact that Reductions 1 and 3 only remove attacks, while Reductions 2 and 4 can also introduce attacks. Furthermore, Proposition 3 allows us to decide in polynomial time whether a given CAF F can be obtained by applying one of the four preference reductions to a PCAF.

But what happens if we restrict ourselves to transitive preferences? Analogously to $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}$, by $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ we denote the set of CAFs obtained by applying Reduction i to PCAFs with a transitive preference relation. It is clear that $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}_{tr} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Interestingly, the relationship between the classes $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ is different to that between $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}$ (Proposition 2). Specifically, $\mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ is not contained in the other classes. Intuitively, this is because, in certain PCAFs F , transitivity can force $a_1 \succ a_n$ via $a_1 \succ a_2 \succ \dots \succ a_n$ such that $(a_n, a_1) \in F$ but $(a_1, a_n) \notin F$. In this case, only Reduction 3 leaves the attacks between a_1 and a_n unchanged.

Proposition 4. *For $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ with $i \neq j$ it holds that $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}_{tr} \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF}_{tr}$.*

We will not characterize all four classes $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}_{tr}$. However, capturing $\mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ will prove useful when analyzing the computational complexity of PCAFs using Reduction 1 (see Section 6). Note that $\text{wfp}(F)$ can be seen as a directed graph, with an edge between vertices a and b whenever $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$. Thus, we may use notions such as paths and cycles in the wf-problematic part of a CAF.

Proposition 5. $F \in \mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ for a CAF F if and only if (1) $wfp(F)$ is acyclic and (2) $(a, b) \in F$ implies that there is no path from a to b in $wfp(F)$.

Proof sketch. Assume there is a cycle (a_1, \dots, a_n, a_1) in $wfp(F)$. Then, since Reduction 1 can not introduce attacks, if there is a PCAF F' such that $\mathcal{R}_1(F') = F$, we have $(a_1, a_2), \dots, (a_n, a_1) \in F'$. This implies $a_1 \succ a_n \succ a_{n-1} \succ \dots \succ a_1$, i.e., \succ is not asymmetric. Similarly, if there is a path (a_1, \dots, a_n) in $wfp(F)$ we have to define $a_n \succ \dots \succ a_1$ in F' . But then $(a_1, a_n) \notin \mathcal{R}_1(F')$.

If $wfp(F)$ is acyclic and there is no path from a to b in $wfp(F)$ such that $(a, b) \in F$, then we can construct a PCAF F' such that $\mathcal{R}_1(F') = F$ in the same way as when \succ is not transitive (cf. proof of Proposition 3). \square

5 I-Maximality

One of the advantages of wfCAFs over general CAFs is that they preserve I-maximality under most maximization-based semantics (cf. Table 1), which leads to more intuitive behavior of these semantics when considering extensions on the claim-level. We now investigate whether these advantages are preserved when preferences are introduced.

Definition 11. σ_p^i is I-maximal for a class \mathcal{C} of PCAFs if, for all F in \mathcal{C} and all $S, T \in \sigma_p^i(F)$, $S \subseteq T$ implies $S = T$.

From known properties of wfCAFs (cf. Table 1) it follows directly that $naive_p^i$ is not I-maximal for PCAFs. It remains to investigate the I-maximality of prf_p^i , stb_p^i , sem_p^i , and stg_p^i for PCAFs. For convenience, given a CAF $F = (A, R, claim)$ and $E \subseteq A$, we sometimes write $E \in \sigma(F)$ for $E \in \sigma((A, R))$.

Lemma 1. Let $F = (A, R, claim, \succ)$ be a PCAF and $E \subseteq A$. $E \in cf(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$ if and only if $E \in cf((A, R, claim))$ for $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$.

In other words, Reductions 2, 3 and 4 preserve conflict-freeness. It is easy to see that this is not the case for Reduction 1. In fact, Reduction 1 has been deemed problematic for exactly this reason when applied to regular AFs [Amgoud and Vesic, 2014], although it is still discussed and considered in the literature alongside the other reductions [Kaci et al., 2021]. We first consider Reduction 3, and show that it preserves I-maximality for some, but not all, semantics.

Proposition 6. prf_p^3 , stb_p^3 , and sem_p^3 are I-maximal for PCAFs.

Proof. By $stb_p^3(F) \subseteq sem_p^3(F) \subseteq prf_p^3(F)$ it suffices to consider prf_p^3 . Towards a contradiction, assume there is a PCAF $F = (A, R, claim, \succ)$ such that $S \subset T$ for some $S, T \in prf_p^3(F)$. Then there are $S', T' \subseteq A$ such that $S' \in prf(\mathcal{R}_3(F))$, $claim(S') = S$, $T' \in prf(\mathcal{R}_3(F))$, and $claim(T') = T$. $S' \not\subseteq T'$ since $S' \in prf(\mathcal{R}_3(F))$. Thus, there is $x \in S'$ such that $x \notin T'$. But $claim(x) \in T$, i.e., there is $x' \in T'$ with $claim(x') = claim(x)$. There are two possibilities for why $x \notin T'$.

Case 1: $T' \cup \{x\} \notin cf(\mathcal{R}_3(F))$, i.e., there exists $y \in T'$ such that $y \notin S'$ and either $(x, y) \in F$ or $(y, x) \in F$. In fact, $(x, y) \notin F$: otherwise, by the well-formedness of $(A, R, claim)$, we have $(x', y) \in F$ and, by Lemma 1, $T' \notin$



Figure 4: CAFs used as counter examples for I-maximality (cf. Proposition 7 and 8). Dashed arrows are edges in $wfp(F)$.

$cf(\mathcal{R}_3(F))$. Thus, $(y, x) \in F$. By the definition of Reduction 3, $(y, x) \in \mathcal{R}_3(F)$. S' must defend x in $\mathcal{R}_3(F)$, i.e., there exists $z \in S'$ such that $(z, y) \in \mathcal{R}_3(F)$. Then $(z, y) \in F$. Since $S \subset T$ there exists $z' \in T'$ such that $claim(z') = claim(z)$. $(z', y) \in F$ by the well-formedness of $(A, R, claim)$. But then $T' \notin cf(\mathcal{R}_3(F))$. Contradiction.

Case 2: x is not defended by T' , i.e., there exists $y \in A$ that is not attacked by T' and such that $(y, x) \in \mathcal{R}_3(F)$. By the same argument as above, there is $z' \in T'$ with $(z', y) \in F$. It cannot be that $(z', y) \in \mathcal{R}_3(F)$, i.e., $y \succ z'$. By the definition of Reduction 3, $(y, z') \in F$ and thus $(y, z') \in \mathcal{R}_3(F)$. But then $T' \notin adm(\mathcal{R}_3(F))$. Contradiction. \square

Of course, positive results regarding the I-maximality of PCAFs with arbitrary preferences, such as in the above proposition, still hold for PCAFs with transitive preference orderings. Conversely, for negative results, it suffices to show that I-maximality is not preserved on transitive orderings to obtain results for the more general case.

Proposition 7. stg_p^3 is not I-maximal for PCAFs, even when considering only transitive preferences.

Proof sketch. Let F be the CAF shown on the left in Figure 4. Observe that $F \in \mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ since $\mathcal{R}_3(F') = F$ for the PCAF F' with the same arguments as F , attacks $\{(a, b), (b, c), (c, a), (a', b), (b, a')\}$ and $b \succ a'$. Moreover, it can be verified that $stg_p^3(F') = \{\{\alpha\}, \{\alpha, \gamma\}, \{\beta\}\}$. \square

In contrast to Reduction 3, under Reductions 1, 2, and 4 we lose I-maximality for *all* semantics.

Proposition 8. σ_p^i , with $\sigma \in \{prf, stb, sem, stg\}$ and $i \in \{1, 2, 4\}$, is not I-maximal for PCAFs, even when considering only transitive preferences.

Proof sketch. We only need to show this for stb_p^i since $stb_p^i(F) \subseteq sem_p^i(F) \subseteq prf_p^i(F)$ and $stb_p^i(F) \subseteq stg_p^i(F)$.

For $i \in \{1, 4\}$, let F be the CAF shown on the right in Figure 1. $F \in \mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ by Proposition 5. Furthermore, $F \in \mathcal{R}_4\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ since $\mathcal{R}_4(F') = F$ for $F' = (\{a, a', b\}, \{(b, a)\}, claim, \succ)$ with $a \succ b$. It can be verified that $stb_c(F) = \{\{\alpha\}, \{\alpha, \beta\}\}$.

For $i = 2$, let G be the CAF shown on the right in Figure 4. $G \in \mathcal{R}_2\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ since $\mathcal{R}_2(G') = G$ for the PCAF G' with attacks $\{(b, a), (b, a'), (b', a), (b', a')\}$ and preferences $a \succ b$ and $a' \succ b'$. $stb_c(G) = \{\{\alpha\}, \{\alpha, \beta\}\}$. \square

Table 3 summarizes our I-maximality results. Reduction 3 manages to preserve I-maximality in most cases. It is also the most conservative of the reductions, preserving conflict-freeness and not adding new attacks. Interestingly, the other three reductions lose I-maximality for *all* semantics.

	$naive_p^i$	stb_p^i	prf_p^i	sem_p^i	stg_p^i
$i \in \{1, 2, 4\}$	x	x	x	x	x
$i=3$	x	✓	✓	✓	x

Table 3: I-maximality of PCAFs. Results also hold when considering only PCAFs with transitive preferences.

6 Computational Complexity

Given a preference Reduction $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we define $Cred_{\sigma,i}^{PCAF}$, $Skept_{\sigma,i}^{PCAF}$, and $Ver_{\sigma,i}^{PCAF}$ analogously to $Cred_{\sigma}^{CAF}$, $Skept_{\sigma}^{CAF}$, and Ver_{σ}^{CAF} , except that we take a PCAF instead of a CAF as input and appeal to the σ_p^i semantics instead of the σ_c semantics. Membership results for PCAFs can be inferred from results for general CAFs (recall that the preference reductions from PCAFs to the respective CAF class can be done in polynomial time), and hardness results from results for wfCAFs. Thus, the complexity of credulous and skeptical acceptance follows immediately, i.e., for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $\sigma \in \{cf, adm, com, naive, stb, prf, sem, stg\}$, $Cred_{\sigma,i}^{PCAF}$ and $Skept_{\sigma,i}^{PCAF}$ have the same complexity as $Cred_{\sigma}^{wfCAF}$ and $Skept_{\sigma}^{wfCAF}$ respectively (cf. Table 2).

However, the complexity of $Ver_{\sigma,i}^{PCAF}$ does not follow from known results. We consider Reduction 1 first.

Proposition 9. $Ver_{\sigma,1}^{PCAF}$ is NP-complete for $\sigma \in \{cf, naive\}$, even when considering only transitive preferences.

Proof sketch. NP-membership follows from known results for general CAFs. NP-hardness: let φ be an arbitrary instance of 3-SAT given as a set $\{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$ of clauses over variables X . We construct a PCAF $F = (A, R, claim, \succ)$ and a set of claims $S = \{1, \dots, m\} \cup X$ as follows:

- $A = V \cup \bar{V} \cup H$ where $V = \{x_i \mid x \in C_i, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$, $\bar{V} = \{\bar{x}_i \mid \neg x \in C_i, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$, and $H = \{x_T, x_F \mid x \in X\}$;
- $R = \{(x_T, x_i), (x_F, x_i) \mid x_i \in V\} \cup \{(x_T, \bar{x}_i), (x_F, \bar{x}_i) \mid \bar{x}_i \in \bar{V}\}$;
- $claim(x_i) = claim(\bar{x}_i) = i$ for all $x_i, \bar{x}_i \in V \cup \bar{V}$, $claim(x_T) = claim(x_F) = x$ for all $x \in X$;
- $x_i \succ x_T$ for all $x_i \in V$ and $\bar{x}_i \succ x_F$ for all $\bar{x}_i \in \bar{V}$.

Figure 5 illustrates the above construction. It can be verified that φ is satisfiable if and only if $S \in cf_p^1(F)$. The same can be shown for $naive_p^1$. Informally, the set S forces us to have, for each $x \in X$, x_T or x_F in S thus simulating a guess for an interpretation. Due to the removed attacks all corresponding occurrences x_i (resp. \bar{x}_i) can be added to S without conflict. Now it amounts to check whether these occurrences cover all i , i.e., make all clauses true under the actual guess. \square

Note that the “trick” in above construction to guess an interpretation does not work for admissible-based semantics, since the occurrences of x_i resp. \bar{x}_i




Figure 5: Reduction of 3-SAT-instance $C_1 = \{a, b, c\}$, $C_2 = \{\neg a, \neg b\}$, $C_3 = \{\neg a, c\}$, $C_4 = \{b, \neg c\}$, to an instance (F, S) of $Ver_{\sigma,1}^{PCAF}$ (cf. Proof of Proposition 9). Dashed arrows are attacks deleted in $\mathcal{R}_1(F)$, i.e., they are edges in $wfp(\mathcal{R}_1(F))$.

in S would remain undefended. Indeed, we need a more involved construction next.

Proposition 10. $Ver_{\sigma,1}^{PCAF}$ is NP-complete for $\sigma \in \{stb, adm, com\}$, even when considering only transitive preferences.

Proof sketch. We show NP-hardness. Let φ be a 3-SAT-instance given as a set $\{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$ of clauses over variables X . For convenience, we directly construct a CAF $F = (A, R, claim)$ with $F \in \mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ instead of providing a PCAF F' such that $\mathcal{R}_1(F') = F$. This is legitimate, as, by our characterization of $\mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ (see Proposition 5), we can obtain F' by simply adding all edges in $wfp(F)$ to R and defining \succ accordingly.

