Universal Matrix as a Cyber-Cognitive Framework Across Systems, Cognition, and Processes

Preprint · April 2025

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.15511.28328

1 author:

Artur Kraskov
Fontys University of Applied Sciences

Universal Matrix as a Cyber-Cognitive Framework Across Systems, Cognition, and Processes

Author: Artur Kraskov

Content

Overview of the Universal Matrix Concept

The **Universal Matrix** is a visual, symbolic framework consisting of a sequence of 12 geometrical symbols (from a single dot up to a complex star shape) that represent a **universal process or lifecycle** from inception to realization [1]. Each subsequent symbol in the matrix is generated by simple heuristic rules (e.g. adding a point or connecting intersections) that ensure a unique, unambiguous progression [1]. The latter six symbols (7–12) essentially **mirror the first six** in a self-similar way, creating a fractal-like pattern of process expansion [1]. The Author describes this pattern as a **"graphical representation system"** that can organize information or steps **at a meta-heuristic level**, much like a generic "life cycle" applicable to any complex task [1]. In other words, the Universal Matrix is proposed as a kind of *visual heuristic* for structuring knowledge and processes.

Notably, the Universal Matrix was inspired by the search for a *universal symbolic language* and has been refined with guiding rules to formalize it programmatically [1]. Its potential is illustrated in **process mining**, where the matrix can serve as a standardized interface to depict any multi-step process in a simple visual form [1]. By abstracting processes into 12 archetypal stages, it aims to **"simplify complicated knowledge and make it accessible"** even to non-experts [1]. Indeed, the paper suggests that this framework could make process analysis tools usable by people without a background in IT or data science [1]. Beyond process visualization, the Universal Matrix is envisioned as the basis for developing *cyber-cognitive* technologies that integrate machine-centric systems with human cognitive processes [1]. In summary, the Universal Matrix provides a **symbolic, visual language** for process representation, intended as a heuristic "glue" across domains of cognition, artificial systems, and user interfaces [1].

Cybernetics and Feedback Systems

In **cybernetics**, complex processes are understood in terms of *feedback loops* and goal-directed behavior. Cybernetics is the transdisciplinary study of **circular causal processes** – how a system's outputs are fed back as inputs to regulate future behavior [2]. Classic examples include thermostats, biological homeostasis, and social systems where outcomes influence new actions. The Universal Matrix's sequence of symbols can be related to cybernetic thinking by interpreting each stage as a state in a **feedback-driven cycle**. For instance, the early symbols (a point, a line, a triangle) might correspond to establishing an initial goal or reference (*point*), connecting causes and effects (*line*), and forming a closed feedback loop (*triangle*, the simplest closed shape). In fact, it was noted in the original publication that the first symbol (a single dot) represents the *appearance of a new element* in a system, and by the third symbol a self-contained triad emerges [1] – reminiscent of a feedback loop where three components interact. Cybernetics provides a language for this: a loop where an action (dot) leads to a result, results are compared to a goal, and adjustments (new dot placements) are made, aligning with the Matrix's stepwise additions.

Modern cybernetics also embraces *second-order cybernetics*, which includes the **observer** (or cognitive agent) as part of the system. This convergence of the **human mind and the machine loop** is often termed a *cyber-cognitive system*. Such a system combines elements of the digital or technical "infosphere" with elements of the human "cognisphere" into a unified purposeful unit [3]. In other words, humans and algorithms together form a *closed-loop system* directed toward goals. The Universal Matrix is explicitly intended to bridge human and machine problem-solving: it is described as a framework for **"cyber-cognitive technology combining cybernetic systems and human cognitive processes."** [1]. This echoes academic efforts to integrate cognitive models into control systems. For example, Cassenti *et al.* (2016) propose *Multi-Level Cognitive Cybernetics*, treating cognition itself as a feedback-controlled process across multiple levels (from metacognition to physiology) [4]. In a similar vein, the Universal Matrix could serve as a *cybernetic interface* for cognition – each symbol cues a particular cognitive action or decision, and the transition from one symbol to the next incorporates feedback from the previous stage's outcome. The structured progression ensures **no ambiguity** in the next step [1], much like a well-tuned feedback controller minimizes uncertainty.

Another relevant cybernetic framework is Stafford Beer's **Viable System Model (VSM)**, which defines a set of five recursive subsystems required for any autonomous, self-regulating system. The VSM's emphasis on *recursive organization* (systems within systems) and balances between stability and adaptation is conceptually parallel to the Universal Matrix's **fractal growth** (where symbols 7–12 repeat the pattern of 1–6 within a larger hexagon) [1]. Both imply that *effective complexity management is self-similar across scales*. The Universal Matrix's later stages show a "hexagonal star within a hexagon" as an optimal, balanced configuration of 12 elements with no further ambiguity [1]. This optimal culmination can be likened to a system reaching a **steady-state goal condition** where feedback has resolved all major errors – an idea central to cybernetics (sometimes called the *ultrastable system* in Ashby's terms). In summary, **cybernetic principles of feedback, recursion, and goal-oriented regulation strongly resonate with the Universal Matrix's structure**. The matrix could be seen as a *heuristic blueprint for a cybernetic process*, guiding a system (or problem-solver) through stages of increasing organization and feedback integration until a robust solution (or equilibrium state) is reached.

