Economics & Business Management
ISSN Print: 3079-5214
ISSN Online: 3079-5222
https://doi.org/10.63313/EBM.9213

# Cross-Domain AI Applications in Management Decision Optimization: Heuristic Algorithms in Practice

**Shengyu Gu**
School of Geography and Tourism, Huizhou University, Huizhou, China
Email: miller@hzu.edu.cn

**How to cite this paper:** Gu, S. (2026). Cross-Domain AI Applications in Management Decision Optimization: Heuristic Algorithms in Practice. Economics & Business Management, 6(3), 36–51. ISSN Print: 3079-5214, ISSN Online: 3079-5222.
https://doi.org/10.63313/EBM.9213
**Published: 2026-08-04**

Copyright © 2026 by author(s) and Erytis Publishing Limited.
This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/



## Abstract

This study proposes a unified framework of AI-driven management decision optimization based on heuristic algorithms and demonstrates its applicability across heterogeneous domains. Rather than treating artificial intelligence as a sector-specific technical artifact, the paper conceptualizes AI as a managerial decision engine that supports forecasting, optimization, risk control, and strategic coordination under uncertainty, resource constraints, and time pressure. Drawing on comparative evidence from tourism management and healthcare governance, the analysis shows that heuristic algorithms such as Genetic Algorithms, Ant Colony Optimization, Particle Swarm Optimization, Simulated Annealing, and rule-based heuristics perform structurally similar decision functions despite differences in data content and institutional context. The core contribution lies in shifting evaluation criteria from domain accuracy toward governance-oriented performance, including decision quality, efficiency, transparency, responsiveness, and institutional impact. The findings demonstrate strong cross-domain transferability of heuristic decision logic and confirm that AI reshapes management reasoning itself rather than merely automating sectoral tools. Tourism is positioned as a methodological origin for decision optimization research, while healthcare serves as a high-stakes application context. Overall, the study establishes heuristic AI as a generalizable management science methodology for complex decision optimization across domains.

## Keywords

AI Decision Optimization; Heuristic Algorithms; Management Science; Cross-Domain Applications; Tourism Management; Healthcare Governance; Algorithmic Governance; Decision Performance; Institutional Usability

## 1. Introduction: AI as a Management Decision Optimization Tool

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly embedded in organizational decision processes, yet it is often framed as a technical innovation rather than as a managerial instrument. This study adopts a different positioning: AI is not merely a computational artifact, but a decision optimization engine within management

science. Its primary contribution lies in supporting complex managerial choices under uncertainty, resource constraints, and time pressure. From this perspective, heuristic AI algorithms should be understood as tools for structuring and improving decision-making rather than as isolated technical solutions.

Management decision-making has long been characterized by bounded rationality, competing objectives, and incomplete information. Classic studies in organizational theory emphasize that managers rarely seek mathematically optimal solutions; instead, they aim for feasible and timely choices within institutional and cognitive limits (Mintzberg, Raisinghani, & Théorêt, 1976). With the rise of big data and digital platforms, these challenges have intensified. Decision environments are now defined by high-dimensional data streams, dynamic feedback loops, and escalating expectations for transparency and accountability. AI enters this context not as a substitute for managerial judgment, but as a mechanism for decision optimization, enabling organizations to explore alternatives, evaluate trade-offs, and respond adaptively to change.

Tourism management, healthcare administration, and smart governance provide representative examples of such decision environments. Although their substantive goals differ, they share structural characteristics that make them suitable for a unified analytical framework. First, all three involve multi-objective decisions. Tourism authorities must balance economic growth, environmental sustainability, and visitor satisfaction. Healthcare administrators must trade off efficiency, equity, and quality of care. Smart governance systems must reconcile service performance, legal compliance, and public trust. These objectives cannot be reduced to a single metric, which makes optimization inherently complex (Khan et al., 2025).

Second, these domains operate under profound uncertainty. Tourism demand fluctuates with seasonality and crises; healthcare outcomes depend on heterogeneous patient responses; governance systems face unpredictable social and political dynamics. Predictive analytics alone cannot resolve such uncertainty. Instead, heuristic AI algorithms provide approximate yet robust strategies that allow decision-makers to navigate uncertain environments by iteratively improving solutions rather than seeking unreachable optima (Talbi, 2009).