- $A = V \cup \bar{V} \cup H$ where $V = \{x_i \mid x \in C_i, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$, $\bar{V} = \{\bar{x}_i \mid \neg x \in C_i, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$, and $H = \{x_{i,j}^k, \hat{x}_{i,j}^k \mid 1 \leq k \leq 4, x_i \in V, \bar{x}_j \in \bar{V}\}$;
- $R = \{(x_i, x_{i,j}^1), (x_{i,j}^1, x_{i,j}^2), (x_{i,j}^2, \bar{x}_j), (\bar{x}_j, x_{i,j}^3), (x_{i,j}^3, x_{i,j}^4), (x_{i,j}^4, x_i) \mid x_i \in V, \bar{x}_j \in \bar{V}\}$;
- $claim(x_i) = claim(\bar{x}_i) = i$ for all x_i, \bar{x}_i ,
 $claim(x_{i,j}^k) = claim(\hat{x}_{i,j}^k) = x_{i,j}^k$ for all $x_{i,j}^k, \hat{x}_{i,j}^k$.

For verification consider the set $S = \{1, \dots, m\} \cup \{claim(a) \mid a \in H\}$. Figure 6 illustrates the above construction. It can be verified that (1) $F \in \mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$; (2) φ is satisfiable iff $S \in stb_c(F)$. Likewise for adm_c and com_c . Intuitively, for each x_i, \bar{x}_j , the helper arguments $x_{i,j}^k$ and the corresponding cycle ensures that only one of x_i, \bar{x}_j can be chosen. Note that x_i and \bar{x}_j must not attack each other directly because of well-formedness in the original CAF. \square

In fact, when applying Reduction 1, we lose the advantages of wfCAFs for *all* investigated semantics, since also for the remaining semantics verification remains harder than in the case of wfCAFs.

Proposition 11. $Ver_{\sigma,1}^{PCAF}$ is Σ_2^P -complete for $\sigma \in \{prf, sem, stg\}$, even when considering only transitive preferences.

The proposition can be proven by adapting the standard translation for skeptical acceptance of preferred-semantics [Dvořák and Dunne, 2017, Reduction 3.7].

We now turn our attention to Reductions 2, 3, and 4. Since these reductions do not remove conflicts between arguments, it is easy to see that verification for conflict-free and naive semantics remains tractable.




Figure 6: Reduction of 3-SAT-instance $C_1 = \{a\}$, $C_2 = \{-a, b\}$, $C_3 = \{-b, c\}$, to an instance (F', S) of $Ver_{stb,1}^{PCAF}$ (cf. Proof of Proposition 10). Dashed arrows are attacks deleted from F' , i.e., they are edges in $wfp(\mathcal{R}_1(F'))$.

Proposition 12. $Ver_{\sigma, i \in \{2,3,4\}}^{PCAF}$ is in \mathbf{P} for $\sigma \in \{cf, naive\}$.

Proof sketch. By Lemma 1, given a PCAF F , it suffices to test whether C is conflict-free (resp. naive) in the underlying CAF of F . This can be done in polynomial time for wfCAFs (cf. Table 2). \square

As it turns out, with Reductions 2, 3, and 4 we retain the benefits of wfCAFs over general CAFs for almost all investigated semantics with respect to computational complexity. In short, verification for wfCAFs is easier than on general CAFs because, given a wfCAF F and a set of claims C , a set of arguments S can be constructed in polynomial time such that S is the unique maximal admissible set in F with claim $claim(S) = C$ [Dvořák and Woltran, 2020]. Making use of the fact that Reductions 2, 3, and 4 do not alter conflicts between arguments, we can construct such a maximal set of arguments also for PCAFs: given a PCAF F and set C of claims, we define the set $E_0(C)$ containing all arguments of F with a claim in C ; the set $E_1^i(C)$ is obtained from $E_0(C)$ by removing all arguments attacked by $E_0(C)$ in the underlying CAF of F ; finally, the set $E_*^i(C)$ is obtained by repeatedly removing all arguments not defended by $E_1^i(C)$ in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$ until a fixed point is reached. Recall that $S_{(A,R)}^+ = \{a \mid (b, a) \in R, b \in S\}$ denotes the arguments attacked by S in (A, R) .

Definition 12. Given a PCAF $F = (A, R, claim, \succ)$, a set of claims C , and $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned}
E_0(C) &= \{a \in A \mid claim(a) \in C\}; \\
E_1^i(C) &= E_0(C) \setminus E_0(C)_{(A,R)}^+; \\
E_k^i(C) &= \{x \in E_{k-1}^i(C) \mid x \text{ is defended by } E_{k-1}^i(C) \\
&\quad \text{in } \mathcal{R}_i(F)\} \text{ for } k \geq 2; \\
E_*^i(C) &= E_k^i \text{ for } k \geq 2 \text{ such that } E_k^i(C) = E_{k-1}^i(C).
\end{aligned}$$

The above definition is based on [Dvořák and Woltran, 2020, Definition 5], but with the crucial differences that undefended arguments are (a) computed

w.r.t. $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$ and (b) are iteratively removed until a fixed point is reached. The sets $E_1^i(C)$ and $E_*^i(C)$ have useful properties.

For conflict-free based semantics we observe that the conflicts are not affected by the reductions and thus one can use existing results for well-formed CAFs [Dvořák and Woltran, 2020, Lemma 1] to obtain that $E_1^i(C)$ is the unique candidate for the maximal conflict-free set of arguments that realizes the claim set C .

Lemma 2. *Let F be a PCAF, C be a set of claims and $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. We have that $C \in cf_p^i(F)$ iff $claim(E_1^i(C)) = C$. Moreover, if $C \in cf_p^i(F)$ then $E_1^i(C)$ is the unique maximal conflict-free set S in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$ such that $claim(S) = C$.*

For admissible semantics we are looking for a conflict-free set that defends all its arguments. Thus we start from the conflict-free set $E_1^i(C)$. Notice that arguments that are not in $E_1^i(C)$ cannot be contained in any admissible set S with $claim(S) = C$. We can then obtain the maximal admissible set realizing C in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$ by iteratively removing arguments that are not defended by the current set of arguments. Once we reach a fixed-point we have an admissible set, but need to check whether we still cover all the claims of C .

Lemma 3. *Let F be a PCAF, C be a set of claims and $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. We have that $C \in adm_p^i(F)$ iff $claim(E_*^i(C)) = C$. Moreover, if $C \in adm_p^i(F)$ then $E_*^i(C)$ is the unique maximal admissible set S in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$ such that $claim(S) = C$.*

By computing the maximal conflict-free (resp. admissible) extensions $E_1^i(C)$ (resp. $E_*^i(C)$) for a set of claims C , the verification problem becomes easier for most semantics.

Proposition 13. *$Ver_{\sigma, i \in \{2, 3, 4\}}^{PCAF}$ is in P for $\sigma \in \{adm, stb\}$. It is coNP-complete for $\sigma \in \{prf, sem, stg\}$, even when considering only transitive preferences.*

Proof sketch. Let $F = (A, R, claim, \succ)$ be a PCAF, let C be a set of claims, and let $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. We can compute $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$, $E_1^i(C)$, and $E_*^i(C)$ in polynomial time.

For *adm*, by Lemma 3, it suffices to test whether $claim(E_*^i(C)) = C$. For *stb*, we first check whether $C \in adm_p^i(F)$. If not, $C \notin stb_p^i(F)$. If yes, then, by Lemma 3, $claim(E_*^i(C)) = C$. We can check in polynomial time if $E_*^i(C) \in stb(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$. If yes, we are done. If no, then there is an argument x that is not in $E_*^i(C)$ but is also not attacked by $E_*^i(C)$ in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$. Moreover, there can be no other $S \in stb(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$ with $claim(S) = C$ since for any such S we would have $S \subseteq E_*^i(C)$, which would imply that S does not attack x and that $x \notin S$.

The arguments for $\sigma \in \{prf, sem, stg\}$ are similar, but some checks require coNP-time. \square

Regarding complete semantics, only Reduction 3 retains the benefits of wfCAFs. Here, the fact that Reductions 2 and 4 can introduce new attacks is enough to see an increase in complexity.

Proposition 14. *$Ver_{com, 3}^{PCAF}$ is in P. $Ver_{com, i \in \{2, 4\}}^{PCAF}$ is NP-complete, even for transitive preferences.*

Proof sketch. P-membership for $Ver_{com, 3}^{PCAF}$ is similar to the proof of Proposition 13. We demonstrate NP-hardness of $Ver_{com, 4}^{PCAF}$. Let φ be an arbitrary




Figure 7: $\mathcal{R}_4(F)$ from the proof of Proposition 14, $\varphi = ((a \vee b) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b))$. Symmetric attacks drawn in gray and thick have been introduced by Reduction 4.

σ	$i = 1$	$i \in \{2, 4\}$	$i = 3$
<i>cf/adm/naive/stb</i>	NP-c	in P	in P
<i>com</i>	NP-c	NP-c	in P
<i>prf/sem/stg</i>	Σ_2^P -c	coNP-c	coNP-c

Table 4: Complexity of $Ver_{\sigma,i}^{PCAF}$. Results also hold when considering only PCAFs with transitive preferences.

instance of 3-SAT given as a set C of clauses over variables X and let $\overline{X} = \{\overline{x} \mid x \in X\}$. We construct a PCAF $F = (A, R, claim, \succ)$ as well as a set of claims $S = X \cup \{\varphi\}$:

- $A = \{\varphi\} \cup C \cup X \cup \overline{X} \cup \{d_x \mid x \in X\} \cup \{d'_x \mid x \in X \cup \overline{X}\}$;
- $R = \{(c, \varphi) \mid c \in C\} \cup \{(c, c) \mid c \in C\} \cup \{(c, x) \mid x \in c, c \in C\} \cup \{(c, \overline{x}) \mid \neg x \in c, c \in C\} \cup \{(d'_x, x) \mid x \in X \cup \overline{X}\} \cup \{(d'_x, d_x), (d'_{\overline{x}}, d_x) \mid x \in X\}$;
- $claim(x) = claim(\overline{x}) = x$ for $x \in X$,
 $claim(v) = v$ otherwise;
- $x \succ c, x \succ d'_x$ for all $x \in X \cup \overline{X}$ and all $c \in C$.

Figure 7 illustrates the above construction. It can be verified that φ is satisfiable iff $S \in com_c(\mathcal{R}_4(F))$. \square

Table 4 summarizes our complexity results. Reduction 3 preserves the lower complexity of wfCAFs for all investigated semantics, while Reductions 2 and 4 preserve the lower complexity for all but complete semantics. Reduction 1 does not preserve the advantages of wfCAFs, and rather exhibits the full complexity as general CAFs. Notice that the lower complexity of the verification problem is crucial for enumerating extensions. In particular, the improved enumeration algorithm for wfCAFs [Dvořák and Woltran, 2020] is based on the polynomial time verification of claim-sets and thus extends to PCAFs under Reductions 2–4.

7 Conclusion

Many approaches to structured argumentation (i) assume that arguments with the same claims attack the same arguments and (ii) take preferences into ac-

count. Investigations on claim-augmented argumentation frameworks (CAFs) so far only consider (i), showing that the resulting subclass of well-formed CAFs (wfCAFs) has several desired properties. The research question of this paper is to analyze whether these properties carry over when preferences are taken into account, since the incorporation of preferences can violate the syntactical restriction of wfCAFs.

To this end, we introduced preference-based claim-augmented argumentation frameworks (PCAFs) and investigated the impact of the four preference reductions commonly used in abstract argumentation when applied to PCAFs. In particular, we examined and characterized CAF-classes that result from applying these reductions to PCAFs, and furthermore investigated the fundamental properties of I-maximality and computational complexity for PCAFs. Preserving I-maximality is desirable since it implies intuitive behavior of maximization-based semantics, while the complexity of the verification problem is crucial for the enumeration of claim-extensions. Insights in terms of both semantical and computational properties provide necessary foundations towards a practical realization of this particular argumentation paradigm (we refer to, e.g., [Baumeister et al., 2021, Fazzinga et al., 2020], for a similar research endeavor in terms of incomplete AFs).

Our results show that (1) Reduction 3, the most conservative of the four reductions, exhibits the same properties as wfCAFs regarding computational complexity while also preserving I-maximality for most of the semantics; (2) Reductions 2 and 4 retain the advantages of wfCAFs regarding complexity for all but complete semantics, but do not preserve I-maximality for any investigated semantics; (3) under Reduction 1, neither complexity properties nor I-maximality are preserved. The above results hold even if we restrict ourselves to transitive preferences. It is worth noting that Reduction 3 behaves favorably on regular AFs as well, fulfilling many principles for preference-based semantics [Kaci et al., 2018, Table 1].

A possible direction for future work is to lift the preference ordering over arguments to sets of arguments and select extensions in this way. This has been investigated for regular AFs in combination with Reduction 2 [Amgoud and Vesic, 2014]. Another direction is to extend our studies to alternative semantics for CAFs [Dvořák et al., 2020, Dvořák et al., 2021], where subset-maximization is handled on the claim-level instead of on the argument-level.

References

- [Amgoud and Cayrol, 1998] Amgoud, L. and Cayrol, C. (1998). On the acceptability of arguments in preference-based argumentation. In *Proc. UAI'98*, pages 1–7. Morgan Kaufmann.
- [Amgoud and Cayrol, 2002] Amgoud, L. and Cayrol, C. (2002). A reasoning model based on the production of acceptable arguments. *Ann. Math. Artif. Intell.*, 34(1-3):197–215.
- [Amgoud and Vesic, 2014] Amgoud, L. and Vesic, S. (2014). Rich preference-based argumentation frameworks. *Int. J. Approx. Reason.*, 55(2):585–606.

