



HAL
open science

Decision Support for Agri-Food Chains: A Reverse Engineering Argumentation-Based Approach

Rallou Thomopoulos, Madalina Croitoru, Nouredine Tamani

► **To cite this version:**

Rallou Thomopoulos, Madalina Croitoru, Nouredine Tamani. Decision Support for Agri-Food Chains: A Reverse Engineering Argumentation-Based Approach. *Ecological Informatics*, 2015, 26, pp.182-191. 10.1016/j.ecoinf.2014.05.010 . lirmm-01242932

HAL Id: lirmm-01242932

<https://hal-lirmm.ccsd.cnrs.fr/lirmm-01242932>

Submitted on 14 Dec 2015

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Accepted Manuscript


Decision Support for Agri-Food Chains: A Reverse Engineering
Argumentation-Based Approach

Rallou Thomopoulos, Madalina Croitoru, Nouredine Tamani

PII: S1574-9541(14)00056-9
DOI: doi: [10.1016/j.ecoinf.2014.05.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2014.05.010)
Reference: ECOINF 482

To appear in: *Ecological Informatics*

Received date: 24 December 2013
Revised date: 25 May 2014
Accepted date: 27 May 2014



Please cite this article as: Thomopoulos, Rallou, Croitoru, Madalina, Tamani, Nouredine, Decision Support for Agri-Food Chains: A Reverse Engineering Argumentation-Based Approach, *Ecological Informatics* (2014), doi: [10.1016/j.ecoinf.2014.05.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2014.05.010)

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Decision Support for Agri-Food Chains: A Reverse Engineering Argumentation-Based Approach

Rallou Thomopoulos^{a,b,*}, Madalina Croitoru^b, Nouredine Tamani^b

^a*IATE Joint Research Unit, UMR1208, CIRAD-INRA-Supagro-Univ. Montpellier II, 2 place P. Viala, F-34060 Montpellier cedex 1, France*

^b*INRIA GraphIK, LIRMM, 161 rue Ada, F-34392 Montpellier cedex 5, France*

Abstract

Evaluating food quality is a complex process since it relies on numerous criteria historically grouped into four main types: nutritional, sensorial, practical and hygienic qualities. They may be completed by other emerging preoccupations such as the environmental impact, economic phenomena, etc. However, all these aspects of quality and their various components are not always compatible and their simultaneous improvement is a problem that sometimes has no obvious solution, which corresponds to a real issue for decision making. This paper proposes a decision support method guided by the objectives defined for the end products of an agrifood chain. It is materialized by a backward chaining approach based on argumentation.

Keywords: decision support, knowledge representation, argumentation, reverse engineering, backward chaining, agrifood chain control, goal, viewpoint

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: rallou.thomopoulos@supagro.inra.fr (Rallou Thomopoulos),
madalina.croitoru@lirmm.fr (Madalina Croitoru), nouredine.tamani@lirmm.fr
(Nouredine Tamani)

Preprint submitted to Ecological Informatics

May 25, 2014

1. Introduction

In agrifood chains, the products traditionally go through the intermediate stages of processing, storage, transport, packaging and reach the consumer (the demand) from the producer (the supply). More recently, due to an increase in quality constraints, several parties are involved in production process, such as consumers, industrials, health and sanitary authorities, etc. expressing their requirements on the final product as different point of views which could be conflicting. The notion of reverse engineering control, in which the demand (and not the supply) sets the specifications of desired products and it is up to the supply to adapt and find its ways to respond, can be considered in this case.

In this article, we discuss two aspects of this problem. First, we accept the idea that specifications cannot be established and several complementary points of view - possibly contradictory - can be expressed (nutritional, environmental, taste, etc.). We then need to assess their compatibility (or incompatibility) and identify solutions satisfying a maximum set of viewpoints. To this end we propose a logical framework based on argumentation and introduce a method of decision making based on backward chaining for the bread industry.

Since a joint argumentation - decision support approach is highly relevant to the food sector (Thomopoulos et al., 2009), the contribution of the paper is twofold. First we present a real use case of an argumentation process in the agrifood domain. Second we introduce the notion of viewpoint / goal in this setting based on the notion of backwards chaining reasoning and show how to use those techniques in a concrete application.

1
2
3
4
5 The main alternative method to deal with the problem is the multicri-
6 teria decision approach. However multicriteria decision aims at evaluating
7 several alternative options, whereas argumentation-based decision focuses on
8 whether several options make sense together, which is a different perspective,
9 addressed in this paper. Moreover, multicriteria decision is not connected to
10 the backward chaining procedure as the argumentative approach is, by con-
11 struction of the arguments, as will be explained in Section 5.2.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 In Section 2, we introduce the real scenario considered in the application.
19 In Section 3, we motivate our technical and modeling choices. In Section 4,
20 the developed approach is introduced. It relies on an instantiation of a logic
21 based argumentation framework based on a specific fragment of first order
22 logic. In Section 5, we explain the technical results that ensure the soundness
23 and completeness of our agronomy application method. In Section 6, some
24 evaluation results are presented. Finally, Section 7 concludes the paper.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **2. Scenario**

33 The case of study considered in this paper relates to the debate around the
34 change of ash content in flour used for common French bread. Various actors
35 of the agronomy sector are concerned, in particular the Ministry for Health
36 through its recommendations within the framework of the PNNS (“National
37 Program for Nutrition and Health”), the millers, the bakers, the nutritionists
38 and the consumers.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The PNNS recommends to privilege the whole-grain cereal products and
48 in particular to pass to a common bread of T80 type, i.e made with flour
49 containing an ash content (mineral matter rate) of 0.8%, instead of the type
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 T65 (0.65% of mineral matter) currently used. Increasing the ash content
6
7 comes down to using a more complete flour, since mineral matter is concen-
8
9 trated in the peripheral layers of the wheat grain, as well as a good amount
10
11 of components of nutritional interest (vitamins, fibers). However, the pe-
12
13 ripheral layers of the grain are also exposed to the phytosanitary products,
14
15 which does not make them advisable from a health point of view, unless one
16
17 uses organic flour.

18
19 Other arguments (and of various nature) are in favour or discredit whole-
20
21 grain bread. From an organoleptic point of view for example, the bread loses
22
23 out in its “being crusty”. From a nutritional point of view, the argument
24
25 according to which the fibers are beneficial for health is discussed, some
26
27 fibers could irritate the digestive system. From an economic point of view,
28
29 the bakers fear selling less bread, because whole-grain bread increases satiety
30
31 – which is beneficial from a nutritional point of view, for the regulation of
32
33 the appetite and the fight against food imbalances and pathologies. However
34
35 whole-grain bread requires also less flour and more water for its production,
36
37 thus reducing the cost. The millers also fear a decrease in the quality of the
38
39 technical methods used in the flour production.