Third, resource constraints define managerial reality across domains. Tourism systems must allocate limited infrastructure and personnel; healthcare systems must manage beds, staff, and medical equipment; governance systems must distribute budgets and regulatory capacity. AI-driven optimization models increasingly shape how these scarce resources are prioritized, reinforcing the idea that AI functions as a management tool for allocation and coordination rather than as a purely technical device (Hagiu & Wright, 2025).

Finally, all three domains experience acute time pressure. Decisions about congestion control, emergency care, or crisis governance must be made rapidly, often with incomplete information. Heuristic algorithms are particularly well suited

to such contexts because they generate satisfactory solutions within limited time frames, aligning with real organizational needs (Kleinberg, Ludwig, Mullainathan, & Obermeyer, 2015).

This convergence suggests that sectoral differences mask a deeper methodological unity. Whether classifying tourist flows, stratifying patient risk, or optimizing policy interventions, organizations rely on similar AI-enabled decision functions: prediction, optimization, classification, and recommendation. The central question is therefore not whether AI works in a specific industry, but how heuristic AI algorithms optimize managerial decisions across domains.

Based on this perspective, the present study is guided by three research questions.

RQ1: How do heuristic AI algorithms optimize managerial decisions across different domains? This question focuses on the functional role of heuristic algorithms in supporting complex choices under uncertainty and constraints.

RQ2: What decision functions are transferable across domains? Here, the study examines whether prediction, optimization, and risk grouping represent common decision logics that transcend sectoral boundaries.

RQ3: How should performance be evaluated beyond domain-specific accuracy? Instead of relying on technical metrics alone, this research emphasizes decision quality, efficiency, transparency, and institutional usability as key evaluation criteria.

By framing AI as a management decision optimization tool, this study contributes to management science in three ways. First, it shifts analytical attention from algorithms to decision functions. Second, it highlights the cross-domain transferability of heuristic AI methods. Third, it redefines performance in governance terms rather than technical accuracy. Tourism and healthcare are treated as comparative application contexts, not as defining disciplinary boundaries. The core contribution lies in demonstrating that heuristic AI algorithms constitute a generalizable methodology for managerial decision optimization in complex systems.

## 2. Theoretical Foundations: AI, Heuristics & Management Science

Management science has long recognized that decision-making in complex environments cannot be reduced to purely rational optimization. Bounded rationality, introduced by Simon (1957), establishes that decision-makers operate under cognitive, informational, and temporal constraints. Rather than identifying optimal solutions, organizations rely on simplified rules and satisficing strategies to cope with uncertainty and complexity. This theoretical foundation provides a natural entry point for understanding why heuristic AI algorithms have become central to managerial decision optimization.

### 2.1. Heuristic Decision-Making

Heuristics are not irrational shortcuts but adaptive strategies that allow agents to make effective decisions with limited information and time (Gigerenzer & Gaissmaier, 2011). In management contexts, heuristics structure attention, reduce dimensionality, and guide action under uncertainty. AI-based heuristics extend this logic by formalizing search, approximation, and rule-based reasoning through computational mechanisms. Genetic algorithms, swarm intelligence, and rule-based systems operationalize bounded rationality by iteratively improving solutions rather than solving analytically intractable optimization problems (Talbi, 2009). Thus, heuristic AI aligns with management science traditions that privilege feasibility, robustness, and interpretability over mathematical optimality.

### 2.2. Algorithmic Governance

The concept of algorithmic governance further situates AI within institutional decision systems. Algorithmic governance refers to the use of computational models to structure, guide, and constrain organizational actions (Kango, 2025). In this view, algorithms are not neutral tools but governance mechanisms that embed values, priorities, and accountability structures. For tourism authorities, predictive algorithms regulate visitor flows and trigger congestion policies. For healthcare institutions, classification and optimization models influence patient prioritization and resource allocation. AI thus becomes part of the governance architecture that coordinates actors and legitimizes decisions (Janssen & van der Voort, 2016).

### 2.3. Decision Optimization Theory

Decision optimization theory integrates prediction with prescriptive analytics, shifting focus from "what will happen" to "what should be done" (Khan et al., 2025). AI contributes by enabling organizations to explore large decision spaces and evaluate trade-offs among competing objectives. Unlike traditional optimization, which often assumes stable parameters and complete information, heuristic AI models are designed for dynamic and uncertain environments. They generate near-optimal solutions under constraints, making them particularly suitable for management contexts where objectives are plural and evolving.

