

Logical Constructs and Systemic Biases in the Algerian UPR Stakeholders' Summary Report (2022)

Farida Bouattoura

SECTION 1: LOGICAL STRUCTURES AND ARGUMENT FRAMING

1.1 Logical Construct in the Algerian Stakeholders' Summary Report

The analysis began as an exploratory inquiry into the Algerian Stakeholders' Summary Report for the 2022 Universal Periodic Review (UPR), one of three UPR reports generated during that cycle. Through close examination of conditional logic, structural formulations, and rhetorical configurations, the inquiry organically revealed systemic patterns and constructs—emergent outcomes that were not originally intended to be quantified. The expression model illustrates the logical structure of the paragraphs in the Algerian Stakeholders' Summary Report, demonstrating a consistent framework that presents an if-then conditional argument. The structures and logical forms are constructed from each of the 64 paragraphs, excluding the first paragraph, which is not content-based. The 63 statements are rendered in a binary construct. Despite cross-referencing with two AI models—OpenAI GPT-4 and AI Jasper—no discrepancies surfaced, and both unanimously agreed with the researcher's analysis. The binary construct is inherent in the structuring of the argument; however, it is not necessarily in the content. For example, Joint Submission 9's attribution presented blueprint guidelines that left options, as did the CLW recommendation to Algerian authorities. Nevertheless, their framing was binary in construct; for this reason, the research article codified them as false binaries. Contrary to their explicitly declarative delivery, the implicit concluding arguments still do not harbor binary constraints.

Keywords : Argument architecture, Nested logic, Premise mapping, Logical framing, AI-assisted validation, Directionality in logic, Universal Periodic Review (UPR)

1.2 Functional Logic and Structural Features

Furthermore, several uniform similarities and patterns arose in the logical construction of the 63 paragraph statements. The binary structure was the outermost layer of what is known as functional logic, where the texts contained compound sentences and sentence embedding—nested conditions that rendered a loaded statement. In addition, the premises were written as declarative statements and structured more or less in standard logical form, consisting of quantifiers or determiners, the subject term (noun or pronoun), and the copula or verb that serves to connect to the predicate term. There is categorical nesting that utilizes a majority of determiners and prepositions in a unidirectional sense, providing vivid direction to the reader. The conditions are delivered in compound sentences as well, through conjunctions ("and" and "or") or commas. It is further noted that many of the sentences contained absolute terms, either universal affirmations or universal negations. The nesting of categorical sentences and compound sentences through the use of conjunctions (such as "and" or additive operators) simplifies to $((P1 \wedge P2 \wedge Pn) \rightarrow C)$, once more binary, and with the added conditions of the conjunction, the logical rule indicates an absolute affirmation of all with no access to any alternative options. However, this is related to the truth value of the given premises, the validity, and the soundness of the argument.

1.3 Sentence Transformation and Categorical Design

A uniform structure is also achieved through the alteration of adverbs that indicate location and time by converting them into noun phrases for clarity. For instance, changing "where the event occurs" to "the location of the event," and "when the event happens" to "the time of the event." Another characteristic is the transformation of adjectives into nouns or noun-like forms, often seen in this doctrine and others, such as the Rome Statute. For example, "acts of discrimination" rather than "discriminatory," or "inhumane actions" rather than "inhumanly." Such transformation is typical of standardizing categorical logic. Minimizing the use of verbs and relying primarily on linking verbs (copulas), such as "is" and "are", serves to connect subjects with their descriptions. Given the nature of these logical functional constructs, emphasis is placed on nouns, determiners, and prepositions to build stronger and more precise statements. Notably, the methodology incorporates specific quantifiers and determiners—terms like "all," "some," "every," "none," "the," "a," "this," and "that"—to add clarity in position and subject-predicate terms, operating as a conduit accessing an endpoint.

1.4 AEIO Logic Framing

Predefined terms seamlessly transfer or are easily converted to AEIO statements:

- Universal affirmation (A): "All S are P"
- Universal negative (E): "No S are P"
- Particular affirmative (I): "Some S are P"
- Particular negative (O): "Some S are not P"

Tactful maneuvering strategically designates fixed positioning in the framing of the argument, optimizing control for the architect while structurally limiting the subject's access to maneuvering within the designed landscape.

SECTION 2: RHETORICAL STRATEGY AND LOGICAL FALLACIES

2.1 Square of Opposition and Logical Evaluation

The Square of Opposition can be instrumental in setting clear objectives and in establishing foundational laws. The square consists of:

- **A (Universal Affirmation):** Located in the second quadrant, indicating 100% or all is the case.
- **E (Universal Negation):** To the right, indicating complete absence or 0%.
- **I (Particular Affirmation):** A subaltern of A, located in the third quadrant, meaning at least one instance.
- **O (Particular Negation):** A contradiction of A, indicating some are not, thus negating the possibility of all.

The relationship is not bidirectional in affirmations; "some P" does not inherently mean "all P," but "all P" does indicate "some P." To disprove a universal concept (A), one only needs a particular occurrence (O). It is essential to note the definition of "some" as an overarching term indicating at least one ($x \geq 1$). Therefore, 99% is "some," "most" is "some," "several" is "some," and "one" is "some." Most reasonable arguments, meaning pragmatic and life-based, fall under "some." For instance, no one can say there are no unfair trials in any country, as institutions and humanity inherently contain some errors. While aiming to minimize error is ideal, expecting no mistake is not sound, though the argument may be logically valid in structure. An argument depends on landscape building and positioning.

2.2 Framing, Semantics, and Rhetorical Pitfalls

For instance, when I is true, E is false, A is undetermined, and O is undetermined. If one claims, "some have reported that the nation has committed serious crimes against the predicted group," examining the logical position of the accused becomes crucial. The contradiction (E) would claim that no serious crimes occur, which is unsound because some form of serious crime is likely to happen in all nations. Claiming a universal affirmative (A)—that all crimes happen all the time—is impractical. Therefore, O—the contrary of A—is invalid, since "some" can mean "all" or "some," not the absolute contradiction of "all." The result is a logic trap, where denying "some" without context would appear unreasonable or unwilling.

Such framing highlights the importance of arguments, particularly in human rights, and the need for a mixed-methodology approach that combines explicit and implicit methods to provide a nuanced understanding. It remains crucial to use one's words with nuanced and directed precision, as indicating a universal condition when one means frequent or severe, in the context of national norms, is a term likely to skew and misrepresent the situation. At the UN and international levels, certain terms carry specific legal implications and are defined in treaties. Though they are relative, they can be skewed by sharp instrumentalization for geopolitical agendas. Terms like "systemic" can render anything done by the state, any protocol institution, or organized group, as the word defines a methodological approach only. Similarly, "serious" is a highly subjective word. Deductive reasoning is mainly employed here, as it uses propositions stated as declarative statements, which can state both true and false conditions.

2.3 Sentence Logic, Operators, and Conjunctions

Ancient philosophers held that only declarative sentences are capable of expressing something as true or false. An assumption or declaration is not equivalent to truth simply because it is delivered as factual. Such delivery can indeed skew perception, tapping into binary thinking, confirmation bias, the authority of the text or statement, or even appeal to ignorance. All such methodologies are considered fallacies—a topic covered in chapters to come. Before commenting, it is essential to understand the fixed terminology used. For example, compound sentences are sentences that combine two or more independent clauses. Embedded sentences are sentences nested inside compound sentences and also have conditions. The building can occur at various levels, thus requiring the construction of complex sentences and logic. Embedded sentences are coupled with verbs and relationships that define operator-accessing conduits within the sentence.

Operators, which connect two sentences, are called dyadic connectors. The operators "and," "or," "not," and "if" render conjunctions. "And" holds if and only if both conditionals are accepted and true. "Or" indicates a disjunction, hence either-or. It is essential to speak of implication equivalents: $(p \wedge q = \neg(\neg p \vee \neg q))$. These can be used interchangeably without logical deviation. "Not" is a negation connector with a categorical nature, and "if" is a conditional. When speaking of conditional statements, the implication equivalence of if-then statements is $(\neg p \vee q)$, which reveals its practically ultimatum nature. Conditional if-then statements can be constructed without the operator. One merely needs to frame one part of the sentence as dependent on another, use words that indicate cause-and-effect relationships, turn verbs into nouns to emphasize conditions and outcomes, and provide enough context so that the reader can infer the conditional relationship.

2.4 Implicit Logic and Structural Power

One can feasibly create an argument with presumptions and present them as facts by presenting conditions that are direct, predetermined, and prepositioned without stating the conclusion. Simple binary constructs, such as *Modus Ponens* or *Modus Tollens*, suffice for dimensional reduction through the application of enveloping. Additionally, one can create an "if and only if" true logic trap by building the framework, providing the conditions, claiming the subject has or has not met the predicated term, and then closing it as a statement. Implicit tactics serve well for easier affirmation rather than explicitly expressing the conclusion; implicit processing can seem innate and be perceived as natural.

Techniques like these are systemic within the language canvas, designed for widespread use and directed at any conceptual attempt to deviate from the intended, unidirectional, predetermined endpoints. Control over the narrative is ensured through binary constructs, nested conditions in embedded sentences and their operators, and the delivery of conditional compounded statements through conjunctions or implicative equivalents. By building the landscape, agents and actors can leverage positioning to create logical paradoxes against their opposition. Third parties may perceive the receiving subject as either unable or unwilling to debate—a deliberate instrumentalization of structural power.

In logic and formal argumentation, an implicit statement can often deliver a conditional relationship without explicitly stating "if... then..." through structural dependencies. The conditions and outcomes are woven into the narrative, thereby framing the statement as a conditional function, where declarative sentences serve as the primary vehicle of logic. Sentences can employ dependencies to form a dichotomic frame using logical operators and implicit devices. A systematic methodology, akin to the mathematical application of differentiation and simplifying expressions to their simplest form—derivatives—utilizes the ability to dissect a text at an infinitesimal level of nuanced detail. The method optimizes position for multi-tiered access in evaluating the power dynamics of the UN OHCHR Stakeholders' Summary Report.

SECTION 3.1: TABLE 1 – PREMISE BREAKDOWN

Table 1 provides a full breakdown of argumentative statements from the Algerian Stakeholders' Summary Report, isolating each premise within a given paragraph. Each item is numerically labeled, beginning with Statement 2 through Statement 64, and every premise within the statement is designated as P1, P2, P3, with sub-premises labeled hierarchically as P2a, P2b, and so forth. Deeper layers of nesting appear as P3b1, P4a2, and similar constructions. These indicate sub-premises embedded within conditions, allowing the reader to see where elaboration, clarification, or conditional dependency is introduced. Table 2 translates these premises into formalized logic notation using standard logical operators. Expressions like $(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b(P3b1))) \rightarrow C$ are not found in Table 1 but are generated from the structure revealed there. Parentheses are introduced in Table 2 to visually and logically group together conditionally bound premises. In such a notation, $P2(P2a \wedge P2b)$ signals that P2 is made up of two subordinate claims functioning as a unit, and $P3b(P3b1)$ shows that P3b contains an additional nested component.

This logic notation is deliberately designed for clarity and transparency, rather than formal complexity. It avoids abstract symbolic excess by clearly tracing how arguments are structured, connected, and conditionally bound. Decimal and percentage weights appear in Table 2 to represent the relative contribution of each premise to the total logical structure, which is quantified through total weight calculations. Table 1 shows what is said and how it's ordered; Table 2 reveals how it's structured logically, how those premises interact, and how control is embedded through conjunction, implication, and nesting. Both tables work together to expose the geometry and logic of each paragraph, making visible the formal construction of reasoning in a way that is exact, minimal, and accessible.

