

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360454996>

# Important Neutrosophic Rules for Decision-Making in the Case of Uncertain Data

Article · April 2022

DOI: 10.54216/IJNS.1803014

---

CITATIONS

0

3 authors, including:



[Maissam Ahmed Jdid](#)

Al\_sham\_Private University

9 PUBLICATIONS 11 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



## Important Neutrosophic Rules for Decision-Making in the Case of Uncertain Data

Maissam Jdid<sup>1,\*</sup>, Basel Shahin<sup>2</sup>, Fatima Al Suleiman<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Faculty of Informatics Engineering, Al-Sham Private University, Damascus, Syria

<sup>3</sup>Business Supervisor- Department of Mathematical, Faculty of Science, Damascus, Syria

Emails; [m.j.foit@aspu.edu.sy](mailto:m.j.foit@aspu.edu.sy); [b.sh.foit@aspu.edu.sy](mailto:b.sh.foit@aspu.edu.sy); [fatimasuliman2009@gmail.com](mailto:fatimasuliman2009@gmail.com)

### Abstract

An urgent need to make a rational decision has emerged in the world of rapid changes based on quantitative methods that reduce the proportion of risk, especially if the decisions are fateful and the decision issues are huge and complex, noting that the decision-making process and the selection of the optimal alternative depends on the quality of the data that describes the issue that the decision is intended to be taken. Because the theory of administrative decision-making depends on this data and on the type of this data if it is confirmed data or unconfirmed data and not specified with sufficient accuracy, or random data that is repeated according to a certain probability distribution law, after which the decision maker uses the methods used to obtain on the optimal decision. In this research we will study the theory of administrative decisions in the case of uncertain data, which is the situation that the decision maker faces, and he does not know anything certain about the state that nature (market or management --) will take, nor even about the possibilities of any of them, then it is assumed that the cases the possible ones are equal and they enter the analysis at the same opportunity and make a trade-off between the alternatives available to him in all circumstances. In the classical logic, a set of rules was used to help the decision maker to make the ideal decision, and since the ideal decision depends on specific classical values that do not take into account the changes that may occur in the work environment, which is represented by high prices or unavailability of materials or others, it was necessary to search for a better method that helps us to avoid dealing with specific values and gives us a margin of freedom. Therefore, in this research, we will study the theory of decision-making in the case of uncertain data using the Neutrosophic Logic, the logic that helps us to face fluctuations and changes that we may encounter during work, through uncertainty that the Neutrosophical values have, which we will take in the elements of the profit (or loss) matrix and rely on them in the decision-making process, as we will take these values in the form of fields representing the minimum field of profit (or loss) that we can get in the worst cases of nature, and represents the upper limit of the field of profit (or loss) that we can get in the best cases of nature, and we will show the most important rules used in the case of uncertain data with an applied example of each rule.

**Keywords:** Decision-Making Theory; Neutrosophic Logic; Decision-Making in Case of Uncertainty

### 1. Introduction

To avoid economic inflation and the sensitivity of political and military situations, the need to know the results of any decision appeared before taking it, which prompted mathematicians to develop mathematical models aimed at searching for optimal strategies in conditions of doubt and uncertainty. From the most prominent scientists who had a great impact in this field Von Neumann - Morgan Strain - Nash and the scientist Herbert Simon, who is considered the father of the theory of decision-making, and this is due to the great importance of the theories he developed, as it opened the way for new methods called today artificial intelligence [1,2,3]. The decision, in all fields, is increasing day by day. It was necessary for a new logic to keep pace with the great scientific development, and to limit risks and losses. The Neutrosophic logic, the logic whose emersion was a revolution in all fields of science, was founded by the American mathematical philosopher Florentin Smarandache [4,5,6,7,8], where he presented it in 1995 as a generalization of Fuzzy Logic, and as an extension of the theory of fuzzy categories, presented by Lotfi Zadeh [9] in 1965, where it came to replace the binary logic that recognizes right and wrong by entering a third neutral case, which can be interpreted as undetermined or uncertain, Neutrosophic logic has grown and developed significantly in

recent years through its application in measurement, sets, graphs, and many scientific and practical fields, [10,11,12,13,14,15,16, 17,18,19,20,21,22,23].