### 2.4. AI Functions in Management Decision Optimization

Across domains, AI fulfills a limited number of core decision functions: prediction, optimization, classification, recommendation, and automation. These functions map directly onto managerial objectives such as uncertainty reduction, efficiency, risk control, value maximization, and cost reduction. Table 1 summarizes these functions and illustrates their cross-domain applicability in tourism and healthcare systems.

**Table 1.** AI Functions in Management Decision Optimization

| AI Function | Decision Role | Tourism Example | Healthcare Example | Management Objective |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Prediction | Forecasting | Demand forecasting | Disease risk | Uncertainty reduction |
| Optimization | Resource allocation | Capacity planning | Bed allocation | Efficiency |
| Classification | Risk grouping | Over-tourism zones | Patient stratification | Risk control |
| Recommendation | Strategy | Marketing strategy | Treatment planning | Value maximization |
| Automation | Operations | Ticket pricing | Appointment scheduling | Cost reduction |

Table 1 demonstrates that AI functions are structurally identical across domains even when substantive goals differ. This reinforces the argument that heuristic algorithms should be understood as management decision instruments rather than sector-specific technologies.

## 3. Decision Environments Across Domains

While tourism and healthcare differ in mission and regulation, their decision environments exhibit parallel characteristics that necessitate heuristic AI approaches. These environments are defined by four shared features: high-dimensional data, dynamic uncertainty, institutional constraints, and stakeholder conflicts.

### 3.1. High-Dimensional Data

Tourism systems process mobility traces, booking transactions, social media reviews, and sensor data. Healthcare systems integrate electronic health records (EHR), imaging, genomics, and laboratory results. Both generate massive, heterogeneous datasets that exceed human processing capacity. High dimensionality increases the risk of overfitting, misinterpretation, and delayed responses. AI-based heuristics help reduce complexity by identifying salient patterns and actionable classifications (Jordan & Mitchell, 2015).

### 3.2. Dynamic Uncertainty

Uncertainty in tourism arises from seasonality, crises, and shifting consumer preferences. In healthcare, uncertainty stems from biological variability and evolving epidemiological conditions. These dynamics undermine static decision rules. Heuristic AI models accommodate change by continuously updating solutions and exploring alternative strategies rather than relying on fixed parameters (Talbi, 2009).

### 3.3. Institutional Constraints

Tourism decisions are shaped by public policy, environmental regulation, and

budget limitations. Healthcare decisions are governed by legal frameworks, clinical guidelines, and ethical oversight. In both domains, algorithms operate within institutional boundaries that define what is permissible and legitimate. Algorithmic outputs must therefore be interpretable and auditable to support accountability (Kango, 2025).

### 3.4. Stakeholder Conflicts

Multiple stakeholders influence decisions in both sectors. Tourism governance involves governments, businesses, residents, and visitors. This multi-objective challenge is highly prominent in the preservation and tourism commercialization of Huidong Intangible Cultural Heritage, where heuristic optimization must balance cultural authenticity with local economic viability and community alignment. Healthcare administration involves clinicians, patients, insurers, and regulators. Conflicting objectives complicate optimization. AI systems must reconcile trade-offs rather than maximize a single outcome, reinforcing the need for heuristic and multi-objective decision models (Khan et al., 2025).

Table 2 compares the decision contexts of tourism and healthcare and highlights their shared challenges.

**Table 2.** Decision Context Comparison

| Dimension | Tourism | Healthcare | Shared Challenge |
|---|---|---|---|
| Data types | Mobility, bookings, reviews | EHR, imaging, genomics | Heterogeneity |
| Velocity | High (real-time) | Moderate | Timeliness |
| Risk | Economic | Clinical | High stakes |
| Governance | Policy-driven | Regulation-driven | Accountability |
| Objective | Experience optimization | Health outcomes | Resource efficiency |

The comparison reveals that differences are primarily in data content and regulatory emphasis, while decision structures remain similar. Both domains demand tools that can operate under uncertainty, integrate diverse information, and support accountable action.

### 3.5. Implications for Cross-Domain AI

These shared characteristics justify a cross-domain perspective on heuristic AI applications. Instead of developing isolated sectoral solutions, management science can identify transferable decision functions and governance principles. Tourism and healthcare thus serve as complementary laboratories for understanding how heuristic algorithms optimize managerial decisions in complex systems.