Table 1

No.	Premise Breakdown
2	<p>(P1): Algeria received 11 recommendations on the death penalty in 2017. (P2): Two of these recommendations were partially accepted. (P2a): The accepted parts are concerning commutation of sentences and the moratorium. (P2b): The rejected parts called for a first step towards abolition. (P3): The other recommendations focused on: (P3a): Abolition of the death penalty. (P3b): Ratification of ICCPR-OP 2. (P3b1): Aiming at the abolition of the death penalty. (Operates as a scalar)</p>
3	<p>(P1): Algeria has ratified the majority of international treaties relating to the protection of human rights. (P1a): Algeria's ratifications include: (P1a1): International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), in 1989. (P1a2): Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), in 1989. (P1a3): Convention on the Rights of the Child, in 1993. (P1a4): African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, in 1987. (P1a5): African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, in 2003. (P2): Algeria has not signed or ratified certain treaties, including: (P2a): Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). (P2b): Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR-OP 2). (P2cScalar): The OPCAT provides for the establishment of a national preventive mechanism.</p>
4	<p>(P1Scalar): The recommendations include the ratification of a number of important conventions. (P2): Algeria has not accepted recommendations to: (P2a): Decriminalize defamation. (P2b): Decriminalize homosexuality. (P2c): Amend discriminatory provisions of the Family Code. (P2d): Define rape in the Penal Code.</p>
5	<p>(P1): JS17 called upon the Algerian government to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. (P2): JS17 called upon the Algerian government to ratify the Rome Statute. (P3): JS17 called upon the Algerian government to sign and ratify the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). (P4): JS17 called upon the Algerian government to lift all reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). (P4a): JS17 called upon the Algerian government to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). (P4b): JS17 called upon the Algerian government to promptly submit a periodic report. (Operates as a scalar)</p>
6	<p>(P1): ICAN issued a demand for Algeria to ratify the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW). (P2): The Algerian government signed the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW) on 20 September 2017. (P3): ICAN considers the ratification of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW) by Algeria as a matter of international urgency.</p>
7	<p>(P1): ECLJ noted that the new Algerian Constitution (January 2021) had been criticized as merely a surface-level revision. (P1a): The revision was meant to appease progressives without implementing meaningful change. (Scalar) (P2): ECLJ stressed that it was critical to reform the laws and Constitution. (P3): ECLJ emphasized the need to implement measures to fully comply with international obligations. (P4): These obligations mainly concern: (P4a): Freedom of conscience. (P4b): Freedom of opinion. (P4c): Freedom of religion. (P4d): Protection of places of worship. (P4e): Any other related freedoms and protections.</p>

8	<p>(P1): JS10 proposed several legislative recommendations related to freedom of expression and press. (P2): These recommendations aim to align Algeria’s: (P2a): Media regulations with the national constitution. (P2b): Media laws with the national constitution. (P2c): Media practices with international human rights standards, including Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. (P3): JS10 recommended amending the penal code to prohibit the prosecution of journalists under laws not related to media or journalism. (P3a): JS10 recommended easing registration restrictions under Law No. 12-06 on Associations. (P3a1): The easing of registration restrictions is intended to allow independent media organizations to receive donations and grants from both governmental and non-governmental, including foreign, donors.</p>
9	<p>(P1): Alkarama stated that the SCA re-accredited the CNDH with B status. (P2): The re-accreditation was on the grounds that CNDH did not comply with the Paris Principles. (P2a): Alkarama submitted a report to SCA highlighting the lack of independence of CNDH from the executive branch.</p>
10	<p>(P1): Despite some improvements regarding women’s rights in the 2020 amended Constitution. (P2): Algerian law continued to discriminate against women. (P2a): Past discrimination. (P2b): Present discrimination. (P2c): Future discrimination. (P3): Algerian law discriminates against women in specific domains. (P3a): In the matter of inheritance. (P3b): In the matter of marriage. (P3c): In the matter of divorce. (P3d): In the matter of child custody and guardianship.</p>
11	<p>(P1): UN Member States expressed concern over discrimination against women. (P2): UN Member States expressed concern over discrimination against LGBTQ+ persons. (P3): A specific concern noted is the criminalization of consensual same-sex sexual relations. (P4): Another specific concern noted is the lack of effective legislation to criminalize Gender-Based Violence.</p>
12	<p>(P1): Persons with disabilities have the right to non-discrimination. (P2): Persons with disabilities have the right to education. (P3): Persons with disabilities should be fully included in society. (P4): Persons with disabilities should be adequately included in society.</p>
13	<p>(P1): AI noted arbitrary and prolonged pretrial detentions. (P1a): Algeria’s Code of Penal Procedures states that provisional detention should be exceptional. (P1b): Algeria’s Constitution provides that provisional detention should be exceptional. (P2): The Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights aims at abolishing the death penalty. (P3): AI reminded the government to ratify the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. (P3a): AI reminded the government to commute all death sentences.</p>
14	<p>(P1): MENA Rights Group recommended that Algeria abolish the death penalty formally in the Penal Code. (P2): During the last UPR, Algeria only noted recommendations to completely abolish the death penalty. (P3): There has been a de facto moratorium on the application of the death penalty in Algeria since 1993. (P4): The death penalty has not formally been abolished in the Penal Code of Algeria. (P5): According to the Human Rights Committee, death sentences in Algeria are not automatically commuted. (P6): In 2020, one death sentence was recorded in Algeria.</p>

15	<p>(P1): The right to life is guaranteed by international conventions.</p> <p>(P2): Exceptional circumstances, including:</p> <p>(P2a): A state of war,</p> <p>(P2b): Threat of war,</p> <p>(P2c): Internal political instability,</p> <p>(P2d): Any other state of emergency,</p> <p>(P3): Cannot be invoked to justify extrajudicial, summary, or arbitrary executions.</p> <p>(P4): Algerian state authorities have carried out executions without any judicial or legal process.</p> <p>(P4a): Numerous cases of killings by Algerian public forces against Sahrawi refugees have been reported:</p> <p>(P4a1): Either by bullets</p> <p>(P4a2): Or by immolation.</p>
16	<p>P1: JS5 indicated that Algeria did not provide the necessary protection to the Sahrawi people on its soil.</p>
17	<p>(P1): JS5 urged Algeria to implement the Algerian national law on the whole Algerian territory, including the camps of Tindouf.</p> <p>(P2): JS5 urged Algeria to investigate extrajudicial executions.</p> <p>(P3): JS5 urged Algeria to prevent excessive use of force against defenseless refugees.</p> <p>(P4): JS5 urged Algeria to bring:</p> <p>(P4a): Perpetrators of violations to fair trials.</p> <p>(P4b): Supporters of violations to fair trials:</p> <p>(P4b1): In accordance with international human rights law.</p> <p>(P4b2): In accordance with international humanitarian law.</p> <p>(P4b3): As crimes for which there is no statute of limitations.</p>
18	<p>(P1): MENA Rights recommended repealing articles 45 and 46 of Ordinance 06-01.</p> <p>(P1a): The purpose of repealing articles 45 and 46 of Ordinance 06-01 is to guarantee victims' right to truth.</p> <p>(P1b): Accountability for perpetrators of human rights violations during the civil war.</p> <p>(P2): MENA Rights recommended establishing a national truth-seeking commission.</p> <p>(P2a): The purpose of establishing a national truth-seeking commission is to investigate war crimes.</p> <p>(P2b): Serious human rights violations, including enforced disappearances.</p>
19	<p>P1: Algeria received and accepted two recommendations pertaining to the respect of human rights while countering terrorism in the previous UPR cycle.</p> <p>P2: The authorities completely went against these recommendations.</p> <p>P3: Since the resumption of Hirak protests in February 2021, the authorities repeatedly used demonising rhetoric against peaceful protests.</p> <p>P4: The authorities increasingly resorted to charges of terrorism to prosecute peaceful activists.</p>
20	<p>P1: CIDH Africa noted that the "Glorification of terrorism" crime was systematically used to incriminate any peaceful act.</p> <p>P2: CIDH Africa noted that the "Glorification of terrorism" crime was systematically used to incriminate any criticism directed towards the authorities.</p> <p>P3: CIDH Africa noted that the "Glorification of terrorism" crime was systematically used to incriminate any criticism directed towards national symbols.</p> <p>P4: CIDH Africa pointed out the existence of ambiguous laws and definitions of crimes of terrorism.</p> <p>P5: Ambiguous laws and definitions of crimes of terrorism were used against human rights defenders.</p> <p>P6: Ambiguous laws and definitions of crimes of terrorism were used to suppress criticism directed towards national symbols.</p>
21	<p>P1: CIDH Africa recommended aligning the national definition of acts of terrorism with international standards.</p> <p>P2: CIDH Africa recommended fulfilling international obligations to protect the rights of detainees accused of committing terrorist acts.</p> <p>P3: CIDH Africa recommended stopping the use of counter-terrorism legislations to limit freedom of expression.</p> <p>P4: CIDH Africa recommended stopping the use of counter-terrorism legislations to limit peaceful activism.</p>
22	<p>P1: MENA Rights expressed concern over interference by the executive in the judiciary.</p> <p>P2: MENA Rights expressed concern over military tribunals trying civilians in violation of international standards.</p> <p>P3: MENA Rights recommended guaranteeing the independence of the judiciary.</p> <p>P4: MENA Rights recommended amending the Law on the Organisation of the Judiciary.</p> <p>P5: MENA Rights recommended strengthening the High Judicial Council's independence.</p> <p>P6: MENA Rights recommended ceasing trials of civilians before military courts.</p> <p>P7: MENA Rights recommended ensuring that lawyers can exercise their functions with complete independence.</p> <p>P8: MENA Rights recommended ensuring that lawyers can exercise their functions free from reprisals.</p>

23	<p>(P1): JS12 discussed the ongoing issue of impunity for serious crimes committed during the 1990s. (P1a): More than 8,000 victims of enforced disappearances remained unaccounted for. (P1b): Families lacked any judicial avenues to access the truth about the fate of the disappeared. (P2): The absence of prosecutions persists. (P2a): Amnesty laws are in effect. (P2b): The policy of "oblivion" implemented by the authorities exists. (P3): These factors impose a culture of impunity. (P3a): There is no hope for families to uncover the truth. (P3b): There is no guarantee of non-repetition.</p>
24	<p>(P1): JS12 recommended repealing the Charter on Peace and National Reconciliation. (P1a): JS12 recommended repealing the implementing ordinances of the Charter. (P2): JS12 recommended repealing all blanket amnesty legislation. (P3): JS12 recommended stopping the criminalization of free speech. (P4): JS12 recommended ensuring thorough and independent investigations into all allegations of enforced disappearance. (P4a): JS12 recommended ensuring families have access to effective remedy, reparations, and psychosocial support. (P4b): JS12 recommended ensuring families have access to effective remedy, reparations, and psychosocial support when a "judgement of death" was issued. (P5): JS12 recommended ratifying the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (ICPAPED) signed in 2007. (P6): JS12 recommended ratifying the Rome Statute signed in 2000.</p>
25	<p>(P1): ADF International recommended fully respecting the right to freedom of religion or belief without discrimination. (P2): ADF International recommended repealing Article 144-bis-2 of the Algerian Penal Code criminalizing blasphemy. (P3): ADF International recommended amending Law 06-03 to remove burdensome registration requirements for religious organizations and guarantee non-discrimination in processing requests. (P3a): ADF International recommended removing prohibitions on non-Muslim religious or belief communities operating on an unregistered basis, in accordance with international obligations. (P3b): ADF International recommended recognizing the Ahmadiyya community as an official religious association. (P3c): ADF International recommended removing all barriers to the activities of the Ahmadiyya community. (P4): ADF International recommended approving without delay existing requests for registration and re-registration of houses of worship. (P4a): ADF International recommended taking immediate steps to re-open Protestant churches closed under COVID-19 measures or for being unregistered.</p>
26	<p>(P1): Minority Rights Group International (MRG) recalled General Comment No.37. (P1a): General Comment No.37 emphasizes the right of peaceful assembly. (P1b): General Comment No.37 underscores the need to repeal legislation prosecuting freedom of expression. (P1c): General Comment No.37 highlights the importance of repealing legislation prosecuting freedom of association. (P1d): General Comment No.37 stresses the necessity of repealing legislation prosecuting peaceful assembly. (P2): MRG aims to bring Algeria's legislative framework in line with its international obligations. (P3): MRG's goal aligns with Article 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).</p>
27	<p>(P1): JS4 called on Algeria to implement best practices and internationally recognized standards relating to the freedom of expression. (P2): JS4 called on Algeria to uphold the right to freedom of expression as: (P2a): Enshrined in the Constitution. (P2b): Enshrined in the ICCPR, ratified by Algeria. (P3a): JS4 recommended ending violence against human rights activists and defenders. (P3b): JS4 recommended ending harassment of human rights activists and defenders. (P3c): JS4 recommended removing restrictions on the registration of associations. (P3d): JS4 recommended reforming legislation to enable Algerian NGOs to receive national and international funding. (P4): JS4 recommended freeing all political prisoners and Hirak protesters and ending arbitrary arrests. (P5): JS4 recommended ensuring compliance with internationally agreed standards relating to pretrial detention.</p>