**2. Discussion: [1, 2]**

When the data is uncertain and the decision maker does not know anything about the state that nature will take, not even about the possibilities of any of them occurring, he will deal with them on the basis that they are equivalent, and enter into the analysis at the same opportunity, then he will make a trade-off between the alternatives available to him in all circumstances by using specific rules that were developed to study the state of uncertainty [1,2], we will study in this research some of the rules that were used in the classical logic to determine the optimal decision in the event of uncertainty, according to the Neutrosophic Logic, where we will take in the elements of the profit (or loss) Neutrosophic values of the matrix .

**The Problem of Decision-making:**

Let us have a set of alternatives, which we will symbolize with  $a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_m$ , and a group of states of nature, which we will symbolize with  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \dots, \theta_n$ , and we have the profit (or loss) resulting from the alternative  $i$ , since  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, m$ , and the state of nature  $j$ , since  $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n$ , we will represent the above in the following table:

states of nature alternatives	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$	-----	$\theta_n$
$a_1$	$Nx_{11}$	$Nx_{12}$	$Nx_{13}$	-----	$Nx_{1n}$
$a_2$	$Nx_{21}$	$Nx_{22}$	$Nx_{23}$	-----	$Nx_{2n}$
$a_3$	$Nx_{31}$	$Nx_{32}$	$Nx_{33}$	-----	$Nx_{3n}$
...	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
$a_m$	$Nx_{m1}$	$Nx_{m2}$	$Nx_{m3}$	-----	$Nx_{mn}$

**Required:** Determining the appropriate alternative so that the decision maker achieves the greatest profit (i.e. the least loss).

To determine the optimal alternative, and since the situation is a state of uncertainty, we will use one of the following rules:

**1- Neutrosophic Laplace's Rule (Average Gain or Loss):**

In this rule we calculate the average profit (or loss) corresponding to each of the available alternatives, then we choose the largest (smallest) average, and the alternative corresponding to this value is the appropriate decision.

states of nature alternatives	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$	-----	$\theta_n$	average of profit or loss
$a_1$	$Nx_{11}$	$Nx_{12}$	$Nx_{13}$	-----	$Nx_{1n}$	$\overline{NX}_1 = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n Nx_{1j}}{n}$
$a_2$	$Nx_{21}$	$Nx_{22}$	$Nx_{23}$	-----	$Nx_{2n}$	$\overline{NX}_2 = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n Nx_{2j}}{n}$

$a_3$	$Nx_{31}$	$Nx_{32}$	$Nx_{33}$	-----	$Nx_{3n}$	$\overline{NX}_3 = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n Nx_{3j}}{n}$
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
$a_m$	$Nx_{m1}$	$Nx_{m2}$	$Nx_{m3}$	-----	$Nx_{mn}$	$\overline{NX}_m = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n Nx_{mj}}{n}$

In the case of profit, we have:

$$\overline{NX}^* = \text{Max}\{\overline{NX}_1, \overline{NX}_2, \overline{NX}_3, \dots, \overline{NX}_m\}$$

In case of loss, we have:

$$\overline{NX}^* = \text{Min}\{\overline{NX}_1, \overline{NX}_2, \overline{NX}_3, \dots, \overline{NX}_m\}$$

In addition, the appropriate alternative is the alternative corresponding to  $\overline{NX}^*$

We illustrate the above with the following example:

**Practical example:**

An investor wants an amount of millions of dollars in the available investment areas, which are:

- $a_1$  Cars trading.
- $a_2$  Real estate trading.
- $a_3$  Purchasing shares of a service company.
- $a_4$  Establishing an industrial project.

It is required to determine the appropriate alternative for the investor according to the following economic conditions:

- $\theta_1$  Declining of the economic situation.
- $\theta_2$  Stabilization of the economic situation.
- $\theta_3$  Improving of the economic situation.