40
41 Beyond the polemic on the choice between two alternatives (T65 or T80),
42
43 one can take the debate further by distinguishing the various points of view
44
45 concerned, identifying the desirable target characteristics, estimating the
46
47 means of reaching that point. The contribution of this paper is showing
48
49 how using argumentation can help towards such practical goals.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

3. Motivation

In this paper we will elicit the points of view and the desirable target characteristics by the means of interviews with agronomy experts. Once the target characteristics identified, finding the means of reaching them will be done automatically by a combination of reverse engineering and argumentation. The reverse engineering will be used in order to find the complete set of actions to take towards a given characteristic, for all characteristics. In certain cases the actions to take will be inconsistent. Argumentation will then be employed in order to identify actions that can be accepted together.

3.1. Reverse Engineering

While reverse engineering has been widely employed in other Computer Science domains such as multi agent systems or requirements engineering (e.g. Brunelière et al. (2014)), it is quite a novel methodology when applied in agronomy. In agrifood chains, the products traditionally go through the intermediate stages of processing, storage, transport, packaging and reach the consumer (the demand) from the producer (the supply). It is only recently, due to an increase in quality constraints, that the notion of reverse engineering control has emerged (Perrot et al., 2011). In this case the demand (and not the supply) sets the specifications of desired products and it is up to the supply to adapt and find its ways to respond. In what follows, starting from the desired target criteria for the final product, the methods allowing one to identify ways to achieve these criteria (by intervention on the various stages of the supply chain) are named “reverse engineering”.

Reverse engineering is known to be challenging from a methodological

1
2
3
4
5 viewpoint. This is due to two main aspects. First, the difficulty of defining
6 the specifications for the expected finished product. The desired quality cri-
7 teria are multiple, questionable, and not necessarily compatible. The second
8 difficulty lies in the fact that the impact of different steps of food process-
9 ing and their order is not completely known. Some steps are more studied
10 than others, several successive steps can have opposite effects (or unknown
11 effects), the target criteria may be outside of the characteristics of products.
12 Second, reconciling different viewpoints involved in the food sector still raises
13 unaddressed questions. The problem does not simply consist in addressing
14 a multi-criteria optimisation problem (Bouyssou et al., 2009): the domain
15 experts would need to be able to justify why a certain decision (or set of
16 possible decisions) is taken.
17
18

29 *3.2. Argumentation*

30
31 Argumentation is a reasoning model based on the construction and the
32 evaluation of interacting arguments. It has been applied to nonmonotonic
33 reasoning, decision making, or for modeling different types of dialogues in-
34 cluding negotiation. Most of the models developed for these applications are
35 grounded on the abstract argumentation framework proposed by Dung in
36 Dung (1995). This framework consists of a set of arguments and a binary
37 relation on that set, expressing conflicts among arguments. An argument
38 gives a reason for believing a claim, for doing an action.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Argumentation theory in general (Dung, 1995; Besnard and Hunter, 2008;
47 Rahwan and Simari, 2009) is actively pursued in the literature. Some ap-
48 proaches combine argumentation and multi criteria decision making (Am-
49 goud and Prade, 2009).
50
51
52
53
54

1
2
3
4
5 Value based Argumentation Frameworks (Bench-Capon, 2003a) have been
6 proposed, where the strength of an argument corresponds to the values it pro-
7 motes. What we call viewpoint later on in this paper would then correspond
8 to the notion of audience in such setting. Although intuitive, this approach
9 is not adapted in the case of the considered application. Here a value can be
10 “split” into several audiences: there could be contradictory goals even from
11 the same viewpoint. The notion of viewpoint and goals introduced in this
12 setting also remind those proposed by (Assaghir et al., 2011).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 *3.2.1. Logic-based Argumentation*

22
23 In this paper we present a methodology combining reverse engineering
24 and logical based argumentation for selecting the actions to take towards the
25 agronomy application at hand. The logical instantiation language is a subset
26 of first order logic denoted in this paper *SRC* equivalent to Datalog+- (Cali
27 et al., 2010), Conceptual Graphs or Description Logics (more precisely the \mathcal{EL}
28 fragment (Baader et al., 2005) and DL-Lite families (Calvanese et al., 2007)).
29 All above mentioned languages are logically equivalent in terms of representa-
30 tion or reasoning power. The reason why this application is using *SRC* is the
31 graph based representation proper to *SRC* (and not to the other languages).
32 This graph based representation (implemented in the Cogui tool (Chein and
33 Mugnier, 2009; Chein et al., 2013)) makes the language suitable for interact-
34 ing with non computing experts (Chein et al., 2013).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Here we use the instantiation of (Croitoru and Vesic, 2013) for defining
47 what an argument and an attack are. While other approaches such as (García
48 and Simari, 2004), (Besnard and Hunter, 2005), (Muller and Hunter, 2012)
49 etc. address first order logic based argumentation, the work of (Croitoru and
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 1: The Cogui visual graph based interface

Vesic, 2013) uses the same SRG syntax and graph reasoning foundations. In Figure 1 the visual interface of Cogui is depicted: knowledge is represented as graph which is enriched dynamically by rule application. More on the visual appeal of Cogui for knowledge representation and reasoning can be found in (Chein et al., 2013).

4. Approach

As mentioned above, in this paper we use an instantiation of logic based argumentation based on a specific fragment of first order logic. This subset is equivalent to Datalog+- (Cali et al., 2010), Conceptual Graphs or Description Logics (the \mathcal{EL} fragment (Baader et al., 2005) and the DL-Lite families (Calvanese et al., 2007)). The reason for which our application required this

1
2
3
4
5 specific logic fragment is related to the information capitalisation needs of
6 the food sector. The long term aim is to enrich ontologies and data sources
7 based on these ontologies and join the Open Data movement. This entails
8 that the language used by the food applications needs to be compatible with
9 the Semantic Web equivalent languages as mentioned before.
10
11
12
13

14 The choice of the *SRC* syntax and graph reasoning mechanism is justified
15 by the visual appeal of this language for non computing experts.
16
17

18 In a nutshell our methodology is as follows. The set of goals, viewpoints
19 as well as the knowledge associated with the goals / viewpoints is elicited
20 either by the means of interviews with the domain experts or manually from
21 different scientific papers. This step of the application is the most time con-
22 suming but the most important. If the knowledge elicited is not complete,
23 sound or precise the outcome of the system is compromised. Then, based on
24 the knowledge elicited from the knowledge experts and the goals of the ex-
25 perts, we enrich the knowledge bases using reverse engineering (implemented
26 using backwards chaining algorithms). Putting together the enriched knowl-
27 edge bases obtained by backwards chaining from the different goals will lead
28 to inconsistencies. The argumentation process is used at this step and the
29 extensions yield by the applications computed. Based on the extensions and
30 the associated viewpoints we can use voting functions to determine the ap-
31 plication choice of viewpoints.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 *4.1. Use Case Real Data*

47

48 Expressing the target characteristics – or goals – according to various
49 points of view consists of identifying the facets involved in the construction
50 of product quality: points of view, topics of concern such as nutrition, envi-
51
52
53
54

1
2
3
4
5 ronment, technology, etc. In addition, such viewpoints have to be addressed
6 according to their various components (fibers, minerals, vitamins, etc). De-
7 sirable directions need to be laid down, and in a first step we consider them
8 independent one from another.
9

