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Response to Commentary on “Argumentation Mining in Parliamentary Discourse”
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Canada
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The analysis of change of framing over time, although an important goal, is not an immediate goal of this research; rather, we focus on argumentation mining, and providing the means for political scientists to perform such analyses.

While we appreciate that the importance of computational analysis of framing is recognized, we stress that this computational analysis has relied on previously defined frames that were drawn from manual content analysis; the automatic identification of new frames is still well beyond the state of the art. Furthermore, as mentioned in the paper, frames may be thought to be located in several places—communicator, text, receiver, and culture—and taking into account these locations to find and study frames is not a trivial task by any means. In this work, we have seen that even expert annotators often disagree in identifying frames. So, it would be rather optimistic to suppose that computers can be trained to replace humans in this level of argumentation analysis any time soon.