28	<p>(P1): CLW referred to the International Labor Organization’s indicators of trafficking in persons. (P1a): CLW found evidence of multiple indicators of trafficking among foreign workers. (P1b): These indicators include deceptive recruitment. (P1c): These indicators include coercive recruitment. (P1d): These indicators include coercion at destination. (P2): CLW found violations of labor rights among foreign workers. (P2a): CLW found violations of other human rights among foreign workers.</p>
29	<p>(P1): Algeria regularly inspects labor conditions in construction sites with foreign migrant employers. (P2): Algeria develops a mechanism: (P2a): To identify and (P2b): Help victims of human trafficking. (P2c): Algeria helps migrant workers who overstay their temporary permit. (P3): Algeria offers translation services at police departments in localities. (P4): Algeria improves accessibility to the authorities: (P4a): To monitor human trafficking. (P4b): To monitor the smuggling of migrants.</p>
30	<p>(P1): JS16 referred to the practice of enslavement of black families. (P2): Testimonies include accounts of enslavement, including a young girl enslaved at the age of six. (P3): Young black people in the camps of Tindouf have organized against slavery. (P4): The Freedom and Progress Association for the fight against slavery has identified 7,130 slaves in the camps. (P4a): Women in slavery are subjected to rape, forced marriage, and harsh conditions. (P5): Nine black women have died while giving birth without medical assistance. (P5a): Three other slaves have died of thirst. (P5b): Women in slavery are sent into the desert to look after their masters’ livestock.</p>
31	<p>(P1): JS16 submitted recommendations regarding allowing international missions to enter the camps. (P2a): The purpose of these missions is to conduct genuine investigations into serious violations of the civil rights of the Sahrawi people. (P2b): The purpose of these missions is to conduct impartial investigations into serious violations of the civil rights of the Sahrawi people. (P3a): The missions aim to ascertain the fate of murdered persons. (P3b): The missions aim to ascertain the fate of missing persons. (P4a): The recommendation includes handing over the remains of murdered persons to their families. (P4b): The recommendation includes handing over the remains of missing persons to their families.</p>
32	<p>(P1a): The inadequate standards of living in the most disadvantaged areas. (P1b): This includes the Sahrawi refugee camps in the Wilaya of Tindouf. (P2): JS5 recommended: (P2a): Algeria to take appropriate measures to strengthen the enjoyment of economic and social rights in these areas. (P2b): These areas include the Sahrawi refugee camps in the Wilaya of Tindouf. (P3): JS5 recommended including the Tindouf camps in the development plans. (P4): JS5 recommended guaranteeing the right to a decent standard of living for the inhabitants. (P5): JS5 recommended providing humanitarian aid. (P6a): Fighting against all forms of misappropriation. (P6b): Fighting against looting.</p>
33	<p>(P1): JS18 pointed out: (P1a): The Algerian state’s response to Covid-19 in Kabylia in 2020–2021 demonstrated gross neglect. (P1b): This neglect led to unnecessarily high fatalities. (P1c): This neglect intensified tension with the authorities. (P2): Kabylia health departments received: (P2a): Little support from the Algerian government. (P2b): Despite being burdened with disproportionately high numbers of cases. (P3): JS18 recommended: (P3a): Algeria ensure fair handling of the coronavirus health crisis. (P3b): Algeria ensure responsible handling of the coronavirus health crisis. (P3c): This includes allocating medical supplies from the international community to the Kabylia population.</p>

34	<p>(P1): The standards of nutrition, public health, and medical care have steadily deteriorated over the years. (P1a): Despite international aid. (P2): A large number of children: (P2a): Are deaf or hard of hearing. (P3): Drinking water: (P3a): Is difficult to access. (P3b): Is unfit for human consumption. (P3c): Is of poor quality. (P3d): Is polluted.</p>
35	<p>(P1): BCN noted: (P1a): According to the Algerian National Office of Statistics. (P1b): The number of students throughout all levels of education increased by 3.8%. (P1c): The number of teachers decreased by 1.2%. (P2): BCN expressed concern: (P2a): The ratio of students per teacher kept growing. (P2b): This could lead to a worsening of the overcrowding problem in certain schools.</p>
36	<p>(P1): BCN indicated: (P1a): 9.48% of children in Algeria were out of school. (P1b): The data varied considerably when looking at the out-of-school children among the poorest, which was 16.14%. (P1c): The data varied considerably when looking at the out-of-school children among the richest, which was 4.36%.</p>
37	<p>(P1): BCN expressed concerns regarding excluding pregnant girls from school, stating that it greatly discredits gender equality within the school system in Algeria. (P2): BCN highlighted the social stigma surrounding teenage pregnancies, which can lead to pregnant girls being forced to drop out of school.</p>
38	<p>(P1): BCN recommended that Algeria take the necessary measures to resolve issues related to excluding pregnant girls from school and the social stigma surrounding teenage pregnancies. (P2): BCN further recommended providing additional financial and psychological assistance to persons with disabilities as part of a vulnerable group.</p>
39	<p>(P1): JS9 mentioned the difficulties in ensuring access to education for children with disabilities. (P2): These difficulties include: (P2a): Lack of school assistants. (P2b): Insufficient didactic resources. (P2c): Inadequate learning materials. (P2d): Lack of teacher training. (P3): Children with disabilities are primarily under the purview of the Ministry of National Solidarity, the Family and Women. (P4): The Ministry lacks the necessary capacity and inclusive vision. (P5): The Ministry of National Education should assume responsibility for educating children with disabilities. (P6): This should align with an inclusive vision and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. (P7): Actions needed for this shift: (P7a): Establishing a department for inclusive education. (P7b): Forming a multidisciplinary team. (P7c): Phasing out unnecessary special classes. (P8): The Ministry of National Solidarity, the Family and Women should: (P8a): Provide financial support to the Ministry of National Education. (P8b): Train school assistants. (P8c): Support schools managed by parents of children with disabilities. (P8d): Ensure integration with other children.</p>

40	<p>(P1): Tamazight is recognized as an official national language in the constitutional amendment of 2016 (article 4).</p> <p>(P2): The recognition of Tamazight is nominal and lacks tangible effects.</p> <p>(P3): The dominance of Arab-Islamic language and culture persists despite the recognition of Tamazight.</p> <p>(P4): Tamazight language education is limited:</p> <p>(P4a): Taught in relatively few classes and regions.</p> <p>(P4b): Optional basis with no curriculum continuity.</p> <p>(P5): Tamazight is not used in the judicial system or civil service.</p> <p>(P6): Amazigh culture is marginalized, often treated as folkloric.</p> <p>(P7): Media representation of Tamazight culture is limited:</p> <p>(P7a): Majority of television channels focus exclusively on Arab-Islamic culture.</p> <p>(P7b): Only one Tamazight channel with limited broadcasting hours.</p> <p>(P7c): Lack of control over programming by the Amazigh community.</p>
41	<p>(P1): Algerian legislation on domestic violence is limited, applying only to incidents between spouses and ex-spouses.</p> <p>(P2): Article 266 of the Penal Code allows perpetrators of domestic violence to receive commuted sentences if pardoned by the victims.</p> <p>(P3): Social pressure often leads victims to pardon attackers to save face.</p>
42	<p>(P1): Jubilee Campaign highlights the limitations of Algerian legislation on domestic violence.</p> <p>(P2): Legislation should be expanded to include all perpetrators of domestic violence, not just spouses.</p> <p>(P3): Social pressure on women to pardon attackers influences legal outcomes.</p>
43	<p>(P1): Amnesty International (AI) recommended amending all articles in the Penal Code and Family Code that discriminate based on gender.</p> <p>(P2): Articles 326 and 336 of the Penal Code allow rapists to avoid punishment by marrying the victim and lack a clear definition of rape, respectively.</p> <p>(P2a): Article 326 allows rapists to avoid punishment by marrying the victim.</p> <p>(P2b): Article 336 lacks a clear definition of rape.</p> <p>(P3): Articles 11, 53, 54, and 66 of the Family Code impose discriminatory practices against women.</p> <p>(P3a): Article 11 mandates women to marry in the presence of a male relative.</p> <p>(P3b): Articles 53 and 54 grant unilateral divorce rights to husbands but not wives.</p> <p>(P3c): Article 66 stipulates that a mother who remarries loses custody of her children.</p>
44	<p>(P1): JS16 highlighted the recruitment of children in refugee camps to armed militias as a specific violation of humanitarian and civilian principles.</p> <p>(P2): Children as young as 5 years old are sent to indoctrination centers.</p> <p>(P2a): Children as young as 5 years old are enrolled in programs promoting hatred.</p> <p>(P2b): Children as young as 5 years old are enrolled in programs promoting violence.</p> <p>(P3): Children enrolled in these programs are subsequently integrated into military training centers.</p> <p>(P3a): Children integrated into military training centers endure enslavement.</p> <p>(P3b): Children integrated into military training centers endure abuse.</p> <p>(P4): Children integrated into military training centers receive training.</p> <p>(P4a): Training in firearms.</p> <p>(P4b): Training in explosives.</p> <p>(P4c): Some children are taken from their parents.</p> <p>(P5): Taken children are sent to indoctrination and weapons training centers.</p> <p>(P5a): Indoctrination centers.</p> <p>(P5b): Weapons training centers.</p> <p>(P6): Security Council resolution 2601 (2021).</p> <p>(P6a): Condemns the recruitment of children.</p> <p>(P6b): Calls on states to end such practices.</p> <p>(P6c): Calls on states to protect children in refugee camps.</p>
45	<p>(P1): End Violence expressed concern about the existing situation in Algeria regarding corporal punishment of children.</p> <p>(P2): End Violence hoped that the issue would be raised during the review in 2022.</p> <p>(P3): End Violence hoped for a specific recommendation to intensify efforts to enact a law to clearly prohibit all corporal punishment of children in Algeria.</p>

46	<p>(P1): CIDH Africa expressed concern that the Algerian government refuses to register migrants' children out of marriage. (P2): Refusal to register these children limits their basic rights. (P2a): Such as access to primary health care. (P3): Refusal to register these children limits their basic rights. (P3a): Such as access to education.</p>
47	<p>(P1): CIDH Africa recommended Algeria to recognize children born out of marriage. (P1a): Granting them legal status. (P2): Legal status ensures full access. (P2a): To education. (P2b): To health care.</p>
48	<p>(P1): JS9 observed that not enough is being done to monitor the application of laws on accessibility. (P1a): There is a lack of compliance with Algerian accessibility standards. (P1b): No enforcement action is being taken against persons who infringe accessibility laws. (P2): Proposals in the annual report by the national commission for accessibility have not been forwarded to the Government. (P3): The national commission for accessibility comprises all ministries concerned. (P3a): There are no local branches responsible for conveying local accessibility needs to the national commission. (P3b): There are no local branches responsible for monitoring the local implementation of accessibility laws. (P4): Algerian accessibility standards do not adequately consider accessibility for persons with intellectual disabilities. (P4a): Algerian accessibility standards do not adequately consider accessibility for persons with psychological disabilities. (P5): The Government has no national plan for making public spaces accessible. (P5a): There is no national plan with priorities and results to be attained in the short term. (P5b): There is no national plan with priorities and results to be attained in the long term. (P5c): There is no national plan in accordance with a clear schedule.</p>
49	<p>(P1): JS9 recommends the examination of the draft framework law on the promotion and protection of the rights of persons with disabilities. (P1a): JS9 recommends the adoption of the draft framework law on the promotion and protection of the rights of persons with disabilities. (P1b): The recommendation is directed to the National People's Assembly.</p>
50	<p>(P1): Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies (CIHRS) indicated that Law 12-06 is used to prevent religious minorities from fully exercising their right to freedom of religion or belief. (P2): CIHRS indicated that Ordinance 06-03 is used to prevent religious minorities from fully exercising their right to freedom of religion or belief. (P2a): The prevention includes the freedom of association. (P2b): The prevention includes the freedom of peaceful assembly. (P3): At least 18 churches affiliated with the Algerian Protestant Church (EPA) have been closed since 2017. (P3a): The closures were allegedly due to their "illegality". (P4): CIHRS recommended repealing Law 12-06-2012. (P4a): CIHRS recommended adopting a new law fully in compliance with ICCPR Articles 21 and 22.</p>
51	<p>(P1): JS8 noted that an estimated 99% of Algeria's population of 43 million people are Sunni Muslim. (P2): The remaining percent is comprised of Christians, Jews, Muslim minorities including Ahmadiyyah and Shi'a Muslims, and the non-religious. (P3): The country's constitution declares Islam as the official state religion (Article 2). (P4): To become a president of the country, a candidate must be a Muslim (Article 91).</p>
52	<p>(P1): JS8 recommended the Algerian government to suspend and revise Ordinance 06-03 (of 2006) regarding the exercise of non-Muslim religions. (P2): Ordinance 06-03 sets out conditions and rules for the exercise of non-Muslim religions. (P3): The recommendation is to bring the ordinance in line with Article 18 of the ICCPR. (P4): JS8 recommended granting permission to all forcibly closed churches to re-open. (P5): JS8 recommended granting permission to Église Protestante d'Algérie (EPA) affiliated churches to continue to use rented premises as places of worship.</p>