The annual profits of these investments, according to the economic conditions, are shown in the following table: (One thousand dollars annually)

		states of nature		
		$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$
alternatives	$a_1$	[100, 190]	[200, 260]	[300, 390]
	$a_2$	[-400, -220]	[160, 170]	[600, 650]
	$a_3$	[100, 170]	[290, 370]	[300, 360]
	$a_4$	[133, 180]	[160, 280]	[290, 400]

**Required:** find the appropriate alternative using the Neutrosophic Laplace Rule:

We calculate the average profit corresponding to each alternative, and thus we get the following table:

states of nature alternatives	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$	average of profit
$a_1$	[100, 190]	[200, 260]	[300, 390]	$\frac{[100, 190] + [200, 260] + [300, 390]}{3} = [200, 280]$
$a_2$	[-400, -220]	[160, 170]	[600, 650]	$\frac{[-400, -200] + [160, 170] + [600, 650]}{3} = [120, 206.7]$
$a_3$	[100, 170]	[290, 370]	[300, 360]	$\frac{[100, 170] + [290, 370] + [300, 360]}{3} = [230, 300]$
$a_4$	[133, 180]	[160, 280]	[290, 400]	$\frac{[133, 180] + [160, 280] + [290, 400]}{3} = [194.3, 286.7]$

By comparing the elements of the last column, we notice that the largest value of the average profit is [230, 300] thousand dollars corresponding to the Cars trading ( $a_3$ ), so we consider the alternative  $a_3$  to be the appropriate decision for the investor according to Laplace's rule.

**2- The Neutrosophic Maxi Max rule:**

This rule is based on calculating the largest value of profit for each alternative (in each line), then finding the largest of these, and considering the value that corresponds to it as the appropriate decision.

Therefore, if we denote NY for the Maxi Max  $Nx_{ij}$  for the profit from variant  $i$  versus the state of nature  $j$ , we get the following relationship:

$$NY = \text{Max}_i \left[ \text{Max}_j Nx_{ij} \right] = \text{Max}_i NY_i$$

We explain this rule through the following table:

states of nature alternatives	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$	-----	$\theta_n$	$NY_i = \text{Max}_j Nx_{ij}$
$a_1$	$Nx_{11}$	$Nx_{12}$	$Nx_{13}$	-----	$Nx_{1n}$	$NY_1 = \text{Max}_j Nx_{1j}$
$a_2$	$Nx_{21}$	$Nx_{22}$	$Nx_{23}$	-----	$Nx_{2n}$	$NY_2 = \text{Max}_j Nx_{2j}$
$a_3$	$Nx_{31}$	$Nx_{32}$	$Nx_{33}$	-----	$Nx_{3n}$	$NY_3 = \text{Max}_j Nx_{3j}$
...	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
$a_m$	$Nx_{m1}$	$Nx_{m2}$	$Nx_{m3}$	-----	$Nx_{mn}$	$NY_m = \text{Max}_j Nx_{mj}$

We illustrate the above with the following example:

**Practical example:** We will take the same example given in the previous rule:

alternatives \ states of nature	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$
a <sub>1</sub>	[100, 190]	[200, 260]	[300, 390]
a <sub>2</sub>	[-400, -220]	[160, 170]	[600, 650]
a <sub>3</sub>	[100, 170]	[290, 370]	[300, 360]
a <sub>4</sub>	[133, 180]	[160, 280]	[290, 400]

It is required to determine the appropriate alternative using the Maxi Max rule.

alternatives \ states of nature	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$	$NY_i = \text{Max}_j Nx_{ij}$
a <sub>1</sub>	[100, 190]	[200, 260]	[300, 390]	[300, 390]
a <sub>2</sub>	[-400, -220]	[160, 170]	[600, 650]	[600, 650]
a <sub>3</sub>	[100, 170]	[290, 370]	[300, 360]	[300, 360]
a <sub>4</sub>	[133, 180]	[160, 280]	[290, 400]	[290, 400]

By comparing the elements of the last column, we get:  $NY = \text{Max}_i \left[ \text{Max}_j x_{ij} \right] = [600, 650]$

That is, the largest values are the value [600, 650] corresponding to alternative a<sub>2</sub>. Thus, alternative a<sub>2</sub> is the appropriate alternative according to the Maxi Max rule, that is, the investor must invest the amount in real estate trading.

