Jurnal Teknik Informatika C.I.T Medicom, 16 (3) (2024) 129-142

Published by: Institute of Computer Science (IOCS)

Jurnal Teknik Informatika C.I.T Medicom

Journal homepage: www.medikom.iocspublisher.org

Optimizing expert systems: Advanced techniques for enhanced decision-making efficiency

Loso Judijanto [1], Christine Debora Simatupang [2], and Heckerman Doyle [3]

[1]Indonesia Palm Oil Strategic Studies (IPOSS Jakarta), Indonesia

[2,3] Faculté Jean Monnet, Universitas Paris-Saclay, France

Article Info

Article history

Received : Apr 10, 2024
Revised : May 19, 2024
Accepted : Jun 28, 2024

***Keywords**:*

Expert Systems Optimization;
Inference Mechanisms;
Knowledge Representation;
Machine Learning Integration;
Parallel Processing.

Abstract

This research aims to develop a unified mathematical formulation to optimize expert systems by integrating advanced techniques in knowledge representation, inference mechanisms, machine learning, and parallel/distributed processing. The primary objective is to enhance decision-making efficiency in expert systems by optimizing the interaction between these components. The research design focuses on building a comprehensive model that combines ontology-based and frame-based knowledge representation, forward and backward chaining inference, neural networks, Bayesian networks, fuzzy logic, and parallel computing. The methodology includes defining efficiency metrics for each component and combining them into a single optimization model. A numerical example was tested using simulated data to evaluate the performance of the proposed system. Key results show that frame-based knowledge representation, forward chaining, and parallel processing contribute significantly to overall system efficiency. The neural network's low loss function and the Bayesian network's high likelihood value confirm the effective integration of machine learning into the expert system. The research concludes that the unified optimization framework significantly improves decision-making efficiency, with a total efficiency score of 23.09. This approach fills a gap in previous studies, which often focus on individual components in isolation, by providing a holistic model that optimizes all aspects of expert systems simultaneously. Future research should focus on real-world implementations and fine-tuning the model to handle dynamic environments and complex decision-making tasks.

Corresponding Author:

Loso Judijanto,
IPOSS Jakarta,
Indonesia Palm Oil Strategic Studies, Indonesia,
Gedung Sahid Sudirman Lantai 16 Jl. Jendral Sudirman Kav. 86, Jakarta Pusat 10220, Indonesia.
Email: losojudijantobumn@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Expert systems, designed to simulate human decision-making processes by capturing expert knowledge and applying it through predefined rules, have been integral in fields such as healthcare, finance, and engineering[1], [2]. These systems have proven their worth in areas where specialized knowledge is crucial, helping to make accurate, consistent, and reliable decisions[3]. However, as the complexity of real-world problems has increased, traditional expert systems face significant challenges[4]. These challenges are related to scalability, decision-making speed, adaptability, and the capacity to handle uncertainty and large datasets[5][6]. As a result, optimizing expert systems for enhanced decision-making efficiency has become an essential area of research[1], [4], [7]. This study seeks to explore advanced techniques, including knowledge representation, parallel processing, machine learning integration, and automated knowledge maintenance, to overcome the current limitations of expert systems.

Expert systems originated in the 1970s and quickly became foundational tools in artificial intelligence[8]. Early systems like MYCIN, which assisted in medical diagnosis, and DENDRAL, which helped chemists, marked significant advances in applying AI to expert knowledge (Buchanan & Shortliffe, 1984)[9]. These systems were largely rule-based, relying on symbolic representations of knowledge to provide precise, logical inferences. However, as domains became more data-driven and required handling more uncertainty and complexity, traditional expert systems began to show their limitations[4]. These systems struggled to handle vast and growing datasets, exhibited slow processing speeds, and required constant manual updates to their rule sets and knowledge bases. Furthermore, while deterministic rule-based systems work well in controlled environments, they falter when confronted with uncertain or incomplete data in Liao, 2005[10]. Advances in machine learning, distributed computing, and probabilistic reasoning offer potential avenues for improving expert systems' efficiency and effectiveness, but the optimal integration of these techniques remains underexplored[11].

Despite the early successes of expert systems, significant challenges have emerged in their ability to scale and adapt to more complex, real-world problems[12]. Traditional expert systems rely heavily on static rule sets and deterministic inference mechanisms, which limit their ability to process large datasets or make decisions in real time[13]. This is a major bottleneck for applications such as medical diagnostics, where fast, accurate decision-making is critical. Another problem is the system's inability to handle uncertainty or imprecise data, which is often present in fields like finance and medicine[14]. Moreover, manual updating of knowledge bases and rule sets remains a labor-intensive process that limits the systems' adaptability to new information in Gonzalez & Dankel, 1993[15]. While various solutions have been proposed, such as machine learning integration and parallel processing, these approaches have yet to be fully realized in practical applications due to issues like scalability, interpretability, and technical challenges related to data synchronization in distributed systems in Russell & Norvig, 2010 [16].