- [Atkinson et al., 2017] Atkinson, K., Baroni, P., Giacomin, M., Hunter, A., Prakken, H., Reed, C., Simari, G. R., Thimm, M., and Villata, S. (2017). Towards artificial argumentation. *AI Magazine*, 38(3):25–36.
- [Atkinson and Bench-Capon, 2021] Atkinson, K. and Bench-Capon, T. J. M. (2021). Value-based argumentation. *IfCoLog Journal of Logic and its Applications*, 8(6):1543–1588.
- [Baroni et al., 2018] Baroni, P., Caminada, M., and Giacomin, M. (2018). Abstract argumentation frameworks and their semantics. In *Handbook of Formal Argumentation*, chapter 4, pages 159–236. College Publications.
- [Baroni and Riveret, 2019] Baroni, P. and Riveret, R. (2019). Enhancing statement evaluation in argumentation via multi-labelling systems. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 66:793–860.
- [Baumeister et al., 2021] Baumeister, D., Järvisalo, M., Neugebauer, D., Niskanen, A., and Rothe, J. (2021). Acceptance in incomplete argumentation frameworks. *Artif. Intell.*, 295:103470.
- [Caminada et al., 2015] Caminada, M., Sá, S., Alcântara, J., and Dvořák, W. (2015). On the equivalence between logic programming semantics and argumentation semantics. *Int. J. Approx. Reasoning*, 58:87–111.
- [Cyras and Toni, 2016] Cyras, K. and Toni, F. (2016). ABA+: assumption-based argumentation with preferences. In *Proc.KR’16*, pages 553–556. AAAI Press.
- [Dung, 1995] Dung, P. M. (1995). On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games. *Artif. Intell.*, 77(2):321–358.
- [Dung et al., 2009] Dung, P. M., Kowalski, R. A., and Toni, F. (2009). Assumption-based argumentation. In Simari, G. R. and Rahwan, I., editors, *Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 199–218. Springer.
- [Dvořák and Dunne, 2017] Dvořák, W. and Dunne, P. E. (2017). Computational problems in formal argumentation and their complexity. *IfCoLog Journal of Logic and its Applications*, 4(8):2557–2622.
- [Dvořák et al., 2021] Dvořák, W., Greßler, A., Rapberger, A., and Woltran, S. (2021). The complexity landscape of claim-augmented argumentation frameworks. In *Proc. AAAI’21*, pages 6296–6303. AAAI Press.
- [Dvořák et al., 2020] Dvořák, W., Rapberger, A., and Woltran, S. (2020). Argumentation semantics under a claim-centric view: Properties, expressiveness and relation to SETAFs. In *Proc. KR’20*, pages 341–350. IJCAI.org.
- [Dvořák and Woltran, 2020] Dvořák, W. and Woltran, S. (2020). Complexity of abstract argumentation under a claim-centric view. *Artif. Intell.*, 285:103290.
- [Fazzinga et al., 2020] Fazzinga, B., Flesca, S., and Furfaro, F. (2020). Revisiting the notion of extension over incomplete abstract argumentation frameworks. In *Proc. IJCAI’20*, pages 1712–1718.

- [García and Simari, 2014] García, A. J. and Simari, G. R. (2014). Defeasible logic programming: Delp-servers, contextual queries, and explanations for answers. *Argument Comput.*, 5(1):63–88.
- [Horty, 2002] Horty, J. F. (2002). Skepticism and floating conclusions. *Artif. Intell.*, 135(1-2):55–72.
- [Kaci et al., 2021] Kaci, S., van der Torre, L. W. N., Vesic, S., and Villata, S. (2021). Preference in abstract argumentation. In *Handbook of Formal Argumentation, Volume 2*, pages 211–248. College Publications.
- [Kaci et al., 2018] Kaci, S., van der Torre, L. W. N., and Villata, S. (2018). Preference in abstract argumentation. In *Proc. COMMA’18*, volume 305 of *FAIA*, pages 405–412. IOS Press.
- [Li et al., 2011] Li, H., Oren, N., and Norman, T. J. (2011). Probabilistic argumentation frameworks. In *Proc. TAFAs’11*, volume 7132 of *LNCS*, pages 1–16. Springer.
- [Modgil and Prakken, 2013] Modgil, S. and Prakken, H. (2013). A general account of argumentation with preferences. *Artif. Intell.*, 195:361–397.
- [Modgil and Prakken, 2018] Modgil, S. and Prakken, H. (2018). Abstract rule-based argumentation. In *Handbook of Formal Argumentation*, chapter 6, pages 287–364. College Publications.
- [Prakken and Sartor, 1997] Prakken, H. and Sartor, G. (1997). Argument-based extended logic programming with defeasible priorities. *J. Appl. Non Class. Logics*, 7(1):25–75.
- [van der Torre and Vesic, 2017] van der Torre, L. and Vesic, S. (2017). The principle-based approach to abstract argumentation semantics. *IfCoLog Journal of Logic and its Applications*, 4(8):2735–2778.

A Proofs

Here we gather full proofs for our results.

A.1 Proofs for Section 4

Proposition 1. *Let \mathbf{CAF} be the set of all CAFs and \mathbf{wfCAF} the set of all wfCAF. For all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ it holds that $\mathbf{wfCAF} \subset \mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF} \subset \mathbf{CAF}$.*

Proof. Let $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. $\mathbf{wfCAF} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}$ follows from the fact that any $(A, R, \text{claim}) \in \mathbf{wfCAF}$ can be obtained via Reduction i from the PCAF $(A, R, \text{claim}, \emptyset)$.

$\mathbf{wfCAF} \subset \mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}$: consider the PCAF $F = (\{a, b\}, \{(a, a), (a, b), (b, a), (b, b)\}, \text{claim}, \succ)$ with $\text{claim}(a) = \text{claim}(b)$, and $b \succ a$. For all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ we have $\mathcal{R}_i(F) = (\{a, b\}, \{(a, a), (b, a), (b, b)\}, \text{claim})$, i.e., the resulting CAF $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$ is not well-formed.

$\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF} \subset \mathbf{CAF}$: Towards a contradiction, assume there is a PCAF $F = (A, R, \text{claim}, \succ)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_i(F) = (A, R', \text{claim})$ with $(a, b), (b, a) \in R'$ but $(a, a), (b, b) \notin R'$ for some $a, b \in A$ with $\text{claim}(a) = \text{claim}(b)$. This means that either $(a, b) \in R$ or $(b, a) \in R$, since none of four reductions can introduce the attacks (a, b) and (b, a) at the same time. By symmetry, we only look at the case that $(a, b) \in R$. Then, since (A, R, claim) is well-formed and since $\text{claim}(a) = \text{claim}(b)$, $(b, b) \in R$. But \succ is non-reflexive, i.e., (b, b) is not removed by Reduction i and therefore $(b, b) \in R'$. Contradiction. \square

Proposition 2. *For all $i \in \{1, 2, 4\}$ and all $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ such that $i \neq j$ it holds that $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF} \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF}$ and $\mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF} \subset \mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}$.*

Proof. We show the various statements separately.

- $\mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF} \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF}$ with $j \in \{2, 3, 4\}$: let F be the CAF shown in Figure 8a. F is in $\mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}$ as it can be obtained by applying Reduction 1 to the PCAF $(A, R, \text{claim}, \succ)$ with $R = \{(a, b), (b, b)\}$ and $b \succ a$. Towards a contradiction, assume there is a PCAF F' such that $\mathcal{R}_j(F') = F$. Since self-attacks can not be removed by any of the four reductions, $(b, b) \in F'$. Since the underlying CAF of F' must be well-formed, also $(a, b) \in F'$. But then, by the definition of Reduction j , either $(a, b) \in \mathcal{R}_j(F')$ or $(b, a) \in \mathcal{R}_j(F')$. Contradiction.
- $\mathcal{R}_2\text{-CAF} \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF}$ with $j \in \{1, 3, 4\}$: let F be the CAF shown in Figure 8b. F is in $\mathcal{R}_2\text{-CAF}$ as it can be obtained by applying Reduction 2 to the PCAF $(A, R, \text{claim}, \succ)$ with $R = \{(a, b), (b, b)\}$ and $b \succ a$. Towards a contradiction, assume there is a PCAF F' such that $\mathcal{R}_j(F') = F$. Then $(b, b) \in F'$ and therefore also $(a, b) \in F'$. But $(b, a) \notin F'$, since $(a, a) \notin F'$ and therefore also $(a, a) \notin F'$. But Reductions 1 and 3 can not introduce (b, a) in this case, while Reduction 4 can not introduce (b, a) without retaining (a, b) .
- $\mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF} \subset \mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF}$ with $j \in \{1, 2, 4\}$: let F be any CAF in $\mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF}$. Then there is a PCAF $F' = (A, R', \text{claim}, \succ)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_3(F') = F$. If $(a, b) \in F'$ and $(a, b) \in F$ we can assume that $b \not\succeq a$ without loss of generality. If $(a, b) \in F'$ but $(a, b) \notin F$, then, by definition of Reduction 3,

$(b, a) \in F'$ and $b \succ a$. In this case, Reduction j functions in the same way as Reduction 3 (cf. Definition 7 and Figure 2), i.e., $\mathcal{R}_j(F') = F$. This proves $\mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF}$. $\mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF} \subset \mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF}$ follows from $\mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF} \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF}$.

- $\mathcal{R}_4\text{-CAF} \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF}$ with $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$: let F be the CAF shown in Figure 8c. F is in $\mathcal{R}_4\text{-CAF}$ as it can be obtained by applying Reduction 4 to the PCAF $(A, R, \text{claim}, \succ)$ with $R = \{(a, b), (b, b)\}$ and $b \succ a$. Towards a contradiction, assume there is a PCAF F' such that $\mathcal{R}_j(F') = F$. Then $(b, b) \in F'$ and therefore also $(a, b) \in F'$. But $(b, a) \notin F'$, since $(a, a) \notin F'$. But Reduction 1, 2 and 3 can not introduce (b, a) , at least not without deleting (a, b) . \square




Figure 8: CAFs that are contained only in $\mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}$, $\mathcal{R}_2\text{-CAF}$, and $\mathcal{R}_4\text{-CAF}$ respectively. Dashed arrows are edges in the wf-problematic part of the respective CAF.

Proposition 3. *Let $F = (A, R, \text{claim})$ be a CAF. Then*

- $F \in \mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}$ iff $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$ implies $(b, a) \notin \text{wfp}(F)$;
- $F \in \mathcal{R}_2\text{-CAF}$ iff there are no arguments a, a', b, b' in F with $\text{claim}(a) = \text{claim}(a')$ and $\text{claim}(b) = \text{claim}(b')$ such that $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$, $(b, a) \notin R$, $(a', b) \in R$, and either $(b, a') \in R$ or $((a', b') \notin R$ and $(b', a') \notin R)$;
- $F \in \mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF}$ iff $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$ implies $(b, a) \in R$;
- $F \in \mathcal{R}_4\text{-CAF}$ iff there are no arguments a, a', b, b' in F with $\text{claim}(a) = \text{claim}(a')$ and $\text{claim}(b) = \text{claim}(b')$ such that $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$, $(b, a) \notin R$, $(a', b) \in R$, and either $(b, a') \notin R$ or $((a', b') \notin R$ and $(b', a') \notin R)$.

Proof. See below (Lemmas 4, 5, 6, and 7). \square

Lemma 4. *Let $F = (A, R, \text{claim})$ be a CAF. $F \in \mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}$ iff $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$ implies $(b, a) \notin \text{wfp}(F)$.*

Proof. “ \implies ”: By contrapositive. Suppose there is $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$ such that $(b, a) \in \text{wfp}(F)$. Towards a contradiction, assume $F \in \mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}$. Then there is a PCAF $F' = (A, R', \text{claim}, \succ)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_1(F') = F$. Since Reduction 1 can only delete but not introduce attacks, and since the underlying CAF of F' must be well-formed, $(a, b) \in R'$ and $(b, a) \in R'$. However, then also $(b \succ a)$ and $(a \succ b)$ which means that F' is not asymmetric. Contradiction.

“ \impliedby ”: Suppose that $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$ implies $(b, a) \notin \text{wfp}(F)$. Then $\mathcal{R}_1(F') = F$ for the PCAF $F' = (A, R', \text{claim}, \succ)$ with $R' = R \cup \{(a, b) \mid (a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)\}$ as well as $a \succ b \iff (b, a) \in R' \setminus R$. The underlying CAF of F' is well-formed since $\text{wfp}((A, R', \text{claim})) = \emptyset$. Furthermore, \succ is asymmetric since $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$ implies $(b, a) \notin \text{wfp}(F)$ and by construction of F' . \square

Lemma 5. *Let $F = (A, R, \text{claim})$ be a CAF. $F \in \mathcal{R}_2\text{-CAF}$ iff there are no arguments a, a', b, b' in F with $\text{claim}(a) = \text{claim}(a')$ and $\text{claim}(b) = \text{claim}(b')$ such that $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$, $(b, a) \notin R$, $(a', b) \in R$, and either $(b, a') \in R$ or $((a', b') \notin R$ and $(b', a') \notin R)$.*

Proof. “ \implies ”: By contrapositive. Suppose that there are $a, a', b, b' \in A$ with $\text{claim}(a') = \text{claim}(a)$ and $\text{claim}(b') = \text{claim}(b)$ such that $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$, $(b, a) \notin R$, $(a', b) \in R$, and either $(b, a') \in R$ or $((a', b') \notin R$ and $(b', a') \notin R)$. Towards a contradiction, assume that $F \in \mathcal{R}_2\text{-CAF}$. Then there must be a PCAF $F' = (A, R', \text{claim}, \succ)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_2(F') = F$. Reduction 2 can not completely remove conflicts between arguments. Since there is no conflict between a and b in F there can be no conflict in F' either, i.e., $(a, b) \notin R'$ and $(b, a) \notin R'$. Therefore, since the underlying CAF (A, R', claim) of F' must be well-formed, $(a', b) \notin R'$. Since $(a', b) \in R$ it must be that $(b, a') \in R'$ and $a' \succ b$. Then $(b, a') \notin \mathcal{R}_2(F')$. Furthermore, by the well-formedness of (A, R', claim) , we have that $(b', a') \in R'$ and therefore either $(a', b') \in \mathcal{R}_2(F')$ or $(b', a') \in \mathcal{R}_2(F')$. Contradiction to $\mathcal{R}_2(F') = F$.

“ \impliedby ”: Our underlying assumption is that there are no arguments a, a', b, b' in F with $\text{claim}(a) = \text{claim}(a')$ and $\text{claim}(b) = \text{claim}(b')$ such that $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$, $(b, a) \notin R$, $(a', b) \in R$, and either $(b, a') \in R$ or $((a', b') \notin R$ and $(b', a') \notin R)$. We will construct a PCAF $F'' = (A, R'', \text{claim}, \succ)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_2(F'') = F$.