**3- The Neutrosophic Maxi Min Rule:**

This rule is based on calculating the smallest value of gain for each alternative (in each line), if the conditions of nature are bad, and then searching for the largest of these small ones, and considering the value corresponding to it as the appropriate decision.

Therefore, if we denote **NZ** for the largest of the smallest and  $Nx_{ij}$  for the profit from variant  $i$  versus the state of nature  $j$ , we get the following relation:

$$NZ = \text{Max}_i \left[ \text{Min}_j Nx_{ij} \right] = \text{Max}_i NZ_i$$

We explain this rule through the following table:

alternatives \ states of nature	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$	-----	$\theta_n$	$NZ_i = \text{Min}_j Nx_{ij}$
a <sub>1</sub>	$Nx_{11}$	$Nx_{12}$	$Nx_{13}$	-----	$Nx_{1n}$	$NZ_1 = \text{Min}_j Nx_{1j}$
a <sub>2</sub>	$Nx_{21}$	$Nx_{22}$	$Nx_{23}$	-----	$Nx_{2n}$	$NZ_2 = \text{Min}_j Nx_{2j}$
a <sub>3</sub>	$Nx_{31}$	$Nx_{32}$	$Nx_{33}$	-----	$Nx_{3n}$	$NZ_3 = \text{Min}_j Nx_{3j}$
...	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
a <sub>m</sub>	$Nx_{m1}$	$Nx_{m2}$	$Nx_{m3}$	-----	$Nx_{mn}$	$NZ_m = \text{Min}_j Nx_{mj}$

We illustrate the above with the following example:

**Practical example:** We will take the same example given in the previous rule:

states of nature alternatives	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$
a <sub>1</sub>	[100, 190]	[200, 260]	[300, 390]
a <sub>2</sub>	[-400, -220]	[160, 170]	[600, 650]
a <sub>3</sub>	[100, 170]	[290, 370]	[300, 360]
a <sub>4</sub>	[133, 180]	[160, 280]	[290, 400]

It is required to determine the appropriate alternative using the Maxi Min Rule.

states of nature alternatives	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$	$NZ_i = \text{Max}_j Nx_{ij}$
a <sub>1</sub>	[100, 190]	[200, 260]	[300, 390]	[100, 190]
a <sub>2</sub>	[-400, -220]	[160, 170]	[600, 650]	[-400, -220]
a <sub>3</sub>	[100, 170]	[290, 370]	[300, 360]	[100, 170]
a <sub>4</sub>	[133, 180]	[160, 280]	[290, 400]	[133, 180]

Comparing the elements of the last column, we get:

$$NZ = \text{Max}_i \left[ \text{Min}_j x_{ij} \right] = [133, 180]$$

That is, the largest values are the value [133, 180] corresponding to the alternative a<sub>4</sub>. Thus, the alternative a<sub>4</sub> is the appropriate alternative according to Maxi Min Rule, that is, the investor must invest the amount in establishing an industrial project.

#### 4- The Neutrosophic Horwes Rule:

Since most of the decision-makers do not look at the future with a completely optimistic or completely pessimistic view, but rather they expect the future to take a middle state between the states of optimism and pessimism, so (Horwes) put a composite rule of the two rules given by the relationship:

$$NH = \text{Max}_i \left[ \alpha NY_i + (1 - \alpha) NZ_i \right]$$

Since this rule  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$  gives us a certain value confined between NZ, NY, that is  $NZ \leq NH \leq NY$ , noting that NH is related to the value we give to  $\alpha$ , and this makes it tend towards the value NY if  $\alpha > 0.5$  and towards NZ if  $\alpha < 0.5$ , and if we put  $\alpha = 0$  we get NZ and if we put  $\alpha = 1$  we get NY.