## 4. Heuristic Algorithms as Decision Optimization Tools

Heuristic algorithms are best understood not as mathematical optimization techniques but as decision optimization tools embedded in managerial processes. Their value lies in structuring search, simplifying complexity, and generating

feasible solutions under uncertainty and constraints. In management science, these algorithms operationalize bounded rationality by enabling organizations to explore large decision spaces without requiring exhaustive computation (Simon, 1957; Talbi, 2009). This section interprets major heuristic families-Genetic Algorithms (GA), Ant Colony Optimization (ACO), Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO), Simulated Annealing (SA), and rule-based heuristics-through their decision roles rather than algorithmic mechanics.

### 4.1. Genetic Algorithms (GA): Feature and Strategy Search

Genetic Algorithms support managerial decision-making by performing global searches across complex strategy spaces. In tourism systems, GA-based approaches can identify optimal combinations of demand drivers, pricing variables, and service configurations for destination planning. In healthcare governance, they are applied to selecting influential risk factors from large clinical or epidemiological datasets. Their core decision function is feature and strategy exploration, enabling managers to evaluate trade-offs among competing objectives. GA's strength lies in escaping local optima and generating diverse candidate solutions (Holland, 1992). However, from a governance perspective, computational cost and transparency pose challenges, as iterative evolutionary processes are difficult to explain to stakeholders.

### 4.2. Ant Colony Optimization (ACO): Path and Process Optimization

ACO is particularly suited for decisions involving routing and sequencing. In tourism, ACO can optimize tourist movement patterns, itinerary planning, and crowd dispersion strategies by learning efficient paths from historical flow data. In healthcare systems, similar logic is applied to treatment pathways and patient flow management across departments. The decision function of ACO is adaptive path optimization, where solutions evolve through accumulated experience. Its advantage is flexibility in dynamic environments (Dorigo & Stützle, 2004). A practical optimization of this path-learning logic is observed in regional cultural tourism management, such as applying ACO-based models to design interactive visitor routing and custom exhibition experiences within the Huidong Intangible Cultural Heritage platforms. The governance caveat lies in interpretability: probabilistic path selection may conflict with institutional demands for explicit rules and accountability.

### 4.3. Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO): Parameter and Resource Tuning

PSO supports decision optimization by adjusting parameters in complex classification and allocation problems. Tourism managers use PSO to fine-tune segmentation models and capacity thresholds. Healthcare administrators use it to

optimize risk classification parameters and scheduling policies. PSO's decision role is parameter tuning for efficiency, enabling rapid convergence toward workable solutions (Kennedy & Eberhart, 1995). Its strength is speed and simplicity, but its sensitivity to initialization and noise can produce unstable recommendations if not governed through validation protocols.

### 4.4. Simulated Annealing (SA): Policy Optimization under Constraints

Simulated Annealing is useful for policy-level decisions that involve escaping entrenched practices. In tourism, SA can optimize pricing strategies and congestion control policies under multiple constraints. In healthcare, it supports resource scheduling and staffing decisions when multiple objectives conflict. The algorithm's decision function is policy optimization through controlled exploration, allowing temporary acceptance of suboptimal solutions to avoid stagnation (Kirkpatrick, Gelatt, & Vecchi, 1983). While effective in complex landscapes, its stochastic nature raises concerns about stability and repeatability in governance settings.

### 4.5. Rule-Based Heuristics: Speed and Institutional Alignment

Rule-based heuristics represent the most interpretable form of decision optimization. In tourism crises, predefined rules trigger rapid responses such as travel restrictions or capacity limits. In healthcare emergencies, triage rules prioritize patients based on observable indicators. Their decision role is fast, institutionally aligned action. They excel in transparency and speed but lack adaptability, making them rigid in novel situations (Gigerenzer & Gaissmaier, 2011).

### 4.6. Comparative Decision Roles

Across domains, heuristic algorithms perform structurally identical decision functions: search, optimization, classification, and prioritization. Differences lie in application content, not decision logic. Table 3 summarizes how each heuristic family operates as a management decision tool in tourism and healthcare contexts.

**Table 3.** Heuristic Algorithms in Decision Optimization

| Algorithm | Decision Function | Tourism Application | Healthcare Application | Advantage | Governance Caveat |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GA | Feature & strategy search | Demand pattern selection | Risk factor selection | Global search | Computational cost |
| ACO | Path optimization | Tourist routing | Treatment pathways | Adaptivity | Interpretability |
| PSO | Parameter tuning | Market segmentation | Risk classification | Efficiency | Sensitivity |
| SA | Policy optimization | Pricing strategy | Resource scheduling | Escape local optima | Stability |
| Rule-based | Fast decisions | Crisis tourism response | Emergency triage | Speed | Rigidity |

This comparison confirms that heuristic algorithms should be evaluated according to decision contribution-efficiency, robustness, and governance usability-rather than algorithmic elegance. Their cross-domain relevance demonstrates that AI functions as a general management decision optimization engine.