But first, as an intermediate step, we construct the CAF $F' = (A, R', \text{claim})$. We say that (b, a) is forced in F if $(a, b) \in R$ and if there is an argument a' with $\text{claim}(a') = \text{claim}(a)$ such that $(a', b) \notin R$ and $(b, a') \notin R$. Observe that if (b, a) is forced in F , then (a, b) cannot be forced in F by our underlying assumption. Furthermore, if (b, a) is forced in F , then $(b, a) \notin R$, again by our underlying assumption. We construct $R' = (R \cup \{(b, a) \mid (b, a) \text{ is forced in } F\}) \setminus \{(a, b) \mid (b, a) \text{ is forced in } F\}$. Note that $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F')$ implies $(b, a) \in R'$ for all arguments a, b : towards a contradiction, assume otherwise. Then there is some $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F')$ such that $(b, a) \notin R'$. Then $(a, b) \notin R$ and $(b, a) \notin R$ by construction of R' . Furthermore, since $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F')$, there must be some a' with $\text{claim}(a') = \text{claim}(a)$ and $(a', b) \in R'$. It cannot be that $(a', b) \in R$, otherwise (b, a') would be forced in F and $(a', b) \notin R'$. Thus, $(b, a') \in R$ and (a', b) was added to R' because it is forced in F . But this is only possible if there is some b' with $\text{claim}(b') = \text{claim}(b)$ and $(a', b') \notin R$ and $(b', a') \notin R$. This contradicts our underlying assumption: $(b', a') \in \text{wfp}(F)$, $(a', b') \notin R$, $(b, a') \in R$, $(a, b) \notin R$, and $(b, a) \notin R$.

Now we construct $R'' = R' \cup \{(a, b) \mid (a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F')\}$. Furthermore, $b \succ a \iff (a, b) \in R'' \setminus R$. Finally, $F'' = (A, R'', \text{claim}, \succ)$. The underlying CAF of F'' is well-formed since $\text{wfp}((A, R'', \text{claim})) = \emptyset$ by construction. Moreover, \succ is asymmetric since if $(a, b) \in R''$ and $(b, a) \in R''$ then, by construction of R' and R'' , either $(a, b) \in R$ or $(b, a) \in R$. Lastly, we show that $\mathcal{R}_2(F'') = F$: if $(a, b) \in R'' \setminus R$, then we defined $b \succ a$ and thus $(a, b) \notin \mathcal{R}_2(F'')$. If $(a, b) \in R \setminus R''$, then (b, a) was forced in F , i.e., $(b, a) \notin R$ but $(b, a) \in R'$ and therefore also $(b, a) \in R''$. Thus, we define $a \succ b$ which means that $(a, b) \in \mathcal{R}_2(F'')$. \square

Lemma 6. *Let $F = (A, R, \text{claim})$ be a CAF. $F \in \mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF}$ iff $(a, b) \in \text{wfp}(F)$ implies $(b, a) \in R$.*

Proof. “ \implies ”: By contrapositive. Suppose there is $(a, b) \in wfp(F)$ such that $(b, a) \notin R$. Towards a contradiction, assume $F \in \mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF}$. Then there is a PCAF $F' = (A, R', claim, \succ)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_3(F') = F$. Since Reduction 3 can only delete but not introduce attacks, and since $(A, R', claim)$ must be well-formed, $(a, b) \in R'$. However, Reduction 3 can not completely remove conflicts between arguments, i.e., either $(a, b) \in \mathcal{R}_3(F')$ or $(b, a) \in \mathcal{R}_3(F')$. Contradiction.

“ \impliedby ”: Suppose $(a, b) \in wfp(F)$ implies $(b, a) \in R$. Then $\mathcal{R}_3(F') = F$ for the PCAF $F' = (A, R', claim, \succ)$ with $R' = R \cup \{(a, b) \mid (a, b) \in wfp(F)\}$ as well as $a \succ b \iff (b, a) \in R' \setminus R$. $(A, R', claim)$ is well-formed since $wfp((A, R', claim)) = \emptyset$. Furthermore, \succ is asymmetric by construction. \square

Lemma 7. *Let $F = (A, R, claim)$ be a CAF. $F \in \mathcal{R}_4\text{-CAF}$ iff there are no arguments a, a', b, b' in F with $claim(a) = claim(a')$ and $claim(b) = claim(b')$ such that $(a, b) \in wfp(F)$, $(b, a) \notin R$, $(a', b) \in R$, and either $(b, a') \notin R$ or $((a', b') \notin R$ and $(b', a') \notin R)$.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Lemma 5:

“ \implies ”: By contrapositive. Suppose that there are $a, a', b, b' \in A$ with $claim(a') = claim(a)$ and $claim(b') = claim(b)$ such that $(a, b) \in wfp(F)$, $(b, a) \notin R$, $(a', b) \in R$, and either $(b, a') \notin R$ or $((a', b') \notin R$ and $(b', a') \notin R)$. Towards a contradiction, assume that $F \in \mathcal{R}_4\text{-CAF}$. Then there must be a PCAF $F' = (A, R', claim, \succ)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_4(F') = F$. Reduction 4 can not completely remove conflicts between arguments. Since there is no conflict between a and b in F there can be no conflict in F' either, i.e., $(a, b) \notin R'$ and $(b, a) \notin R'$. Therefore, since the underlying CAF of F' must be well-formed, $(a', b) \notin R'$. The only way to obtain $(a', b) \in R$ from $(a', b) \notin R'$ via Reduction 4 is to have $(b, a') \in R'$ and $a' \succ b$. Then $(b, a') \in \mathcal{R}_4(F')$. Furthermore, by the well-formedness of $(A, R', claim)$, we have that $(b', a') \in R'$ and therefore either $(a', b') \in \mathcal{R}_4(F')$ or $(b', a') \in \mathcal{R}_4(F')$. Contradiction to $\mathcal{R}_4(F') = F$.

“ \impliedby ”: Our underlying assumption is that there are no arguments a, a', b, b' in F with $claim(a) = claim(a')$ and $claim(b) = claim(b')$ such that $(a, b) \in wfp(F)$, $(b, a) \notin R$, $(a', b) \in R$, and either $(b, a') \notin R$ or $((a', b') \notin R$ and $(b', a') \notin R)$. We will construct a PCAF $F'' = (A, R'', claim, \succ)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_4(F'') = F$.

But first, as an intermediate step, we construct the CAF $F' = (A, R', claim)$. We say that (b, a) is forced in F if $(a, b) \in R$, $(b, a) \in R$, and if there is an argument a' with $claim(a') = claim(a)$ such that $(a', b) \notin R$ and $(b, a') \notin R$. Observe that if (b, a) is forced in F , then (a, b) cannot be forced in F by our underlying assumption. We construct $R' = R \setminus \{(a, b) \mid (b, a) \text{ is forced in } F\}$. Note that $(a, b) \in wfp(F')$ implies $(b, a) \in R'$ for all arguments a, b : towards a contradiction, assume otherwise. Then there is some $(a, b) \in wfp(F')$ such that $(b, a) \notin R'$. Then $(a, b) \notin R$ and $(b, a) \notin R$ by construction of R' . Furthermore, there must be some a' with $claim(a') = claim(a)$ and $(a', b) \in R'$. It cannot be that $(a', b) \in R$ and $(b, a') \in R$, otherwise (b, a') would be forced in F and $(a', b) \notin R'$. Thus, $(a', b) \in R$ and $(b, a') \notin R$ by construction of F' . But this contradicts our underlying assumption: $(a, b) \in wfp(F)$, $(b, a) \notin R$, $(a', b) \in R$, and $(b, a') \notin R$.

Now we construct $R'' = R' \cup \{(a, b) \mid (a, b) \in wfp(F')\}$. Furthermore, $b \succ a \iff (a, b) \in R'' \setminus R$ or $(b, a) \in R \setminus R''$. Finally, $F'' = (A, R'', claim, \succ)$.

The underlying CAF of F'' is well-formed since $wfp((A, R'', claim)) = \emptyset$ by construction. Moreover, \succ is asymmetric: if $b \succ a$, there are two cases.

1. $(a, b) \in R'' \setminus R$. Clearly, $(a, b) \notin R \setminus R''$. Moreover, $(a, b) \in R'' \setminus R$ implies $(b, a) \in R$ since we did not add attacks to R'' if there was no conflict between these attacks in R . Thus, $(b, a) \notin R'' \setminus R$. We can conclude $a \not\succeq b$.
2. $(b, a) \in R \setminus R''$. Clearly, $(b, a) \notin R'' \setminus R$. Moreover, $(b, a) \in R \setminus R''$ implies $(a, b) \in R''$, since we never completely removed conflicts when constructing R'' from R . Thus, $(a, b) \notin R \setminus R''$. We can conclude $a \not\succeq b$.

Lastly, we show that $\mathcal{R}_4(F'') = F$: if $(a, b) \in R'' \setminus R$, then we defined $b \succ a$. As above, $(a, b) \in R'' \setminus R$ implies $(b, a) \in R$. The only possible reason for why we added (a, b) to R'' is because $(a, b) \in wfp(F')$. As previously discussed, this means that $(b, a) \in R'$ and therefore also $(b, a) \in R''$. Thus, $(a, b) \notin \mathcal{R}_4(F'')$. If $(a, b) \in R \setminus R''$, then $a \succ b$. As above, this implies $(b, a) \in R''$, and therefore $(a, b) \in \mathcal{R}_4(F'')$. \square

Proposition 4. For $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ with $i \neq j$ it holds that $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}_{tr} \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF}_{tr}$.

Proof. For $i \in \{1, 2, 4\}$, showing $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}_{tr} \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ can be done in the same way as showing $\mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF} \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF}$ in the proof of Proposition 2 (note that the preference relations of the PCAFs associated with the CAFs of Figure 8 are transitive). It remains to show $\mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF}_{tr} \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ with $j \in \{1, 2, 4\}$.

Let F be the CAF shown in Figure 9. F is in $\mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF}_{tr}$: a PCAF that reduces to F must have $c \succ b$ and $b \succ a$, which forces $c \succ a$ by transitivity. However, the attack (a, c) is not deleted by Reduction 3 if there is no attack (c, a) .

F is not in $\mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ since a PCAF that reduces to F would need to have $c \succ b$, $b \succ a$, and therefore also $c \succ a$. But Reduction 1 would delete the attack (a, c) .

Towards a contradiction, assume there is a PCAF F' such that $\mathcal{R}_2(F') = F$. First, we show that $(a, b) \in F'$, $(b, a) \in F'$, $(b, c) \in F'$, and $(c, b) \in F'$.

- Assume $(a, b) \notin F'$. Then two things most hold. Firstly, it must be that $(b, a) \in F'$, otherwise $(b, a) \notin F$. Secondly, $(a', b) \notin F'$, otherwise the underlying CAF of F' would not be well-formed. This means that (a', b) must have been introduced into F by applying Reduction 2, i.e., by reversing (b, a') . Therefore, $(b, a') \in F'$. But then also $(b', a') \in F'$, otherwise the underlying CAF of F' is not well-formed. But then, by the definition of Reduction 2, either $(b', a') \in F$ or $(a', b') \in F$, which is not the case. Contradiction.
- Assume $(b, a) \notin F'$. Then, since the underlying CAF of F' must be well-formed, $(b', a) \notin F'$. This means $(a, b') \in F'$, otherwise we cannot obtain F from F' via Reduction 2. This means that $(a', b') \in F'$, which is not possible since neither $(a', b') \in F$ nor $(b', a') \in F$.
- Assume $(b, c) \notin F'$. Then two things most hold. Firstly, it must be that $(c, b) \in F'$, otherwise $(c, b) \notin F$. Secondly, $(b', c) \notin F'$, otherwise the underlying CAF of F' would not be well-formed. This means that (b', c) must have been introduced into F by applying Reduction 2, i.e.,

by reversing (c, b') . Therefore, $(c, b') \in F'$. But then also $(c', b') \in F'$, otherwise the underlying CAF of F' is not well-formed. But then, by the definition of Reduction 2, either $(c', b') \in F$ or $(b', c') \in F$, which is not the case. Contradiction.

- Assume $(c, b) \notin F'$. Then, since the underlying CAF of F' must be well-formed, $(c', b) \notin F'$. This means $(b, c') \in F'$, otherwise we cannot obtain F from F' via Reduction 2. This means that $(b', c') \in F'$, which is not possible since neither $(b', c') \in F$ nor $(c', b') \in F'$.

Since $(a, b) \in F'$, $(b, a) \in F'$, $(b, c) \in F'$, and $(c, b) \in F'$, the only way to obtain F from F' via Reduction 2 is to set $c \succ b$ and $b \succ a$. But then $c \succ a$ which means that $(a, c) \notin F$. Contradiction, i.e., $F \notin \mathcal{R}_2\text{-CAF}_{tr}$.

Now assume there is a PCAF G' such that $\mathcal{R}_4(G') = F$. It must be that $(a, b) \in G'$ since we can not obtain $(a', b) \in \mathcal{R}_4(G')$ and $(b, a') \notin \mathcal{R}_4(G')$ without $(a', b) \in G'$. Analogously, it must be that $(b, c) \in G'$. Then in order to have $\mathcal{R}_4(G') = F$ we need to set $c \succ b$ and $b \succ a$. But then $c \succ a$ which means that it can not be that $(a, c) \in \mathcal{R}_4(G')$ and $(c, a) \notin \mathcal{R}_4(G')$. Contradiction, i.e., $F \notin \mathcal{R}_4\text{-CAF}_{tr}$. \square




Figure 9: A CAF which shows that $\mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF}_{tr} \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}_j\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ for $j \in \{1, 2, 4\}$. Dashed arrows are edges in the wf-problematic part.

Proposition 5. $F \in \mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ for a CAF F if and only if (1) $wfp(F)$ is acyclic and (2) $(a, b) \in F$ implies that there is no path from a to b in $wfp(F)$.

Proof. Let $F = (A, R, claim)$.

