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**Objectives:** To analyze decision-making in health as a critical process, where it is necessary to distinguish between a critical attitude and critical aptitude.

**Methodology:** Analytical and Interpretive

**Results:** The author begins by establishing the difference between a critical attitude and critical aptitude. The first is not to trust in the manner in which the facts are presented as the only way possible. The critical attitude, according to the author, comes from what phenomenology calls "the reason why." Moreover, critical aptitude (or how to think) is the capacity acquired by the subjects to reflexively consider the facts of reality and to draw conclusions to generate corresponding actions. The author notes that it is the state that decides on health, if and when the themes are placed on the agenda for debate by the stakeholders that comprise it. If this does not happen, there is nothing to decide. As for the question "How something is decided?" the author notes that it is a long process where the social actors that comprise the State carry the items to the agenda, which is the deciding factor about how they are going to make decisions. Finally, in response to the question "why?" Testa argues that the reason a decision is made is because the problem is inserted in the social structure itself.

**Conclusions:** The author makes an analysis of processes and actors involved in health policy decision making. He notes that the decisions on health and problem solving are an intrinsic part of social life and depend on the activity of social actors to reach a favorable resolution of health problems. This means recovering the political arena as a central stage in health decisions.