## 5. Real, Verifiable Cross-Domain Data Sources

To empirically ground cross-domain decision optimization, this study employs only public, verifiable datasets that support managerial and policy decisions rather than clinical diagnosis or marketing personalization. These datasets reflect institutional data environments in which heuristic algorithms operate as governance tools.

### 5.1. Tourism Data Sources

The UN Tourism (formerly UNWTO) statistics database provides standardized global indicators on visitor flows, arrivals, and tourism expenditures. These data support national and regional policy planning and enable optimization of tourism development strategies (Basera & Batinoluho, 2025).

OpenStreetMap (OSM) tourism points of interest (POIs) supply spatial data on attractions, accommodation, and infrastructure. These datasets are essential for routing optimization, congestion management, and spatial decision modeling in smart tourism systems (Haklay & Weber, 2008).

The World Tourism Cities Federation (WTCF) database offers comparative indicators across major tourism cities, enabling benchmarking and strategic coordination among urban destinations (Zhang, 2025). These data are used for cross-city decision optimization and policy evaluation.

### 5.2. Healthcare Data Sources

The European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) provides surveillance data on infectious diseases across Europe. These datasets support regional risk modeling and resource allocation decisions in public health governance (Wise et al., 2025).

NHS Open Data from the United Kingdom includes service utilization, hospital performance, and workforce indicators. These data enable optimization of healthcare delivery and institutional planning (Tazare et al., 2024).

The CDC WONDER system in the United States offers mortality and health risk statistics, widely used for policy evaluation and decision optimization in public health administration (Maqsood et al., 2023).

### 5.3. Governance Perspective on Data

These datasets share three characteristics: (1) they are multi-source and heterogeneous, (2) they are designed for policy and management use rather than individual diagnosis, and (3) they support optimization of institutional decisions. Heuristic algorithms operate on these datasets to improve forecasting, routing, risk grouping, and resource planning. Table 4 summarizes their role in cross-domain decision optimization.

**Table 4.** Cross-Domain Decision Optimization Datasets

| Dataset | Sector | Data Type | Scale | Decision Use |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| UN Tourism | Tourism | Visitor flows | Global | Policy planning |
| OSM Tourism | Tourism | Spatial POIs | City-level | Routing optimization |
| WTCF | Tourism | City indicators | Global | Benchmarking |
| ECDC | Healthcare | Disease incidence | Regional | Risk modeling |
| NHS Open Data | Healthcare | Service data | National | Resource planning |
| CDC WONDER | Healthcare | Mortality & risk | National | Policy evaluation |

### 5.4. Implications for Cross-Domain AI

The use of these datasets underscores the paper's core argument: heuristic AI algorithms are not tied to a specific industry but to decision environments defined by uncertainty, scale, and governance needs. Tourism and healthcare merely provide contrasting yet structurally similar arenas for studying AI-driven decision optimization. The emphasis on real, verifiable data further strengthens the claim that AI should be evaluated in terms of its contribution to institutional decision processes rather than domain-specific prediction accuracy.

## 6. Decision Outcomes & Performance Metrics

Traditional evaluations of artificial intelligence systems emphasize technical accuracy, such as prediction precision or classification error rates. However, in management decision optimization, performance must be assessed in terms of governance outcomes rather than algorithmic benchmarks alone. Heuristic AI algorithms shape how institutions allocate resources, respond to crises, and justify actions. Therefore, relevant performance dimensions include decision quality, efficiency, transparency, responsiveness, and institutional impact (Khan et al., 2025; Janssen & van der Voort, 2016).

### 6.1. Decision Quality

Decision quality refers to the extent to which AI-supported decisions reduce uncertainty and improve reliability. In tourism management, demand prediction models inform congestion control and infrastructure investment. In healthcare governance, risk stratification models guide patient prioritization and resource planning. Although prediction accuracy remains important, its managerial meaning lies in enabling stable and defensible actions. Kleinberg et al. (2015) argue that the policy value of prediction systems depends on how predictions are embedded in decision rules rather than on accuracy metrics alone.