- Suppose $wfp(F)$ is acyclic and there is no $(a, b) \in F$ with a path from a to b in $wfp(F)$. Construct the PCAF $F' = (A, R', claim, \succ)$ with $R' = R \cup \{(a, b) \mid (a, b) \in wfp(F)\}$ and $b \succ a$ iff there is a path from a to b in $wfp(F)$. $(A, R', claim)$ is well-formed by construction. \succ is transitive because if there is a path from a to b and from b to c , then there is also a path from a to c . \succ is asymmetric because otherwise there would be a path from a to b and from b to a , which again would mean that there is a cycle. It remains to show that $\mathcal{R}_1(F') = F$. Let (a, b) be any attack in F' . We distinguish two cases:

- $(a, b) \in F$. Then, since there is no path from a to b in $wfp(F)$, $b \not\succ a$. Therefore, $(a, b) \in \mathcal{R}_1(F')$.
- $(a, b) \notin F$. Then, by construction, $(a, b) \in wfp(F)$ and therefore $b \succ a$. Thus, (a, b) is removed from F' by Reduction 1, i.e., $(a, b) \notin \mathcal{R}_1(F')$.

Note also that, by construction of F' , there can be no $(a, b) \in F$ such that $(a, b) \notin F'$.

- Suppose $wfp(F)$ is cyclic. Then there are arguments $x_1, \dots, x_n \in F$ such that $x_1 = x_n$ and $(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in wfp(F)$ for all $1 \leq i < n$. Towards a contradiction, assume there is a PCAF $F' = (A, R', claim, \succ)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_1(F') = F$. Then $(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in F'$ for all $1 \leq i < n$, otherwise $(A, R', claim)$ would not be well-formed. In order to have $\mathcal{R}_1(F') = F$ we must have $x_{i+1} \succ x_i$ for all $1 \leq i < n$. But then, by transitivity and since $x_1 = x_n$ we obtain $x_1 \succ x_1$, which is in contradiction to \succ being asymmetric.

On the other hand, suppose there is an attack $(a, b) \in F$ with a path from a to b in $wfp(F)$. Let us denote this path as x_1, \dots, x_n with $x_1 = a$ and $x_n = b$. By the same argument as above, if there was a PCAF $F' = (A, R', claim, \succ)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_1(F') = F$, then $x_n \succ x_1$, i.e., $b \succ a$. But then $(a, b) \notin \mathcal{R}_1(F')$. Contradiction. \square

A.2 Proofs for Section 5

Lemma 1. *Let $F = (A, R, claim, \succ)$ be a PCAF and $E \subseteq A$. $E \in cf(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$ if and only if $E \in cf((A, R, claim))$ for $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$.*

Proof. Let $F = (A, R, claim, \succ)$ be a PCAF and let $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. Observe that if $(a, b) \in F$ then either $(a, b) \in \mathcal{R}_i(F)$ or $(b, a) \in \mathcal{R}_i(F)$. In other words, if there is an attack between two arguments in a PCAF, then there will still be at least one attack between those arguments after Reduction i has been applied. Conversely, if there is an attack $(a, b) \in \mathcal{R}_i(F)$, then it must be that either $(a, b) \in F$ or $(b, a) \in F$. Thus the argument set E is conflict free in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$ iff it is conflict-free in $(A, R, claim)$. \square

Proposition 6. *prf_p^3 , stb_p^3 , and sem_p^3 are I-maximal for PCAFs.*

Proof. We show this for prf_p^3 . The other results follow from $stb_p^3(F) \subseteq sem_p^3(F) \subseteq prf_p^3(F)$. Towards a contradiction, assume there is a PCAF $F = (A, R, claim, \succ)$ such that $S \subset T$ for some $S, T \in prf_p^3(F)$. Then there must be $S' \subseteq A$ such that $S' \in prf(\mathcal{R}_3(F))$ and $claim(S') = S$, as well as $T' \subseteq A$ with $T' \in prf(\mathcal{R}_3(F))$ and $claim(T') = T$. Observe that $S' \not\subseteq T'$, otherwise $S' \notin prf(\mathcal{R}_3(F))$. Thus, there is $x \in S'$ (with $claim(x) \in S$) such that $x \notin T'$. However, $claim(x) \in T$ since $S \subset T$, i.e., there is some $x' \in T'$ such that $claim(x') = claim(x)$. There are two possibilities for why x is not in T' :

1. $T' \cup \{x\} \notin cf(\mathcal{R}_3(F))$. By Lemma 1, $T' \cup \{x\} \notin cf((A, R, claim))$. Therefore, there is some $y \in T'$ such that $y \notin S'$ and either $(x, y) \in F$ or $(y, x) \in F$. Actually, it cannot be that $(x, y) \in F$, otherwise, by the well-formedness of $(A, R, claim)$, we would have $(x', y) \in F$ which, also by Lemma 1, would mean that $T' \notin cf(\mathcal{R}_3(F))$. Thus, $(y, x) \in F$. Since $(x, y) \notin F$, and by the definition of Reduction 3, $(y, x) \in \mathcal{R}_3(F)$. S' must defend x from y in $\mathcal{R}_3(F)$, i.e., there is some $z \in S'$ such that $(z, y) \in \mathcal{R}_3(F)$. Therefore, also $(z, y) \in F$. Since we have that $S \subset T$ there is some $z' \in T'$ such that $claim(z') = claim(z)$. $(z', y) \in F$ by the well-formedness of $(A, R, claim)$. But then, by Lemma 1, $T' \notin cf(\mathcal{R}_3(F))$. Contradiction.

2. x is not defended by T' . Then there is some $y \in A$ such that $(y, x) \in \mathcal{R}_3(F)$ and such that y is not attacked by any argument in T' . But S' must defend x against y in $\mathcal{R}_3(F)$, i.e., there is $z \in S'$ such that $(z, y) \in \mathcal{R}_3(F)$. Then also $(z, y) \in F$. Since $S \subset T$ there is some $z' \in T'$ such that $claim(z') = claim(z)$. $(z', y) \in F$ by the well-formedness of $(A, R, claim)$. It cannot be that $(z', y) \in \mathcal{R}_3(F)$, i.e., $y \succ z'$. But then, by the definition of Reduction 3, we must have $(y, z') \in F$ and also $(y, z') \in \mathcal{R}_3(F)$, which means that T' is attacked by y but not defended against it, i.e., $T' \notin adm(\mathcal{R}_3(F))$. Contradiction. \square

Proposition 7. stg_p^3 is not I-maximal for PCAFs, even when considering only transitive preferences.

Proof. Let F be the CAF shown in Figure 10a. Clearly, $F \in \mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF}_{tr}$. We can see that $naive(F) = \{\{a, a'\}, \{a', c\}, \{b\}\}$. Furthermore, $\{a, a'\}_F^\oplus = \{a, a', b\}$, $\{a', c\}_F^\oplus = \{a, a', c\}$, and $\{b\}_F^\oplus = \{a', b, c\}$. Since the ranges of all three naive extensions are incomparable, we have that $stg(F) = naive(F)$ and thus $stg_c(F) = \{\{\alpha\}, \{\alpha, \gamma\}, \{\beta\}\}$. \square

Proposition 8. σ_p^i , with $\sigma \in \{prf, stb, sem, stg\}$ and $i \in \{1, 2, 4\}$, is not I-maximal for PCAFs, even when considering only transitive preferences.

Proof. We show this for stb_p^i . The other results follow by $stb_p^i(F) \subseteq sem_p^i(F) \subseteq prf_p^i(F)$ and $stb_p^i(F) \subseteq stg_p^i(F)$.

For $i \in \{1, 4\}$, let F be the CAF shown in Figure 10b. $F \in \mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ by Proposition 5. $F \in \mathcal{R}_4\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ since $\mathcal{R}_4(F') = F$ for $F' = (A, R, claim, \succ)$ with $A = \{a, a', b\}$, $R = \{(b, a)\}$, $claim(a) = claim(a') = \alpha$, $claim(b) = \beta$, and $a \succ b$. As required, the underlying CAF of F' is well-formed. It can be verified that $stb(F) = \{\{a, a'\}, \{a', b\}\}$ and thus $stb_c(F) = \{\{\alpha\}, \{\alpha, \beta\}\}$.

For $i = 2$, let G be the CAF of Figure 10c. $G \in \mathcal{R}_2\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ since $\mathcal{R}_2(G') = G$ for the PCAF $G' = (A', R', claim', \succ)$ with $R' = \{(b, a), (b, a'), (b', a), (b', a')\}$, $a \succ b$, and $a' \succ b'$. As required, the underlying CAF of G' is well-formed. It can be verified that $stb(G) = \{\{a, a', a''\}, \{a'', b, b'\}\}$ and thus $stb_c(G) = \{\{\alpha\}, \{\alpha, \beta\}\}$. \square




Figure 10: CAFs used as counter examples for I-maximality of some semantics. Dashed arrows are edges in the respective wf-problematic part.

A.3 Proofs for Section 6

Proposition 9. $Ver_{\sigma,1}^{PCAF}$ is NP-complete for $\sigma \in \{cf, naive\}$, even when considering only transitive preferences.

Proof. NP-membership follows from results for general CAFs (cf. Table 2). We now show NP-hardness. Let φ be an arbitrary instance of 3-SAT given as a set $\{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$ of clauses over variables X . Without loss of generality, we can assume that every variable appears both positively and negatively in φ . We construct a PCAF $F = (A, R, \text{claim}, \succ)$ as well as a set of claims S :

- $A = V \cup \bar{V} \cup H$ where $V = \{x_i \mid x \in C_i, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$, $\bar{V} = \{\bar{x}_i \mid \neg x \in C_i, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$, and $H = \{x_T, x_F \mid x \in X\}$;
- $R = \{(x_T, x_i), (x_F, x_i) \mid x_i \in V\} \cup \{(x_T, \bar{x}_i), (x_F, \bar{x}_i) \mid \bar{x}_i \in \bar{V}\}$;
- $\text{claim}(x_i) = \text{claim}(\bar{x}_i) = i$ for all $x_i, \bar{x}_i \in V \cup \bar{V}$, $\text{claim}(x_T) = \text{claim}(x_F) = x$ for all $x \in X$;
- $x_i \succ x_T$ for all $x_i \in V$ and $\bar{x}_i \succ x_F$ for all $\bar{x}_i \in \bar{V}$;
- $S = \{1, \dots, m\} \cup X$.

Figure 11 illustrates the above construction (and is in fact identical to Figure 5 from the main text). Let $F' = \mathcal{R}_1(F) = (A, R', \text{claim})$.

Assume φ is satisfiable. Then there is an interpretation I such that $I \models \varphi$. Let $E = \{x_T \in H \mid x \in I\} \cup \{x_F \in H \mid x \notin I\} \cup \{x_i \in V \mid x \in I\} \cup \{\bar{x}_i \in \bar{V} \mid x \notin I\}$. It can be easily verified that E is conflict free in (A, R') and that $\text{claim}(E) = S$. Towards a contradiction, assume that E is not a naive extension, i.e., that there is a conflict-free extension D for (A, R') such that $D \supset E$. Consider any x such that $x_T \in E$ (the case that $x_F \in E$ is analogous). Then also $x_T \in D$. Since D must be conflict-free, $\bar{x}_j \notin D$ for all corresponding \bar{x}_j . Furthermore, for all corresponding x_i , we have $x_i \in E$ and thus $x_i \in D$. But then $x_F \notin D$. Since for all $x \in X$ either $x_T \in E$ or $x_F \in E$, this means that $D \subseteq E$. Contradiction, i.e., E is naive in (A, R') .

Assume S is conflict-free in (A, R', claim) . Then there is some $E \subseteq A$ such that E is conflict-free in (A, R') and $\text{claim}(E) = S$. Let x be any variable in X . Since $x \in \text{claim}(E)$ it must be that either $x_T \in E$ or $x_F \in E$. Thus, for all i, j , we have $x_i \in E \implies \bar{x}_j \notin E$ and $\bar{x}_i \in E \implies x_j \notin E$ (otherwise, we would need both $x_T \notin E$ and $x_F \notin E$ for E to be conflict-free). Furthermore, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, there must be some x such that $x_i \in E$ or $\bar{x}_i \in E$. Let $I = \{x \mid x_i \in E \text{ for some } i\}$. Then for every i there is some x such that either $x \in C_i$ and $x \in I$ or $\neg x \in C_i$ and $x \notin I$. Thus, I satisfies all clauses in C which means that φ is satisfiable. The proof works likewise if we assume S to be naive since $\text{naive}_c(G) \subseteq \text{cf}_c(G)$ for any CAF G . \square

Proposition 10. $\text{Ver}_{\sigma,1}^{\text{PCAF}}$ is NP-complete for $\sigma \in \{\text{stb}, \text{adm}, \text{com}\}$, even when considering only transitive preferences.

Proof. NP-membership follows from results for general CAFs (cf. Table 2). We show NP-hardness. Let φ be an arbitrary 3-SAT-instance given as a set $\{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$ of clauses over variables X . For convenience, we directly construct a CAF $F = (A, R, \text{claim})$ with $F \in \mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ instead of providing a PCAF F' such that $\mathcal{R}_1(F') = F$. This is legitimate, as, by our characterization of $\mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ (see Proposition 5), we can obtain F' by simply adding all edges in $\text{wfp}(F)$ to R and defining \succ accordingly. We also construct a set of claims S .




Figure 11: Reduction of 3-SAT-instance $C_1 = \{a, b, c\}$, $C_2 = \{\neg a, \neg b\}$, $C_3 = \{\neg a, c\}$, $C_4 = \{b, \neg c\}$, to an instance (F, S) of $Ver_{cf,1}^{PCAF}$. Dashed arrows are attacks deleted in $\mathcal{R}_1(F)$, i.e., they are edges in $wfp(\mathcal{R}_1(F))$.