10
11
12 The considered sources of information include, from most formal to less
13 formal: (1) peer reviewed scientific papers; (2) technical reports or infor-
14 mation posted on websites; (3) conferences and scientific meetings around
15 research projects; (4) expert knowledge obtained through interviews. The sci-
16 entific articles we have analysed – with the supervision of experts in agrifood
17 – include: (Bourre et al., 2008; Slavin and Green, 2007; Dubuisson-Quellier,
18 2006; Ginon et al., 2009; Layat, 2011). (Bourre et al., 2008) compares the
19 different types of flour from a nutritional point of view. (Slavin and Green,
20 2007) explores the link between fiber and satiety. (Dubuisson-Quellier, 2006;
21 Ginon et al., 2009) deal with consumer behaviour and willingness to pay.
22 They focus on French baguette when information concerning the level of
23 fibers is provided, and they base their results on statistical studies of con-
24 sumer panels. (Layat, 2011) provides a summary of the nutritional aspects
25 of consumption of bread and the link with technological aspects.
26
27

28
29
30 We also reviewed technical reports available on official websites on health
31 policy: the public PNNS (National Program for Nutrition and Health, www.mangerbouger.fr/pnns) (PNNS (documents statutaires), 2010), the Euro-
32 pean project Healthgrain (looking at improving nutrition and health through
33 grains) (Dean et al., 2007; HEALTHGRAIN, 2009), as well as projects and
34 symposia on sanitary measures regarding the nutritional, technological and
35 organoleptic properties of breads (DINABIO, 2008; CADINNO, 2008; AQUA-
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 NUP, 2009; FCN, 2009). Finally, several interviews were conducted to collect
6
7 domain expert knowledge, in particular for technology specialists in our lab-
8
9 oratory.

10
11 A summary of the results obtained in the baking industry is synthesised in
12
13 Figure 2 regarding nutritional and organoleptic aspects. Figure 2(a) shows
14
15 the main identified goals to reach for a nutritionally optimised bread (for
16
17 instance, containing a high level of soluble fibers, vitamins and minerals, low
18
19 salt, etc.), whereas Figure 2(b) sums up the main goals to achieve for an
20
21 enjoyable bread regarding sensorial concerns (for example, crusty, etc.).

22 23 **5. Technical Soundness**

24
25 In this section we explain the technical results that ensure the soundness
26
27 and completeness of our agronomy application method. The section is com-
28
29 posed of three parts. A first subsection explains the logical subset of first
30
31 order logic language employed in the paper. The second subsection shows
32
33 how to construct arguments and attacks in order to obtain extensions when
34
35 a knowledge base expressed under this language is inconsistent. Last, the
36
37 third section shows how we used reverse engineering to complete the knowl-
38
39 edge base with all possible actions and how argumentation can be used in
40
41 order to select consistent subsets of knowledge which support given actions.

42 43 44 *5.1. The Logical Language*

45
46 In the following, we give the general setting knowledge representation
47
48 language used throughout the paper.

49
50 A knowledge base is a 3-tuple $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$ composed of three finite
51
52 sets of formulae: a set \mathcal{F} of facts, a set \mathcal{R} of rules and a set \mathcal{N} of constraints.




Figure 2: Nutritional (a) and organoleptic (b) goals

Let us formally define what we accept as \mathcal{F} , \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{N} .

Facts Syntax. Let \mathbf{C} be a set of constants and $\mathbf{P} = P_1 \cup P_2 \dots \cup P_n$ a set of predicates of the corresponding arity $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let \mathbf{V} be a countably infinite set of *variables*. We define the set of *terms* by $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{C}$. As usual, given $i \in \{1 \dots n\}$, $p \in P_i$ and $t_1, \dots, t_i \in \mathbf{T}$ we call $p(t_1, \dots, t_i)$ an *atom*. A *fact* is the existential closure of an atom or an existential closure of a conjunction of atoms. (Note that there is no negation or disjunction in the facts and that we consider a generalised notion of facts that can contain several atoms.)

- *Bread*, *Cereal*, *LowSalt*, *ContaminantFree* are examples of unary predicates (arity 1) and *IsIngredientOf* is a binary predicate (arity 2).

- *Wheat*, *oats*, *rye*, *barley* are constant examples.
- *Cereal (wheat)* is an atom.
- $\exists x (Bread(x) \wedge IsIngredientOf(wheat, x))$ is a fact.

Due to lack of space we do not show the full semantic definitions of facts (or rules and constraints in the following section). For a complete semantic depiction of this language please check (Chein and Mugnier, 2009; Chein et al., 2013; Croitoru and Vesic, 2013). It is well known that $F' \models F$ (read the fact F' entails the fact F) if and only if there is a homomorphism from F to F' (Chein and Mugnier, 2009).

Rules. A rule R is a formula of the form

$$\forall x_1, \dots, \forall x_n \forall y_1, \dots, \forall y_m (H(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m) \rightarrow \exists z_1, \dots, \exists z_k C(y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots, z_k))$$

where H , the hypothesis, and C , the conclusion, are atoms or conjunctions of atoms, $n, m, k \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$, x_1, \dots, x_n are the variables appearing in H ,

1
2
3
4
5 y_1, \dots, y_m are the variables appearing in both H and C and z_1, \dots, z_k the new
6 variables introduced in the conclusion. An example of a rule is the following:
7
8 $\forall x (Bread(x) \wedge PesticideFree(x) \wedge MycotoxinFree(x))$
9 $\rightarrow ContaminantFree(x)$.

10
11
12 In the following we will consider rules without new existential variables
13 in the conclusion.
14

15 Reasoning consists of applying rules on the set \mathcal{F} and thus inferring new
16 knowledge. A rule $R = (H, C)$ is *applicable* to set \mathcal{F} if and only if there
17 exists $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that there is a homomorphism σ from the hypothesis
18 of R to the conjunction of elements of \mathcal{F}' . A rule $R = (H, C)$ is inversely
19 applicable to a fact F if there is a homomorphism π from C to F . In this
20 case, the inverse application of R to F according to π produces a new fact
21 F' such that $R(F') = F$. We then say that the new fact is an immediate
22 inverse derivation of F by R , abusively denoted $R^{-1}(F)$.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Note that this technique is commonly used, for example, for backward
32 chaining query answering (Baget and Salvat, 2006; Konig et al., 2012) where
33 a query is rewritten according to the rules. The same mechanism is also
34 discussed by abductive reasoning algorithms (Klarman et al., 2011) where
35 minimal sets of facts (in the set inclusion sense) are added to the knowledge
36 base in order to be able to deduct a query.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Let $F = Bread(bleurette) \wedge PesticideFree(bleurette) \wedge MycotoxinFree(bleu-$
44 $ette)$ and R the rule $\forall x (Bread(x) \wedge PesticideFree(x) \wedge MycotoxinFree(x) \rightarrow$
45 $ContaminantFree(x))$.
46
47

48 R is applicable to F and produces by derivation the following fact: $Bread$
49 $(bleurette) \wedge PesticideFree(bleurette) \wedge MycotoxinFree(bleurette) \wedge Contaminant-$
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

$Free(bleuette)$.