### 6.2. Efficiency

Efficiency concerns the optimization of scarce resources under competing objectives. Tourism systems seek to maximize capacity utilization while avoiding overcrowding. Healthcare systems aim to allocate beds, staff, and equipment in ways that minimize

waste and delays. Heuristic optimization algorithms contribute by exploring feasible allocations and adapting to changing conditions. From a governance perspective, efficiency translates into institutional sustainability and fiscal responsibility (Hagiu & Wright, 2025).

### 6.3. Responsiveness

Responsiveness captures how quickly decision systems react to shocks and emerging risks. Tourism authorities rely on AI-driven monitoring to respond to crises such as pandemics or extreme weather events. Healthcare administrators use similar systems to manage emergency surges and outbreaks. Talbi (2009) emphasizes that heuristic algorithms are particularly suitable for time-sensitive environments because they generate satisfactory solutions without exhaustive computation. Responsiveness therefore becomes a key indicator of decision system resilience.

### 6.4. Transparency

Transparency refers to the clarity with which AI-supported decisions can be explained and justified. In tourism governance, policy clarity is required to legitimize restrictions or pricing strategies. In healthcare, explainability is essential for administrative accountability and public trust. Kango (2025) notes that algorithmic regulation must be interpretable to sustain legitimacy. Transparency thus functions as a bridge between technical models and institutional acceptance.

### 6.5. Adaptivity and Institutional Impact

Adaptivity reflects the capacity of decision systems to adjust to market changes, disease spread, or policy shifts. Both tourism and healthcare operate in dynamic environments where static optimization fails. Adaptive AI systems support continuous learning and iterative improvement, reinforcing governance stability (Janssen & van der Voort, 2016). Institutional impact is realized when AI improves coordination among agencies, standardizes decision practices, and strengthens trust in governance processes.

Table 5 summarizes these performance dimensions and illustrates how tourism and healthcare systems translate technical outputs into governance outcomes.

**Table 5.** Decision Optimization Performance Metrics

| Metric | Tourism | Healthcare | Governance Impact |
|---|---|---|---|
| Accuracy | Demand prediction | Risk stratification | Reliability |
| Efficiency | Capacity use | Resource use | Sustainability |
| Responsiveness | Crisis response | Emergency care | Stability |
| Transparency | Policy clarity | Explainability | Trust |
| Adaptivity | Market change | Disease spread | Governance |

The table demonstrates that performance criteria converge across domains when interpreted through a governance lens. Decision optimization is therefore not

measured by domain accuracy alone but by institutional usability and legitimacy.

## 7. Governance, Ethics & Institutional Trust

The deployment of heuristic AI algorithms in management decision optimization raises fundamental questions of governance rather than medical or technical ethics. The central issues concern algorithmic governance, accountability, transparency, policy frameworks, and institutional legitimacy.

### 7.1. Algorithmic Governance

Algorithmic governance describes the use of computational systems to structure organizational decisions and regulatory actions (Kango, 2025). In tourism, algorithms govern visitor flows and capacity controls. In healthcare, they influence patient prioritization and service planning. These systems become part of the institutional architecture, embedding values such as efficiency, safety, and equity into automated processes. As such, AI does not merely support decisions; it reshapes authority and responsibility within organizations.

### 7.2. Accountability

Accountability requires that decisions influenced by algorithms can be traced back to responsible actors and justified through institutional rules. Janssen and van der Voort (2016) argue that adaptive governance must balance automation with human oversight to ensure that decision authority remains accountable. In tourism governance, accountability mechanisms include policy audits and public reporting of AI-supported strategies. In healthcare administration, institutional review processes and regulatory compliance structures perform a similar function.

### 7.3. Transparency

Transparency is a prerequisite for trust. Without understanding how decisions are produced, stakeholders may resist or contest algorithmic outputs. Kleinberg et al. (2015) emphasize that prediction systems must be integrated with clear decision policies to avoid opaque and unchallengeable authority. Transparency therefore entails not only technical explainability but also communicable governance rationales.

### 7.4. Policy Frameworks

Effective governance of AI requires formal policy frameworks that define acceptable uses, data standards, and decision boundaries. Hagiu & Wright (2025) notes that AI-driven optimization influences market structures and institutional behavior, necessitating regulatory coordination. In tourism, policy frameworks guide how predictive systems can be used for pricing or crowd control. In healthcare, regulations define how decision-support systems can influence administrative

planning.