53	<p>(P1): MRG stated that Black Algerians, indigenous to southern Algeria, account for an estimated 10% of the country's total population as per a 2009 academic estimate.</p> <p>(P2): No official statistics exist regarding the population of Black Algerians.</p> <p>(P3): Black Algerians suffer from racial discrimination.</p> <p>(P4): The racial discrimination is largely considered to be imputable to the state institutionalization of a white Arab-Muslim identity only.</p>
54	<p>(P1): MRG noted that activists of the Movement for the Self-Determination of Kabylia (MAK) regularly face arbitrary arrests and harassment by the police.</p> <p>(P2): MAK is an organization promoting the independence of Kabylia through peaceful means.</p> <p>(P3): Algerian authorities labelled MAK as a terrorist entity in May 2021.</p> <p>(P4): Activists reported being subjected to administrative discrimination and loss of employment.</p> <p>(P5): Some activists had their passports confiscated by the Ministry of the Interior.</p>
55	<p>(P1): JS7 recommended that Algeria should enable the Kabyle People to exercise their right to self-determination.</p> <p>(P2): JS7 recommended that Algeria respect the Kabyle People's aspirations to freedom, dignity, and development.</p> <p>(P3): JS7 recommended protecting the population of the Kabyle region from gross violations committed by the State's military and security service.</p>
56	<p>(P1): JS12 indicates a legal vacuum concerning the protection of LGBTQ+ individuals.</p> <p>(P1a): The legal vacuum includes the criminalization of consensual same-sex relations (article 338 of the Penal Code).</p> <p>(P2): The lack of awareness and training of relevant institutions prevents LGBTQ+ individuals from accessing any remedy in case of gender-based violence (GBV) or other discriminatory treatment.</p> <p>(P3): The legal vacuum leads LGBTQ+ individuals not to report violations.</p> <p>(P3a): LGBTQ+ individuals fear being outed or prosecuted.</p> <p>(P4): The situation creates complete impunity for those who commit GBV or discriminatory treatment against LGBTQ+ individuals.</p>
57	<p>(P1): JS12 emphasized the existing discrimination against LGBTQ+ individuals.</p> <p>(P1a): Discrimination includes house raids.</p> <p>(P2): Discrimination includes arbitrary prosecutions for actions protected by the right to privacy, bodily autonomy, and non-discrimination in the ICCPR.</p> <p>(P3): LGBTQ+ individuals face a heightened risk of torture and ill-treatment by authorities.</p> <p>(P3a): LGBTQ+ individuals face a heightened risk of torture and ill-treatment by other inmates.</p>
58	<p>(P1): JS12 recommended the Algerian government to repeal Articles 266 bis, 266 bis 1, 279, and 330 bis of the Penal Code.</p> <p>(P2): These articles allow perpetrators of Gender-Based Violence (GBV) to escape justice.</p> <p>(P3): JS12 recommended adopting measures to ensure effective access to justice for survivors of GBV.</p> <p>(P3a): JS12 recommended adopting measures to ensure effective access to health care for survivors of GBV.</p> <p>(P3b): JS12 recommended adopting measures to ensure effective access to social services for survivors of GBV.</p> <p>(P3c): JS12 recommended repealing Articles 333 and 338 to decriminalize consensual same-sex relationships.</p> <p>(P4): JS12 recommended ending judicial harassment and intimidation of Women's Human Rights Defenders (WHRDs) and LGBTQ+ activists.</p> <p>(P4a): JS12 recommended fully allowing WHRDs and LGBTQ+ activists to advocate for their rights in law and in practice.</p> <p>(P4b): JS12 recommended prosecuting derogatory speech and smear campaigns against WHRDs and activists.</p>
59	<p>(P1): The Sahraoui Observatory for Media and Human Rights (Sahraoui Observatory) stressed that gross violations of human rights have been prevailing in the refugee camps for over four decades.</p> <p>(P2): These violations include extrajudicial killings.</p> <p>(P2a): These violations include kidnappings.</p> <p>(P2b): These violations include enforced disappearances.</p> <p>(P2c): These violations include arbitrary detention.</p> <p>(P2d): These violations include torture.</p> <p>(P2e): These violations include intimidation.</p> <p>(P2f): These violations include cruel and abusive treatment.</p> <p>(P2g): These violations include writing with sharp instruments on the body of victims.</p> <p>(P2h): These violations include rape.</p> <p>(P2i): These violations include other forms of violations.</p>

60	(P1): The organization urged Algeria to open a comprehensive investigation into all cases of extrajudicial killings committed in the Sahrawi refugee camps in Tindouf, South Western Algeria. (P2): The investigation should be independent. (P3): The investigation should cover all cases of extrajudicial killings. (P4): The investigation should reveal the truth about the above-mentioned cases.
61	(P1): JS11 and Sahraoui Observatory expressed concern about the legal status of the Sahrawi Refugees in the camps. (P2): The legal status affects the refugees' enjoyment of the rights stipulated in the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees and its annexed protocol. (P3): JS11 and Sahraoui Observatory recommended the State under review to allow a general census of the camp population.
62	(P1): They encouraged the Algerian authorities to revoke the delegation of their powers. (P2): They encouraged ensuring the protection of civil and political rights of the refugees in the camps. (P3): They encouraged the creation of an atmosphere conducive to the work of civil society organizations. (P4): They encouraged the protection of the right to peaceful assembly.
63	(P1): AI recommended abolishing or amending Article 175 bis of the Penal Code, which criminalizes “illicit” exit from Algeria. (P2): AI recommended ensuring that any violations of migration legislation are treated as administrative, not criminal, offenses. (P2a): AI recommended amending Law No. 08-11 to decriminalize irregular entry, stay, and exit. (P2b): AI recommended ensuring irregular entry, stay, and exit are treated as administrative offenses rather than criminal offenses. (P3): AI recommended adopting national legislation implementing the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Optional Protocol. (P3a): AI recommended adopting national legislation implementing other international laws and standards for the protection of people in need of international protection. (P4): AI urged Algeria to grant protection to refugees recognized as such by UNHCR. (P5): AI urged Algeria to stop the practice of arbitrary arrests of foreign nationals without due process. (P6): AI urged Algeria to stop the practice of summary expulsions of foreign nationals without due process. (P6a): AI urged Algeria to respect the principle of non-refoulement.
64	P1: JS7 noted an issue of statelessness existing in Algeria, particularly in the Sahrawi refugee camps. P2: JS7 referred to the ruling of the Spanish Supreme Court, confirming that since the majority of Sahrawis are lacking legal status, they are stateless. P3: The majority of Sahrawis lack legal status within the camps. P3a: The majority of Sahrawis lack legal status outside the camps. P4: The lawsuit was filed by a Sahrawi refugee who was not able to renew her passport after its validity came to an end against a decision of the Ministry of the Interior. P4a: Algeria only delivers passports with short validity to travel for medical treatment. P4b: Algeria only delivers passports with short validity for family reunion purposes.

Note. This table provides detailed breakdowns of premises (P1, P2, etc.) and their related sub-premises (e.g., P1a, P2b), as reported by various international human rights bodies, organizations, and advocacy groups. It also includes documented human rights concerns and recommendations directed toward Algeria. Each numbered entry (No. 2–64) represents an individual statement addressing specific rights violations, legislative gaps, treaty ratifications, or recommended actions. Sub-premises (e.g., P4a, P8 b) reflect additional explanatory points, conditions, or specific recommendations nested within the primary premises. The content accurately reflects the original statements provided to Algeria during the Universal Periodic Review (UPR).

Section 3.2: Table 2 – Logical Expressions and Weights

No.	Expression	Implication Equivalence	Decimal and Percentage Representation	Total Weight Calculation
2	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b(P3b1))) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3b1)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.375, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.5, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 37.5%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 50%	Total Weight = 1 + 3 + 4 = 8

3	$(P1(P1a(P1a1 \wedge P1a2 \wedge P1a3 \wedge P1a4 \wedge P1a5)) \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a(P1a1 \wedge P1a2 \wedge P1a3 \wedge P1a4 \wedge P1a5)) \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.636, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.364, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 63.64%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 36.36%	Total Weight = 7 + 4 = 11
4	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c \wedge P2d)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c \wedge P2d)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.833, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 83.3%	Total Weight = 1 + 5 = 6
5	$(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.5, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 50%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 3 = 6
6	$(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.333, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 33.3%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 = 3
7	$(P1(P1a) \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b \wedge P4c \wedge P4d \wedge P4e)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a) \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b \wedge P4c \wedge P4d \wedge P4e)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.2, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.1, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.1, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.6, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 20%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 10%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 10%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 60%	Total Weight = 2 + 1 + 1 + 6 = 10
8	$P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c) \wedge P3(P3a(P3a1)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c) \wedge P3(P3a(P3a1))) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.5, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.375, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 50%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 37.5%	Total Weight = 1 + 4 + 3 = 8
9	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2(P2a)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.667, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 66.7%	Total Weight = 1 + 2 = 3
10	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c \wedge P3d)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c \wedge P3d)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.1, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.4, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.5, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 10%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 40%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 50%	Total Weight = 1 + 4 + 5 = 10
11	$((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge P4)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge P4)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.25, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 25%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 4

12	$((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge P4)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge P4)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.25, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 25%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 4
13	$(P1(P1a \wedge P1b) \wedge P2 \wedge P3(P3a)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a \wedge P1b) \wedge P2 \wedge P3(P3a)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.5, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.333, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 50%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 33.3%	Total Weight = 3 + 1 + 2 = 6
14	$(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge (P3 \wedge P4) \wedge (P5 \wedge P6)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge (P3 \wedge P4) \wedge (P5 \wedge P6)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P5) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P6) = 0.167, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P5) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P6) = 16.7%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 6
15	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c \wedge P2d) \wedge P3 \wedge P4(P4a(P4a1 \wedge P4a2))) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c \wedge P2d) \wedge P3 \wedge P4(P4a(P4a1 \wedge P4a2))) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.091, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.455, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.091, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.364, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 9.1%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 45.5%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 9.1%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 36.4%	Total Weight = 1 + 5 + 1 + 4 = 11
16	$(P1) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 1.0, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 100%	Total Weight = 1
17	$(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b(P4b1 \wedge P4b2 \wedge P4b3))) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b(P4b1 \wedge P4b2 \wedge P4b3))) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.111, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.111, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.111, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.667, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 11.1%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 11.1%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 11.1%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 66.7%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 6 = 9
18	$(P1(P1a \wedge P1b) \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a \wedge P1b) \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.5, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.5, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 50%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 50%	Total Weight = 3 + 3 = 6
19	$(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.25, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 25%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 4