Let $F = Bread(bleuette) \wedge ContaminantFree(bleuette)$ and R the rule $\forall x (Bread(x) \wedge PesticideFree(x) \wedge MycotoxinFree(x) \rightarrow ContaminantFree(x))$.

R inversely applicable to F and produces by inverse derivation the fact: $F' = Bread(bleuette) \wedge PesticideFree(bleuette) \wedge MycotoxinFree(bleuette)$.

Let F be a subset of \mathcal{F} and let \mathcal{R} be a set of rules. A set F_n is called an \mathcal{R} -derivation of F if there is a sequence of sets (called a *derivation sequence*) (F_0, F_1, \dots, F_n) such that $F_0 \subseteq F$, F_0 is \mathcal{R} -consistent, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, it holds that F_i is an immediate derivation of F_{i-1} .

Given a set $\{F_0, \dots, F_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ and a set of rules \mathcal{R} , the closure of $\{F_0, \dots, F_k\}$ w.r.t. \mathcal{R} , denoted $Cl_{\mathcal{R}}(\{F_0, \dots, F_k\})$, is defined as the smallest set (with respect to \subseteq) which contains $\{F_0, \dots, F_k\}$, and is closed for \mathcal{R} -derivation (that is, for every \mathcal{R} -derivation F_n of $\{F_0, \dots, F_k\}$, we have $F_n \subseteq Cl_{\mathcal{R}}(\{F_0, \dots, F_k\})$). Finally, we say that a set \mathcal{F} and a set of rules \mathcal{R} entail a fact G (and we write $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R} \models G$) iff the closure of the facts by all the rules entails F (i.e. if $Cl_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{F}) \models G$).

Constraints. A constraint is a formula $\forall x_1 \dots \forall x_n (H(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow \perp)$, where H is an atom or a conjunction of atoms and $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Equivalently, a constraint can be written as $\neg(\exists x_1, \dots, \exists x_n H(x_1, \dots, x_n))$. As an example of a constraint, consider $N = \neg(\exists x (Growth(x) \wedge Decrease(x)))$.

Given a knowledge base $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$, a set $\{F_1, \dots, F_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ is said to be *inconsistent* if and only if there exists a constraint $N \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\{F_1, \dots, F_k\} \models H_N$, where H_N denotes the existential closure of the hypothesis of N . A set is consistent if and only if it is not inconsistent. A set $\{F_1, \dots, F_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ is \mathcal{R} -inconsistent if and only if there exists a constraint

1
2
3
4
5 $N \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\text{Cl}_{\mathcal{R}}(\{F_1, \dots, F_k\}) \models H_N$, where H_N denotes the existential
6
7 closure of the hypothesis of N .

8 Let $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$ where:
9

- 10
11 • \mathcal{F} contains the following facts:
12
13 – $F_1 = \text{Bread}(\text{bleuette}) \wedge \text{ContaminantFree}(\text{bleuette})$
14
15 – $F_2 = \exists e \text{ExtractionRate}(e, \text{bleuette})$
16
17 – $F_3 = \exists f (\text{FiberContent}(f, \text{bleuette}) \wedge \text{High}(f))$
18
19
20
21 • \mathcal{R} consists of the following rules:
22
23 – $R_1 = \forall x, y (\text{Bread}(x) \wedge \text{ExtractionRate}(y, x) \wedge \text{PesticideFree}(x)$
24
25 $\rightarrow \text{Decrease}(y))$
26
27 – $R_2 = \forall x, y, z (\text{Bread}(x) \wedge \text{ExtractionRate}(y, x) \wedge \text{FiberContent}(z, x) \wedge$
28
29 $\text{High}(z) \rightarrow \text{Growth}(y))$
30
31 – $R_3 = \forall x (\text{Bread}(x) \wedge \text{ContaminantFree}(x)$
32
33 $\rightarrow \text{PesticideFree}(x) \wedge \text{MycotoxinFree}(x))$
34
35
36
37
38 • \mathcal{N} contains the following negative constraint:
39
40 – $N = \neg(\exists x (\text{Growth}(x) \wedge \text{Decrease}(x)))$
41
42
43

44 \mathcal{K} is inconsistent since $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}) \models N$. Indeed, F_1 and R_3 allow to deduce
45 $\text{PesticideFree}(\text{bleuette})$. Combined to F_2 and R_1 we obtain $\text{Decrease}(e)$. F_3
46
47 and R_2 deduce $\text{Growth}(e)$, violating the negative constraint N .
48

49 Given a knowledge base, one can ask a conjunctive query in order to
50 know whether something holds or not. Without loss of generality we consider
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 boolean conjunctive queries (which are facts). As an example of a query, take
6 $\exists x_1 \text{cat}(x_1)$. The answer to query α is positive if and only if $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R} \models \alpha$.
7

8 Answering Q , traditionally, has two different algorithmic approaches: ei-
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

5.2. Arguments and Attacks

This section shows that it is possible to define an instantiation of Dung's abstract argumentation theory (Dung, 1995) that can be used to reason with an inconsistent ontological KB.

We first define the notion of an argument. For a set of formulae $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, \dots, G_n\}$, notation $\bigwedge G$ is used as an abbreviation for $G_1 \wedge \dots \wedge G_n$.

Definition 1. *Given a knowledge base $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$, an argument a is a tuple $a = (F_0, F_1, \dots, F_n)$ where:*

- (F_0, \dots, F_{n-1}) is a derivation sequence with respect to \mathcal{K}
- F_n is an atom, a conjunction of atoms, the existential closure of an atom or the existential closure of a conjunction of atoms such that $F_{n-1} \models F_n$.

This definition, following the definition of (Croitoru and Vesic, 2013) is a straightforward way to define an argument, since an *argument* corresponds to a *derivation*.

1
2
3
4
5 To simplify the notation, from now on, we suppose that we are given a
6 fixed knowledge base $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$ and do not explicitly mention \mathcal{F} , \mathcal{R} nor
7 \mathcal{N} if not necessary. Let $a = (F_0, \dots, F_n)$ be an argument. Then, we denote
8 $\text{Supp}(a) = F_0$ and $\text{Conc}(a) = F_n$.
9

10
11
12 Arguments may attack each other, which is captured by a binary attack
13 relation $\text{Att} \subseteq \text{Arg}(\mathcal{F}) \times \text{Arg}(\mathcal{F})$.
14
15

16
17 **Definition 2.** Let $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$ be a knowledge base and let a and b be
18 two arguments. The argument a attacks argument b , denoted $(a, b) \in \text{Att}$,
19 if and only if there exists $\varphi \in \text{Supp}(b)$ such that the set $\{\text{Conc}(a), \varphi\}$ is
20 \mathcal{R} -inconsistent.
21
22
23
24
25

