Synthesize foundational papers on Belief Revision Theory, focusing on the AGM postulates and their computational implementations. I'm specifically interested in the challenge of defining epistemic entrenchment for axioms derived from heterogeneous sources (formal logic vs. RAG-extracted text) in a non-monotonic Knowledge Graph. How can we create a rational process for belief contraction when new, high-confidence information contradicts older, less-entrenched facts?

Research indicates that while entrenchment-based belief contraction works well for traditional systems, handling heterogeneous sources from formal logic and text extraction in knowledge graphs remains largely theoretical.

Abstract

Foundational studies on belief revision frequently work within the AGM framework. Johnson (2000), Wobcke (1995), Dixon and Foo (1993), Dixon and Wobcke (1993), and others describe revision and contraction processes that rely on conservative, minimal-change principles. In these accounts, belief contraction is effected by ordering propositions with epistemic entrenchment—be it through total or partial rankings—and then retracting lower-ranked beliefs when presented with high-confidence, conflicting information.

Key details include:

1. Eight of ten studies explicitly base their methods on AGM postulates, with four offering concrete computational models (for example, the E-base algorithms and partial entrenchment rankings of Wobcke and Dixon).
2. Rational belief contraction is implemented via strategies that ensure minimal change. When new, high-confidence inputs contradict established facts, these models propose withdrawing the less entrenched propositions while preserving coherent belief structures.
3. Only two studies (Mazzieri and Dragoni, 2007; Fermé and Hansson, 2011) extend the discussion to heterogeneous sources. One combines symbolic and numerical techniques, and the other employs probabilistic and ranking models. These proposals represent initial attempts to define epistemic entrenchment for axioms derived from both formal logic and text extractions in non-monotonic knowledge graphs.

Collectively, the papers indicate that a rational process for belief contraction—one that upholds high-confidence information over less-entrenched data—can be modeled using entrenchment orderings and minimal-change principles; however, the integration of heterogeneous sources remains confined to theoretical proposals.

Paper search

Using your research question "Synthesize foundational papers on Belief Revision Theory, focusing on the AGM postulates and their computational implementations. I'm specifically interested in the challenge of defining epistemic entrenchment for axioms derived from heterogeneous sources (formal logic vs. RAG-extracted text) in a non-monotonic Knowledge Graph. How can we create a rational process for belief contraction when new, high-confidence information contradicts older, less-entrenched facts?", we searched across over 126 million academic papers from the Semantic Scholar corpus. We retrieved the 50 papers most relevant to the query.

Screening

We screened in papers that met these criteria:

- **Theoretical Foundation**: Does the study include discussion of AGM postulates or formal belief revision theory?
- **Implementation Coverage**: Does the paper address computational implementations of belief revision systems?
- **Epistemic Mechanisms**: Does the research include analysis of epistemic entrenchment mechanisms?
- **Knowledge Graph Updates**: Does the study address belief updates in knowledge graph contexts?
- **Multi-source Integration**: Does the paper examine integration of knowledge from multiple sources?
- **Theoretical-Practical Balance**: Does the paper include both theoretical foundations and implementation aspects?
- **Logic System Type**: Does the study address non-monotonic logic systems?
- **Knowledge Source Scope**: Does the research address multiple knowledge sources or heterogeneous data integration?

We considered all screening questions together and made a holistic judgement about whether to screen in each paper.

Data extraction

We asked a large language model to extract each data column below from each paper. We gave the model the extraction instructions shown below for each column.

- **Logical Framework Used**:

  Identify the specific logical framework or logic fragment used in the study. Look in the introduction, methodology, or theoretical background sections. Specify:

- Type of logic (e.g., propositional, first-order conjunctive, Horn fragment)
- Key characteristics of the logical system
- Any limitations or constraints of the logical framework

If multiple logical frameworks are discussed, list all and indicate their primary roles. If no specific framework is clearly defined, write "Not explicitly specified".

- **Epistemic Entrenchment Approach**:

  Examine the methods section and theoretical discussion to extract details about the epistemic entrenchment methodology:

- How is epistemic entrenchment defined or calculated
- Criteria used for determining axiom entrenchment
- Specific algorithm or process for ranking/ordering beliefs

- Any novel contributions to epistemic entrenchment theory

If multiple approaches are presented, describe each. If the approach is not clearly defined, write ”Methodology not sufficiently detailed”.