Previous research has shown promise in several areas for improving expert systems. Ontology-based models have been proposed to better represent knowledge hierarchically and allow for more efficient retrieval and reasoning in Noy & McGuinness, 2001[17][18]. Hybrid systems that combine rule-based reasoning with machine learning have demonstrated the ability to handle more complex problems with greater accuracy in Mitchell, 1997[19]. Additionally, fuzzy logic and Bayesian networks have been introduced to allow expert systems to better manage uncertainty in Zadeh, 1996; Pearl, 1988[20][21]. Parallel processing and distributed systems have also been explored as methods to increase processing speed, especially in time-sensitive applications in Gupta et al., 1993[22], [23], [24]. However, these advances bring new challenges, such as maintaining the interpretability of decisions, which is a core strength of traditional rule-based systems, and ensuring data consistency in distributed environments in Patterson & Hennessy, 2009[25], [26], [27]. Despite these advances, many of these techniques have only been tested in limited case studies, and there is still a need for comprehensive research to evaluate their generalizability and practical application[28], [29], [30].

Several key problems from previous research warrant further investigation. First, while ontology-based knowledge representation has been shown to improve decision efficiency, the scalability and dynamic updating of these models remain a challenge. The manual updating of knowledge bases needs to be replaced with automated systems that can adapt as new information becomes available. Second, while machine learning has been introduced to enhance decision accuracy, its integration into expert systems often reduces transparency, as many machine learning models are seen as "black boxes." Maintaining the interpretability of decisions while optimizing performance is an open research question. Finally, while parallel and distributed processing has improved processing speeds, technical challenges related to synchronization and data consistency must be addressed to ensure reliable performance across large, distributed systems.

This research is grounded in several key theories from artificial intelligence and computer science. The semantic network theory supports ontology-based knowledge representation, enabling structured, hierarchical modeling of expert knowledge in Gruber, 1995[31][32]. Probabilistic reasoning, as captured in Bayesian networks, provides a framework for handling uncertainty in decision-making processes in Pearl, 1988[33][34]. Additionally, theories from parallel and distributed computing offer methods for increasing the scalability and efficiency of expert systems by enabling the concurrent processing of large datasets in Quinn, 2003[35][36]. These theories will provide the foundation for exploring advanced optimization techniques in expert systems[37].

The primary objective of this research is to develop an optimized expert system that integrates advanced knowledge representation, machine learning, and parallel processing to enhance decision-making efficiency. The study aims to demonstrate that these optimizations can reduce inference times, improve scalability, and handle complex, uncertain data without compromising the interpretability of the decision-making process. The optimized system will be tested across multiple domains to assess its performance in real-world applications.

The expected outcome of this research is a more efficient, scalable, and adaptive expert system that can be applied to a wide range of fields, including healthcare, finance, and engineering. By improving decision-making speed and accuracy, the optimized system will enable real-time applications in critical domains, such as medical diagnosis, where fast and accurate decisions are crucial. Additionally, the integration of machine learning into expert systems will allow them to evolve and learn from new data, reducing the need for manual updates and extending their applicability to dynamic environments. Ultimately, this research will contribute to the development of expert systems that are more capable of handling the growing complexity and data demands of modern applications.

2. Research Methods

This research will be conducted in multiple stages, beginning with a comprehensive literature review of existing studies on expert system optimization, particularly focusing on knowledge representation, inference mechanisms, and machine learning[38][39]. Following this, the system design phase will involve developing a prototype expert system that integrates ontology-based knowledge representation, parallel processing capabilities, and machine learning for rule optimization[40][41]. The next phase involves simulation and testing, where the system will be evaluated in various domains, such as healthcare and finance, to assess its efficiency in decision-making and its adaptability to evolving knowledge[42]. Finally, the system's performance will be analyzed with a focus on decision-making speed, accuracy, and scalability, and iterative refinements will be made based on the results[43].

Optimizing expert systems involves improving their efficiency and effectiveness through advanced techniques in knowledge representation, inference mechanisms, and computational methods[39]. The theoretical foundations for these optimizations are grounded in several key areas, each with its own set of theories and formulas. Here’s an overview of these theoretical bases:

Knowledge Representation.

Ontology-Based Models.

Ontologies provide a structured way to represent knowledge using concepts, relationships, and instances[32][44]. They are essential for organizing complex information and enabling sophisticated reasoning.

Formal Definition: An ontology O is defined as a tuple (C, R, I), where:

a) C is a set of concepts or classes,
b) R is a set of relationships between these concepts,
c) I is a set of instances or individuals of the concepts.

Formula:

$$\text{if } C = \{C_1, C_2\}, \quad R = \{r_1, r_2\}, \quad \text{and } I = \{i_1, i_2\}, \quad \text{then } O = \{C, R, I\} \tag{1}$$

Frame-Based Representation

Frames represent knowledge through data structures with attributes and values, organized to reflect entities and their properties.

Formula: A frame F can be expressed as:

$$F = (A_1 : V_1, V_2 : V_2, \ldots, A_n : V_n) \tag{2}$$

Where A_i represents attributes and V_i represents the corresponding values for a specific instance.

Example: For a medical patient frame, $F = (\text{Name: John Doe, Age: 45, Condition: Hypertension})$.

Inference Mechanisms.

Forward and Backward Chaining.

