

#	Architecture (Rule-Based ES)	Typical Uses / Applications	Key Features	Main Limitations	Representative Scholarly Reference
1	<b>Traditional centralized production-rule architecture</b> (knowledge base + inference engine + working memory)	Diagnostic and advisory systems in medicine, engineering, finance, etc.; e.g., medical diagnosis of memory-loss diseases	Central knowledge base of IF–THEN rules <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inference engine with forward/backward chaining</li> <li>• Working memory for case-specific facts</li> <li>• Explanation and knowledge-acquisition subsystems</li> </ul>	Brittle when rules conflict or are incomplete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard knowledge engineering and maintenance</li> <li>• Poor handling of uncertainty (unless extended)</li> <li>• Scalability issues for very large rule sets</li> </ul>	K. R. Hole and V. S. Gulhane, “Rule-Based Expert System for the Diagnosis of Memory Loss Diseases,” <i>Int. J. Innov. Sci. Eng. Technol.</i> , vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 80–83, May 2014
2	<b>Blackboard architecture</b>	Complex problem solving with multiple heterogeneous knowledge sources: speech understanding (HEARSAY-II), robotics, image interpretation, planning and scheduling, control systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Global shared data structure (“blackboard”)</li> <li>• Independent knowledge sources (KSs) that read/write to the blackboard</li> <li>• Control component that opportunistically selects KSs based on current state</li> <li>• Supports incremental, cooperative problem solving</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complex control strategy design</li> <li>• Non-trivial to parallelize efficiently</li> <li>• Implementation overhead and higher resource usage</li> <li>• Harder to verify and test than simple centralized ES</li> </ul>	H. P. Nii, “Blackboard Systems at the Architecture Level,” <i>Expert Syst. Appl.</i> , vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 43–54, 1994.
3	<b>Fuzzy rule-based expert system architecture</b>	Decision support in domains with vagueness/linguistic concepts: cyber security risk assessment,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard ES components plus: fuzzifier, fuzzy inference, defuzzifier</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designing membership functions and rule base is expert-intensive •</li> </ul>	K. Göztepe, “Designing a Fuzzy Rule Based Expert System for Cyber Security,”

		control systems, medical and industrial decision making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Linguistic variables and membership functions</li> <li>• Rules of form “IF A is High AND B is Low THEN risk is Medium”</li> <li>• Handles imprecision and partial truth gracefully</li> </ul>	<p>Rule explosion for many variables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tuning can be difficult; behaviour may be opaque to non-experts</li> <li>• Still usually centralized and not inherently scalable</li> </ul>	<i>Int. J. Inf. Secur. Sci.</i> , vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 13–19, 2012.
4	<b>Hybrid fuzzy-neural rule-based architecture</b> (neuro-fuzzy ES)	Network monitoring and intrusion detection; classification and prediction problems where learning from data and interpretability are both desired	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combines fuzzy rule base with neural network learning (e.g., ANFIS-style)</li> <li>• Dual knowledge representation (rules + numeric parameters)</li> <li>• Can automatically learn and adapt membership functions and/or rules from data</li> <li>• Better generalization to new patterns than purely rule-engineered ES</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More complex architecture and training pipeline</li> <li>• Requires substantial labelled data and careful training</li> <li>• Learned parameters can reduce transparency vs. pure symbolic rules</li> <li>• Higher computational cost at training time</li> </ul>	A. Ahmad <i>et al.</i> , “A Hybrid Rule Based Fuzzy-Neural Expert System for Passive Network Monitoring,” in <i>Proc. Arab Conf. Inf. Technol. (ACIT)</i> , 2002, pp. 746–752; also available as arXiv:1304.7843, 2013.
5	<b>Distributed / multi-agent rule-based expert system architecture</b>	Large-scale event-stream processing, distributed control, security monitoring, grid/IoT environments; e.g., ERESYE-based ES and Rule Responder multi-agent systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple rule engines or agents deployed across nodes</li> <li>• Often use blackboard or message-passing middleware</li> <li>• Meta-rules and control strategies coordinate rule</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Architecture and debugging are significantly more complex</li> <li>• Consistency and synchronization of distributed knowledge</li> </ul>	A. Boaye Belle, T. C. Lethbridge, M. Garzón and O. O. Adesina, “Design and Implementation of Distributed Rule-Based Expert Systems,” <i>Expert Syst.</i>

			activation across engines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports concurrency, scalability, fault tolerance and proximity to data sources</li> </ul>	bases are non-trivial <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication latency can affect real-time reasoning</li> <li>• Requires sophisticated deployment and monitoring tooling</li> </ul>	<i>Appl.</i> , vol. 96, pp. 129–148, 2018.
--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------

Hybrid fuzzy-neural rule-based systems are the most useful to modern AI as they combine two strengths:

- Rules that are clear and easily understandable to humans, and
- Neural networks capable of learning from data.

This combination means the system can adjust its fuzzy sets and sometimes even update rules automatically as new data comes in. This solves one of the biggest problems of older expert systems, which needed experts to manually write and maintain every rule. In areas like network monitoring, these hybrid systems perform better and react more accurately than systems that rely only on rules or only on neural networks, while still keeping decisions understandable.

These include very large or fast-changing environments, such as cloud systems, IoT networks, or real-time event processing, where the reasoning is divided among many agents or rule engines for faster, highly scalable systems, better suited for big, continuous streams of data. In many modern setups, each agent may well use its own hybrid model of rules and learning.

Current trends in rule-based systems

Mixing rules with machine learning.

Many new systems are combining ML with rule engines so that the systems can learn patterns from data, but also provide clear, explainable logic. The ML takes care of prediction; the rules handle safety, explanation, and regulatory constraints.

Better handling of uncertainty.

Fuzzy expert systems are being enhanced to deal with uncertainty more precisely, for instance, using type-2 fuzzy sets or other mathematical models. These help systems to reason out much better in a noisy or unclear situation. Distributed and event-driven rule systems. Multi-agent rule architectures are becoming increasingly widespread; mainly for IoT and web-based applications, they allow multiple rule engines to interact with each other, react on events, and scale to large environments. Integration with digital twins and no-code tools. New expert-system shells tie rule reasoning to digital twin models and provide simple interfaces to allow non-programmers to add rules. Some even use large language models to help create rules or to improve the knowledge base.