We explain this rule through the following table:

states of nature alternatives	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$	-----	$\theta_n$	$NH_i = \alpha NY_i + (1 - \alpha) NZ_i$
a <sub>1</sub>	$Nx_{11}$	$Nx_{12}$	$Nx_{13}$	-----	$Nx_{1n}$	$NH_1 = \alpha NY_1 + (1 - \alpha) NZ_1$
a <sub>2</sub>	$Nx_{21}$	$Nx_{22}$	$Nx_{23}$	-----	$Nx_{2n}$	$NH_2 = \alpha NY_2 + (1 - \alpha) NZ_2$
a <sub>3</sub>	$Nx_{31}$	$Nx_{32}$	$Nx_{33}$	-----	$Nx_{3n}$	$NH_3 = \alpha NY_3 + (1 - \alpha) NZ_3$
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

$a_m$	$Nx_{m1}$	$Nx_{m2}$	$Nx_{m3}$	-----	$Nx_{mn}$	$NH_m = \alpha NY_m + (1 - \alpha)NZ_m$
-------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-------	-----------	---

Where  $NY_i$  and  $NZ_i$  are calculated as in the previous two rules, and we choose the appropriate alternative according to this rule.

$$NH = \text{Max}_i[\alpha NY_i + (1 - \alpha)NZ_i]$$

We illustrate this rule through the example given in the previous rules and consider  $\alpha = 0.2$ .

states of nature alternatives	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$	$NY_i$	$NZ_i$	$NH_i$
$a_1$	[100 , 190]	[200 , 260]	[300 , 390]	[300 , 390]	[100 , 190]	[140 , 230]
$a_2$	[- 400 , - 22]	[160 , 170]	[600 , 650]	[600 , 650]	[- 400 , - 22]	[- 200 , - 4]
$a_3$	[100 , 170]	[290 , 370]	[300 , 360]	[300 , 360]	[100 , 170]	[140 , 208]
$a_4$	[133 , 180]	[160 , 280]	[290 , 400]	[290 , 400]	[133 , 180]	[164.4 , 224]

We apply the rule  $NH = \text{Max}_i[\alpha NY_i + (1 - \alpha)NZ_i]$  to the elements of the last column. We note that the largest value is [164.4 , 224] and it corresponds to the  $a_4$  alternative, and therefore the  $a_4$  alternative is the appropriate decision according to the (Horwes) rule, that is, the investor must invest the amount in establishing an industrial project.

**5- The Neutrosophic Min Max Rule (Savage Rule):**

This rule depends on new expressions called Savage Expressions that we symbolize with  $NS_{ij}$  and get them from the relationship:

$$NS_{ij} = [\text{Max}_i Nx_{ij}] - Nx_{ij}$$

	states of nature alternatives	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$	---	$\theta_n$	Savage expressions			
							$\theta'_1$	$\theta'_2$	$\theta'_3$	--
$a_1$	$Nx_{11}$	$Nx_{12}$	$Nx_{13}$	---	$Nx_{1n}$	$NS_{11}$	$NS_{12}$	$NS_{13}$	-----	$NS_{1n}$
$a_2$	$Nx_{21}$	$Nx_{22}$	$Nx_{23}$	---	$Nx_{2n}$	$NS_{21}$	$NS_{22}$	$NS_{23}$	-----	$NS_{2n}$
$a_3$	$Nx_{31}$	$Nx_{32}$	$Nx_{33}$	---	$Nx_{3n}$	$NS_{31}$	$NS_{32}$	$NS_{33}$	-----	$NS_{3n}$
---	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
---	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	

$a_m$	$Nx_{m1}$	$Nx_{m2}$	$Nx_{m3}$	---	$Nx_{mn}$	$NS_{m1}$	$NS_{m2}$	$NS_{m3}$	-----	$NS_{mn}$
-------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-------	-----------

That is, we take the largest value in each column and then subtract the values in that column from it, we get a new column, and from the new columns we get a new matrix that we call the Savage Expression Matrix, then we apply to the elements of this matrix the following rule  $Max_j NS_{ij}$ , that is, we choose from each line the largest value, and thus we get on a new column in the matrix of Savage amounts, as in the following table:

Savage expressions					$Max_j NS_{ij}$
$\theta'_1$	$\theta'_2$	$\theta'_3$	--	$\theta'_n$	
$NS_{11}$	$NS_{12}$	$NS_{13}$	-----	$NS_{1n}$	$Max_j NS_{1j}$
$NS_{21}$	$NS_{22}$	$NS_{23}$	-----	$NS_{2n}$	$Max_j NS_{2j}$
$NS_{31}$	$NS_{32}$	$NS_{33}$	-----	$NS_{3n}$	$Max_j NS_{3j}$
-----	-----	-----	-----		
$NS_{m1}$	$NS_{m2}$	$NS_{m3}$	-----	$NS_{mn}$	$Max_j NS_{mj}$

We compare the elements of the new column and choose the smallest value for which the corresponding alternative is the appropriate decision, i.e. we apply the relationship:

$$Min_i \left( Max_j NS_{ij} \right)$$

We illustrate this rule through the example given in the previous rules:

states of nature alternatives	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\theta_3$	Savage expressions		
				$\theta'_1$	$\theta'_2$	$\theta'_3$
a <sub>1</sub>	[100, 190]	[200, 260]	[300, 390]	[10, 33]	[90, 110]	[260, 300]
a <sub>2</sub>	[-400, -220]	[160, 170]	[600, 650]	[-267, -40]	[130, 200]	[0, 0]
a <sub>3</sub>	[100, 170]	[290, 370]	[300, 360]	[10, 33]	[0, 0]	[290, 300]
a <sub>4</sub>	[133, 180]	[160, 280]	[290, 400]	[0, 0]	[90, 130]	[250, 310]

We have taken the largest value in each column and then subtracted from it the values in that column, and thus we got a new matrix that we call the Savage Amounts Matrix.

We applied the following rule  $Max_j NS_{ij}$  to the elements of this matrix, and thus we got a new column in the Savage Amounts Matrix as shown in the following table:

Savage Expressions			$Max_j NS_{ij}$
$\theta'_1$	$\theta'_2$	$\theta'_3$	
[10, 33]	[90, 110]	[260, 300]	[260, 300]
[-267, -40]	[130, 200]	[0, 0]	[130, 200]
[10, 33]	[0, 0]	[290, 300]	[290, 300]
[0, 0]	[90, 130]	[250, 310]	[250, 310]

We compare the elements of the new column and choose the smallest value for which the corresponding alternative is the appropriate decision, i.e. we apply the relationship:

$$Min_i \left( Max_j NS_{ij} \right) = [130, 200]$$

In addition, the value [130, 200] is the appropriate value according to the rule (Savage), and it is corresponding to the alternative  $a_2$ , that is, the appropriate decision is the alternative  $a_2$  according to this rule (Savage), the investor must invest the amount in the real estate trade.

### Conclusion and results:

From the previous study, we get the following table:

The decision	Alternative	The profit	The rule
Cars trading	$a_3$	[230, 300]	Laplace
Real estate trade	$a_2$	[600, 650]	Maxi Max
Establishing an industrial project	$a_4$	[133, 180]	Maxi Min
Establishing an industrial project	$a_4$	[164.4, 224]	Horwes
Real estate trade	$a_2$	[130, 200]	Savage

We note from the table that:

The alternative  $a_2$  was chosen according to two rules, the Maxi Max rule and Min Max Rule (Savage Rule), but with a different estimate of the profit, and the reason for this is due to the optimist's view and his choice of the highest profit.

The alternative  $a_4$  was chosen according to two rules, the Maxi Min rule and Horwes rule. The reason for this is that the rule of Horwes is related to the value we give to  $\alpha$ , and this makes it tend towards NZ if  $\alpha < 0.5$  and in this issue  $\alpha = 0.2$  and  $0.2 < 0.5$  were chosen, and if it was chosen is greater than  $0.5$  we would have found a convergence between the base of the Horwes and the base of Maxi Max.

Alternative  $a_3$  was chosen according to Laplace's rule only.

Alternative  $a_1$  was not selected according to any of the rules.

The decision remains with the investor because he is the decision maker.

We also note that the Neutrosophical values of profits give us for each alternative the lowest possible profit in the event that was chosen and the greatest profit, according to the state of nature.

We are looking forward in the near future to prepare research in decision-making theory that includes other cases and decision trees.