- $A = V \cup \bar{V} \cup H$ where $V = \{x_i \mid x \in C_i, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$, $\bar{V} = \{\bar{x}_i \mid \neg x \in C_i, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$, and
 $H = \{x_{i,j}^k, \hat{x}_{i,j}^k \mid 1 \leq k \leq 4, x_i \in V, \bar{x}_j \in \bar{V}\}$;
- $R = \{(x_i, x_{i,j}^1), (x_{i,j}^1, x_{i,j}^2), (x_{i,j}^2, \bar{x}_j), (\bar{x}_j, x_{i,j}^3), (x_{i,j}^3, x_{i,j}^4), (x_{i,j}^4, x_i) \mid x_i \in V, \bar{x}_j \in \bar{V}\}$;
- $claim(x_i) = claim(\bar{x}_i) = i$ for all x_i, \bar{x}_i ,
 $claim(x_{i,j}^k) = claim(\hat{x}_{i,j}^k) = x_{i,j}^k$ for all $x_{i,j}^k, \hat{x}_{i,j}^k$;
- $S = \{1, \dots, m\} \cup \{claim(a) \mid a \in H\}$.

Figure 12 illustrates the above construction (and is the same as Figure 6 in the main text). In general, every $\hat{x}_{i,j}^k$ only has outgoing edges in the wf-problematic part, and no incoming or outgoing attacks in R . Every $x_{i,j}^k$ only has incoming edges in the wf-problematic part. Finally, there can be no edges in the wf-problematic part between any x_i (or \bar{x}_i) and any other x_j (or \bar{x}_j). From this, and by the above construction, we can infer that $(A, R, claim)$ fulfills all of the conditions to be in $\mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ (cf. Proposition 5). It remains to show the correctness of the above construction.

Assume φ is satisfiable. Then there is an interpretation I such that $I \models \varphi$. Let $E = \{x_i \in V \mid x \in I\} \cup \{\bar{x}_i \in \bar{V} \mid x \notin I\} \cup \{x_{i,j}^2, x_{i,j}^3 \mid x_i, \bar{x}_j \in A, x \in I\} \cup \{x_{i,j}^1, x_{i,j}^4 \mid x_i, \bar{x}_j \in A, x \notin I\} \cup \{\hat{x}_{i,j}^k \mid \hat{x}_{i,j}^k \in A\}$. It can be verified that E is stable in (A, R) and that $claim(E) = S$. Since $stb_c(F) \subseteq com_c(F) \subseteq adm_c(F)$ for any CAF F , S is also admissible and complete in $(A, R, claim)$.

Assume S is admissible in $(A, R, claim)$. Then there is some $E \subseteq A$ such that E is admissible in (A, R) and $claim(E) = S$. Thus, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, there must be some x such that $x_i \in E$ or $\bar{x}_i \in E$. Consider the case that $x_i \in E$. Since E is admissible, $x_{i,j}^1 \notin E$ for any j such that $\bar{x}_j \in A$. This further means that $\bar{x}_j \notin E$ for any $\bar{x}_j \in A$, since we would need $x_{i,j}^1 \in E$ to defend \bar{x}_j from the attack by $x_{i,j}^2$. Likewise, if $\bar{x}_i \in E$, then $x_j \notin E$ for all $x_j \in A$. Let $I = \{x \mid x_i \in E \text{ for some } i\}$. Then for every i there is some x such that either $x \in C_i$ and $x \in I$ or $\neg x \in C_i$ and $x \notin I$. Thus, I satisfies all clauses in C which means that φ is satisfiable. The proof works likewise if we assume S to be stable or complete since $stb_c(F) \subseteq com_c(F) \subseteq adm_c(F)$ for any CAF F . \square

Proposition 11. $Ver_{\sigma,1}^{PCAF}$ is Σ_2^P -complete for $\sigma \in \{prf, sem, stj\}$, even when considering only transitive preferences.

Proof. Σ_2^P -membership follows from results for general CAFs (cf. Table 2). We show hardness separately below (Lemmas 8, 9, and 10). \square




Figure 12: Reduction of 3-SAT-instance $C_1 = \{a\}$, $C_2 = \{-a, b\}$, $C_3 = \{-b, c\}$, to an instance (F', S) of $Ver_{stb,1}^{PCAF}$. Dashed arrows are attacks deleted in $\mathcal{R}_1(F')$, i.e., they are edges in $wfp(\mathcal{R}_1(F'))$.

Lemma 8. $Ver_{prf,1}^{PCAF}$ is Σ_2^P -hard, even for transitive preferences.

Proof. We provide a reduction from QBF_{\forall}^2 to the complementary problem of $Ver_{prf,1}^{PCAF}$. This is an adaptation of [Dvořák and Dunne, 2017, Reduction 3.7]. Let $\Phi = \forall Y \exists Z \varphi(Y, Z)$ be an arbitrary instance of QBF_{\forall}^2 . Let $X = Y \cup Z$. We assume φ to be in CNF and denote the set of clauses in φ by C . Without loss of generality, we can assume that every clause contains either z or $\neg z$ for at least one $z \in Z$. We construct a CAF (A, R, claim) as well as a set of claims S :

- $A = \{\varphi, \bar{\varphi}\} \cup C \cup X \cup \bar{X} \cup Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^*$, where $\bar{X} = \{\bar{x} \mid x \in X\}$, $Y^* = \{y^* \mid y \in Y\}$, and $\bar{Y}^* = \{\bar{y}^* \mid y \in Y\}$;
- $R = \{(x, \bar{x}), (\bar{x}, x) \mid x \in X\} \cup \{(x, c) \mid x \in c, c \in C\} \cup \{(\bar{x}, c) \mid \neg x \in c, c \in C\} \cup \{(c, c) \mid c \in C\} \cup \{(c, \varphi) \mid c \in C\} \cup \{(\varphi, \bar{\varphi}), (\bar{\varphi}, \bar{\varphi})\} \cup \{(\bar{\varphi}, z), (\bar{\varphi}, \bar{z}) \mid z \in Z\}$;
- $\text{claim}(v^*) = v$ for $v \in Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^*$ and $\text{claim}(v) = v$ else;
- $S = Y \cup \bar{Y}$.

Figure 13 illustrates the above construction. First of all, we can see that (A, R, claim) is in $\mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ since all paths in $wfp(F) = \{(v^*, v) \mid v \in Y \cup \bar{Y}\}$ are of length 1 (only arguments in $Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^*$ have outgoing edges in $wfp(F)$). It remains to verify the correctness of the reduction, i.e., we will show that $S \notin \text{prf}_c(F)$ iff Φ is valid.

First assume Φ is valid, that is, for all $Y' \subseteq Y$, there is $Z' \subseteq Z$ such that $M = Y' \cup Z'$ is a model of φ . Towards a contradiction, assume $S \in \text{prf}_c(F)$. Then there must be some $E \subseteq A$ such that $E \in \text{prf}((A, R))$ and $\text{claim}(E) = S$. Clearly, $Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^* \subseteq E$; moreover, E contains either y or \bar{y} for each $y \in Y$ (otherwise $E \cup \{y\}$ is a proper admissible superset of E , contradiction to E being preferred in (A, R)). Let $Y' = E \cap Y$. By assumption, there is $Z' \subseteq Z$ such that

$M = Y' \cup Z'$ is a model of φ . We show that $D = Y^* \cup \overline{Y}^* \cup M \cup \{\overline{x} \mid x \notin M\} \cup \{\varphi\}$ is admissible: D is conflict-free by construction. D is admissible since φ defends $v \in Z' \cup \{\overline{z} \mid z \notin Z'\}$ against $\overline{\varphi}$; moreover, each argument $v \in X$ defends itself against \overline{v} and vice versa; also, $M \cup \{\overline{x} \mid x \notin M\}$ defends φ against each attack from clause-arguments $c \in C$ since φ is satisfiable: For each clause $c \in C$, there is either $v \in M$ with $v \in C$ or $\neg v \in C$ for some $v \notin M$. In the first case, $(v, c) \in R$ and $v \in E$, in the latter, $(\overline{v}, c) \in R$ and $\overline{v} \in E$. Now observe that E and D both contain $Y' \cup \{\overline{y} \mid y \notin Y'\} \cup Y^* \cup \overline{Y}^*$ (by construction of D), that is, $E \subset D$ and therefore $E \notin \text{prf}_c((A, R))$. Contradiction.

Now assume $S \notin \text{prf}_c(F)$. Consider an arbitrary subset $Y' \subseteq Y$. We show that there is some $Z' \subseteq Z$ such that $Y' \cup Z'$ is a model of φ . Let $E = Y' \cup \{\overline{y} \mid y \notin Y'\} \cup Y^* \cup \overline{Y}^*$ (and observe that $\text{claim}(E) = S$). By assumption $S \notin \text{prf}_c(F)$ we have that E is not preferred in (A, R) , that is, there is some $D \in \text{adm}((A, R))$ with $D \supset E$. Thus, there is some $v \in A \setminus E$ such that $v \in D$. It follows that $\varphi \in D$: Clearly, $v \in \{\varphi\} \cup Z \cup \overline{Z}$ since each remaining argument is either self-attacking or attacked by E (and thus also by D). In case $v = \varphi$, we are done; in case $v \in Z \cup \overline{Z}$, we have $\varphi \in D$ by admissibility of D (observe that φ is the only attacker of $\overline{\varphi}$). Consequently, D defends φ against each attack from each clause-argument $c \in C$. Now, let $Z' = Z \cap D$. We show that $M = Y' \cup Z'$ is a model of φ . Consider some arbitrary clause $c \in C$. Since $\varphi \in D$, there is some $v \in D$ such that $(v, c) \in R$ by admissibility of D . In case $v \in X$, we have $v \in M$ and $v \in c$ by construction of F ; similarly, in case $v \in \overline{X}$ we have $v \notin M$ and $\neg v \in c$. Thus c is satisfied by M . Since c was chosen arbitrary it follows that φ is satisfiable. We have shown that Φ is valid. \square




Figure 13: Reduction of the QBF_{\forall}^2 instance $\forall a \exists b((a \vee b) \wedge (\neg a \vee b))$ to an instance of $\text{Ver}_{\text{prf},1}^{\text{PCAF}}$.

Lemma 9. $\text{Ver}_{\text{sem},1}^{\text{PCAF}}$ is Σ_2^{P} -hard, even for transitive preferences.

Proof. We provide a reduction from QBF_{\forall}^2 to the complementary problem: For an instance $\Phi = \forall Y \exists Z \varphi(Y, Z)$ of QBF_{\forall}^2 where φ is given by a set of clauses C over atoms in $X = Y \cup Z$, we construct a CAF $F = (A, R, \text{claim})$ as well as a set of claims S :

- $A = \{\varphi, \overline{\varphi}\} \cup C \cup X \cup \overline{X} \cup Y^* \cup \overline{Y}^* \cup \{d_v \mid v \in Y \cup \overline{Y}\}$, where $\overline{X} = \{\overline{x} \mid x \in X\}$, $Y^* = \{y^* \mid y \in Y\}$, and $\overline{Y}^* = \{\overline{y}^* \mid y \in Y\}$;
- $R = \{(x, \overline{x}), (\overline{x}, x) \mid x \in X\} \cup \{(c, c), (c, \varphi) \mid c \in C\} \cup \{(x, c) \mid x \in c, c \in C\} \cup \{(\overline{x}, c) \mid \neg x \in c, c \in C\} \cup$

$$\{(d_v, d_v), (v, d_v) \mid v \in Y \cup \bar{Y}\} \cup \{(\varphi, \bar{\varphi}), (\bar{\varphi}, \bar{\varphi})\} \cup \{(\bar{\varphi}, z), (\bar{\varphi}, \bar{z}) \mid z \in Z\};$$

- $claim(v^*) = v$ for $v \in Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^*$ and $claim(v) = v$ else;
- $S = Y \cup \bar{Y}$.

Figure 14 illustrates the above construction. The constructed CAF is contained in $\mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ since all paths in $wfp(F) = \{(v^*, v) \mid v \in Y \cup \bar{Y}\}$ are of length 1 (only arguments in $Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^*$ have outgoing edges in $wfp(F)$). It remains to verify the correctness of the reduction, i.e., we will show that $S \notin sem_c(F)$ iff Φ is valid.

First assume Φ is valid, that is, for all $Y' \subseteq Y$, there is $Z' \subseteq Z$ such that $M = Y' \cup Z'$ is a model of φ . Towards a contradiction, assume $S \in sem_c(F)$ and consider a *sem*-realization E of S , i.e., $claim(E) = S$ and $E \in sem((A, R))$. Clearly, $Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^* \subseteq E$; moreover, E contains either y or \bar{y} for each $y \in Y$ (otherwise $E \cup \{y\}$ is a proper admissible superset of E , contradiction to E being semi-stable in (A, R)). Let $Y' = E \cap Y$. By assumption, there is $Z' \subseteq Z$ such that $M = Y' \cup Z'$ is a model of φ . We show that $D = Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^* \cup M \cup \{\bar{x} \mid x \notin M\} \cup \{\varphi\}$ is admissible: D is conflict-free by construction. D is admissible since φ defends $v \in Z' \cup \{\bar{z} \mid z \notin Z'\}$ against $\bar{\varphi}$; moreover, each argument $v \in X$ defends itself against \bar{v} and vice versa; also, $M \cup \{\bar{x} \mid x \notin M\}$ defends φ against each attack from clause-arguments $c \in C$ since φ is satisfiable: For each clause $c \in C$, there is either $v \in M$ with $v \in C$ or $\neg v \in C$ for some $v \notin M$. In the first case, $(v, c) \in R$ and $v \in E$, in the latter, $(\bar{v}, c) \in R$ and $\bar{v} \in E$. Now observe that E and D both contain $Y' \cup \{\bar{y} \mid y \notin Y'\} \cup Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^*$ (by construction of D), that is, D properly extends E . Since φ is not contained in $E \cup E^+$ ($\varphi \notin E$ since $claim(E) = S$ and $\varphi \notin S$ and $\varphi \notin E^+$ since the only attacker of φ are clause-arguments $c \in C$), it follows that $E \cup E^+ \subset D \cup D^+$, that is, we have found an admissible set D having range larger than E . Consequently, $S \notin sem_c(F)$.