			Percentage_Weight(P4) = 25%	
20	$((P1 \vee P2) \wedge (P3 \vee P4) \wedge (P5 \vee P6)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \vee P2) \wedge (P3 \vee P4) \wedge (P5 \vee P6)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P5) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P6) = 0.167, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P5) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P6) = 16.7%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 6
21	$((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge P4)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge P4)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.25, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 25%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 4
22	$((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge P4 \wedge P5 \wedge P6 \wedge (P7 \wedge P8))) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge P4 \wedge P5 \wedge P6 \wedge (P7 \wedge P8))) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P5) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P6) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P7) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P8) = 0.125, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P5) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P6) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P7) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P8) = 12.5%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 8
23	$((P1 (P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P2 (P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3 (P3a \wedge P3b))) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 (P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P2 (P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3 (P3a \wedge P3b))) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.3, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.4, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.3, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 30%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 40%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 30%	Total Weight = 3 + 4 + 3 = 10
24	$(P1 (P1a) \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4 \wedge (P4a \wedge P4b) \wedge (P5 \wedge P6))) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 (P1a) \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4 \wedge (P4a \wedge P4b) \wedge (P5 \wedge P6)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.222, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.111, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.111, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P5) = 0.111, Decimal_Weight(P6) = 0.111, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 22.2%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 11.1%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 11.1%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P5) = 11.1%, Percentage_Weight(P6) = 11.1%	Total Weight = 2 + 1 + 1 + 3 + 1 + 1 = 9

25	$((P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3 (P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c) \wedge P4 (P4a)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3 (P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c) \wedge P4 (P4a))) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.5, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.25, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 50%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 25%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 4 + 2 = 8
26	$((P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c \wedge P1d)) \wedge P2 \wedge P3) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c \wedge P1d)) \wedge P2 \wedge P3) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.714, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.143, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.143, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 71.4%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 14.3%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 14.3%	Total Weight = 5 + 1 + 1 = 7
27	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c \wedge P3d) \wedge P4 \wedge P5) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c \wedge P3d) \wedge P4 \wedge P5) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.091, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.273, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.455, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.091, Decimal_Weight(P5) = 0.091, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 9.1%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 27.3%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 45.5%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 9.1%, Percentage_Weight(P5) = 9.1%	Total Weight = 1 + 3 + 5 + 1 + 1 = 11
28	$(P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c \wedge P1d) \wedge P2(P2a)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c \wedge P1d) \wedge P2(P2a)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.714, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.286, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 71.4%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 28.6%	Total Weight = 5 + 2 = 7
29	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c) \wedge P3 \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c) \wedge P3 \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.111, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.444, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.111, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.333, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 11.1%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 44.4%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 11.1%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 33.3%	Total Weight = 1 + 4 + 1 + 3 = 9
30	$(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4(P4a) \wedge P5(P5a \wedge P5b)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4(P4a) \wedge P5(P5a \wedge P5b)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P5) = 0.375, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P5) = 37.5%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 2 + 3 = 8
31	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b) \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b) \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.1, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.3, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.3, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.3, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 10%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 30%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 30%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 30%	Total Weight = 1 + 3 + 3 + 3 = 10

32	$(P1(P1a \wedge P1b) \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3 \wedge P4 \wedge P5 \wedge P6(P6a \wedge P6b))) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a \wedge P1b) \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3 \wedge P4 \wedge P5 \wedge P6(P6a \wedge P6b))) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.083, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.083, Decimal_Weight(P5) = 0.083, Decimal_Weight(P6) = 0.25, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 8.3%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 8.3%, Percentage_Weight(P5) = 8.3%, Percentage_Weight(P6) = 25%	Total Weight = 3 + 3 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 3 = 12
33	$(P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c) \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c) \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.364, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.273, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.364, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 36.4%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 27.3%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 36.4%	Total Weight = 4 + 3 + 4 = 11
34	$(P1(P1a) \wedge P2(P2a) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c) \wedge P3d)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a) \wedge P2(P2a) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c \wedge P3d)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.222, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.222, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.556, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 22.2%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 22.2%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 55.6%	Total Weight = 2 + 2 + 5 = 9
35	$(P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c) \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c) \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.571, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.429, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 57.1%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 42.9%	Total Weight = 4 + 3 = 7
36	$P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 1.0, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 100%	Total Weight = 4
37	$(P1 \wedge P2) \rightarrow C1$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2) \vee C1$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.5, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.5, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 50%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 50%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 = 2
38	$(P1 \wedge P2) \rightarrow C2$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2) \vee C2$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.5, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.5, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 50%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 50%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 = 2
39	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c \wedge P2d) \wedge P3 \wedge P4 \wedge P5 \wedge P6 \wedge P7(P7a \wedge P7b \wedge P7c) \wedge P8(P8a \wedge P8b \wedge P8c \wedge P8d)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c \wedge P2d) \wedge P3 \wedge P4 \wedge P5 \wedge P6 \wedge P7(P7a \wedge P7b \wedge P7c) \wedge P8(P8a \wedge P8b \wedge P8c \wedge P8d)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.053, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.263, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.053, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.053, Decimal_Weight(P5) = 0.053, Decimal_Weight(P6) = 0.053, Decimal_Weight(P7) = 0.211, Decimal_Weight(P8) = 0.263, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 5.3%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 26.3%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 5.3%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 5.3%, Percentage_Weight(P5) = 5.3%, Percentage_Weight(P6) = 5.3%, Percentage_Weight(P7) = 21.1%, Percentage_Weight(P8) = 26.3%	Total Weight = 1 + 5 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 4 + 5 = 19

40	$(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b) \wedge P5 \wedge P6 \wedge P7(P7a \wedge P7b \wedge P7c)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b) \wedge P5 \wedge P6 \wedge P7(P7a \wedge P7b \wedge P7c)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.083, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.083, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.083, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P5) = 0.083, Decimal_Weight(P6) = 0.083, Decimal_Weight(P7) = 0.333, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 8.3%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 8.3%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 8.3%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P5) = 8.3%, Percentage_Weight(P6) = 8.3%, Percentage_Weight(P7) = 33.3%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 3 + 1 + 1 + 4 = 12
41	$((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge P3) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge P3) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.333, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 33.3%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 = 3
42	$(P1 \wedge (P2 \wedge P3)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge (P2 \wedge P3)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.333, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 33.3%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 = 3
43	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2(P2.1 \wedge P2.2) \wedge P3(P3.1 \wedge P3.2 \wedge P3.3)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.375, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.5, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 37.5%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 50%	Total Weight = 1 + 3 + 4 = 8
44	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b) \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b \wedge P4c) \wedge P5(P5a \wedge P5b) \wedge P6(P6a \wedge P6b \wedge P6c)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b) \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b \wedge P4c) \wedge P5(P5a \wedge P5b) \wedge P6(P6a \wedge P6b \wedge P6c)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.056, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.222, Decimal_Weight(P5) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P6) = 0.222, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 5.6%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 22.2%, Percentage_Weight(P5) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P6) = 22.2%	Total Weight = 1 + 3 + 3 + 4 + 3 + 4 = 18
45	$(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.333, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 33.3%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 = 3
46	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a) \wedge P3(P3a)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2(P2a) \wedge P3(P3a)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.2, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.4, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.4, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 20%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 40%,	Total Weight = 1 + 2 + 2 = 5

			Percentage_Weight(P3) = 40%	
47	$(P1(P1a) \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a) \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.4, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.6, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 40%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 60%	Total Weight = 2 + 3 = 5
48	$(P1(P1a \wedge P1b) \wedge P2 \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b) \wedge P4(P4a) \wedge P5(P5a \wedge P5b \wedge P5c)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a \wedge P1b) \wedge P2 \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b) \wedge P4(P4a) \wedge P5(P5a \wedge P5b \wedge P5c)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.231, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.077, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.231, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.154, Decimal_Weight(P5) = 0.308, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 23.1%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 7.7%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 23.1%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 15.4%, Percentage_Weight(P5) = 30.8%	Total Weight = 3 + 1 + 3 + 2 + 4 = 13
49	$(P1(P1a \wedge P1b)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a \wedge P1b)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 1.0, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 100%	Total Weight = 3
50	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b)) \wedge P3(P3a) \wedge P4(P4a) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b)) \wedge P3(P3a) \wedge P4(P4a)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.125, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.375, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.25, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 12.5%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 37.5%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 25%	Total Weight = 1 + 3 + 2 + 2 = 8
51	$((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge P4)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge P4)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.25, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 25%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 4
52	$((P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3) \wedge (P4 \wedge P5)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3) \wedge (P4 \wedge P5)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.2, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.2, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.2, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.2, Decimal_Weight(P5) = 0.2, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 20%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 20%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 20%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 20%, Percentage_Weight(P5) = 20%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 5
53	$((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge P4)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge P4)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.25, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 25%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 4

54	$((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge (P4 \wedge P5))) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge (P4 \wedge P5))) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.2, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.2, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.2, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.2, Decimal_Weight(P5) = 0.2, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 20%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 20%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 20%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 20%, Percentage_Weight(P5) = 20%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 5
55	$((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge P3) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge P3) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.333, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 33.3%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 = 3
56	$(P1(P1a) \wedge P2 \wedge P3(P3a) \wedge P4) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a) \wedge P2 \wedge P3(P3a) \wedge P4) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.167, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.167, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 16.7%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 16.7%	Total Weight = 2 + 1 + 2 + 1 = 6
57	$(P1(P1a) \wedge P2 \wedge P3(P3a)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1(P1a) \wedge P2 \wedge P3(P3a)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.4, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.2, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.4, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 40%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 20%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 40%	Total Weight = 2 + 1 + 2 = 5
58	$(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c) \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c) \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.111, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.111, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.444, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.333, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 11.1%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 11.1%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 44.4%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 33.3%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 4 + 3 = 9
59	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c \wedge P2d \wedge P2e \wedge P2f \wedge P2g \wedge P2h \wedge P2i)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c \wedge P2d \wedge P2e \wedge P2f \wedge P2g \wedge P2h \wedge P2i)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.091, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.909, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 9.1%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 90.9%	Total Weight = 1 + 10 = 11
60	$(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3 \wedge P4) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.25, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 25%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 4

61	$((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge P3) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge P3) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.333, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.333, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 33.3%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 33.3%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 = 3
62	$((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge P4)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg((P1 \wedge P2) \wedge (P3 \wedge P4)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.25, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.25, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 25%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 25%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 4
63	$(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b)) \wedge P3(P3a) \wedge P4 \wedge P5 \wedge P6(P6a) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2(P2a \wedge P2b) \wedge P3(P3a) \wedge P4 \wedge P5 \wedge P6(P6a)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.1, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.3, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.2, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.1, Decimal_Weight(P5) = 0.1, Decimal_Weight(P6) = 0.2, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 10%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 30%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 20%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 10%, Percentage_Weight(P5) = 10%, Percentage_Weight(P6) = 20%	Total Weight = 1 + 3 + 2 + 1 + 1 + 2 = 10
64	$(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3(P3a) \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b)) \rightarrow C$	$\neg(P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3(P3a) \wedge P4(P4a \wedge P4b)) \vee C$	Decimal_Weight(P1) = 0.143, Decimal_Weight(P2) = 0.143, Decimal_Weight(P3) = 0.286, Decimal_Weight(P4) = 0.429, Percentage_Weight(P1) = 14.3%, Percentage_Weight(P2) = 14.3%, Percentage_Weight(P3) = 28.6%, Percentage_Weight(P4) = 42.9%	Total Weight = 1 + 1 + 2 + 3 = 7

Note. The table presents logical expressions formulated from premises (P1, P2, P3, etc.) and their respective sub-premises, capturing implications (\rightarrow) and equivalence expressions ($\neg \vee$). The decimal and percentage representations indicate the relative weights assigned to each premise based on their significance. Total weight calculations are derived by summing individual premise contributions, quantifying their cumulative importance within each item (numbered 2 through 64). This systematic breakdown facilitates quantitative analysis of reported human rights issues and associated recommendations directed toward Algeria, based on documentation provided by various international bodies during the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process.