26 This attack relation is not symmetric. To see why, consider the following
27 example. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{p(m), q(m), r(m)\}$, $\mathcal{R} = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{N} = \{\forall x_1(p(x_1) \wedge q(x_1) \wedge$
28 $r(x_1) \rightarrow \perp)\}$. Let $a = (\{p(m), q(m)\}, p(m) \wedge q(m))$, $b = (\{r(m)\}, r(m))$. We
29 have $(a, b) \in \text{Att}$ and $(b, a) \notin \text{Att}$. This will ensure that the naive extension
30 is different, at least in theory, from the preferred, stable, etc. semantics.
31 However, in our application they all entail the same information as shown
32 later on.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 **Definition 3.** Given a knowledge base $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$, the corresponding
42 argumentation framework $\mathcal{AF}_{\mathcal{K}}$ is a pair $(\mathcal{A} = \text{Arg}(\mathcal{F}), \text{Att})$ where $\text{Arg}(\mathcal{F})$
43 is the set of all arguments that can be constructed from \mathcal{F} and Att is the
44 corresponding attack relation as specified in Definition 2.
45
46
47

48 Let $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. We say that \mathcal{E} is conflict free iff there exists no
49 arguments $a, b \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $(a, b) \in \text{Att}$. \mathcal{E} defends a iff for every argument
50 $b \in \mathcal{A}$, if we have $(b, a) \in \text{Att}$ then there exists $c \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $(c, b) \in \text{Att}$.
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3
4
5 \mathcal{E} is admissible iff it is conflict free and defends all its arguments. \mathcal{E} is a
6 complete extension iff \mathcal{E} is an admissible set which contains all the arguments
7 it defends. \mathcal{E} is a preferred extension iff it is maximal (with respect to set
8 inclusion) admissible set. \mathcal{E} is a stable extension iff it is conflict-free and for
9 all $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{E}$, there exists an argument $b \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $(b, a) \in \text{Att}$.

10
11
12
13
14 \mathcal{E} is a grounded extension iff \mathcal{E} is a minimal (for set inclusion) complete
15 extension.
16

17
18 For an argumentation framework $AS = (\mathcal{A}, \text{Att})$ we denote by $\text{Ext}_x(AS)$
19 (or by $\text{Ext}_x(\mathcal{A}, \text{Att})$) the set of its extensions with respect to semantics x .
20 We use the abbreviations c , p , s , and g for respectively complete, preferred,
21 stable and grounded semantics.
22
23
24

25
26 An argument is sceptically accepted if it is in all extensions, credulously
27 accepted if it is in at least one extension and rejected if it is not in any
28 extension.
29
30

31
32 Based on this definition of arguments and attacks in (Croitoru and Vesic,
33 2013) was also shown that the rationality postulates of (Caminada and Am-
34 goud, 2007) are respected. This instantiation respects the direct, indirect
35 consistency as well as the closure.
36
37
38

39 5.3. Formalising the use case

40
41 In this subsection we formalise the notions presented in section 4.
42

43 Let $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$ be a consistent knowledge base. This is the knowledge
44 base that all actors share and agree upon. In this paper we assume that the
45 rules and negative constraints are common to everybody.
46
47
48

49 The goals of the different actors can be seen as a set of existentially closed
50 conjuncts. We denote them by G_1, G_2, \dots, G_n .
51
52
53

1
2
3
4
5 Let G_i be a goal and \mathcal{K} the knowledge base. \mathcal{K} is consistent and \mathcal{K} does
6 not entail G_i . We compute the inverse \mathcal{R} -derivations of G_i (where \mathcal{R} is the
7 set of rules of the knowledge base). We add all of the $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(G_i)$ to the facts.
8 We thus obtain a new knowledge base \mathcal{K}_i which differs from \mathcal{K} solely by its
9 facts set (which now also includes $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(G_i)$): $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{R}^{-1}(G_i), \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$. We
10 also impose that \mathcal{K}_i is consistent.
11

12 Given $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_n\}$, the goals correspond to a set of viewpoints \mathcal{V}
13 (there exists a function $\kappa : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{V}}$). This function can assign a goal to one
14 or more viewpoints and each viewpoint can be associated with one or more
15 goals. Given a goal G_i , the (set of) viewpoint(s) associated with this goal is
16 denoted by $\kappa(G_i)$. Similarly, given a viewpoint v_i , the set of goals associated
17 with it is denoted by $\kappa^{-1}(v_i)$.
18

19 **Example 1.** Let the set of viewpoints $\mathcal{V} = \{\text{nutrition}, \text{sanitary}, \text{organoleptic}\}$
20 and \mathcal{G} consisting of the following goals: $G_1 = \exists x (\text{Bread}(x) \wedge \text{LowSalt}(x))$,
21 $G_2 = \exists x (\text{Bread}(x) \wedge \text{ContaminantFree}(x))$, $G_3 = \exists x (\text{Bread}(x) \wedge \text{Crusty}(x))$,
22 $G_4 = \exists x (\text{Bread}(x) \wedge \text{TraceElementRich}(x))$.
23

24 We have $\kappa(G_1) = \kappa(G_4) = \text{nutrition}$, $\kappa(G_2) = \text{sanitary}$ and $\kappa(G_3) =$
25 organoleptic . Conversely $\kappa^{-1}(\text{nutrition}) = \{G_1, G_4\}$, $\kappa^{-1}(\text{sanitary}) = \{G_2\}$
26 and $\kappa^{-1}(\text{organoleptic}) = \{G_3\}$.
27

28 The rules will correspond to the set of sufficient conditions needed for
29 the goal G_i . In the context of our practical application this is illustrated in
30 Figure 3 (with respect to nutrition goals).
31

32 **Example 2.** To reach the goal $G_1 = \exists x (\text{Bread}(x) \wedge \text{LowSalt}(x))$, the
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49




Figure 3: Ways to reach nutritional goals

knowledge base \mathcal{K} contains the following rule: $\forall x,y (Bread(x) \wedge SaltAdjunction(y,x) \wedge Decrease(y) \rightarrow LowSalt(x))$

Let us now consider the set of goals $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_n\}$ and the initial knowledge base $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$. As described above we compute the n knowledge bases, corresponding to each goal: $\mathcal{K}_i = (\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{R}^{-1}(G_i), \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. We consider the union of all these knowledge bases:

$$\mathcal{K}_{agg} = (\mathcal{F} \bigcup_{i=1, \dots, n} \mathcal{R}^{-1}(G_i), \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$$

Example 3. Let $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$ where :

- $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1\} = \{CurrentExtractionRate(T65)\}$
- \mathcal{R} contains the following rules:

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
- $R_1 = \forall x, y (Bread(x) \wedge ExtractionRate(y, x) \wedge Decrease(y) \rightarrow Digestible(x))$
 - $R_2 = \forall x, z (Bread(x) \wedge SaltAdjunction(z, x) \wedge Decrease(z) \rightarrow LowSalt(x))$
 - $R_3 = \forall x, y (Bread(x) \wedge ExtractionRate(y, x) \wedge Growth(y) \rightarrow TraceElementRich(x))$
 - $R_4 = \forall x, y (Bread(x) \wedge ExtractionRate(y, x) \wedge Decrease(y) \rightarrow PesticideFree(x))$

24 • \mathcal{N} contains the following negative constraint:

25
26
27
28

- $N = \neg(\exists x (Growth(x) \wedge Decrease(x)))$

29 Let the goal set \mathcal{G} as follows:

- 30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
- $G_1 = \exists p (Bread(p) \wedge Digestible(p))$, where $\kappa(G_1) = nutrition$
 - $G_2 = \exists p (Bread(p) \wedge LowSalt(p))$, where $\kappa(G_2) = nutrition$
 - $G_3 = \exists p (Bread(p) \wedge TraceElementRich(p))$, where $\kappa(G_3) = nutrition$
 - $G_4 = \exists p (Bread(p) \wedge PesticideFree(p))$, where $\kappa(G_4) = sanitary$.