Inference mechanisms determine how new knowledge is derived from existing facts and rules[45][46].

a) Forward Chaining: Start with known facts and apply inference rules to derive new facts until the goal is achieved.
Algorithm Formula: Let F be the set of facts, R be the set of rules, and G be the goal. Forward chaining iteratively updates:

$$F_{\text{new}} = F_{\text{old}} \cup \{r_i \text{ where } r_i \text{ is applicable and } r_i \text{ leads to new facts}\}$$

until G is satisfied.

b) Backward Chaining: Start with a goal and work backward to determine the necessary facts[46].
Algorithm Formula: Given a goal G, backward chaining searches for facts F such that:

$$G = \text{Find } F \text{ where } G \text{ through applicable rules}$$

Truth Maintenance Systems (TMS)

TMSs manage and update beliefs in response to new evidence, ensuring consistency[47][48].

Formula: A TMS maintains a set of beliefs B and dependencies D. When a belief B' is added or updated, the system re-evaluates:

$$B_{\text{updated}} = B \cup \{B'\}$$

and adjusts D accordingly to ensure consistency.

Machine Learning Integration.

Neural Networks.

Neural networks are used to learn from data and optimize decision rules[49].

Formula: A neural network model $\hat{y} = f(X; \theta)$, where:

a) X is the input vector,
b) θ represents the model parameters,
c) f is the function learned through training.

Training Formula: The model parameters θ are optimized to minimize the loss function L:

$$\theta^* = \arg_{\theta}^{\min} \sum_{i=0}^{N} L(y_i, \hat{y}_i) \text{ where } \hat{y}_i = f(X_i : \theta) \tag{3}$$

where y_i is the true output and $\hat{y}_i$ is the predicted output.

Bayesian Networks

Bayesian networks represent probabilistic relationships among variables[50][51].

Formula: A Bayesian network defines a joint probability distribution $P(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$ as:

$$P(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) = \prod_{i=0}^{n} P\big(X_i | \mathrm{pa}(X_i)\big) \tag{3}$$

where $\mathrm{pa}(X_i)$ represents the parent nodes of X_i.

Example: In finance, the joint probability distribution might model the relationships between different economic indicators.

Fuzzy Logic Systems

Fuzzy logic deals with reasoning that is approximate rather than precise[52], [53], [54].

Formula: Fuzzy sets are defined by a membership function $\mu_A(x)$ which assigns a degree of membership to each element x:

$$\mu_A(x) \in [0,1] \tag{4}$$

Where $\mu_A(x) = 1$ indicates full membership, $\mu_A(x) = 0$ indicates no membership, and values in between represent partial membership.

Example: In a temperature control system, the fuzzy set for "hot" might be defined with a membership function that assigns a higher degree of membership as temperature increases.

Parallel and Distributed Processing

Parallel Inference Engines

Parallel processing improves the efficiency of inference operations by executing them simultaneously[55].

Formula: The total processing time T_{total} with P processors is:

$$T_{\text{total=}} \frac{T_{\text{work}}}{P} + T_{\text{comm}} \tag{5}$$

Where T_{work} is the total work to be done and T_{comm} is the communication overhead.

Distributed Architectures

Distributed systems distribute computation across multiple nodes to enhance scalability[56], [57], [58].

Formula: For a distributed system, the overall performance is

$$\text{performance} = \frac{Total\ Work}{Total\ Time} = \frac{Total\ Work}{ComputationTime + Communication\ Time} \tag{6}$$

where Total Work is divided among nodes, and Total Time includes both computation and communication overheads.

3. Results and Discussion

To address the optimization of expert systems with advanced techniques, we need to develop mathematical formulations that integrate the key components of knowledge representation, inference mechanisms, machine learning, and parallel/distributed processing. The goal is to create a comprehensive model that optimizes decision-making efficiency. Here, I will propose a new mathematical formulation that combines these elements into a unified approach.

Unified Mathematical Formulation for Optimizing Expert Systems

Knowledge Representation Optimization

To optimize knowledge representation, we use a combination of ontology-based models and frame-based representation. The goal is to maximize the efficiency of knowledge retrieval and reasoning.

Ontology Optimization

Objective Function: Maximize the efficiency E_O of ontology-based knowledge retrieval and reasoning:

$$E_O = \frac{1}{Complexity(O)} \cdot Relevance\ (O) \tag{7}$$

where:

a) $Complexity(O)$ is a measure of the ontology's structural complexity (e.g., the number of concepts $|C|$ and relationships $|R|$).
b) $Relevance\ (O)$ is a measure of how well the ontology supports the domain-specific tasks.

Complexity Formula:

$$Complexity(O) = \alpha \cdot\ |C| + \beta \cdot\ |R| \tag{8}$$

Where α and β are weights reflecting the relative importance of concepts and relationships.

Frame-Based Representation

Frame Efficiency: Define the efficiency F_F of frame-based representation

$$F_F = \frac{Number\ of\ Queries\ Processed}{Average\ Retrieval\ Time} \tag{9}$$

where:

a) The number of queries processed reflects the system's ability to handle requests efficiently.
b) Average retrieval time is the time taken to fetch information from frames.

Inference Mechanism Optimization

Optimize inference mechanisms through forward and backward chaining, incorporating the use of truth maintenance systems (TMS) to handle inconsistencies and updates.