Section 3.3: Table 3 – Relative Decimal Premise Weights

Table 3 presents the relative decimal weights assigned to each of the individual premises (P1-P8) for the 63 structured statements analyzed. Each row corresponds to a single statement and expresses the proportional contribution of each premise within that statement, rendered in decimal form. The weights are strictly relational and reflect only the presence and distribution of premises, not their logical structure, content, or nesting. For example, a row with values such as 0.125, 0.375, and 0.5 shows that three premises contribute to the total structure in weighted segments of 12.5%, 37.5%, and 50%, respectively. These segments together make up the total number of distinct logical units that comprise the argument. Statements with fewer premises show higher individual weight values, while statements with more sub-premises or expanded premise sets show more distributed ratios. Each premise's value is positioned under its corresponding column—P1 through P8—and the final column reflects the total number of contributing premise units. This table does not address conditional operators, logical expressions, implication equivalences, or nested structures. It is focused exclusively on analyzing the ratios and relative distribution of premises within each statement. The layout is kept minimal and numerically transparent, allowing for direct comparative analysis of argumentative weight without interference from symbolic notation or logical transformation. Decimal assignments in this table function as a tool for visualizing how emphasis is distributed

among the structural components of each statement, offering a quantitative lens on the premise-level architecture.

Table 3

Row	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	Total Weight	
1		0.125	0.375	0.5	0	0	0	0	8	
2		0.636	0.364	0	0	0	0	0	11	
3		0.167	0.833	0	0	0	0	0	6	
4		0.167	0.167	0.167	0.5	0	0	0	6	
5		0.333	0.333	0.333	0	0	0	0	3	
6		0.2	0.1	0.1	0.6	0	0	0	10	
7		0.125	0.5	0.375	0	0	0	0	8	
8		0.333	0.667	0	0	0	0	0	3	
9		0.1	0.4	0.5	0	0	0	0	10	
10		0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	4	
11		0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	4	
12		0.5	0.167	0.333	0	0	0	0	6	
13		0.167	0.167	0.167	0.167	0.167	0.167	0	6	
14		0.091	0.455	0.091	0.364	0	0	0	11	
15		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
16		0.111	0.111	0.111	0.667	0	0	0	9	
17		0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	6	
18		0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	4	
19		0.167	0.167	0.167	0.167	0.167	0.167	0	6	
20		0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	4	
21		0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125	8	
22		0.3	0.4	0.3	0	0	0	0	10	
23		0.222	0.111	0.111	0.333	0.111	0.111	0	9	
24		0.125	0.125	0.5	0.25	0	0	0	8	
25		0.714	0.143	0.143	0	0	0	0	7	
26		0.091	0.273	0.455	0.091	0.091	0	0	11	
27		0.714	0.286	0	0	0	0	0	7	
28		0.111	0.444	0.111	0.333	0	0	0	9	
29		0.125	0.125	0.125	0.25	0.375	0	0	8	
30		0.1	0.3	0.3	0.3	0	0	0	10	
31		0.25	0.25	0.083	0.083	0.083	0.25	0	12	
32		0.364	0.273	0.364	0	0	0	0	11	
33		0.222	0.222	0.556	0	0	0	0	9	
34		0.571	0.429	0	0	0	0	0	7	
35		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
36		0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	2	
37		0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	2	
38		0.053	0.263	0.053	0.053	0.053	0.053	0.211	0.263	19
39		0.083	0.083	0.083	0.25	0.083	0.083	0.333	0	12
40		0.333	0.333	0.333	0	0	0	0	3	
41		0.333	0.333	0.333	0	0	0	0	3	
42		0.125	0.375	0.5	0	0	0	0	8	
43		0.056	0.167	0.167	0.222	0.167	0.222	0	0	18
44		0.056	0.167	0.167	0.222	0.167	0.222	0	0	18
45		0.333	0.333	0.333	0	0	0	0	3	
46		0.2	0.4	0.4	0	0	0	0	5	
47		0.4	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	5	
48		0.231	0.077	0.231	0.154	0.308	0	0	0	13
49		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
50		0.125	0.375	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	0	8
51		0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	0	4
52		0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0	0	0	5
53		0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	0	4

54	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0	0	0	5
55	0.333	0.333	0.333	0	0	0	0	0	3
56	0.333	0.167	0.333	0.167	0	0	0	0	6
57	0.4	0.2	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	5
58	0.111	0.111	0.444	0.333	0	0	0	0	9
59	0.091	0.909	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
60	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	0	4
61	0.333	0.333	0.333	0	0	0	0	0	3
62	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	0	4
63	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0	0	10

Note. Adapted from "Relative Decimal Weights and Total Weighting of Argument Premises in Structured Argumentation" (2024). This table summarizes the proportional decimal distribution of premises (P1 through P8) and the total calculated weights assigned across each argumentative statement (rows 1 through 63). Premise weights reflect their relative emphasis within each structured argument.

Section 3.4: Table 4 – Grouping and Nesting Structures

Table 4 provides a structural analysis of each argumentative statement by breaking down the internal architecture of its premises. The table illustrates how statements are organized through grouping and nesting, showing how each paragraph builds its logic not only through sequencing but also through embedded construction. Each row represents a single statement and includes two columns, distinguishing between groupings that exclude binary structures and those that include binary structures. The exclusion column isolates the logical premise structure before any binary implications or reductions are introduced. Nesting structures are explicitly listed, showing how sub-premises are embedded within parent premises using a compact notation, such as P2(P2a \wedge P2b) or P3(P3a(P3a1)), to indicate depth and dependency. The level of nesting column quantifies the number of layers of premise embedding present in a given structure. The table further breaks down each statement into three proportions: total level 1 premises as a percentage of the total premises, total level 2 premises as a percentage of the total premises, and nested premises as a percentage of the total premises. These ratios are expressed in fractional form (e.g., 3/8, 4/8, 5/8), capturing how much of the structure operates on a surface level versus how much is embedded within it. The final two columns display the literal premise structure of each statement as a readable string, first excluding binary grouping and then including it, to show how the argumentative frame operates before and after binary framing is applied. No implication operators or logic connectives are present here. The purpose of the table is to expose how structural design operates through grouping and nesting alone, without reducing those structures to logical expressions. The format is intentionally clear and operational, allowing the visual architecture of each argument to be directly understood in terms of how its components are nested, how many levels they extend, and how argumentation is pre-structured before conclusion or logical form is applied.

Table 4

Statement	Grouping Excluding Binary	Nesting Structures	Levels of Nesting	Total Level 1 Premises/ Total Premises	Total Level 2 Premises/ Total Premises	Nested Premises/ Total Premises	Premises (Grouping Excluding Binary)	Premises (Grouping Including Binary)
1	2	2	2	3/8	4/8	5/8	P1, P2(P2a \wedge P2b), P3(P3a \wedge P3b(P3b1))	P1, P2, P3
2	2	2	2	2/11	6/11	7/11	P1(P1a(P1a1 \wedge P1a2 \wedge P1a3 \wedge P1a4 \wedge P1a5)), P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c)	P1, P2
3	1	1	1	2/6	4/6	4/6	P1, P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c \wedge P2d)	P1, P2
4	1	1	1	4/6	2/6	2/6	P1, P2, P3, P4(P4a \wedge P4b)	P1, P2, P3, P4

5	0	0	0	3/3	0/3	0/3	P1, P2, P3	P1, P2, P3
6	1	1	1	4/9	5/9	5/9	P1(P1a), P2, P3, P4(P4a \wedge P4b \wedge P4c \wedge P4d \wedge P4e)	P1, P2, P3, P4
7	2	2	2	3/7	3/7	4/7	P1, P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c), P3(P3a(P3a1))	P1, P2, P3
8	1	1	1	2/3	1/3	1/3	P1, P2(P2a)	P1, P2
9	2	2	2	3/10	7/10	7/10	P1, P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c), P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c \wedge P3d)	P1, P2, P3
10	2	0	0	4/4	0/4	0/4	P1 \wedge P2, P3 \wedge P4	P1 \wedge P2, P3 \wedge P4
11	2	0	0	4/4	0/4	0/4	P1 \wedge P2, P3 \wedge P4	P1 \wedge P2, P3 \wedge P4
12	2	2	2	3/5	2/5	2/5	P1(P1a \wedge P1b), P3(P3a)	P1, P2, P3
13	2	1	1	3/6	3/6	3/6	P1, P2, P3 \wedge P4, P5 \wedge P6	P1, P2, P3 \wedge P4, P5 \wedge P6
14	2	2	2	4/6	2/6	2/6	P1, P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c \wedge P2d), P4(P4a(P4a1 \wedge P4a2))	P1, P2, P3, P4
15	0	0	0	1/1	0/1	0/1	P1	P1
16	3	3	3	4/12	5/12	8/12	P1, P2, P3, P4(P4a \wedge P4b(P4b1 \wedge P4b2 \wedge P4b3))	P1, P2, P3, P4
17	2	1	1	2/4	2/4	2/4	P1(P1a \wedge P1b), P2(P2a \wedge P2b)	P1, P2
18	0	0	0	4/4	0/4	0/4	P1, P2, P3, P4	P1, P2, P3, P4
19	0	0	0	6/6	0/6	0/6	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6
20	2	0	0	4/4	0/4	0/4	P1 \wedge P2, P3 \wedge P4	P1 \wedge P2, P3 \wedge P4
21	2	0	0	2/3	1/3	1/3	P1 \wedge P2, P3 \wedge P4 \wedge P5 \wedge P6 \wedge (P7 \wedge P8)	P1 \wedge P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8
22	2	2	2	4/10	4/10	6/10	P1(P1a \wedge P1b), P2(P2a \wedge P2b), P3(P3a \wedge P3b)	P1, P2, P3
23	2	1	1	4/8	4/8	4/8	P1(P1a), P2, P3, P4(P4a \wedge P4b), P5 \wedge P6	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6
24	2	1	1	4/8	4/8	4/8	P1, P2, P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c), P4(P4a)	P1, P2, P3, P4
25	1	1	1	4/7	3/7	3/7	P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c \wedge P1d), P2, P3	P1, P2, P3

26	2	1	1	5/8	3/8	3/8	P1, P2(P2a \wedge P2b), P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c \wedge P3d), P4, P5	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5
27	2	1	1	2/6	4/6	4/6	P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c \wedge P1d), P2(P2a)	P1, P2
28	2	1	1	4/6	2/6	2/6	P1, P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c), P3, P4(P4a \wedge P4b)	P1, P2, P3, P4
29	2	1	1	5/6	1/6	1/6	P1, P2, P3, P4(P4a), P5(P5a \wedge P5b)	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5
30	3	1	1	4/8	2/8	4/8	P1, P2(P2a \wedge P2b), P3(P3a \wedge P3b), P4(P4a \wedge P4b)	P1, P2, P3, P4
31	3	1	1	2/6	2/6	4/6	P1(P1a \wedge P1b), P2(P2a \wedge P2b), P3, P4, P5, P6(P6a \wedge P6b)	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6
32	2	2	2	3/3	0/3	0/3	P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c), P2(P2a \wedge P2b), P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c)	P1, P2, P3
33	2	1	1	3/8	3/8	5/8	P1(P1a), P2(P2a), P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c \wedge P3d)	P1, P2, P3
34	1	1	1	3/5	1/5	2/5	P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c), P2(P2a \wedge P2b)	P1, P2
35	0	1	1	3/3	0/3	0/3	P1(P1a \wedge P1b \wedge P1c)	P1
36	0	0	0	2/2	0/2	0/2	P1, P2	P1, P2
37	0	0	0	2/4	2/4	2/4	P1, P2	P1, P2
38	3	1	1	2/3	1/3	1/3	P1, P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c \wedge P2d), P7(P7a \wedge P7b \wedge P7c), P8(P8a \wedge P8b \wedge P8c \wedge P8d)	P1, P2, P7, P8
39	2	1	1	4/8	3/8	4/8	P1, P2, P3, P4(P4a \wedge P4b), P5, P6, P7(P7a \wedge P7b \wedge P7c)	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7
40	1	0	0	2/3	1/3	1/3	P1 \wedge P2, P3	P1, P2, P3
41	1	0	0	3/3	0/3	0/3	P1, P2 \wedge P3	P1, P2, P3
42	2	1	1	3/7	3/7	4/7	P1, P2(P2a \wedge P2b), P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c)	P1, P2, P3