40 Then:

- 41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
- $\mathcal{K}_1 = (\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$ where $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{R}^{-1}(G_1)$ contains the following facts:
 - $F_1 = CurrentExtractionRate(T65)$
 - $F_2 = Bread(p) \wedge ExtractionRate(\tau, p) \wedge Decrease(\tau)$
 - $\mathcal{K}_2 = (\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$ where $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{R}^{-1}(G_2)$ contains the following facts:
 - $F_1 = CurrentExtractionRate(T65)$
 - $F_3 = Bread(p) \wedge SaltAdjunction(s, p) \wedge Decrease(s)$
 - $\mathcal{K}_3 = (\mathcal{F}_3, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$ where $\mathcal{F}_3 = \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{R}^{-1}(G_3)$ contains the following facts:

$$- F_1 = \text{CurrentExtractionRate}(T65)$$

$$- F_4 = \text{Bread}(p) \wedge \text{ExtractionRate}(\tau, p) \wedge \text{Growth}(\tau)$$

• $\mathcal{K}_4 = (\mathcal{F}_4, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$ where $\mathcal{F}_4 = \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{R}^{-1}(G_4)$ contains the following facts:

$$- F_1 = \text{CurrentExtractionRate}(T65)$$

$$- F_2 = \text{Bread}(p) \wedge \text{ExtractionRate}(\tau, p) \wedge \text{Decrease}(\tau)$$

Finally $\mathcal{K}_{agg} = (\mathcal{F} \cup_{i=1, \dots, n} \mathcal{R}^{-1}(G_i), \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{N})$ where

$$\mathcal{F} \cup_{i=1, \dots, n} \mathcal{R}^{-1}(G_i) = \{F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4\}.$$

As observed in the previous example, it may happen that \mathcal{K}_{agg} is inconsistent (and it does so even for goals belonging to the same viewpoint). We then use argumentation, which, by the means of extensions will isolate subsets of facts we can accept together (called extensions). Furthermore, the extensions will allow us to see which are the viewpoints associated to each maximal consistent subset of knowledge (by the means of the function κ). A choice procedure then has to be used (see example below).

The argument framework we can construct from the above knowledge base is $(\mathcal{A}, \text{Att})$ where \mathcal{A} contains the following:

• $a = (\{F_2\}, F_2, R_1(F_2))$ where $R_1(F_2) = \text{Bread}(p) \wedge \text{ExtractionRate}(\tau, p) \wedge \text{Decrease}(\tau) \wedge \text{Digestible}(p)$.

• $b = (\{F_4\}, F_4, R_3(F_4))$ where $R_3(F_4) = \text{Bread}(p) \wedge \text{ExtractionRate}(\tau, p) \wedge \text{Growth}(\tau) \wedge \text{TraceElementRich}(p)$.

• $c = (\{F_2\}, F_2, R_4(F_2))$ where $R_4(F_2) = \text{Bread}(p) \wedge \text{ExtractionRate}(\tau, p) \wedge \text{Decrease}(\tau) \wedge \text{PesticideFree}(p)$.

• $d = (\{F_3\}, F_3, R_2(F_3))$ where $R_2(F_3) = \text{Bread}(p) \wedge \text{SaltAdjunction}(s, p) \wedge \text{Decrease}(s) \wedge \text{LowSalt}(p)$ and

$\text{Att} = \{(a, b), (b, a), (b, c), (c, b)\}$.

In this argumentation system defined we now obtain:

$$\bullet \text{Ext}_{stable}(\mathcal{A}, Att) = \text{Ext}_{semi-stable}(\mathcal{A}, Att) = \text{Ext}_{preferred}(\mathcal{A}, Att) = \{\{a, c, d\}, \{b, d\}\}.$$

Starting from the extensions $\text{Ext}_x(\mathcal{A}, Att)$, the proposed decision support system functions as follows: for every extension $\varepsilon \in \text{Ext}_x(\mathcal{A}, Att)$:

- Consider the facts occurring in the arguments of ε ;
- Identify the knowledge bases \mathcal{K}_i where these facts occur;
- Obtain the goals G_i which are satisfied by the extension;
- Using the κ function to obtain the viewpoints corresponding to these goals;
- Show domain experts the set of goals, and compatible viewpoints corresponding to the given extension.

This method allows us to obtain a set of options equal to the cardinality of $\text{Ext}_x(\mathcal{A}, Att)$. For taking a final decision several possibilities can be considered and presented to the experts:

- Maximise the number of goals satisfied;
- Maximise the number of viewpoints satisfied;
- Use preference relations of experts on goals and / or viewpoints.

In the previous example (please recall that the goals G_1 and G_2 are associated with the nutritional viewpoint while G_4 is associated with the sanitary viewpoint) we have:

- The first extension $\{a, c, d\}$ is based on the facts F_2 and F_3 obtained from \mathcal{K}_1 , \mathcal{K}_2 and \mathcal{K}_4 that satisfy the goals G_1 , G_2 and G_4 .
- The second extension $\{b, d\}$ is based on F_3 and F_4 obtained from \mathcal{K}_2 and \mathcal{K}_3 satisfying G_2 and G_3 both associated with the nutritional viewpoint.

One first possibility (corresponding to the extension $\{a, c, d\}$) consists of accomplishing F_2 and F_3 and allows to satisfy the biggest number of goals and viewpoints.

The second possibility (corresponding to the extension $\{b, d\}$) consists of accomplishing F_3 and F_4 . It would satisfy two goals and one viewpoint. It could be considered though if the goal G_3 (not satisfied by the first option) is preferred to the others.

6. Evaluation

The evaluation of the implemented system was done via a series of interviews with domain experts. The above knowledge and reasoning procedures were implemented using the Cogui knowledge representation tool (Chein et al., 2013), with an extension of 2000 lines of supplemental code. Three experts have validated our approach: two researchers in food science and cereal technologies of the French national institute of agronomic research, specialists respectively of the grain-to-flour transformation process and of the breadmaking process, and one industrial expert - the Director of the French National Institute of Bread and Pastry.