Now assume $S \notin sem_c(F)$. Consider an arbitrary subset $Y' \subseteq Y$. We show that there is some $Z' \subseteq Z$ such that $Y' \cup Z'$ is a model of φ . Let $E = Y' \cup \{\bar{y} \mid y \notin Y'\} \cup Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^*$ (and observe that $claim(E) = S$). By assumption $S \notin sem_c(F)$ we have that E is not semi-stable in (A, R) , that is, there is some $D \in adm((A, R))$ with $D \cup D^+ \supset E \cup E^+$. In particular, we have $D \supset E$ since each argument $d_v \in E^+$, $v \in Y \cup \bar{Y}$, has precisely one non-self-attacking attacker (namely the argument v). Thus, $Y' \cup \{\bar{y} \mid y \notin Y'\} \subseteq D$; moreover, D contains each argument $v \in Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^*$ since each such argument is unattacked. It follows that $\varphi \in D$: Since $E \subset D$, there is some $v \in A \setminus E$ such that $v \in D$. Clearly, $v \in \{\varphi\} \cup Z \cup \bar{Z}$ since each remaining argument is either self-attacking or attacked by E (and thus also by D). In case $v = \varphi$, we are done; in case $v \in Z \cup \bar{Z}$, we have $\varphi \in D$ by admissibility of D (observe that φ is the only attacker of $\bar{\varphi}$). Consequently, D defends φ against each attack from each clause-argument $c \in C$. Now, let $Z' = Z \cap D$. We show that $M = Y' \cup Z'$ is a model of φ . Consider some arbitrary clause $c \in C$. Since $\varphi \in D$, there is some $v \in D$ such that $(v, c) \in R$ by admissibility of D . In case $v \in X$, we have $v \in M$ and $v \in c$ by construction of F ; similarly, in case $v \in \bar{X}$ we have $v \notin M$ and $\neg v \in c$. Thus, c is satisfied by M . Since c was chosen arbitrarily it follows that φ is satisfiable. We have shown that Φ is valid. \square




Figure 14: Reduction of the QBF_{\forall}^2 instance $\forall a \exists b ((a \vee b) \wedge (\neg a \vee b))$ to an instance of $\text{Ver}_{sem,1}^{PCAF}$.

Lemma 10. $\text{Ver}_{stg,1}^{PCAF}$ is Σ_2^P -hard, even for transitive preferences.

Proof. We provide a reduction from QBF_{\forall}^2 to the complementary problem: For an instance $\Phi = \forall Y \exists Z \varphi(Y, Z)$ of QBF_{\forall}^2 where φ is given by a set of clauses C over atoms in $X = Y \cup Z$, we construct a CAF $F = (A, R, \text{claim})$ as well as a set of claims S :

- $A = \{\bar{\varphi}\} \cup C \cup X \cup \bar{X} \cup Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^* \cup \{d_v \mid v \in Y \cup \bar{Y}\}$, where $\bar{X} = \{\bar{x} \mid x \in X\}$, $Y^* = \{y^* \mid y \in Y\}$, and $\bar{Y}^* = \{\bar{y}^* \mid y \in Y\}$;
- $R = \{(x, \bar{x}), (\bar{x}, x) \mid x \in X\} \cup \{(x, c) \mid x \in c, c \in C\} \cup \{(\bar{x}, c) \mid \neg x \in c, c \in C\} \cup \{(c, c) \mid c \in C\} \cup \{(d_v, d_v), (v, d_v) \mid v \in Y \cup \bar{Y}\} \cup \{(\bar{\varphi}, c) \mid c \in C\} \cup \{(z, \bar{\varphi}), (\bar{z}, \bar{\varphi}) \mid z \in Z\}$;
- $\text{claim}(v^*) = v$ for $v \in Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^*$ and $\text{claim}(v) = v$ else;
- $S = Y \cup \bar{Y} \cup \{\bar{\varphi}\}$.

Figure 15 illustrates the above construction. The constructed CAF is contained in $\mathcal{R}_1\text{-CAF}_{tr}$ since all paths in $\text{wfp}(F) = \{(v^*, v) \mid v \in Y \cup \bar{Y}\}$ are of length 1 (only arguments in $Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^*$ have outgoing edges in $\text{wfp}(F)$). It remains to verify the correctness of the reduction, i.e., we will show that $S \notin \text{stg}_c(F)$ iff Φ is valid. The proof proceeds similar as the proof of Proposition 9.

First assume Φ is valid. Towards a contradiction, assume $S \in \text{stg}_c(F)$ and consider a stg -realization E of S . Clearly, $Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^* \subseteq E$; moreover, E contains either y or \bar{y} for each $y \in Y$ (otherwise $E \cup \{y\}$ is a proper conflict-free superset of E , contradiction to E being stage in (A, R)). Let $Y' = E \cap Y$. By assumption, there is $Z' \subseteq Z$ such that $M = Y' \cup Z'$ is a model of φ . Now, let $D = Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^* \cup M \cup \{\bar{x} \mid x \notin M\}$; clearly, D is conflict-free by construction. We will prove that $D \cup D^+ \supset E \cup E^+$: First observe that $v \in D \cap E$ for every $v \in A$ with $\text{claim}(v) \in Y \cup \bar{Y}$ ($Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^* \cup Y' \subseteq E \cap D$ by definition, and $\{\bar{y} \mid y \notin Y'\} \subseteq E$ since E contains either y or \bar{y} for each $y \in Y$ as outlined above; notice that each other argument having claim $cl \in Y \cup \bar{Y}$ is attacked by $Y' \cup \{\bar{y} \mid y \notin Y'\}$ and

thus cannot be contained in D or in E). Moreover, we have that each $c \in C$ is attacked by D since M is a model of φ : Consider an arbitrary clause $c \in C$, then there is either $x \in M$ with $x \in c$ (in this case, $(x, c) \in R$), or there is some $x \in X$ with $x \notin M$ and $\neg x \in c$ (then $(\bar{x}, c) \in R$ and $\bar{x} \in D$). In both cases, we have that D attacks c . Furthermore, $\bar{\varphi} \in D^+$ since for each $z \in Z$, either $z \in D$ or $\bar{z} \in D$ by definition of D . Thus $D \cup D^+ \supset E \cup E^+$, contradiction to the assumption.

Now assume $S \notin \text{stg}_c(F)$ and consider an arbitrary subset $Y' \subseteq Y$. We show that there is $Z' \subseteq Z$ such that $Y' \cup Z'$ is a model of φ . Let $E = Y' \cup \{\bar{y} \mid y \notin Y'\} \cup Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^*$ (and observe that $\text{claim}(E) = S \setminus \{\bar{\varphi}\}$). By assumption we have that $E \cup \{\bar{\varphi}\}$ is not stage in (A, R) , that is, there is some $D \in \text{cf}((A, R))$ with $D \cup D^+ \supset E \cup \{\bar{\varphi}\} \cup (E \cup \{\bar{\varphi}\})^+$. We can assume that $D \supset E$ since each argument $d_v \in E^+$, $v \in Y \cup \bar{Y}$, has precisely one non-self-attacking attacker (namely the argument v) thus $Y' \cup \{\bar{y} \mid y \notin Y'\} \subseteq D$; moreover, D contains each argument $v \in Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^*$ since each such argument is unattacked. Moreover observe that $\bar{\varphi} \notin D$ since each set of the form $Y' \cup \{\bar{y} \mid y \notin Y'\} \cup Y^* \cup \bar{Y}^* \cup \{\bar{\varphi}\}$ is naive in (A, R) (i.e., it is a maximal conflict-free set since $\bar{\varphi}$ attacks each literal over atoms in Z as well as every clause-argument $c \in C$) and thus cannot be extended any further. It follows that there is some argument in $E \cup \{\bar{\varphi}\}$ which is contained in the range of D rather than in D - since $D \supset E$ as outlined above we conclude $\bar{\varphi} \notin D$ (and thus $\bar{\varphi} \in D^+$). Also, we have that D attacks each clause-argument $c \in C$ since $c \in (E \cup \{\bar{\varphi}\})^+$, and, moreover, since each such argument is self-attacking. Now, let $Z' = Z \cap D$. We show that $M = Y' \cup Z'$ is a model of φ . Consider some arbitrary clause $c \in C$. Then there is some argument $v \in D$ such that $(v, c) \in R$. As outlined above, $v \neq \bar{\varphi}$ since $\bar{\varphi}$ is not contained in D . Consequently, we have $v \in X \cup \bar{X}$. In case $v \in X$ we have $v \in M \cap c$, in case $v \in \bar{X}$ we have $\neg v \in c$ by definition of R and $v \notin M$ - in every case, the clause c is satisfied by M . As c was chosen arbitrary it follows that φ is satisfiable and thus Φ is valid. \square




Figure 15: Reduction of the QBF_{\forall}^2 instance $\forall a \exists b((a \vee b) \wedge (\neg a \vee b))$ to an instance of $\text{Ver}_{\text{stg},1}^{\text{PCAF}}$.

Proposition 12. $\text{Ver}_{\sigma,i \in \{2,3,4\}}^{\text{PCAF}}$ is in P for $\sigma \in \{\text{cf}, \text{naive}\}$.

Proof. Let $F = (A, R, \text{claim}, \succ)$ be a PCAF, C a set of claims, and $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. To check whether $C \in \text{cf}_p^i(F)$, by Lemma 1, it suffices to check whether $C \in$

$cf_c((A, R, claim))$ which can be done in polynomial time on well-formed CAFs (cf. Table 2). Analogously, to check $C \in naive_p^i(F)$ it suffices to check if $C \in naive_c((A, R, claim))$, which can also be done in polynomial time on well-formed CAFs. \square

Lemma 2. *Let F be a PCAF, C be a set of claims and $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. We have that $C \in cf_p^i(F)$ iff $claim(E_1^i(C)) = C$. Moreover, if $C \in cf_p^i(F)$ then $E_1^i(C)$ is the unique maximal conflict-free set S in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$ such that $claim(S) = C$.*

Proof. Let $F = (A, R, claim, \succ)$ be a PCAF. From [Dvořák and Woltran, 2020, Lemma 1] we know that $C \in cf_c((A, R, claim))$ iff $claim(E_1^i(C)) = C$, as well as that, if $C \in cf_c((A, R, claim))$ then $E_1^i(C)$ is the unique maximal conflict-free set S in $(A, R, claim)$ with $claim(S) = C$. From this and our Lemma 1, our result follows immediately. \square

Lemma 3. *Let F be a PCAF, C be a set of claims and $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. We have that $C \in adm_p^i(F)$ iff $claim(E_*^i(C)) = C$. Moreover, if $C \in adm_p^i(F)$ then $E_*^i(C)$ is the unique maximal admissible set S in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$ such that $claim(S) = C$.*

Proof. Let $F = (A, R, claim, \succ)$ be a PCAF, C a set of claims, and $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. Assume $claim(E_*^i(C)) = C$. By construction, $E_*^i(C) \in adm(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$, and thus $C \in adm_p^i(F)$.

Now assume $C \in adm_p^i(F)$. Then there exists $S \subseteq A$ such that $claim(S) = C$ and $S \in adm(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$. Furthermore, $C \in cf_p^i(F)$ and therefore, by Lemma 2, $S \subseteq E_1^i(C)$. By construction, $E_*^i(C) \subseteq E_1^i(C)$. Moreover, any $x \in S$ is defended by S in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$ and therefore also by $E_1^i(C)$. Thus, by definition, $x \in E_2^i(C)$. By the same argument, if $x \in S$ and $x \in E_k^i(C)$ then $x \in E_{k+1}^i(C)$. We can conclude that $S \subseteq E_*^i(C) \subseteq E_1^i(C)$ and thus $claim(E_*^i(C)) = C$. By the above we have that $E_*^i(C)$ is admissible and each $S \subseteq A$ such that $claim(S) = C$ is a subset of $E_*^i(C)$. In other words $E_*^i(C)$ is the unique maximal admissible set S in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$ such that $claim(S) = C$. \square

Proposition 13. *$Ver_{\sigma, i \in \{2, 3, 4\}}^{PCAF}$ is in P for $\sigma \in \{adm, stb\}$. It is coNP-complete for $\sigma \in \{prf, sem, stg\}$, even when considering only transitive preferences.*

We split the proof into the following two Lemmas:

Lemma 11. *$Ver_{\sigma, i \in \{2, 3, 4\}}^{PCAF}$ is in P for $\sigma \in \{adm, stb\}$.*

Proof. Let $F = (A, R, claim, \succ)$ be a PCAF, let C be a set of claims, and let $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. We can compute $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$, $E_1^i(C)$, and $E_*^i(C)$ in polynomial time.

For *adm*, by Lemma 3, it suffices to test whether $claim(E_*^i(C)) = C$.

For *stb*, we first check whether $C \in adm_p^i(F)$. If not, $C \notin stb_p^i(F)$. If yes, then, by Lemma 3, $claim(E_*^i(C)) = C$. We can check in polynomial time if $E_*^i(C) \in stb(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$. If yes, we are done. If no, then there is an argument x that is not in $E_*^i(C)$ but is also not attacked by $E_*^i(C)$ in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$. Moreover, there can be no other $S \in stb(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$ with $claim(S) = C$ since for any such S we would have $S \subseteq E_*^i(C)$, which would imply that S does not attack x and that $x \notin S$. \square

Lemma 12. *$Ver_{\sigma, i \in \{2, 3, 4\}}^{PCAF}$ is coNP-complete for $\sigma \in \{prf, sem, stg\}$, even for transitive preferences.*

Proof. Let $F = (A, R, \text{claim}, \succ)$ be a PCAF, let C be a set of claims, and let $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$.

coNP-hardness for $\sigma \in \{\text{prf}, \text{sem}, \text{stg}\}$ follows from known properties of wfCAFs (see Table 2). For membership regarding prf , we first check if $C \in \text{adm}_p^i(F)$. If not, $C \notin \text{prf}_p^i(F)$. If yes, then $\text{claim}(E_*^i(C)) = C$. We can check in coNP if $E_*^i(C) \in \text{prf}(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$. If yes, we are done. If no, then, by Lemma 3, there can be no other $S \in \text{prf}(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$ with $\text{claim}(S) = C$, since S would have to be admissible in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$ and therefore $S \subseteq E_*^i(C)$.