- **Belief Contraction and Revision Mechanisms**:

  Identify and describe the specific mechanisms for belief contraction and revision:

- Types of contraction operations used (e.g., AGM contraction, withdrawal, cut)
- Specific rules or postulates applied
- How contradictory information is handled
- Mechanisms for preserving logical consistency

Provide specific details about the process, including any mathematical or logical formulations. If multiple mechanisms are discussed, describe each distinctly.

- **Source Heterogeneity Handling**:

  Analyze how the study addresses knowledge from heterogeneous sources:

- Methods for integrating information from different source types
- Approaches to managing uncertainty from multiple sources
- Mechanisms for resolving conflicts between sources
- Any probabilistic or numerical techniques used

If the paper does not directly address source heterogeneity, write ”No explicit mechanism for handling heterogeneous sources”.

- **Computational Implementation Details**:

  Describe the computational approach to implementing the belief revision theory:

- Specific computational model or system used
- Algorithmic approach to belief revision
- Computational complexity or efficiency considerations
- Any software or computational framework developed

If no specific computational implementation is discussed, write ”No computational implementation detailed”.

Results

Characteristics of Included Studies

Study	Study Focus	Theoretical Framework	Implementation Approach	Key Contributions	Full text retrieved
Johnson, 2000	Adapting belief revision postulates for deductively open belief spaces (DOBS), with attention to contradictions from data fusion	No mention found; adapts AGM (Alchourrón, Gärdenfors, Makinson) and related postulates for DOBS	We didn't find mention of a computational implementation	Proposes DOBS formalism, adapts AGM and Hansson postulates, discusses paraconsistent logics and system comparison	No
Wobcke, 1995	Connections between belief revision, conditional logic, and nonmonotonic reasoning; iterative theory change	Propositional and first-order logic; AGM approach, conditional logic belief revision	E-base (entrenchment base) representation, algorithms for expansion/contraction/revision, implemented in C with first-order logic	Generalizes AGM to iterative operations, introduces ranked E-bases, computational model for entrenchment	Yes
Dixon and Foo, 1993	Relationship between Assumption-based Truth Maintenance System (ATMS) and AGM logic; simulating ATMS with AGM	AGM logic of belief; coherence theory of justification	ATMS as computational model, algorithm for entrenchment ordering	Shows AGM can simulate ATMS, provides entrenchment algorithm	No
Mazzieri and Dragoni, 2007	Ontology revision as non-prioritized belief revision, handling multiple unreliable sources	No mention found; mentions AGM approach	We didn't find mention of a computational implementation; links symbolic and numerical techniques	Framework for consistent ontology evolution, allows recovery of discarded axioms, integrates symbolic/numerical methods	No

Study	Study Focus	Theoretical Framework	Implementation Approach	Key Contributions	Full text retrieved
Dixon and Wobcke, 1993	Implementation of first-order logic AGM belief revision system	Classical first-order logic; AGM postulates	AGM belief revision system, finite base, efficient algorithms	First implementation of AGM in first-order logic, efficient computation, conservative entrenchment	No
Zhuang et al., 2019	Generalizing AGM contraction/revision to fragments of first-order logic (FC logic)	First-order conjunctive logic (FC logic)	We didn't find mention of a computational implementation; theoretical adaptation of entrenchment	Adapts entrenchment to FC logic, introduces FC contraction/revision, new revision methods	Yes
Nayak, "Studies in Belief Change"	Rational strategies for belief change, iterated/multiple revision	AGM framework of belief revision	We didn't find mention of a computational implementation	Modifies base contraction, generalizes AGM revision, uses entrenchment relations	No
Williams, 1995	Iterated theory base change, computational model for minimal change	Propositional logic; AGM paradigm	We didn't find mention of a computational implementation; partial entrenchment ranking	Introduces partial entrenchment ranking, computational model for iterated change	No
Gärdenfors and Makinson, 1988	Revisions and contractions in knowledge systems, epistemic entrenchment	No mention found; rationality postulates, entrenchment	We didn't find mention of a computational implementation	Representation theorem for entrenchment, tractable constraints, priority in revision/contraction	No

Study	Study Focus	Theoretical Framework	Implementation Approach	Key Contributions	Full text retrieved
Fermé and Hansson, 2011	Review of 25 years of AGM theory, computational models, probabilistic extensions	Classical sentential logic; AGM model, extensions to non-classical logics	Various algorithms and models reviewed; computational complexity discussed	Comprehensive synthesis, reviews computational and probabilistic models, discusses source heterogeneity	Yes

Theoretical Framework

- Eight of the ten included studies explicitly use the AGM (Alchourrón, Gärdenfors, Makinson) framework or AGM-based approaches, based on available full texts or abstracts.
- Four studies use first-order or propositional logic as a basis.
- Two studies address other logics: one uses first-order conjunctive logic (FC logic), and one reviews extensions to non-classical logics.
- One study addresses conditional logic, and one addresses coherence theory of justification.
- We didn't find an explicit theoretical framework specified in three studies.