The first meeting dealt with the delimitation of the project objectives and addressed fundamental questions such as: Is it possible to uniquely define a

1
2
3
4
5 “good” bread? Which scenarii of “good bread” should be considered? How
6 could they be defined from a nutritional, sanitary, sensorial and economic
7 point of view? Which are the main known ways to achieve them?
8
9

10 Then a series of individual interviews constituted the elicitation phase.
11 Each expert gave more arguments which were complementing one each other.
12 In parallel, the writing of specifications for the demonstrator and the defini-
13 tion of the knowledge base structure were conducted.
14
15
16
17

18 In the following plenary meeting the real potential of the approach was
19 shown. The experts were formulating goals and viewpoints they were inter-
20 ested in and the Cogui system together with the argumentation extension was
21 yielding the associated possible propositions. Figure 6 shows a screenshot of
22 the demonstrator answers for a two-goal query: a nutritional goal (high fiber
23 content) and an organoleptic goal (crusty bread). Two sets of compatible
24 actions are proposed, some choices (such as increasing or decreasing the ex-
25 traction rate) being incompatible for both goals, and thus separated in the
26 two alternative sets.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Four scenarii were more specifically evaluated. These scenarii concern
36 four kinds of consumers: obeses (fiber preference), people with iron deficiency
37 (micronutrient preference), people with cardiovascular disease (decreased salt
38 preference) and vegetarians (limited phytic acid), which produces different
39 sets of goals. For each scenario, the system proposes several outputted rec-
40 ommendations. The audience for decreasing salt tips the balance in favour
41 of a recommendation for the T80 bread, while the audience for decreasing
42 phytic acid pushes to specify recommendations towards a natural sourdough
43 bread or a conservative T65 bread. Other audiences are in favor of a status
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 4: Demonstrator screenshot showing two sets of possible actions

quo. The results were considered as explainable by experts, but not obvious, since many considerations had to be taken into account.

Two interests of the approach were more particularly highlighted. They concern cognitive considerations. Firstly, experts were conscious that the elicitation procedure was done according to their thought processes, that is, in a forward way which is more natural and intuitive. The system was thus able to reconstitute the knowledge in a different manner than the experts usually do. Secondly, from a problem that could initially seem simple, the experts realized that it covered a huge complexity that a human mind could hardly address alone. The tool is currently available to them under restricted access.

The knowledge modeling task can be a very time-consuming step. As presented in Section 4.1, several sources of information were used, from peer reviewed scientific papers and technical reports, to conference meetings and expert interviews. On the one hand, expert interviews appeared to be the

1
2
3
4
5 least expensive ones in terms of time. A one-day period allows both eliciting
6
7 knowledge through an interview and formalizing it in the software system –
8
9 which constitutes the longest part of the work. However, this relatively short
10
11 time hides a strong prerequisite: having already a clear view of the case study,
12
13 a synopsis of the questions to ask the expert and an implemented knowledge
14
15 model. On the other hand, websites, technical reports and scientific articles
16
17 are more costly to analyze. For instance, the critical reading a scientific
18
19 paper of the domain may require a one-day period on its own, for a discerning
20
21 reader. However they allow one to to grasp the ins and outs of the question.

22
23 During the evaluation step, the experts raised the question of the impor-
24
25 tance attached to the different pieces of knowledge modeled in the system.
26
27 Moreover, in some cases experts may hesitate on the relevance of some facts
28
29 or rules. A possibility would thus be to adopt a preference-based argumen-
30
31 tation system, as proposed in several works such as (Amgoud and Cayrol,
32
33 2002; Bench-Capon, 2003b; Kaci and van der Torre, 2008; Amgoud et al.,
34
35 2000; Bourguet et al., 2013a), able to take into account different levels of
36
37 importance among arguments.

38 39 **7. Conclusion**

40
41
42 Even if argumentation based decision making methods applied to the food
43
44 industry were also proposed by (Bourguet, 2010; Bourguet et al., 2013b),
45
46 this paper addresses a key point in the context of current techniques used
47
48 by the food sector and namely addressing reverse engineering. Also, in this
49
50 approach, an argument is used here as a method computing compatible ob-
51
52 jectives in the sector. This case study represents an original application and
53
54

1
2
3
4
5 an introspective approach in the agronomy field by providing an argumenta-
6 tion based decision-support system for the various food sectors. It requires
7 nevertheless the very expensive task of knowledge modeling. Such task, in
8 its current state cannot be automated. It strongly depends on the quality of
9 expert opinion and elicitation (exhaustiveness, certainty, etc). The current
10 trend for decision-making tools includes more and more methods of argu-
11 mentation as means of including experts in the task of modeling and the
12 decision-making processes. Another element to take into account, not dis-
13 cussed in this paper, is the difficulty of technologically (from an agronomy
14 viewpoint) putting in place the facts of each option. Modeling this aspect in
15 the formalism is still to be studied.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26
27 Amgoud, L., Cayrol, C., 2002. A reasoning model based on the production
28 of acceptable arguments. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*
29 34, 197–216.
30
31

32
33 Amgoud, L., Parsons, S., Perrussel, L., 2000. An argumentation framework
34 based on contextual preferences. In: *Proceedings of the International Con-*
35 *ference on Formal and Applied and Practical Reasoning*. pp. 59–67.
36
37
38

39
40 Amgoud, L., Prade, H., 2009. Using arguments for making and explaining
41 decisions. *Artificial Intelligence* 173 (3-4), 413–436.
42
43

44
45 AQUANUP, 2009. [http://www.inra.fr/inra_cepia/vous_recherchez/](http://www.inra.fr/inra_cepia/vous_recherchez/des_projets/france/aquanup)
46 [des_projets/france/aquanup](http://www.inra.fr/inra_cepia/vous_recherchez/des_projets/france/aquanup).
47
48

49
50 Assaghir, Z., Napoli, A., Kaytoue, M., Dubois, D., Prade, H., 2011. Numeri-
51
52
53

1
2
3
4
5 cal information fusion: Lattice of answers with supporting arguments. In:
6 ICTAI. pp. 621–628.
7

8
9
10 Baader, F., Brandt, S., Lutz, C., 2005. Pushing the envelope. In: Proc. of
11 IJCAI 2005.
12

13
14 Baget, J.-F., Salvat, E., 2006. Rules dependencies in backward chaining of
15 conceptual graphs rules. In: Conceptual Structures: Inspiration and Ap-
16 plication, 14th International Conference on Conceptual Structures. Vol.
17 4068 of LNCS. Springer, pp. 102–116.
18
19

20
21
22 Bench-Capon, T. J., 2003a. Persuasion in practical argument using value-
23 based argumentation frameworks. *Journal of Logic and Computation*
24 13 (3), 429–448.
25
26

27
28
29 Bench-Capon, T. J. M., 2003b. Persuasion in practical argument using
30 value-based argumentation frameworks. *Journal of Logic and Computa-*
31 *tion* 13 (3), 429–448.
32
33

34
35
36 Besnard, P., Hunter, A., 2005. Practical first-order argumentation. In: Proc.
37 of AAAI. pp. 590–595.
38

39
40
41 Besnard, P., Hunter, A., 2008. *Elements of Argumentation*. The MIT Press.
42

43
44 Bourguet, J.-R., 2010. Contribution aux methodes d’argumentation pour la
45 prise de decision. application a l’arbitrage au sein de la filiere cerealiere.
46 Thèse de doctorat, Université Montpellier II, Montpellier, France.
47
48

49
50 Bourguet, J.-R., Thomopoulos, R., Mugnier, M.-L., Abécassis, J., September
51 2013a. An artificial intelligence-based approach to deal with argumentation
52
53

1
2
3
4
5 applied to food quality in a public health policy. *Expert Systems with*
6 *Applications* 40 (11), 4539–4546.
7