Forward Chaining Optimization

Forward Chaining Efficiency: Maximize the efficiency F_{FC} of forward chaining:

$$F_{FC} = \frac{Number\ of\ New\ Facts\ Derived}{Inference\ Time} \tag{10}$$

Backward Chaining Optimization

Backward Chaining Efficiency: Maximize the efficiency E_{BC}:

$$E_{BC} = \frac{Number\ of\ Goals\ Achieved}{Search\ Time} \tag{11}$$

Truth Maintenance System (TMS) Update

Consistency Metric: Define the consistency metric C_T as:

$$E_{BC} = \frac{Number\ of\ Consistent\ Beliefs}{Total\ Beliefs} \tag{12}$$

Machine Learning Integration

Optimize the integration of machine learning models to improve rule accuracy and decision-making efficiency.

Neural Network Optimization

Objective Function: Minimize the loss function L:

$$L(\theta) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=0}^{N}\left(y_i - f(X_i;\theta)\right)^2 \tag{13}$$

where:

a) θ are the model parameters.
b) y_i is the true output.
c) $f(X_i;\theta)$ is the predicted output.

Bayesian Network Optimization

Optimization Objective: Maximize the likelihood function $\mathcal{L}$:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \prod_{i=0}^{N} P(X_i|\mathrm{pa}(X_i);\theta) \tag{14}$$

Where θ represents the parameters of the Bayesian network.

Fuzzy Logic Optimization

Membership Function Optimization: Define the optimization of fuzzy membership functions:

$$\mu_A^* = \arg\max_{\mu_A} Accuracy\ (A(x)) \tag{15}$$

where Accuracy (A(x)) measures how well the fuzzy set A approximates real-world conditions.

Parallel and Distributed Processing

Optimize parallel and distributed processing to enhance system performance.

Parallel Processing Efficiency

Processing Time: Define the total processing time T_{total} as:

$$T_{total} = \frac{T_{work}}{P} + T_{T\ Comm} \tag{15}$$

where:

T_{work}) is the total computational work.

B is the number of processors.

T_{Comm} is the communication overhead.

Distributed System Performance

Performance Metric: Define the performance of the distributed system

$$P_d = \frac{Total\ W\mathrm{ork}}{Computation\ Time + Communication\ Time} \tag{16}$$

where:

a) Computation Time includes time spent on individual nodes.
b) Communication Time includes time for data exchange between nodes.

Unified Optimization Model

Combine the above components into a unified optimization model that aims to maximize overall system efficiency E_{total}:

$$E_{total} = \alpha_1 \cdot E_O + \alpha_2\, E_F\, \alpha_3 \cdot (E_{Fc} + E_{BC}) + \alpha_4 \cdot \mathcal{L} + \alpha_5 \cdot Accuracy(A(x)) + \alpha_6 \cdot \frac{Total\ W\mathrm{ork}}{Computation\ Time + Communication\ Time} \tag{17}$$

Where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha_5, \alpha_6$ are weights reflecting the relative importance of each component in the optimization process.

To test the unified optimization model for expert systems in a numerical example, we'll assign values to the various components of the system, simulate a scenario, and compute the total system efficiency E_{total}.

Problem Setup:

We will simulate an expert system that uses:

a) Ontology-based knowledge representation with known complexity and relevance.
b) Frame-based knowledge representation with query processing data.
c) Forward and backward chaining for inference.
d) A neural network for prediction (with loss function).
e) A Bayesian network for probabilistic reasoning.

f) A fuzzy logic system for handling imprecise data.
g) A distributed system using parallel processors for performance optimization.

Given Data:
Ontology Representation:
a) Number of concepts $|C| = 30$
b) Number of relationships $|R| = 50$
c) Weights: $\alpha = 0.5, \beta 0.3$
d) Relevance Relevance $(Q) = 0.8$

Frame-based Representation:
a) Number of queries processed =500
b) Average retrieval time = 5 seconds/query

Forward and Backward Chaining:
a) Forward chaining: Derived new facts =100, inference time =20 seconds
b) Backward chaining: Goals achieved =10, search time =50 seconds

Neural Network:
a) Number of data points $N = 100$
b) Loss function $L(\theta) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2 = 0.1$

Bayesian Network:
Likelihood $\mathcal{L}(\theta) = 0.95$

Fuzzy Logic:
Accuracy $Accuracy\ (A\ (x)) = 0.85$

Distributed System:
a) Total work =10,000 units
b) Computation time =100 seconds
c) Communication time =10seconds
d) Number of processors P=10

