Human performance in **decision-making** terms has been the subject of active research from several perspectives. From a psychological perspective, it is necessary to examine individual decisions in the context of a set of needs, preferences an individual has and values they seek. From a cognitive perspective, the decision making process must be regarded as a continuous process integrated in the interaction with the environment. From a normative perspective, the analysis of individual decisions is concerned with the logic of decision making and rationality and the invariant choice it leads to.[2]
Yet, at another level, it might be regarded as a problem solving activity which is terminated when a satisfactory solution is found. Therefore, decision making is a reasoning or emotional process which can be rational or irrational, can be based on explicit assumptions or tacit assumptions.
Logical decision making is an important part of all science-based professions, where specialists apply their knowledge in a given area to making informed decisions. For example, medical decision making often involves making a diagnosis and selecting an appropriate treatment. Some research using naturalistic methods shows, however, that in situations with higher time pressure, higher stakes, or increased ambiguities, experts use intuitive decision making rather than structured approaches, following a recognition primed decision approach to fit a set of indicators into the expert's experience and immediately arrive at a satisfactory course of action without weighing alternatives. Recent robust decision efforts have formally integrated uncertainty into the decision making process. However, Decision Analysis, recognized and included uncertainties with a structured and rationally justifiable method of decision making since its conception in 1964.
A major part of decision making involves the analysis of a finite set of alternatives described in terms of some evaluative criteria. These criteria may be benefit or cost in nature. Then the problem might be to rank these alternatives in terms of how attractive they are to the decision maker(s) when all the criteria are considered simultaneously. Another goal might be to just find the best alternative or to determine the relative total priority of each alternative (for instance, if alternatives represent projects competing for funds) when all the criteria are considered simultaneously. Solving such problems is the focus of multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) also known as multi-criteria decision making (MCDM). This area of decision making, although it is very old and has attracted the interest of many researchers and practitioners, is still highly debated as there are many MCDA / MCDM methods which may yield very different results when they are applied on exactly the same data.[3] This leads to the formulation of a decision making paradox.

An **expert system** is software that uses a knowledge base of human expertise for problem solving, or clarify uncertainties where normally one or more human experts would need to be consulted. Expert systems are most common in a specific problem domain, and are a traditional application and/or subfield of artificial intelligence (AI). A wide variety of methods can be used to simulate the performance of the expert; however, common to most or all are: 1) the creation of a knowledge base which uses some knowledge representation structure to capture the knowledge of the Subject Matter Expert (SME); 2) a process of gathering that knowledge from the SME and codifying it according to the structure, which is called knowledge engineering; and 3) once the system is developed, it is placed in the same real world problem solving situation as the human SME, typically as an aid to human workers or as a supplement to some information system. Expert systems may or may not have learning components.
Expert systems were introduced by researchers in the Stanford Heuristic Programming Project, including the "father of expert systems" Edward Feigenbaum, with the Dendral and Mycin systems. Principal contributors to the technology were Bruce Buchanan, Edward Shortliffe, Randall Davis, William vanMelle, Carli Scott, and others at Stanford. Expert systems were among the first truly successful forms of AI software.[1][2][3][4][5][6]
The topic of expert systems also has connections to general systems theory, operations research, business process reengineering, and various topics in applied mathematics and management science.

Suppose a goal is to conclude that Fritz hops. Let X = "Fritz". The rule base would be searched and rule (3) would be selected because its conclusion (the then clause) matches the goal. It is not known that Fritz is a frog, so this "if" statement is added to the goal list. The rule base is again searched and this time rule (1) is selected because its then clause matches the new goal just added to the list. This time, the if clause (Fritz is green) is known to be true and the goal that Fritz hops is concluded. Because the list of goals determines which rules are selected and used, this method is called goal driven.
However, note that if we use confidence factors in even a simplistic fashion - for example, by multiplying them together as if they were like soft probabilities - we get a result that is known with a confidence factor of only one-half of 1%. (This is by multiplying 0.5 x 0.01 = 0.005). This is useful, because without confidence factors, we might erroneously conclude with certainty that a sea turtle named Fritz hops just by virtue of being green. In Classical logic or Aristotelian term logic systems, there are no probabilities or confidence factors; all facts are regarded as certain. An ancient example from Aristotle states, "Socrates is a man. All men are mortal. Thus Socrates is mortal."
In real world applications, few facts are known with absolute certainty and the opposite of a given statement may be more likely to be true ("Green things in the pet store are not frogs, with the probability or confidence factor of 99% in my pet store survey"). Thus it is often useful when building such systems to try and prove both the goal and the opposite of a given goal to see which is more likely.