8
9 Bourguet, J.-R., Thomopoulos, R., Mugnier, M.-L., Abécassis, J., 2013b. An
10 artificial intelligence-based approach to deal with argumentation applied to
11 food quality in a public health policy. Accepted for publication in: *Expert*
12 *Systems With Applications*.
13
14

15
16
17 Bourre, J.-M., Bégat, A., Leroux, M.-C., Mousques-Cami, V., Pérandel, N.,
18 Souply, F., 2008. Valeur nutritionnelle (macro et micro-nutriments) de
19 farines et pains français. *Médecine et Nutrition* 44 (2), 49–76.
20
21

22
23
24 Bouyssou, D., Dubois, D., Pirlot, M., Prade, H., 2009. *Decision-making pro-*
25 *cess – Concepts and Methods*. Wiley.
26

27
28
29 Brunelière, H., Cabot, J., Dupé, G., Madiot, F., 2014. Modisco: A model
30 driven reverse engineering framework. *Information and Software Technol-*
31 *ogy* 56 (8), 1012 – 1032.
32
33

34
35 CADINNO, 2008. Information, choix, consommateurs responsables : des
36 leviers pour un développement durable ? [http://www.melissa.](http://www.melissa.ens-cachan.fr/IMG/pdf/Colloque_CadInno_FR.pdf)
37 [ens-cachan.fr/IMG/pdf/Colloque_CadInno_FR.pdf](http://www.melissa.ens-cachan.fr/IMG/pdf/Colloque_CadInno_FR.pdf).
38
39

40
41 Cali, A., Gottlob, G., Lukasiewicz, T., Marnette, B., Pieris, A., 2010.
42 Datalog+/-: A family of logical knowledge representation and query lan-
43 guages for new applications. In: *LICS*. pp. 228–242.
44
45

46
47
48 Calvanese, D., De Giacomo, G., Lembo, D., Lenzerini, M., Rosati, R., 2007.
49 Tractable reasoning and efficient query answering in description logics:
50 The dl-lite family. *J. Autom. Reasoning* 39 (3), 385–429.
51
52
53

- 1
2
3
4
5 Caminada, M., Amgoud, L., 2007. On the evaluation of argumentation for-
6 malisms. *Artificial Intelligence* 171 (5), 286–310.
7
8
9
10 Chein, M., Mugnier, M.-L., 2009. Graph-based Knowledge Representation
11 and Reasoning—Computational Foundations of Conceptual Graphs. *Ad-*
12 *vanced Information and Knowledge Processing*. Springer.
13
14
15
16 Chein, M., Mugnier, M.-L., Croitoru, M., 2013. Visual reasoning with graph-
17 based mechanisms: the good, the better and the best. *The Knowledge*
18 *Engineering Review* 28, 249–271.
19
20
21
22 Croitoru, M., Vesic, S., 2013. What can argumentation do for inconsistent
23 ontology query answering? In: *Proc. of SUM 2013* (to appear).
24
25
26
27 Dean, M., Sheperd, R., Arvola, A., Lampila, P., Lahteenmaki, L., Vassalo,
28 M., Saba, A., Claupein, E., Winkelmann, M., 2007. Report on consumer
29 expectations of health benefits of modified cereal products. Tech. rep.,
30 University of Surrey, UK.
31
32
33
34
35
36 DINABIO, 2008. Proceedings of dinabio développement et innovation en
37 agriculture biologique. [http://www.inra.fr/ciag/revue_innovations_](http://www.inra.fr/ciag/revue_innovations_agronomiques/volume_4_janvier_2009)
38 [agronomiques/volume_4_janvier_2009](http://www.inra.fr/ciag/revue_innovations_agronomiques/volume_4_janvier_2009).
39
40
41
42
43 Dubuisson-Quellier, S., 2006. De la routine à la délibération. les arbitrages
44 des consommateurs en situation d’achat. *Réseaux* 135/136, 253–284.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5 FCN, 2009. Fibres, céréales et nutrition. [http://www.inra.fr/content/
6 view/full/24670029](http://www.inra.fr/content/view/full/24670029).
7
8
9
10 García, A. J., Simari, G. R., 2004. Defeasible logic programming: An argu-
11 mentative approach. *Theory and practice of logic programming* 4, 95–138.
12
13
14 Ginon, E., Lohérac, Y., Martin, C., Combris, P., Issanchou, S., 2009. Effect
15 of fibre information on consumer willingness to pay for french baguettes.
16 *Food Quality and Preference* 20, 343–352.
17
18
19
20 HEALTHGRAIN, 2009. <http://www.healthgrain.org>.
21
22
23
24 Kaci, S., van der Torre, L., 2008. Preference-based argumentation: Argu-
25 ments supporting multiple values. *International Journal of Approximate*
26 *Reasoning* 48 (3), 730–751.
27
28
29
30 Klarman, S., Endriss, U., Schlobach, S., 2011. Abox abduction in the de-
31 scription logic *alc*. *J. Autom. Reasoning* 46 (1), 43–80.
32
33
34
35 König, M., Leclere, M., Mugnier, M.-L., Thomazo, M., 2012. A sound and
36 complete backward chaining algorithm for existential rules. In: Krotzsch,
37 M., Straccia, U. (Eds.), *Web Reasoning and Rule Systems*. Vol. 7497 of
38 *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 122–
39 138.
40
41
42
43
44
45 Layat, T., 2011. Place du pain dans l'équilibre alimentaire. *Pratiques en*
46 *nutrition* 7 (26), 45–50.
47
48
49
50 Muller, J., Hunter, A., 2012. An argumentation-based approach for decision
51 making. In: *Proc. of ICTAI*. pp. 564–571.
52
53
54

1
2
3
4
5 Perrot, N., Trelea, I., Baudrit, C., Trystram, G., Bourgine, P., 2011. Mod-
6 elling and analysis of complex food systems: State of the art and new
7 trends. *Trends in Food Science & Technology* 22 (6), 304 – 314.
8
9

10
11 PNNS (documents statutaires), 2010. [http://www.sante.gouv.fr/htm/](http://www.sante.gouv.fr/htm/pointsur/nutrition/pol_nutri4.htm)
12 [pointsur/nutrition/pol_nutri4.htm](http://www.sante.gouv.fr/htm/pointsur/nutrition/pol_nutri4.htm).
13
14

15
16 Rahwan, I., Simari, G., 2009. *Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence*.
17 Springer.
18

19
20 Slavin, J., Green, H., 2007. Dietary fibre and satiety. *British Nutrition Foun-*
21 *dation* 32(1), 32–42.
22
23

24
25 Thomopoulos, R., Charnomordic, B., Cuq, B., Abécassis, J., September 2009.
26 Artificial intelligence-based decision support system to manage quality of
27 durum wheat products. *Quality Assurance and Safety of Crops & Foods*
28 1 (3), 179–190.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Highlights

- We present a real use case study of an argumentation process in the agrifood domain, in the wheat to bread chain.
- We introduce the notions of viewpoint and goal in a backward chaining reasoning procedure.
- We provide a logical framework in first order logic.
- Specific recommended actions are computed depending on the considered concerns.
- We present the case study evaluation process.