### 7.5. Institutional Legitimacy

Institutional legitimacy emerges when AI systems are perceived as fair, accountable, and aligned with public values. Kango (2025) highlights that legitimacy depends on procedural justice and transparency rather than on technical sophistication alone. Heuristic AI algorithms, when embedded within governance structures, can enhance legitimacy by standardizing decision criteria and reducing arbitrary discretion. Conversely, poorly governed algorithms risk eroding trust and provoking resistance. In sum, the ethical dimension of heuristic AI in management decision optimization is fundamentally a matter of governance design. The challenge is not whether algorithms are morally correct but whether institutions can integrate them into accountable, transparent, and legitimate decision systems. Tourism and healthcare illustrate that governance principles apply across domains, reinforcing the argument that AI functions as a general management science tool rather than a sector-specific technology.

## 8. Cross-Domain Synthesis

The comparative analysis of tourism management and healthcare administration demonstrates that artificial intelligence reshapes management logic itself, rather than merely providing sector-specific technical tools. Across domains, heuristic AI algorithms restructure how organizations forecast, allocate resources, control risk, design strategies, and exercise governance. The central implication is that AI introduces a new decision paradigm grounded in adaptive optimization and bounded rationality rather than deterministic control.

At the core of this synthesis is the recognition that management functions are structurally similar across complex systems. Forecasting in tourism (e.g., visitor demand prediction) and forecasting in healthcare (e.g., disease risk estimation) rely on the same logic of uncertainty reduction. Optimization in both domains involves allocating scarce resources under competing objectives. Risk control emerges through classification and prioritization mechanisms, while strategy is shaped through recommendation and scenario evaluation. Governance is enacted when algorithmic outputs become embedded in institutional rules and policy frameworks (Shrestha et al., 2019).

This convergence supports the argument that AI does not simply automate existing practices but transforms managerial cognition. By formalizing heuristics into computational processes, AI externalizes bounded rationality and enables organizations to explore decision spaces that would otherwise be inaccessible. Raisch and Krakowski (2021) emphasize that human–AI collaboration creates new forms of organizational intelligence in which algorithms guide attention and structure choices rather than replace managerial judgment. Tourism and healthcare

illustrate this transformation clearly: both domains integrate AI into decision routines that combine prediction, optimization, and rule-based action.

Importantly, transferability does not imply uniformity. While the data content and regulatory contexts differ, the decision functions remain invariant. This distinction explains why heuristic algorithms can migrate across sectors. Their effectiveness depends on how well they align with management objectives such as efficiency, stability, and accountability rather than with domain-specific variables. Consequently, the same heuristic logic can govern congestion management in tourism, patient flow in healthcare, and traffic control in smart cities.

Table 6 synthesizes these insights by mapping core management functions across tourism, healthcare, and smart systems. The table demonstrates that forecasting, optimization, risk control, strategy formation, and governance are universally supported by heuristic AI, confirming the cross-domain applicability of decision optimization logic.

**Table 6.** Transferability Matrix

| Management Function | Tourism | Healthcare | Smart Systems |
|---|---|---|---|
| Forecasting | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |
| Optimization | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |
| Risk control | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |
| Strategy | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |
| Governance | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |

This synthesis highlights that AI's transformative role lies in redefining how management systems reason, coordinate, and act. Sectoral applications serve as empirical illustrations of a deeper methodological shift toward algorithmically supported decision optimization.

## 9. Conclusion

This study positions artificial intelligence as a management decision optimization engine rather than as a domain-specific technology. By examining heuristic algorithms across tourism and healthcare, the research demonstrates that AI reshapes managerial logic through prediction, optimization, classification, and governance functions that are structurally transferable across complex systems.

The findings reaffirm three central contributions. First, heuristic AI operationalizes bounded rationality by enabling organizations to navigate uncertainty, resource constraints, and time pressure with adaptive solutions rather than fixed rules. Second, decision performance must be evaluated in governance terms-decision quality, efficiency, transparency, responsiveness, and institutional impact-rather than in technical accuracy alone. Third, the transferability of heuristic algorithms confirms that AI constitutes a methodological foundation for management science, not a collection of sectoral tools.

In terms of scholarly identity, this work establishes a clear positioning. The author is

not primarily a medical AI researcher, but a scholar of AI-driven management decision optimization, heuristic intelligence, and management science methodology. Healthcare is treated as an application case that reveals how heuristic algorithms support high-stakes governance under regulatory constraints. Tourism, by contrast, represents the methodological origin and experimental field where decision optimization principles are developed and tested in dynamic, multi-objective environments.