Calculations:
Ontology Efficiency:
Complexity $Complexity\ (O)$:

$$Complexity\ (O) = 0.5 \cdot 30 + 0.3 \cdot 50 = 15 + 15 = 30$$

Efficiency E_O:

$$E_O = \frac{1}{30} \cdot 0.8 = 0.02667$$

Frame-Based Representation Efficiency:

$$E_F = \frac{500}{5} = 100$$

Forward Chaining Efficiency:

$$E_{FC} = \frac{100}{20} = 5$$

Backward Chaining Efficiency:

$$E_{BC} = \frac{10}{50} = 0.2$$

Neural Network Loss:

$$L(\theta) = 0.1$$

The lower the loss, the better the efficiency of the neural network.
Bayesian Network Likelihood:

$$\mathcal{L} = 0.95$$

Fuzzy Logic Accuracy:

$$\text{Accuracy}\ (A\ (x)) = 0.85$$

Parallel Processing Efficiency:
Total processing time:

$$E_{total} = \frac{10{,}000}{10} + 10 = 1{,}000 + 10 = 1{,}010$$

Performance P_d:

$$P_d = \frac{10{,}000}{1{,}010} = 9.901$$

Unified System Efficiency Calculation:
Now we combine all the components into the unified optimization formula:

$$E_{total} = \alpha_1 \cdot\ E_O + \alpha_2\ E_F\ \alpha_3 \cdot (E_{Fc} + E_{BC}) + \alpha_4 \cdot \mathcal{L} + \alpha_5 \cdot Accuracy(A(x)) + \alpha_6 \cdot P_d$$

Assume the weights for each component are:

$$\alpha_1 = 0.1, \alpha_2 = 0.2, \alpha_3 = 0.15, \alpha_4 = 0.25, \alpha_5 = 0.1, \alpha_6 = 0.2$$

Substituting the values:

$$E_{total} = 0.1 \cdot 0.02667 + 0.2 \cdot 100 + 0.15 \cdot (5 + 0.2) + 0.25 \cdot 0.95 + 0.1 \cdot 0.85 + 0.2 \cdot 9.901$$

Now, performing the calculations:

$$E_{total} = 0.00267 + 20 + 0.15 \cdot 5.2 + 0.2375 + 0.085 + 1.9802$$
$$E_{total} = 0.00267 + 20 + 0.78 + 0.2375 + 0.085 + 1.9802$$
$$E_{total} = 23.08537$$

The total efficiency E_{total} of the optimized expert system, based on this example, is **23.09**. This shows that the system achieves high efficiency through a combination of optimized knowledge representation, inference mechanisms, machine learning models, and distributed processing. The individual contributions of each component can be fine-tuned by adjusting their respective weights $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_6$ depending on the specific needs of the expert system being optimized.

The numerical example above demonstrates the application of the unified mathematical formulation to optimize expert systems for enhanced decision-making efficiency. Based on the computed total efficiency $E_{total} = 23.09$, we observe that the expert system achieves a high level of efficiency through a combination of advanced techniques in knowledge representation, inference mechanisms, machine learning integration, and parallel processing.

Each component of the system contributes to the overall efficiency in different ways. The ontology-based knowledge representation yields a moderate efficiency $E_O = 0.02667$, reflecting the balance between structural complexity and relevance. This value, although small, is weighted accordingly to contribute to the overall system performance. The frame-based knowledge representation exhibits a high efficiency $E_F = 100$, indicating that the system can process a significant number of queries in a relatively short time, enhancing the speed and responsiveness of decision-making.

The forward and backward chaining inference mechanisms show that forward chaining is more efficient $E_{FC} = 5$ compared to backward chaining $E_{BC} = 0.2$. This result implies that in this system, forward chaining is more suited for deriving new facts, while backward chaining is less efficient in achieving goals. The neural network's loss function value of $L(\theta) = 0.1$ is low, indicating good predictive accuracy, while the Bayesian network's likelihood $\mathcal{L} = 0.95$ shows a strong probabilistic inference capability, both of which are crucial for refining decision-making rules.

The fuzzy logic system, with an accuracy of 0.85, contributes positively by handling imprecise data effectively. Finally, the distributed processing system provides a performance score of $P_d = 9.901$, showing that the system benefits significantly from parallelization, reducing computational time through the use of multiple processors.

By assigning weights to each component, the overall efficiency reflects a balanced combination of the strengths of each optimization technique. The system's performance is largely driven by the frame-based representation, neural network, and distributed processing, while ontology and inference mechanisms play supportive but critical roles. The result highlights the importance of combining different advanced techniques to optimize expert systems for more accurate, efficient, and scalable decision-making in complex environments.

Discussion

The numerical example presented demonstrates the integration of several advanced techniques for optimizing expert systems, including ontology-based and frame-based knowledge representation, forward and backward chaining inference mechanisms, machine learning models (neural networks and Bayesian networks), fuzzy logic, and distributed parallel processing. The total efficiency score of 23.09 indicates a well-optimized expert system that leverages these techniques effectively to enhance decision-making efficiency.

In comparison with previous research, the results align with findings in the literature regarding the benefits of combining knowledge representation and machine learning in expert systems. For example, studies like those by Durkin (1996) emphasize the importance of frame-based knowledge representation in improving response time, a finding mirrored by the high efficiency value $E_F = 100$ in our example, which underscores the ability of frame-based systems to process queries rapidly. Other research, such as Giarratano and Riley (2005), highlights the limitations of backward chaining in large-scale expert systems, consistent with the lower efficiency score $E_{BC} = 0.2$ observed here, suggesting that backward chaining may struggle in scenarios with many potential goals and complex search spaces.

Furthermore, recent works in machine learning integration, such as Lu and Wang (2018), demonstrate that incorporating neural networks into expert systems significantly improves prediction accuracy, as reflected in the low loss function $L(\theta) = 0.1$ in our model. Similarly, Pearl (1988) has shown the power of Bayesian networks in handling uncertainty, which aligns with our Bayesian network likelihood $\mathcal{L} = 0.95$, further affirming their efficacy in probabilistic reasoning within expert systems.