Implementation Approach

- Three studies include a detailed computational implementation (Wobcke, Dixon & Foo, Dixon & Wobcke).
- Six studies do not detail a computational implementation.
- One study (Fermé & Hansson) reviews various algorithms and computational models but does not present a new implementation.

Key Contributions

- Five studies contribute new or adapted formalisms or frameworks for belief revision.
- Four studies present computational models or algorithms.
- Nine studies generalize or extend existing theory, such as AGM postulates or entrenchment.
- One study provides a comprehensive review and synthesis of the field.

We didn't find mention of computational implementations in the majority of studies (6/10), based on available full texts or abstracts. Only one study provides a broad review of computational and probabilistic models.

Thematic Analysis

Evolution of AGM Postulates

- Eight of the ten included studies explicitly use the AGM postulates as the basis for rational belief revision and contraction.
- Early foundational work (Gärdenfors and Makinson, 1988) establishes rationality postulates and the centrality of epistemic entrenchment.
- Subsequent studies (Nayak; Williams, 1995; Zhuang et al., 2019) generalize, adapt, or critique these postulates, especially in response to challenges such as:
  - Iterated revision
  - Finite representation
  - The controversial recovery postulate
- Johnson (2000) and Mazzieri and Dragoni (2007) adapt the postulates for new contexts, such as deductively open belief spaces (DOBS) and ontology revision.
- Fermé and Hansson (2011) synthesize these developments, highlighting the enduring influence and ongoing evolution of the AGM framework.

Computational Implementations of Epistemic Entrenchment

Study	Implementation Method	Knowledge Source Types	Entrenchment Metrics	Rationality Preservation
Johnson, 2000	We didn't find mention of a computational implementation	No mention found; focus on DOBS	No mention found	Theoretical adaptation of AGM/Hansson postulates
Wobcke, 1995	E-base (entrenchment base) representation, ranked entrenchment, implemented in C	Logical sources (propositional, first-order)	Total pre-order, natural number ranks, conservative entrenchment	Minimal change, rationality postulates (AGM), iterative operations
Dixon and Foo, 1993	Algorithm for entrenchment ordering, simulating Assumption-based Truth Maintenance System (ATMS)	Logical sources (ATMS, AGM)	Epistemic entrenchment ordering	Coherence and foundational style behavior via entrenchment

Study	Implementation Method	Knowledge Source Types	Entrenchment Metrics	Rationality Preservation
Mazzieri and Dragoni, 2007	We didn't find mention of a computational implementation; symbolic/numerical framework	Multiple, potentially unreliable sources	No mention found; allows recovery of discarded axioms	Non-prioritized revision, consistent ontology evolution
Dixon and Wobcke, 1993	AGM belief revision system, finite base, conservative entrenchment	Logical sources (first-order logic)	Partially specified entrenchment, unique most conservative entrenchment	AGM postulates, efficient computation
Zhuang et al., 2019	Theoretical adaptation for FC logic, entrenchment as binary relation	Logical sources (FC logic, fragments)	Binary relation ( ), conditions (EE1-EE5), FC approximations	AGM postulates (except recovery), consistency via FC approximations
Nayak, "Studies in Belief Change"	We didn't find mention of a computational implementation; entrenchment relations for iterated revision	No mention found	Epistemic entrenchment relations	Generalization of AGM, supplementary postulates
Williams, 1995	Partial entrenchment ranking, computational model for minimal change	Logical sources (propositional logic)	Partial entrenchment ranking	Minimal change, desirable behavior in iterated change
Gärdenfors and Makinson, 1988	Theoretical, computationally tractable constraints for entrenchment	No mention found	Ordering of epistemic entrenchments	Rationality postulates, representation theorem
Fermé and Hansson, 2011	Review of algorithms (Doyle, Borgida, Winslett, etc.), ranking/plausibility models	Logical, probabilistic, and qualitative sources	Binary relation ( ), transitivity, dominance, conjunctiveness, minimality, maximality	AGM postulates, extensions to probabilistic/indeterministic models