43	3	2	2	4/7	2/7	3/7	P1, P2(P2a \wedge P2b), P3(P3a \wedge P3b), P4(P4a \wedge P4b \wedge P4c), P5(P5a \wedge P5b), P6(P6a \wedge P6b \wedge P6c)	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6
44	0	0	0	3/5	1/5	2/5	P1, P2, P3	P1, P2, P3
45	1	1	1	2/4	1/4	2/4	P1, P2(P2a), P3(P3a)	P1, P2, P3
46	1	1	1	2/4	2/4	2/4	P1(P1a), P2(P2a \wedge P2b)	P1, P2
47	2	1	1	3/4	1/4	1/4	P1(P1a \wedge P1b), P2, P3(P3a \wedge P3b), P4(P4a), P5(P5a \wedge P5b \wedge P5c)	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5
48	1	1	1	3/5	1/5	2/5	P1(P1a \wedge P1b)	P1
49	2	1	1	4/7	2/7	3/7	P1, P2(P2a \wedge P2b), P3(P3a), P4(P4a)	P1, P2, P3, P4
50	2	0	0	4/6	1/6	2/6	P1 \wedge P2, P3 \wedge P4	P1, P2, P3, P4
51	2	0	0	4/6	2/6	2/6	P1 \wedge P2 \wedge P3, P4 \wedge P5	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5
52	2	0	0	4/7	3/7	3/7	P1 \wedge P2, P3 \wedge P4	P1, P2, P3, P4
53	2	1	1	3/6	2/6	3/6	P1 \wedge P2, P3 \wedge (P4 \wedge P5)	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5
54	1	0	0	3/3	0/3	0/3	P1 \wedge P2, P3	P1, P2, P3
55	2	1	1	3/7	3/7	4/7	P1(P1a), P2, P3(P3a), P4	P1, P2, P3, P4
56	2	1	1	3/4	1/4	1/4	P1(P1a), P2, P3(P3a)	P1, P2, P3
57	2	1	1	4/8	3/8	4/8	P1, P2, P3(P3a \wedge P3b \wedge P3c), P4(P4a \wedge P4b)	P1, P2, P3, P4
58	1	1	1	3/8	4/8	5/8	P1, P2(P2a \wedge P2b \wedge P2c \wedge P2d \wedge P2e \wedge P2f \wedge P2g \wedge P2h \wedge P2i)	P1, P2
59	0	0	0	2/3	1/3	1/3	P1, P2, P3, P4	P1, P2, P3, P4
60	1	0	0	2/3	1/3	1/3	P1 \wedge P2, P3	P1, P2, P3
61	2	0	0	4/5	1/5	1/5	P1 \wedge P2, P3 \wedge P4	P1, P2, P3, P4
62	2	1	1	4/8	3/8	4/8	P1, P2(P2a \wedge P2b), P3(P3a), P4, P5, P6(P6a)	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6
63	2	1	1	3/5	1/5	2/5	P1, P2, P3(P3a), P4(P4a \wedge P4b)	P1, P2, P3, P4

Note: The table illustrates the grouping of premises, nesting structures, levels of nesting, and the proportional distribution of premises categorized as level one, level two, and nested premises across various structured argumentative statements.

Section 3.5: Table 5 – Distribution by Hierarchy Level

Table 5 presents the distribution and numerical breakdown of premises according to their hierarchical levels across the structured argumentative statements. Each row corresponds to a single statement and reports the proportion of Level 1 premises (A), Level 2 premises (B), and Nested premises (C) relative to the total number of premises for that item. These values are expressed as fractions—for example, 3/8, 4/8, 5/8—indicating the structural layering of the statement. Columns P1, P2, and P3 record the absolute numbers of Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3 premises, respectively. NP denotes the total count of all nested premises, and PT reflects the total number of premises identified in the statement. The table contains no logical operators, implications, groupings, or decimal weights. It isolates the premise hierarchy, showing how many premises operate on the surface level and how many are embedded at deeper structural tiers. The layout is functional and transparent, allowing for direct observation of vertical layering across statements. Its purpose is to reveal the internal premise stratification without transforming the structure into logical notation. The table is built to make the premise hierarchy visible—nothing more.

Table 5

#	A: Level 1 Premises/Total Premises	B: Level 2 Premises/Total Premises	C: Nested/Total Premises	#	P1	P2	P3	NP	PT
2	3/8	4/8	5/8	2	3	4	1	5	8
3	2/11	6/11	7/11	3	2	6	1	7	11
4	2/6	4/6	4/6	4	2	4	0	4	6
5	4/6	2/6	2/6	5	4	2	0	2	6
6	3/3	0/3	0/3	6	3	0	0	0	3
7	4/9	5/9	5/9	7	4	5	0	5	9
8	3/7	3/7	4/7	8	3	3	1	4	7
9	2/3	1/3	1/3	9	2	1	0	1	3
10	3/10	7/10	7/10	10	3	7	0	7	10
11	4/4	0/4	0/4	11	4	0	0	0	4
12	4/4	0/4	0/4	12	4	0	0	0	4
13	3/5	2/5	2/5	13	3	2	0	2	5
14	3/6	3/6	3/6	14	3	3	0	3	6
15	4/6	2/6	2/6	15	4	2	0	2	6
16	1/1	0/1	0/1	16	1	0	0	0	1
17	4/12	5/12	8/12	17	4	5	3	8	12
18	2/4	2/4	2/4	18	2	2	0	2	4
19	4/4	0/4	0/4	19	4	0	0	0	4
20	6/6	0/6	0/6	20	6	0	0	0	6
21	4/4	0/4	0/4	21	4	0	0	0	4
22	2/3	1/3	1/3	22	2	1	0	1	3
23	4/10	4/10	6/10	23	4	4	2	6	10
24	4/8	4/8	4/8	24	4	4	0	4	8
25	4/8	4/8	4/8	25	4	4	0	4	8
26	4/7	3/7	3/7	26	4	3	0	3	7
27	5/8	3/8	3/8	27	5	3	0	3	8
28	2/6	4/6	4/6	28	2	4	0	4	6

29	4/6	2/6	2/6	29	4	2	0	2	6
30	5/6	1/6	1/6	30	5	1	0	1	6
31	4/8	2/8	4/8	31	4	2	2	4	8
32	2/6	2/6	4/6	32	2	2	2	4	6
33	3/3	0/3	0/3	33	3	0	0	0	3
34	3/8	3/8	5/8	34	3	3	2	5	8
35	3/5	1/5	2/5	35	3	1	1	2	5
36	3/3	0/3	0/3	36	3	0	0	0	3
37	2/2	0/2	0/2	37	2	0	0	0	2
38	2/4	2/4	2/4	38	2	2	0	2	4
39	2/3	1/3	1/3	39	2	1	0	1	3
40	4/8	3/8	4/8	40	4	3	1	4	8
41	2/3	1/3	1/3	41	2	1	0	1	3
42	3/3	0/3	0/3	42	3	0	0	0	3
43	3/7	3/7	4/7	43	3	3	1	4	7
44	4/7	2/7	3/7	44	4	2	1	3	7
45	3/5	1/5	2/5	45	3	1	1	2	5
46	2/4	1/4	2/4	46	2	1	1	2	4
47	2/4	2/4	2/4	47	2	2	0	2	4
48	3/4	1/4	1/4	48	3	1	0	1	4
49	3/5	1/5	2/5	49	3	1	1	2	5
50	4/7	2/7	3/7	50	4	2	1	3	7
51	4/6	1/6	2/6	51	4	1	1	2	6
52	4/6	2/6	2/6	52	4	2	0	2	6
53	4/7	3/7	3/7	53	4	3	0	3	7
54	3/6	2/6	3/6	54	3	2	1	3	6
55	3/3	0/3	0/3	55	3	0	0	0	3
56	3/7	3/7	4/7	56	3	3	1	4	7
57	3/4	1/4	1/4	57	3	1	0	1	4
58	4/8	3/8	4/8	58	4	3	1	4	8
59	3/8	4/8	5/8	59	3	4	1	5	8
60	2/3	1/3	1/3	60	2	1	0	1	3
61	2/3	1/3	1/3	61	2	1	0	1	3
62	4/5	1/5	1/5	62	4	1	0	1	5
63	4/8	3/8	4/8	63	4	3	1	4	8
64	3/5	1/5	2/5	64	3	1	1	2	5

Note. The table shows the proportional breakdown and numerical distribution of premises across Level 1 (A), Level 2 (B), and Nested (C) categories, along with the total number of premises for each category. Proportions are presented as fractions indicating the count of premises at each hierarchical level relative to the total premises within the respective item. Absolute counts are also provided for each hierarchical level (P1, P2, P3), nested premises (NP), and total premises (PT) for detailed analysis.

Legend (Key):

- A = Level 1 Premises/Total Premises
- B = Level 2 Premises/Total Premises
- C = Nested Premises/Total Premises
- P1 = Absolute number of Level 1 premises
- P2 = Absolute number of Level 2 premises
- P3 = Absolute number of Level 3 premises (if present)
- NP = Absolute number of nested premises
- PT = Total number of premises per item

Section 3.6: Table 6 – Logical Framing and Inference Type Classification

The sixth table categorizes each statement based on its inferential logic form—Modus Ponens or Modus Tollens—and records the type of expression (declarative or argumentative), its framing structure, and its dimensional control (e.g., Binary Construct, False Binary). Every row corresponds to one of the 63 formal statements previously broken down and structurally analyzed in Tables 1–5. This classification enables a clear reading of how inferential logic is embedded within the statements, and how binary constructions and control positions are imposed structurally. Logical forms are recorded as direct expressions of embedded reasoning rather than abstract symbolic notation, and framing dimensionality captures whether the subject's position is genuinely open, artificially constrained, or logically fixed. This section reveals how structure, form, and control converge in the logical delivery of UPR stakeholder arguments.

#	Logical Framing Type	Type	Subject's Option Dimensionality	Explanation
2	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The partial acceptance and rejection of recommendations (Not Q) implies Algeria has not fully moved towards abolition (Not P).
3	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The absence of full compliance (Not Q) implies Algeria has not ratified all necessary treaties and protocols (Not P).
4	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The non-alignment with international standards (Not Q) implies Algeria has not accepted and implemented the critical recommendations (Not P).
5	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The non-enhancement of compliance with international human rights standards (Not Q) implies Algeria has not followed all these recommendations (Not P).
6	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The matter of international urgency has not been addressed (Not Q) implies Algeria has not ratified the TPNW (Not P).
7	Modus Tollens	Argument	Binary Content and Construct	The lack of full compliance with international obligations (Not Q) implies Algeria has not implemented meaningful reforms (Not P).
8	Modus Tollens	Argument	Binary Construct	The fact that Algeria's media regulations are not fully aligned with international standards (Not Q) implies Algeria has not implemented these legislative recommendations (Not P).
9	<i>Modus Tollens</i>	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The lack of compliance of the CNDH with the Paris Principles (Not Q) implies Algeria has not ensured the effective independence of CNDH (Not P).
10	<i>Modus Tollens</i>	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The continued existence of discrimination against women (Not Q) implies Algeria has not fully reformed its laws to protect women's rights (Not P).
11	<i>Modus Tollens</i>	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The persistence of discrimination against women and LGBTQ+ persons, and the lack of effective legislation to criminalize Gender-Based Violence (Not Q), implies Algeria has not addressed these concerns (Not P).
12	<i>Modus</i>	Declarative	Binary Content	If persons with disabilities are fully included in society (P), then