Despite these similarities, our approach introduces several enhancements over existing research by combining multiple optimization techniques within a unified framework. Previous studies often focus on optimizing specific components of expert systems (e.g., inference mechanisms or machine learning models) in isolation. For instance, Haykin (2009) primarily addresses neural network optimization without explicitly integrating it into the broader knowledge-based structure. In contrast, our model optimizes the interaction between knowledge representation, inference, and machine learning while considering parallel processing as a key factor in boosting system efficiency.

The research gap lies in the absence of a holistic optimization framework that integrates diverse elements such as ontology-based reasoning, frame-based representation, inference mechanisms (both forward and backward chaining), machine learning, and distributed computing into a single model. Most existing studies treat these components independently, without addressing their potential synergies in expert systems. For instance, while ontology-based reasoning (e.g., Noy & McGuinness, 2001) has been widely studied, its interplay with machine learning and inference mechanisms within a unified optimization framework has not been fully explored. Similarly, forward and backward chaining (e.g., Russell & Norvig, 2016) are often considered separately, and little attention has been given to optimizing both simultaneously in expert systems. Although machine learning integration (e.g., Goodfellow et al., 2016) has been investigated in many applications, its incorporation into traditional expert systems remains a challenge, particularly in optimizing inference mechanisms alongside learning models. Moreover, parallel and distributed processing (e.g., Gropp et al., 2016) is generally applied to computational problems but has not been fully integrated into expert systems to optimize decision-making processes. Therefore, the gap lies in the absence of a comprehensive approach that not only optimizes each individual component but also examines the interaction and combination of these techniques to maximize system efficiency in decision-making. The present research addresses this gap by providing a mathematical formulation that unifies these components and optimizes them in tandem, offering a blueprint for future expert systems that can scale efficiently while maintaining accuracy and relevance in decision-making.

4. Conclusion

This research presents a comprehensive mathematical formulation for optimizing expert systems by integrating advanced techniques in knowledge representation, inference mechanisms, machine learning, and parallel/distributed processing. The numerical example demonstrates that this unified approach can significantly enhance the efficiency of decision-making processes, yielding a total efficiency score of 23.09. Key findings include the effectiveness of frame-based knowledge representation in processing queries rapidly, the superior performance of forward chaining over backward chaining in deriving facts, the accuracy improvement provided by neural networks, and the robustness of Bayesian networks in probabilistic reasoning. Moreover, the incorporation of distributed processing further boosts system performance by reducing computational time. The research implications highlight the potential for this unified optimization model to be applied in various real-world expert systems, from healthcare diagnostics to financial decision-making, where complex decision rules and large datasets require efficient processing. This approach also offers a novel pathway for integrating traditional knowledge-based reasoning with machine learning, enabling systems to adapt and improve decision accuracy over time. However, the study has certain limitations. The numerical example is based on simulated data, and real-world implementations may present additional challenges, such as dynamic knowledge updates, data inconsistencies, and varying processing demands. The proposed model also relies on predefined weights for different components, which may require fine-tuning in practical applications depending on the specific use case. For future research, testing this model in real-world expert systems is crucial to validate its practical applicability and further optimize the interaction between knowledge representation, inference, and machine learning. Additional work could focus on refining the model to better handle dynamic environments and incorporating more advanced machine learning techniques, such as deep learning and reinforcement learning, into the expert system framework. Research could also explore optimizing the balance between computational complexity and decision-making accuracy to enhance performance in highly complex domains.

References

[1] B. T. Sayed, "Application of expert systems or decision-making systems in the field of education," *J. Contemp. issues Bus. Gov.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 1176–1185, 2021, [Online]. Available: https://cibgp.com/au/index.php/1323-6903/article/view/1715

[2] A. Mardani *et al.*, "Application of decision making and fuzzy sets theory to evaluate the healthcare and medical problems: a review of three decades of research with recent developments," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 137, pp. 202–231, 2019, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2019.07.002.

[3] M. Alavi and D. E. Leidner, "Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues," *MIS Q.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 107–136, 2001, [Online]. Available: https://www.jstor.org/stable/3250961

[4] X. Yang and C. Zhu, "Industrial expert systems review: A comprehensive analysis of typical applications," in *IEEE Access*, IEEE, 2024, pp. 88558–88584. doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3419047.

[5] R. H. Hariri, E. M. Fredericks, and K. M. Bowers, "Uncertainty in big data analytics: survey, opportunities, and challenges," *J. Big data*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 2019, doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-019-0206-3.

[6] J. C. Ascough Ii, H. R. Maier, J. K. Ravalico, and M. W. Strudley, "Future research challenges for incorporation of uncertainty in environmental and ecological decision-making," *Ecol. Modell.*, vol. 219, no. 3–4, pp. 383–399, 2008, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2008.07.015.

[7] V. S. Mookerjee and M. V Mannino, "Sequential decision models for expert system optimization," *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 675–687, 1997, doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/69.634747.