Ultimately, AI's significance lies in its capacity to transform how organizations think and decide. By embedding heuristic logic into institutional processes, AI becomes an engine of managerial cognition that enables cross-domain learning and systemic innovation. Tourism and healthcare together illustrate that the future of AI research belongs not to isolated sectors but to a unified theory of management decision optimization in complex systems.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the project "Integrated Technical Services for Exhibition & Operations Management - Huidong Intangible Cultural Heritage Hall" (Project No. 18/35900269057).

## References

[1] Basera, V., & Batinoluho, L. (2025). The Future Perspective of Tourism Statistics. Journal of Tourism Quarterly, 7(1-2), 56-60.

[2] Dorigo, M., & Stutzle, T. (2004). Ant Colony Optimization. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

[3] Gigerenzer, G., & Gaissmaier, W. (2011). Heuristic decision making. Annual review of psychology, 62(2011), 451-482.

[4] Hagiu, A., & Wright, J. (2025). Artificial intelligence and competition policy. International Journal of Industrial Organization, 103134.

[5] Haklay, M., & Weber, P. (2008). Openstreetmap: User-generated street maps. IEEE Pervasive computing, 7(4), 12-18.

[6] Holland, J. H. (1992). Adaptation in natural and artificial systems: an introductory analysis with applications to biology, control, and artificial intelligence. MIT press.

[7] Janssen, M., & Van Der Voort, H. (2016). Adaptive governance: Towards a stable, accountable and responsive government. Government Information Quarterly, 33(1), 1-5.

[8] Jordan, M. I., & Mitchell, T. M. (2015). Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects. Science, 349(6245), 255-260.

[9] Kango, U. (2025). Algorithmic governance. In Handbook of Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence (pp. 1-26). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.

[10] Kennedy, J., & Eberhart, R. (1995, November). Particle swarm optimization. In Proceedings of ICNN'95-international conference on neural networks (Vol. 4, pp. 1942-1948). ieee.

[11] Khan, A. N., Salar Khan, A. A., Mansoor, M. A. J., Jameel, A., Rustam, R., Aslam, R., & Shah, J. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Computer Science: Evolution, Techniques, Challenges, and Multidisciplinary Applications. Sch J Eng Tech, 4, 246-263.

[12] Kirkpatrick, S., Gelatt Jr, C. D., & Vecchi, M. P. (1983). Optimization by simulated annealing. science, 220(4598), 671-680.

[13] Kleinberg, J., Ludwig, J., Mullainathan, S., & Obermeyer, Z. (2015). Prediction policy

problems. American Economic Review, 105(5), 491-495.

[14] Maqsood, M. H., Talha, K. M., Minhas, A. M. K., Fudim, M., Khan, S. S., Butler, J., & Khan, M. S. (2023). CDC-WONDER database analysis of COVID-19 and cardiovascular disease-related mortality. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 81(17), 1743-1745.

[15] Mintzberg, H., Raisinghani, D., & Theoret, A. (1976). The structure of" unstructured" decision processes. Administrative science quarterly, 246-275.

[16] Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. Academy of management review, 46(1), 192-210.

[17] Shrestha, Y. R., Ben-Menahem, S. M., & Von Krogh, G. (2019). Organizational decision-making structures in the age of artificial intelligence. California management review, 61(4), 66-83.

[18] Simon, H. A. (1957). Models of man: social and rational; mathematical essays on rational human behavior in society setting. New York: Wiley.

[19] Talbi, E. G. (2009). Metaheuristics: from design to implementation. John Wiley & Sons.

[20] Tazare, J., Henderson, A. D., Morley, J., Blake, H. A., McDonald, H. I., Williamson, E. J., & Strongman, H. (2024). NHS national data opt-outs: trends and potential consequences for health data research. BJGP open, 8(3).

[21] Wise, M., Stone, G., & Sahm, D. (2025). Longitudinal Analysis of the In Vitro Activity of Aztreonam-Avibactam and Comparator Agents Against Enterobacterales Collected in the Middle East/Africa Region for the ATLAS Surveillance Program, 2018-2022. International Journal of Infectious Diseases, 152, 107652.

[22] Zhang, J. (2025). Environmental reporting and tourism development in China. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 33(5), 880-902.