

























ever, this may not be the case in real-world scenarios, see [18] for a discussion. In particular, information received from an agent may change the subjective assessment of its credibility: if an agent often gives good arguments or his information is confirmed by more credible agents then this agent should be assessed more credible as well. The dynamics of credibility assessments can be approached by interpreting credibilities not as annotations but as formulas of the object level themselves and to use traditional revision methods for them as well. Part of future work is on investigating this approach within our framework.

## References

1. Hansson, S.O.: A Textbook of Belief Dynamics. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Norwell, MA, USA (2001)
2. Tamargo, L.H., García, A.J., Falappa, M.A., Simari, G.R.: Modeling knowledge dynamics in multi-agent systems based on informants. *The Knowledge Engineering Review (KER)* **27**(1) (2012) 87–114
3. Khosravifar, B., Gomrokchi, M., Bentahar, J., P.Thiran: Maintenance-based trust for open multiagent systems. In: *AAMAS 09, Budapest, Hungary* (2009)
4. Krümpelmann, P., Thimm, M., Falappa, M.A., Garcia, A.J., Kern-Isberner, G., Simari, G.R.: Selective Revision by Deductive Argumentation. In: *1st Int. Workshop on the Theory and Applications of Formal Argumentation (TAFA)*. (2011)
5. Besnard, P., Hunter, A.: *Elements of Argumentation*. The MIT Press (June 2008)
6. Besnard, P., Hunter, A.: A logic-based theory of deductive arguments. *Artificial Intelligence* **128**(1–2) (2001) 203–235
7. Dung, P.M.: On the Acceptability of Arguments and its Fundamental Role in Nonmonotonic Reasoning. *Artificial Intelligence* **77**(2) (1995) 321–358
8. Fermé, E., Hansson, S.O.: Selective revision. *Studia Logica* **63** (1999) 331–342
9. Alchourron, C.E., Gärdenfors, P., Makinson, D.: On the logic of theory change: Partial meet contraction and revision functions. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* **50**(2) (1985) 510–530
10. Delgrande, J.P., Jin, Y.: Parallel belief revision. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-08)*. (2008)
11. Bench-Capon, T.J.M., Dunne, P.E.: Argumentation in artificial intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence* **171** (2007) 619–641
12. Fermé, E., Saez, K., Sanz, P.: Multiple kernel contraction. *Studia Logica: An International Journal for Symbolic Logic* **73**(2) (March 2003) 183–195
13. Falappa, M.A., Kern-Isberner, G., Simari, G.R.: Belief revision and argumentation theory. In: *Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence*. Springer (2009) 341–360
14. Booth, R.: A negotiation-style framework for non-prioritised revision. In: *Proceedings of TARK'01*. (2001) 137–150
15. Zhang, D., Foo, N., Meyer, T., Kwok, R.: Negotiation as mutual belief revision. In: *Proceedings of AAAI'04*. (2004) 317–322
16. Villata, S., Boella, G., Gabbay, D.M., van der Torre, L.: Arguing about the trustworthiness of the information sources. In Liu, W., ed.: *ECSQARU'11*. Volume 6717 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer (2011) 74–85
17. Sabater, J., Sierra, C.: Regret: A reputation model for gregarious societies. *Fourth Workshop on Deception, Fraud and Trust in Agent Societies* (2001) 61–69
18. Tamargo, L.H., Falappa, M.A., García, A.J., Simari, G.R.: A change model for credibility partial order. In: *Proceeding of the 5th International Conference on Scalable Uncertainty Management (SUM)*. (2011) 317–330