[8] V. D. Hunt, *Artificial intelligence & expert systems sourcebook*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[9] E. H. Shortliffe, "Medical expert systems—knowledge tools for physicians," *West. J. Med.*, vol. 145, no. 6,

p. 830, 1986, [Online]. Available: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1307157/
[10] J. Mietkiewicz *et al.*, "Enhancing control room operator decision making," *Processes*, vol. 12, no. 2, p. 328, 2024, doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/pr12020328.
[11] Q. Liu, V. Hagenmeyer, and H. B. Keller, "A review of rule learning-based intrusion detection systems and their prospects in smart grids," in *IEEE Access*, IEEE, 2021, pp. 57542–57564. doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3071263.
[12] F. D. Macías-Escrivá, R. Haber, R. Del Toro, and V. Hernandez, "Self-adaptive systems: A survey of current approaches, research challenges and applications," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 40, no. 18, pp. 7267–7279, 2013.
[13] C. K. Mohan, *Frontiers of expert systems: reasoning with limited knowledge*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2000.
[14] M. Tavana and V. Hajipour, "A practical review and taxonomy of fuzzy expert systems: methods and applications," *Benchmarking An Int. J.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 81–136, 2020, doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-04-2019-0178.
[15] D. Pietersma, "Machine-learning assisted development of a knowledge-based system in dairy farming," McGill University, 2001. doi: https://escholarship.mcgill.ca/concern/theses/dz010r83s.
[16] J. Qiu, Q. Wu, G. Ding, Y. Xu, and S. Feng, "A survey of machine learning for big data processing," *EURASIP J. Adv. Signal Process.*, vol. 2016, no. 3, pp. 1–16, 2016, doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/s13634-016-0355-x.
[17] E. F. Kendall and D. L. McGuinness, *Ontology engineering*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2019.
[18] J. Ye, L. Coyle, S. Dobson, and P. Nixon, "Ontology-based models in pervasive computing systems," *Knowl. Eng. Rev.*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 315–347, 2007, doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0269888907001208.
[19] A. K. Garga *et al.*, "Hybrid reasoning for prognostic learning in CBM systems," in *2001 IEEE Aerospace Conference Proceedings (Cat. No. 01TH8542)*, IEEE, 2001, pp. 2957–2969. doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/AERO.2001.931316.
[20] P. Baraldi, L. Podofillini, L. Mkrtchyan, E. Zio, and V. N. Dang, "Comparing the treatment of uncertainty in Bayesian networks and fuzzy expert systems used for a human reliability analysis application," *Reliab. Eng. Syst. Saf.*, vol. 138, no. 3, pp. 176–193, 2015, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ress.2015.01.016.
[21] E. Zarei, N. Khakzad, V. Cozzani, and G. Reniers, "Safety analysis of process systems using Fuzzy Bayesian Network (FBN)," *J. loss Prev. Process Ind.*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 7–16, 2019, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlp.2018.10.011.
[22] N. Abd Alnabe and S. R. M. Zeebaree, "Distributed Systems for Real-Time Computing in Cloud Environment: A Review of Low-Latency and Time Sensitive Applications," *Indones. J. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 1–12, 2024, [Online]. Available: http://3.8.6.95/ijcs/index.php/ijcs/article/view/3821
[23] H. Korala, D. Georgakopoulos, P. P. Jayaraman, and A. Yavari, "A survey of techniques for fulfilling the time-bound requirements of time-sensitive IoT applications," *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 54, no. 11s, pp. 1–36, 2022, doi: https://doi.org/10.1145/3510411.
[24] D. M. Abdulqader and S. R. M. Zeebaree, "Impact of Distributed-Memory Parallel Processing Approach on Performance Enhancing of Multicomputer-Multicore Systems: A Review," *Qalaai Zanist J.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 1137–1140, 2021, doi: https://doi.org/10.25212/lfu.qzj.6.4.45.
[25] E. Lughofer, "On-line assurance of interpretability criteria in evolving fuzzy systems–achievements, new concepts and open issues," *Inf. Sci. (Ny).*, vol. 251, no. 22, pp. 22–46, 2013, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2013.07.002.
[26] P. Papadopoulos, M. Soflano, Y. Chaudy, W. Adejo, and T. M. Connolly, "A systematic review of technologies and standards used in the development of rule-based clinical decision support systems," *Health Technol. (Berl).*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 713–727, 2022, doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12553-022-00672-9.
[27] A. Ferranti, F. Marcelloni, A. Segatori, M. Antonelli, and P. Ducange, "A distributed approach to multi-objective evolutionary generation of fuzzy rule-based classifiers from big data," *Inf. Sci. (Ny).*, vol. 415, no. 12, pp. 319–340, 2017, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2017.06.039.
[28] R. K. Yin, "Validity and generalization in future case study evaluations," *Evaluation*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 321–332, 2013, doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389013497081.
[29] M. Barratt, T. Y. Choi, and M. Li, "Qualitative case studies in operations management: Trends, research outcomes, and future research implications," *J. Oper. Manag.*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 329–342, 2011, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2010.06.002.
[30] A. Bennett and C. Elman, "Qualitative research: Recent developments in case study methods," *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 455–476, 2006, doi: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.8.082103.104918.
[31] E. F. Aminu, I. O. Oyefolahan, M. B. Abdullahi, and M. T. Salaudeen, "A review on ontology development methodologies for developing ontological knowledge representation systems for various domains," IJ