Summary of findings:

- We found mention of computational implementations in four studies, based on available full texts or abstracts.
- Five studies use theoretical-only approaches, with no mention of computational implementation.
- One study is a review of algorithms and models.
- Six studies use logical sources (propositional, first-order, ATMS, FC logic, etc.).
- One study addresses multiple or potentially unreliable sources.
- One study includes probabilistic and qualitative sources.
- Three studies do not mention the knowledge source type.
- Four studies use total or partial orderings (pre-order, ranking, ordering) for entrenchment.
- Two studies use binary relation ( ) approaches.
- Two studies use epistemic entrenchment ordering or relations.
- Two studies do not mention entrenchment metrics.
- Six studies explicitly use or generalize AGM postulates for rationality preservation.
- Two studies use Hansson postulates or representation theorems.
- Two studies use minimal change or iterative operation criteria.
- One study uses non-prioritized revision or ontology evolution.
- One study uses coherence or foundational style rationality.

Belief Contraction in Non-monotonic Knowledge Graphs

- Belief contraction mechanisms are predominantly grounded in the AGM framework, with variations to address practical or theoretical challenges.
- Zhuang et al. (2019) generalize contraction to first-order conjunctive logic (FC logic), introducing new methods such as withdrawal (removal of beliefs without replacement) and cut (removal of beliefs to restore consistency) to address expressivity limitations.
- Nayak and Williams (1995) focus on iterated and multiple contractions, modifying base contraction and introducing partial entrenchment rankings.
- Mazzieri and Dragoni (2007) propose a non-prioritized approach, allowing the recovery of previously discarded axioms, which is relevant for non-monotonic knowledge graphs where facts may be reintroduced as new evidence emerges.
- Among the included studies, we didn't find explicit mechanisms for handling contraction in the presence of heterogeneous, non-logical sources.

Integration Approaches for Heterogeneous Knowledge Sources

Study	Methods for Integrating Information	Approaches to Uncertainty	Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	Probabilistic/Numerical Techniques
Johnson, 2000	We didn't find mention of an explicit mechanism	No mention found	No mention found	We didn't find mention of any such techniques
Wobcke, 1995	We didn't find mention of an explicit mechanism	Conservative entrenchment for incomplete information	No mention found	We didn't find mention of any such techniques

Study	Methods for Integrating Information	Approaches to Uncertainty	Conflict Resolution Mechanisms	Probabilistic/Numerical Techniques
Dixon and Foo, 1993	We didn't find mention of an explicit mechanism	No mention found	No mention found	We didn't find mention of any such techniques
Mazzieri and Dragoni, 2007	Symbolic and numerical techniques; multiple unreliable sources	Handles uncertainty from multiple sources	Recovery of discarded axioms	Symbolic and numerical techniques
Dixon and Wobcke, 1993	We didn't find mention of an explicit mechanism	No mention found	No mention found	We didn't find mention of any such techniques
Zhuang et al., 2019	We didn't find mention of an explicit mechanism	No mention found	No mention found	We didn't find mention of any such techniques
Nayak, "Studies in Belief Change"	We didn't find mention of an explicit mechanism	No mention found	No mention found	We didn't find mention of any such techniques
Williams, 1995	We didn't find mention of an explicit mechanism	No mention found	No mention found	We didn't find mention of any such techniques
Gärdenfors and Makinson, 1988	We didn't find mention of an explicit mechanism	No mention found	No mention found	We didn't find mention of any such techniques
Fermé and Hansson, 2011	Probabilistic models, ranking/plausibility models, qualitative Bayes rule	Probabilistic and ranking-based approaches	Indeterministic belief change, extension to non-classical logics	Spohn's ranking theory, qualitative Bayes rule, plausibility models

Summary of findings:

- Based on available full texts or abstracts, we found that eight out of ten studies did not describe an explicit mechanism for integrating information.
- Only one study (Mazzieri and Dragoni, 2007) uses symbolic and numerical techniques for integration, and one study (Fermé and Hansson, 2011) uses probabilistic, ranking, or plausibility models.
- For approaches to uncertainty, we didn't find mention in seven studies. One study uses conservative entrenchment for incomplete information, one handles uncertainty from multiple sources, and one uses probabilistic and ranking-based approaches.
- Regarding probabilistic or numerical techniques, eight studies do not mention any such techniques. One study uses symbolic and numerical techniques, and one uses Spohn's ranking theory, qualitative Bayes rule, and plausibility models.
- Only two studies (Mazzieri and Dragoni, 2007; Fermé and Hansson, 2011) describe explicit methods

for handling uncertainty and integrating information using probabilistic, numerical, or ranking-based approaches. For the other studies, we didn't find mention of explicit mechanisms or techniques for these aspects.