## References

- [1] Alali. Ibrahim Muhammad, Operations Research. Tishreen University Publications, 2004. (Arabic version).
- [2] Maissam Jdid, Operations Research, Faculty of Informatics Engineering, Al-Sham Private University Publications, 2021.
- [3] DavidG. Luenbrgr.YinyuYe, Linear and Nonlinear Programming, Springer Science + Business Media-2015.
- [4] Smarandache, F., Introduction to Neutrosophic statistics, Sitech & Education Publishing, 2014.
- [5] Smarandache, F., Neutrosophy and Neutrosophic Logic, First International Conference on Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Logic, Set, Probability, and Statistics University of New Mexico, Gallup, NM 87301, USA,2002.
- [6] Smarandache, F. A Unifying Field in Logics: Neutrosophic Logic. Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Set, Neutrosophic Probability. American Research Press, Rehoboth, NM, 1999.
- [7] Smarandache, F., Neutrosophic set a generalization of the intuitionistic fuzzy sets. Inter. J. Pure Appl. Math., 24, 287 – 297, 2005.
- [8] Smarandache, F. & Pramanik, S. (Eds). (2016). New trends in neutrosophic theory and applications. Brussels: Pons Editions.
- [9] Zadeh, L. A., Fuzzy Sets. Inform. Control 8 (1965).
- [10] Salama, A. A., Smarandache, F., & Kroumov, V., Neutrosophic crisp Sets & Neutrosophic crisp Topological Spaces. Sets and Systems, 2(1), 25-30, 2014.
- [11] Alhabib, R., Ranna, M., Farah, H. & Salama, A. A., Neutrosophic decision-making & neutrosophic decision tree. Albaath- University Journal, Vol (40), 2018, (Arabic version).
- [12] Alhabib, R., Ranna, M., Farah, H. & Salama, A. A., Studying the Hypergeometric probability distribution according to neutrosophic logic. Albaath- University Journal, Vol (40), 2018, (Arabic version).
- [13] H. E. Khalid, "The Novel Attempt for Finding Minimum Solution in Fuzzy Neutrosophic Relational Geometric Programming (FNRGP) with (max, min) Composition", Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, vol. 11, 2016, pp. 107-111.
- [14] H. E. Khalid, (2020). Geometric Programming Dealt with a Neutrosophic Relational Equations Under the (*max – min*) Operation. Neutrosophic Sets in Decision Analysis and Operations Research, chapter four. IGI Global Publishing House.
- [15] H. E. Khalid, "Neutrosophic Geometric Programming (NGP) with (max-product) Operator, An Innovative Model", Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, vol. 32, 2020.
- [16] H. E. Khalid, A. K. Essa, (2021). The Duality Approach of the Neutrosophic Linear Programming. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 46, 9-23.
- [17] Jdid .M, Alhabib.R and Salama.A.A, Fundamentals of Neutrosophical Simulation for Generating Random Numbers Associated with Uniform Probability Distribution, Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 49, 2022
- [18] Jdid .M, Alhabib.R ,and Salama.A.A, The static model of inventory management without a deficit with Neutrosophic logic, International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS), Volume 16, Issue 1, PP: 42-48, 2021.
- [19] Jdid .M, Alhabib.R ,Bahbouh .O , Salama.A.A and Khalid .H, The Neutrosophic Treatment for multiple storage problem of finite materials and volumes, International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS), Volume 18, Issue 1, PP: 42-56, 2022.
- [20] Jdid .M, Salama.A.A , Alhabib.R ,Khalid .H, and Alsuleiman .F, Neutrosophic Treatment of the static model of inventory management with deficit , International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS), Volume 18, Issue 1, PP: 20-29, 2022.

- [21] Jdid .M, Salama.A.A and Khalid .H, Neutrosophic handling of the simplex direct algorithm to define the optimal solution in linear programming , International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS), Volume 18, Issue 1, PP: 30-41, 2022.
- [22] Jdid .M, Alhabib.R ,Khalid .H, and Salama.A.A, the Neutrosophic Treatment of the static model for the inventory management with safety reserve , International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS), Volume 18, Issue 2, PP: 262-271, 2022.
- [23] Jdid .M, and Khalid .H, mysterious Neutrosophic linear models , International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS), Volume 18, Issue 2, PP: 243-253, 2022.