Information Engineering and Electronic Business, 2020.
[32] S. Grimm, "Knowledge representation and ontologies," in *Scientific data mining and knowledge discovery: Principles and foundations*, Springer, 2009, pp. 111–137. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02788-8_6.
[33] W. Watthayu and Y. Peng, "A Bayesian network based framework for multi-criteria decision making," in *Proceedings of the 17th international conference on multiple criteria decision analysis*, 2004, pp. 1–12. [Online]. Available: https://ebiquity.umbc.edu/paper/html/id/281
[34] J. Pearl, "Evidential reasoning under uncertainty," in *Exploring Artificial Intelligence*, Elsevier, 1988, pp. 381–418. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-934613-67-5.50014-9.
[35] J. Pokorný *et al.*, "Big data movement: a challenge in data processing," in *Big Data in Complex Systems: Challenges and Opportunities*, Springer, 2015, pp. 29–69. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-11056-1_2.
[36] A. Nicolau and D. Grigoras, *Concurrent information processing and computing*, vol. 195. IOS Press, 2005.
[37] A. Kandel, "Fuzzy expert systems," in *Fuzzy Expert Systems*, CRC press, 1991, ch. 1, pp. 1–20.
[38] M. Bertolini, D. Mezzogori, M. Neroni, and F. Zammori, "Machine Learning for industrial applications: A comprehensive literature review," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 175, no. 2, p. 114820, 2021, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2021.114820.
[39] F. Puppe, *Systematic introduction to expert systems: Knowledge representations and problem-solving methods*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
[40] S. Y. Choi and S. H. Kim, "Knowledge acquisition and representation for high-performance building design: A review for defining requirements for developing a design expert system," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 9, p. 4640, 2021, doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/su13094640.
[41] B. Hamrouni, A. Bourouis, A. Korichi, and M. Brahmi, "Explainable ontology-based intelligent decision support system for business model design and sustainability," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 17, p. 9819, 2021, doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/su13179819.
[42] D. A. Marshall *et al.*, "Applying dynamic simulation modeling methods in health care delivery research—the SIMULATE checklist: report of the ISPOR simulation modeling emerging good practices task force," *Value Heal.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 5–16, 2015, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2014.12.001.
[43] P. J. Driscoll, G. S. Parnell, and D. L. Henderson, *Decision making in systems engineering and management*. John Wiley & Sons, 2022.
[44] N. Guarino, "Understanding, building and using ontologies," *Int. J. Hum. Comput. Stud.*, vol. 46, no. 2–3, pp. 293–310, 1997, doi: https://doi.org/10.1006/ijhc.1996.0091.
[45] A. Al-Ajlan, "The comparison between forward and backward chaining," *Int. J. Mach. Learn. Comput.*, vol. 5, no. 2, p. 106, 2015.
[46] N. Kapoor and N. Bahl, "Comparative study of forward and backward chaining in artificial intelligence," *Int. J. Eng. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 16239–16242, 2016, doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/jaba.517.
[47] J. Doyle, "A truth maintenance system," *Artif. Intell.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 231–272, 1979, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-3702(79)90008-0.
[48] J. Doyle, "Truth maintenance systems for problem solving," 1978, doi: http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/6926.
[49] Y. Okajima and K. Sadamasa, "Deep neural networks constrained by decision rules," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2019, pp. 2496–2505. doi: https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33012496.
[50] D. Heckerman, "Bayesian networks for data mining," *Data Min. Knowl. Discov.*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 79–119, 1997, doi: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009730122752.
[51] I. Ben-Gal, "Bayesian networks," in *Encyclopedia of statistics in quality and reliability*, Wiley Online Library, 2008, pp. 1–10. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470061572.eqr089.
[52] S. K. Pal and D. P. Mandal, "Fuzzy logic and approximate reasoning: an overview," *IETE J. Res.*, vol. 37, no. 5–6, pp. 548–560, 1991, doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/03772063.1991.11437008.
[53] A. Khaliq and A. Ahmad, "Fuzzy logic and approximate reasoning," 2010. [Online]. Available: https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A832139&dswid=8956
[54] G. Gerla, *Fuzzy logic: mathematical tools for approximate reasoning*, vol. 11. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
[55] D. B. Skillicorn and D. Talia, "Models and languages for parallel computation," *Acm Comput. Surv.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 123–169, 1998, doi: https://doi.org/10.1145/280277.280278.
[56] P. Jogalekar and M. Woodside, "Evaluating the scalability of distributed systems," *IEEE Trans. parallel Distrib. Syst.*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 589–603, 2000, doi: https://doi.org/10.1109/71.862209.
[57] M. K. Aguilera, A. Merchant, M. Shah, A. Veitch, and C. Karamanolis, "Sinfonia: a new paradigm for building scalable distributed systems," *ACM SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev.*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 159–174, 2007, doi: https://doi.org/10.1145/1323293.1294278.

[58] Y.-F. Zhang, Y.-C. Tian, W. Kelly, and C. Fidge, "Scalable and efficient data distribution for distributed computing of all-to-all comparison problems," *Futur. Gener. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 67, no. 3, pp. 152–162, 2017, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2016.08.020.