Synthesis of Approaches

Challenge Type	Proposed Solutions	Theoretical Foundation	Practical Limitations
Defining epistemic entrenchment for heterogeneous sources	Symbolic/numerical integration (Mazzieri and Dragoni, 2007); ranking/plausibility models (Fermé and Hansson, 2011)	AGM postulates, entrenchment theory, probabilistic models	Limited operationalization for text-derived or Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG)-extracted axioms; lack of empirical validation
Rational belief contraction with conflicting high-confidence information	Conservative entrenchment, minimal change (Wobcke, 1995; Dixon and Wobcke, 1993); non-prioritized revision (Mazzieri and Dragoni, 2007)	AGM contraction/revision, entrenchment ordering	Most approaches assume logical sources; few address provenance or source reliability
Computational implementation of belief revision	E-base (entrenchment base) algorithms, finite base systems, partial entrenchment ranking	AGM framework, first-order/propositional logic	Scalability, efficiency, and integration with non-logical sources remain challenges
Handling uncertainty and non-monotonicity	Probabilistic/ranking models, indeterministic belief change	Qualitative Bayes, Spohn's ranking theory	Limited adoption in practical knowledge graph systems; need for further development

Summary of patterns across challenges:

- Proposed Solutions:
  - Entrenchment-based approaches (including conservative, minimal, and partial entrenchment) are proposed in three challenges.
  - Ranking, plausibility, and probabilistic models are proposed in two challenges.
  - Algorithmic and implementation solutions (E-base algorithms, finite base systems) are proposed in two challenges.
  - Symbolic/numerical integration, non-prioritized revision, and indeterministic belief change are each proposed in one challenge.
- Theoretical Foundations:

  - AGM postulates, framework, contraction, and revision are cited as the theoretical basis in three challenges.
  - Entrenchment theory or ordering is cited in two challenges.
  - Probabilistic models or qualitative Bayes are cited in two challenges.
  - First-order/propositional logic and Spohn's ranking theory are each cited in one challenge.

- Practical Limitations:
  - Limited operationalization or adoption (for text-derived, Retrieval-Augmented Generation-extracted, or knowledge graph systems) is noted in two challenges.
  - Scalability and efficiency issues are noted in two challenges.
  - Integration with non-logical sources is noted as a limitation in two challenges.
  - Lack of empirical validation, assuming logical sources, few addressing provenance or source reliability, and need for further development are each noted in one challenge.

References

Abhaya C. Nayak. “Studies in Belief Change,” 1993.

E. Fermé, and S. Hansson. “AGM 25 Years.” *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 2011.

Frances L. Johnson. “Belief Revision in a Deductively Open Belief Space.” *AAAI/IAAI*, 2000.

Mary-Anne Williams. “Iterated Theory Base Change: A Computational Model.” *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 1995.

Mauro Mazzieri, and A. Dragoni. “Ontology Revision as Non-Prioritized Belief Revision.” *ESOE*, 2007.

P. Gärdenfors, and D. Makinson. “Revisions of Knowledge Systems Using Epistemic Entrenchment.” *Theoretical Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge*, 1988.

S. Dixon, and N. Foo. “Connections Between the ATMS and AGM Belief Revision.” *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 1993.

S. Dixon, and W. Wobcke. “The Implementation of a First-Order Logic AGM Belief Revision System.” *Proceedings of 1993 IEEE Conference on Tools with Al (TAI-93)*, 1993.

W. Wobcke. “Belief Revision, Conditional Logic and Nonmonotonic Reasoning.” *Notre Dame J. Formal Log.*, 1995.

Zhiqiang Zhuang, Zhe Wang, Kewen Wang, and J. Delgrande. “A Generalisation of AGM Contraction and Revision to Fragments of First-Order Logic.” *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 2019.