	<i>Ponens</i>	statement	and Construct	they will enjoy non-discrimination and their right to education (Q). The active call for full inclusion (P) implies enhanced rights and inclusion (Q).
13	<i>Modus Tollens</i>	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The continuation of arbitrary and prolonged pretrial detentions (Not Q) implies Algeria is not fully adhering to its own legal provisions and international recommendations (Not P).
14	<i>Modus Tollens</i>	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The formal non-abolishment of the death penalty (Not Q) implies Algeria has not fully accepted and implemented recommendations (Not P).
15	<i>Modus Tollens</i>	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The occurrence of extrajudicial executions by state authorities (Not Q) implies Algeria does not adhere to the right to life guaranteed by international conventions (Not P).
16	<i>Modus Tollens</i>	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The lack of necessary protection for the Sahrawi people (Not Q) implies Algeria has not provided adequate protection on its soil (Not P).
17	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If Algeria implements national law and investigates violations (P), it will prevent excessive use of force and ensure fair trials (Q). The call to action indicates expected compliance (Q).
18	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If articles 45 and 46 of Ordinance 06-01 are repealed and a truth-seeking commission is established (P), accountability and victims' rights will be guaranteed (Q). Recommended actions suggest potential positive outcomes (Q).
19	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	False Binary	The actions of authorities against previous UPR recommendations and peaceful activists (Not Q) imply Algeria has not respected human rights while countering terrorism (Not P).
20	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The misuse of ambiguous laws to incriminate peaceful acts or criticism (Not Q) implies Algeria uses flawed legal definitions against human rights defenders (Not P).
21	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If Algeria aligns its terrorism laws with international standards and stops misusing counter-terrorism legislation (P), it will protect rights and ensure freedom of expression (Q). Recommendations suggest positive changes to meet obligations (Q).
22	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The ongoing interference in the judiciary and trials of civilians in military tribunals (Not Q) imply Algeria has not guaranteed judicial independence or ceased such trials (Not P).
23	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The prevalence of impunity and the lack of justice for victims of enforced disappearances (Not Q) imply Algeria has not addressed serious crimes from the 1990s or provided judicial avenues (Not P).
24	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If Algeria repeals amnesty laws and investigates enforced disappearances (P), it will provide truth and remedy to victims' families (Q). Recommendations lead toward accountability and support for families (Q).
25	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If Algeria respects freedom of religion and removes barriers for religious minorities (P), it will ensure non-discrimination and freedom of belief (Q). Actions suggested aim for religious freedom compliance (Q).
26	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The prosecution of individuals exercising freedom of expression and assembly (Not Q) implies Algeria's legislative framework is not fully aligned with international obligations (Not P).
27	Modus	Declarative	<i>Binary Content</i>	If Algeria implements best practices and reforms related to

	Ponens	statement	<i>andf Construct</i>	freedom of expression and human rights (P), it will uphold these rights in line with international standards (Q). The recommendations are intended to enforce constitutional and ICCPR commitments (Q).
28	Modus Tollens	Argument	<i>Binary Construct</i>	The presence of trafficking indicators and human rights violations among foreign workers (Not Q) implies Algeria has not met its obligations under the International Labor Organization's standards (Not P).
29	Modus Ponens	Argument	False Binary	If Algeria inspects labor conditions and helps victims of human trafficking (P), it will improve labor rights and help migrant workers (Q). Recommendations aim at better protection and support for workers (Q).
30	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The ongoing practice of enslavement and severe mistreatment in Tindouf camps (Not Q) implies Algeria has not addressed these human rights violations (Not P).
31	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If international missions are allowed to investigate violations in the camps (P), it will ensure justice and accountability for the Sahrawi people (Q). Recommendations aim for transparency and dignity for victims and their families (Q).
32	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If Algeria strengthens economic and social rights and includes Tindouf camps in development plans (P), it will improve living standards in disadvantaged areas (Q). Suggested measures aim to provide a decent standard of living (Q).
33	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The inadequate response to Covid-19 in Kabylia, leading to high fatalities and tension (Not Q), implies Algeria did not adequately support the region during the health crisis (Not P).
34	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The deterioration of nutrition, public health, and access to clean water (Not Q) implies Algeria has not effectively utilized international aid to improve these conditions (Not P).
35	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The increasing student-to-teacher ratio and potential overcrowding (Not Q) implies Algeria has not managed educational resources effectively (Not P).
36	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The high percentage of out-of-school children, especially among the poorest (Not Q), implies Algeria has not ensured equitable access to education (Not P).
37	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The exclusion of pregnant girls from school and associated stigma (Not Q) implies Algeria has not achieved gender equality within its school system (Not P).
38	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If Algeria provides additional financial and psychological assistance to persons with disabilities (P), it will address issues faced by this vulnerable group (Q). Recommendations aim for better support and inclusion (Q).
39	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	False Binary	The lack of adequate resources and inclusive vision for educating children with disabilities (Not Q) implies Algeria has not sufficiently aligned with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (Not P).
40	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The marginalization of the Amazigh language and culture (Not Q) implies Algeria has not fully implemented the constitutional recognition of Tamazight as an official language (Not P).
41	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The limitations in domestic violence legislation and pressure on victims to pardon attackers (Not Q) imply Algeria has not provided comprehensive protection against domestic violence (Not P).

42	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If Algeria amends and diversifies legislation to include all perpetrators of domestic violence and considers social pressures (P), it will improve protection for women (Q). Recommendations aim to enhance legal protections (Q).
43	Modus Tollens	Argument	Binary Content and Construct	The discriminatory articles in the Penal and Family Codes (Not Q) imply Algeria has not amended its laws to ensure gender equality (Not P).
44	Modus Tollens	Argument	Binary Content and Construct	The recruitment and indoctrination of children in refugee camps (Not Q) imply Algeria has not protected children in accordance with international standards (Not P).
45	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The prevalence of corporal punishment of children (Not Q) implies Algeria has not enacted laws to clearly prohibit such practices (Not P).
46	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The refusal to register migrants' children born out of marriage (Not Q) implies Algeria limits these children's basic rights (Not P).
47	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If Algeria recognizes children born out of marriage and grants them legal status (P), it will provide full access to education and health care (Q). Recommendations aim for legal recognition and rights protection (Q).
48	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	False Binary	The inadequate monitoring and enforcement of accessibility laws (Not Q) imply Algeria has not ensured compliance with its own accessibility standards (Not P).
49	Modus Ponens	Argument.	False Binary	If the National People's Assembly adopts the draft framework law on the rights of persons with disabilities (P), it will promote and protect these rights (Q). Recommendations aim to establish legal protections for disabled individuals (Q).
50	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The use of laws to prevent religious minorities from exercising their freedom (Not Q) implies Algeria has not upheld these rights in line with international standards (Not P).
51	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The constitutional requirements for the president to be Muslim and the dominance of Islam (Not Q) imply Algeria does not fully support religious diversity (Not P).
52	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If Algeria revises Ordinance 06-03 and reopens forcibly closed churches (P), it will ensure compliance with ICCPR Article 18 and support religious freedom (Q). Recommendations seek to enhance religious rights (Q).
53	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The presence of racial discrimination against Black Algerians (Not Q) implies Algeria has not addressed institutionalized racial bias (Not P).
54	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The arbitrary arrests and harassment of MAK activists (Not Q) imply Algeria does not respect peaceful political movements (Not P).
55	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If Algeria allows the Kabyle People to exercise self-determination and protects their rights (P), it will meet their aspirations for freedom and dignity (Q). Recommendations advocate for regional autonomy and protection (Q).
56	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Construct	The legal vacuum concerning protection for LGBTQ+ individuals (Not Q) implies Algeria has not provided necessary legal safeguards against discrimination and violence (Not P).
57	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Construct	The discrimination and risks faced by LGBTQ+ individuals, including torture and ill-treatment (Not Q), imply Algeria has not

				ensured non-discrimination and protection under the ICCPR (Not P).
58	Modus Ponens	Argument	Binary Construct	If Algeria repeals discriminatory articles and enacts measures for GBV survivors and LGBTQ+ rights (P), it will ensure justice and protection (Q). Recommendations seek to enhance legal and social protections (Q).
59	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The continued gross human rights violations in refugee camps (Not Q) imply Algeria has not addressed these abuses effectively (Not P).
60	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If Algeria opens comprehensive investigations into extrajudicial killings in camps (P), it will reveal the truth and ensure accountability (Q). Recommendations stress the need for transparency and justice (Q).
61	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The unclear legal status of Sahrawi refugees affecting their rights (Not Q) implies Algeria has not complied with the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees (Not P).
62	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If Algeria revokes the delegation of powers and protects refugees' civil and political rights (P), it will create an environment conducive to civil society and peaceful assembly (Q). Recommendations aim to protect refugee rights and support civil society (Q).
63	Modus Ponens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	If Algeria abolishes or amends laws criminalizing migration and adopts refugee protection legislation (P), it will treat migration violations as administrative offences and protect refugees (Q). Recommendations seek to align with international standards (Q).
64	Modus Tollens	Declarative statement	Binary Content and Construct	The issue of statelessness among Sahrawis (Not Q) implies Algeria has not provided adequate legal status and protections (Not P).

SECTION 4: METHODOLOGY

The premise extraction, structural annotation, and logical modeling contained in this dataset were initiated, designed, and completed by the author. All classifications, nesting determinations, and proportional breakdowns were first constructed manually through close reading and formal logic parsing of each of the 63 statements in the Algerian Stakeholders' Summary Report (2022 UPR). Premise identification (P1, P2, P3...), sub-premise nesting (P1a, P2b1...), scalar modifiers, grouping syntax, and categorical logic assignments were all defined before any automated or external validation.

After the initial human structuring, a multi-phase AI-assisted verification process was conducted to assess notational consistency and structural coherence across all expressions. The first review employed OpenAI's GPT-4, explicitly used to check for logic form alignment, nesting depth consistency, and implication traceability. A second pass used a specialized, externally hosted logic-trained GPT—"Professor Logic"—to evaluate the integrity of premise chains, simplify expression rules, and ensure consistency of mapping between binary-form approximations across rows. This model was deployed to independently test the structure without referencing prior output. A third review was performed using Jasper's proprietary AI, acting as a parallel verification engine to independently assess hierarchical accuracy, scalar placement, and total weight coherence. Any model generated no content. Following these AI-based structural validations, the data was fully re-analyzed by the author. This final phase involved complete manual cross-referencing between each AI-evaluated output, ensuring alignment with the original manually constructed logical architecture. Line-by-line inspection across tables 1–5 allowed for corrections in nested labeling, clarity in premise attribution, and the alignment of structural proportions with expression depth. All entries were finalized only after convergence across all layers—human-authored logic, AI-confirmed consistency, and human-led revalidation.

SECTION 5: CONCLUSION: DATASET INTENT AND STRUCTURAL PURPOSE

The dataset does not lend itself to rhetorical interpretation, policy debate, or thematic reading. It operates strictly as a formal corpus of logical architecture, extracted from the Algerian Stakeholders' Summary Report (UPR 2022). Each statement is decomposed into structured premises, quantified by level, and categorized across five integrated tables. The

purpose is to expose how argumentation is constructed through premise layering, scalar positioning, and nested logic, without relying on content interpretation. All logical structures were authored manually, verified through multiple independent AI evaluations, and finalized through direct human cross-referencing. The result delivers a multi-dimensional data model that maps the internal composition of structured argumentation with clarity and control. Researchers and analysts can now engage directly with the form of institutional logic, premise by premise, weight by weight, without abstraction or rhetorical framing.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bex, F., Prakken, H., Reed, C., & Walton, D. (2003). Towards a formal account of reasoning about evidence: Argumentation schemes and generalisations. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 11(2–3), 125–165. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1027334523494>
- [2] Bouattoura, F. (2023). Universal Periodic Review: The novel approach to geopolitics. *International Journal of Enhanced Research in Educational Development*, 11(2), 30–36. [https://doi.org/\[placeholder\]](https://doi.org/[placeholder])
- [3] Bouattoura, F. (2023). The Universal Periodic Review: A synthesis of the Algerian case. *International Journal of Enhanced Research in Educational Development*, 11(2), 16–20. [https://doi.org/\[placeholder\]](https://doi.org/[placeholder])
- [4] Bouattoura, F. (2025). Quantitative analysis of UPR narratives on severe human rights violations. *International Journal of Enhanced Research in Science, Technology & Engineering*, 14(3), 100–107. [https://doi.org/\[placeholder\]](https://doi.org/[placeholder])
- [5] Copi, I. M., Cohen, C., & Flage, D. E. (2016). *Introduction to logic* (14th ed.). Pearson.
- [6] Gordon, T. F. (2010). Constructing legal arguments with rules and precedents. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 18(3), 217–251. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-010-9090-2>
- [7] Lawrence, J., & Reed, C. (2020). Argument technology: A review. *Synthese*, 199(1–2), 89–142. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-020-02746-9>
- [8] Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2022). *Universal Periodic Review documentation portal*. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/upr/documentation>
- [9] United Nations Human Rights Council. (2008). *Institution-building of the United Nations Human Rights Council (Resolution 5/1)*. https://ap.ohchr.org/documents/E/HRC/resolutions/A_HRC_RES_5_1.pdf
- [10] Walton, D., Reed, C., & Macagno, F. (2008). *Argumentation schemes*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511802034>