For sem , we also first check if $C \in \text{adm}_p^i(F)$. If not, $C \notin \text{sem}_p^i(F)$. If yes, then $\text{claim}(E_*^i(C)) = C$. We can check in coNP if $E_*^i(C) \in \text{sem}(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$. If yes, we are done. If no, then, by Lemma 3, there can be no other $S \in \text{prf}(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$ with $\text{claim}(S) = C$, since S would have to be admissible in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$ and therefore $S \subseteq E_*^i(C)$. As $\text{sem}(\mathcal{R}_i(F)) \subseteq \text{prf}(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$ we obtain that there is no other $S \in \text{sem}(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$ with $\text{claim}(S) = C$.

For stg , we first check if $C \in \text{naive}_p^i(F)$. If not, $C \notin \text{stg}_p^i(F)$. If yes, then $\text{claim}(E_1^i(C)) = C$. We can check in coNP if $E_1^i(C) \in \text{stg}(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$. If yes, we are done. If no, then, by Lemma 2, there can be no other $S \in \text{naive}(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$ with $\text{claim}(S) = C$, since S would have to be conflict-free in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$ and therefore $S \subseteq E_1^i(C)$. As $\text{stg}(\mathcal{R}_i(F)) \subseteq \text{naive}(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$ we obtain that there is no other $S \in \text{stg}(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$ with $\text{claim}(S) = C$. \square

Proposition 14. $Ver_{\text{com},3}^{\text{PCAF}}$ is in P. $Ver_{\text{com},i \in \{2,4\}}^{\text{PCAF}}$ is NP-complete, even for transitive preferences.

Proof. P-membership of $Ver_{\text{com},3}^{\text{PCAF}}$ is shown below (Lemma 13). NP-membership follows from results for general CAFs (cf. Table 2). We show NP-hardness of $Ver_{\text{com},2}^{\text{PCAF}}$ and $Ver_{\text{com},4}^{\text{PCAF}}$ separately below (Lemmas 14 and 15). \square

Lemma 13. $Ver_{\text{com},3}^{\text{PCAF}} \in \text{P}$.

Proof. Let $F = (A, R, \text{claim}, \succ)$ be a PCAF and let C be a set of claims. For com and $i = 3$, we first check if $C \in \text{adm}_p^i(F)$. If not, $C \notin \text{com}_p^i(F)$. If yes, then $\text{claim}(E_*^i(C)) = C$. We can check in polynomial time if $E_*^i(C) \in \text{com}(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$. If no, then $E_*^i(C)$ defends some $x \notin E_*^i(C)$ in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$. Towards a contradiction, assume there is some $S \subseteq A$ such that $S \in \text{com}(\mathcal{R}_i(F))$ and $\text{claim}(S) = C$. By Lemma 3, $S \subseteq E_*^i(C)$, which implies $x \notin S$. Then S can not defend x in $\mathcal{R}_i(F)$, i.e., there must be y and z such that $y \in E_*^i(C)$, $y \notin S$, $(z, x) \in \mathcal{R}_i(F)$, and $(y, z) \in \mathcal{R}_i(F)$. Then also $(y, z) \in F$ by the definition of Reduction 3. But there must also be some $y' \in S$ with $\text{claim}(y') = \text{claim}(y)$, and since the underlying CAF of F is well-formed there must be $(y', z) \in F$. Since there cannot be $(y', z) \in \mathcal{R}_i(F)$, otherwise S would defend x , it has to be that $z \succ y'$. For Reduction 3 this further requires $(z, y') \in F$. Crucially, $(z, y') \in \mathcal{R}_i(F)$. But then S must be defended from z , i.e., there must be some $w \in S$ such that $(w, z) \in \mathcal{R}_i(F)$. But this means that S defends x , i.e., S is not complete. Contradiction. \square

Lemma 14. $Ver_{\text{com},2}^{\text{PCAF}}$ is NP-hard, even for transitive preferences.

Proof. Let φ be an arbitrary instance of 3-SAT given as a set C of clauses over variables X and let $\overline{X} = \{\overline{x} \mid x \in X\}$. We construct a PCAF $F = (A, R, \text{claim}, \succ)$ as well as a set of claims S :

- $A = \{\varphi\} \cup C \cup X \cup \overline{X} \cup \{d_x \mid x \in X\} \cup \{d_x^j \mid x \in X \cup \overline{X}, 1 \leq j \leq 4\}$;
- $R = \{(c, \varphi) \mid c \in C\} \cup \{(c, c) \mid c \in C\} \cup \{(c, x) \mid x \in c, c \in C\} \cup \{(c, \overline{x}) \mid \neg x \in c, c \in C\} \cup \{(d_x^1, x), (d_x^1, d_x^2), (d_x^3, d_x^2), (d_x^3, x), (d_x^4, x) \mid x \in X \cup \overline{X}\} \cup \{(d_x^4, d_x), (d_{\overline{x}}^4, d_x) \mid x \in X\}$;
- $claim(x) = claim(\overline{x}) = claim(d_x^2) = claim(d_{\overline{x}}^2) = x$ for $x \in X$, $claim(v) = v$ else;
- $x \succ c$, $x \succ d_x^1$, $x \succ d_x^4$, $d_x^2 \succ d_x^3$ for all $x \in X \cup \overline{X}$ and all $c \in C$;
- $S = X \cup \{\varphi\}$.

Figure 16 illustrates the above construction. It remains to show that φ is satisfiable if and only if $S \in com_c(\mathcal{R}_2(F))$.




Figure 16: $\mathcal{R}_2(F)$ from the proof of Lemma 14, with $\varphi = ((a \vee b) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b))$. Attacks drawn in gray/thick have been reversed by Reduction 2.

Assume φ is satisfiable. Then there is an interpretation I such that $I \models \varphi$. Let $E = \{x, d_x^2 \mid x \in X, x \in I\} \cup \{\overline{x}, d_{\overline{x}}^2 \mid x \in X, x \notin I\} \cup \{\varphi\}$. Clearly, $claim(E) = S$. Furthermore, E defends φ in $\mathcal{R}_2(F)$ since each clause is satisfied by I , and thus each clause argument c_j is attacked by some x (or \overline{x}) in E . For each variable x , if $x \in E$, then x defends d_x^2 and d_x^2 defends x . Moreover, if $x \in E$, then $\overline{x} \notin E$ and none of d_x , \overline{x} , or $d_{\overline{x}}^j$ with $1 \leq j \leq 4$ is defended by E . Analogously for the case that $\overline{x} \in E$. Thus, E is admissible, and contains all arguments it defends, i.e., $E \in com(\mathcal{R}_2(F))$.

Assume $S \in com_c(\mathcal{R}_2(F))$. Then there is $E \subseteq A$ such that $claim(E) = S$ and $E \in com(\mathcal{R}_2(F))$. For each $x \in X$, at least one of $x, \overline{x}, d_x^2, d_{\overline{x}}^2$ must be contained in E . In fact, if $x \in E$, then also $d_x^2 \in E$ and vice versa. Analogous for \overline{x} and $d_{\overline{x}}^2$. However, it can not be that $x \in E$ and $\overline{x} \in E$, otherwise d_x would

be defended by E and we would have $claim(E) \neq S$. Thus, for each $x \in X$, there is either $x \in E$ or $\bar{x} \in E$, but not both. Furthermore, E defends φ , i.e., E attacks all clause arguments c_j . Therefore, $I \models \varphi$ for $I = X \cap E$. \square

Lemma 15. $Ver_{com,4}^{PCAF}$ is NP-hard, even for transitive preferences.

Proof. This proof is similar to that of Lemma 14. Let φ be an arbitrary instance of 3-SAT given as a set C of clauses over variables X and let $\bar{X} = \{\bar{x} \mid x \in X\}$. We construct a PCAF $F = (A, R, claim, \succ)$ as well as a set of claims S :

- $A = \{\varphi\} \cup C \cup X \cup \bar{X} \cup \{d_x \mid x \in X\} \cup \{d_x^1 \mid x \in X \cup \bar{X}\}$;
- $R = \{(c, \varphi) \mid c \in C\} \cup \{(c, c) \mid c \in C\} \cup$
 $\{(c, x) \mid x \in c, c \in C\} \cup$
 $\{(c, \bar{x}) \mid \neg x \in c, c \in C\} \cup$
 $\{(d_x^1, x) \mid x \in X \cup \bar{X}\} \cup$
 $\{(d_x^1, d_x), (d_{\bar{x}}^1, d_x) \mid x \in X\}$;
- $claim(x) = claim(\bar{x}) = x$ for $x \in X$,
 $claim(v) = v$ otherwise;
- $x \succ c, x \succ d_x^1$ for all $x \in X \cup \bar{X}$ and all $c \in C$;
- $S = X \cup \{\varphi\}$.

Figure 17 illustrates the above construction. It remains to show that φ is satisfiable if and only if $S \in com_c(\mathcal{R}_4(F))$.




Figure 17: $\mathcal{R}_4(F)$ from the proof of Lemma 15, with $\varphi = ((a \vee b) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b))$. Symmetric attacks drawn in gray/thick have been introduced by Reduction 4.

Assume φ is satisfiable. Then there is an interpretation I such that $I \models \varphi$. Let $E = \{x \mid x \in X, x \in I\} \cup \{\bar{x} \mid x \in X, x \notin I\} \cup \{\varphi\}$. Clearly, $claim(E) = S$. Furthermore, E defends φ in $\mathcal{R}_4(F)$ since each clause is satisfied by I , and thus each clause argument c_j is attacked by some x (or \bar{x}) in E . Each variable $x \in X$ clearly defends itself. Moreover, if $x \in E$, then $\bar{x} \notin E$ and none of d_x, \bar{x} , or $d_{\bar{x}}^1$ is defended by E . Analogously for the case that $\bar{x} \in E$. Thus, E is admissible, and contains all arguments it defends, i.e., $E \in com(\mathcal{R}_4(F))$.

Assume $S \in com_c(\mathcal{R}_4(F))$. Then there is $E \subseteq A$ such that $claim(E) = S$ and $E \in com(\mathcal{R}_4(F))$. For each $x \in X$, at least one of x, \bar{x} must be contained in E . In fact, it can not be that $x \in E$ and $\bar{x} \in E$, otherwise d_x would be defended by E and we would have $claim(E) \neq S$. Thus, for each $x \in X$, there is either $x \in E$ or $\bar{x} \in E$, but not both. Furthermore, E defends φ , i.e., E attacks all clause arguments c_j . Thus, $I \models \varphi$ for $I = X \cap E$. \square

B Efficient enumeration of claim-extensions

In this section, we briefly discuss how our findings can be used for efficient enumeration of claim-extensions. For CAFs obtainable by Reduction 2, 3, and 4, we present an fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) algorithm for enumerating extensions that scales exponential with the number k of different claims in the given CAF but only polynomial in its size n .

Proposition 15. *For $\sigma \in \{cf, adm, naive, stb, prf, sem, stg\}$, $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$, and for $\sigma = com$ in case $i = 3$, there is a polynomial $poly(\cdot)$ such that enumerating all σ -extensions of a CAF $(A, R, claim) \in \mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}$ can be done in time in $\mathcal{O}(4^k \cdot poly(n))$, with $|A| = n$, $|claim(A)| = k$.*

Proof. First recall that for CAFs $F \in \mathcal{R}_i\text{-CAF}$, $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ for the semantics $\sigma \in \{cf, adm, naive, stb\}$ as well as for complete semantics for CAFs in $\mathcal{R}_3\text{-CAF}$, the verification problem is in P (cf. Table 4). Thus iterating through all 2^k many sets $C \subseteq claim(A)$ and checking whether $C \in \sigma(F)$ can be done in time $\mathcal{O}(2^k \cdot poly(n))$.

For the remaining semantics, the algorithm builds heavily on the existence and polynomial-time computability of unique maximal realizations (i.e., sets of arguments $E \subseteq A$ with $claim(E) = C$ for a given claim-set C) for conflict-free and admissible claim-sets: Using Lemmata 2 and 3, it suffices to compute $E_1^i(C)$ resp. $E_*^i(C)$ to verify conflict-freeness resp. admissibility of a claim-set C ; moreover, $E_1^i(C)$ resp. $E_*^i(C)$ is the unique maximal conflict-free resp. admissible realization of C in F . Computing all conflict-free resp. admissible claim-sets along with their unique \subseteq -maximal realizations lies thus in $\mathcal{O}(2^k \cdot poly(n))$ as it suffices to loop through all sets $C \subseteq claim(A)$.

For $\sigma = prf$, we compute all preferred argument-extensions of the underlying AF (A, R) . This requires two loops over all unique maximal admissible realizations of the admissible claim-sets of F ; the overall runtime lies thus in $\mathcal{O}((2^k)^2 \cdot poly(n)) = \mathcal{O}(4^k \cdot poly(n))$. We note that for $i = 3$, we obtain a slightly improved runtime by exploiting I-maximality: When iterating through all $C \subseteq claim(A)$, consider larger sets first; if an admissible set C is found, exclude all subsets from further inspection. This procedure runs in time in $\mathcal{O}(2^k \cdot poly(n))$.

For $\sigma \in \{stg, sem\}$ we compute the range for the extensions by adding all attacked arguments to $E_1^i(C)$ resp. $E_*^i(C)$. Finally, we eliminate all sets for which the range is not \subseteq -maximal (analogous to the case for preferred semantics). This algorithm runs in $\mathcal{O}(4^k \cdot poly(n))$. \square

As a consequence, we obtain FPT procedures for deciding credulous and skeptical acceptance as well as for verification of extensions for the respective CAF classes.

Proposition 16. *For $\sigma \in \{cf, adm, naive, stb, prf, sem, stg\}$, $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$, and for $\sigma = com$ in case $i = 3$, $Cred_{\sigma,i}^{PCAF}$, $Skept_{\sigma,i}^{PCAF}$, and $Ver_{\sigma,i}^{PCAF}$ can be solved in time in $\mathcal{O}(4^k \cdot poly(n))$ for CAFs $(A, R, claim)$ with $|claim(A)| \leq k$.*