Systems Science and Process Modeling

Systems science provides generalized frameworks for understanding and visualizing complex processes, and the Universal Matrix can be situated in this context. In systems science, one often seeks *unifying principles or models* that apply to many domains (biological, technical, social systems, etc.). One such approach is **General Systems Theory**, which emphasizes concepts like emergence, hierarchy, and feedback in any system. The Universal Matrix, with its progression from a simple element to an integrated whole, essentially **depicts emergence** – each new symbol emerges from the interactions of prior components. For example, the transition from two points (symbol 2) to a triangle with a third point (symbol 3) represents how adding an element can create a *higher-order structure with new properties* (the triangle's closed area) [1]. This aligns with the general systems idea that *the whole is more than the sum of its parts*. Similarly, the appearance of internal structure at symbol 5 (a point at the intersection of a quadrilateral's diagonals) introduces a "center" of action [1], and symbol 7 creates a new point from intersecting lines within a hexagon [1] – these could correspond to the concept of **emergent subsystems or inner feedback loops** appearing as a system grows in complexity.

A more concrete branch of systems science is **system dynamics**, which uses modeling and simulation to study how processes evolve over time. System dynamics models are built with feedback loops and accumulations (stocks/flows) and often follow a series of steps: *problem definition, system conceptualization (dynamic hypothesis), model formulation, testing, and policy design*. J. Sterman outlines that to build a system dynamics model, one must first define the problem and key variables, then propose an explanation (hypothesis model), simulate it, compare behavior with real data, and finally evaluate interventions [5]. We can see a parallel between these modeling **stages** and segments of the Universal Matrix sequence. In particular, **Shapes 1–4** (dot, line, triangle, quadrangle) might be analogized to **problem definition and conceptual modeling**: starting from a point (identifying a problem or goal), drawing connections (pairwise relationships as in a causal link), forming a minimal feedback loop (triangle – a hypothesis of interactions), and bounding the issue (quadrangle – setting system boundaries). In Sterman's terms, this corresponds to articulating the problem and forming an initial model [5]. **Shapes 5–6** (center point in a quadrangle, then a full hexagon) could correspond to refining the model and establishing a complete structure (the hexagon being a stable structure, akin to a working simulation model). Interestingly, a hexagon is noted as a "perfect shape because of its packing properties" [1], which could be seen as an optimal steady structure – metaphorically similar to a well-calibrated model that fits observed data.

The **later shapes (7–12)** in the Universal Matrix show the *development of new internal structure within the established boundary (hexagon)* [1]. This reflects the systems science notion of **hierarchical levels** or sub-processes. For example, shape 8 introduces a second perpendicular axis inside the hexagon [1], and shape 9 combines prior internal patterns [1]– we can liken this to introducing new feedback loops or variables into a system model to improve its realism (much as one would refine a model after initial tests). In system dynamics terms, after initial simulation one might add detail or auxiliary structures to capture nuances, paralleling the Universal Matrix's increasing internal complexity. By shape 12, the matrix depicts a **hexagonal star** nested in the hexagon (a six-pointed star), which the author describes as an "optimal combination" of 12 points with no ambiguity remaining [1]. In a systems context, this final symbol could be viewed as the system's *fully realized state*, where the structure is rich enough to represent all critical dynamics – analogous to a validated model used for policy or decision-making (the final step Sterman mentions).

It's also instructive to compare the Universal Matrix to established **visual modeling standards** in systems and process engineering. For instance, the **Unified Modeling Language (UML)** and **Systems Modeling Language (SysML)** provide standardized diagrammatic notations to represent system structure and behavior [6]. These notations (adopted as ISO/IEC standards) use a fixed set of symbols (e.g. arrows, boxes, etc.) to depict any system in a consistent way [6]. Likewise, **Object-Process Methodology (OPM)** is an ISO 19450:2024 standard that merges objects and processes into a single modeling language [7]. OPM's strength is in representing complex systems in a *compact, unified visual model* [7]. The Universal Matrix aims for a similar level of **generality and standardization**, but in a more abstract, heuristic form – a *universal visual metaphor* for any process. We might think of it as a candidate for a **"visual language" for processes**. In fact, the paper explicitly notes the Universal Matrix "can be used as an interface or a standard for depicting processes" and likens its discovery to *process standardization and interfacing* efforts [1]. This situates the matrix alongside notations like **BPMN (Business Process Model and Notation)**, which is an OMG specification standardized as ISO/IEC 19510:2013 for business process diagrams [8-9]. BPMN uses flowchart-like symbols to visualize steps, decisions, and parallel branches in business workflows [10]. The Universal Matrix proposes a more *minimalistic set of symbols (just dots and lines)* to encode processes, which could complement these formal languages by providing an **intuitive "big picture" view**. It is intended to be easy enough that even users with no technical background can grasp a process's structure [1], thus acting as a *visual bridge* between system complexity and human understanding.

In summary, from a systems science perspective the Universal Matrix can be seen as:

(a) an embodiment of general principles like emergence and hierarchy (through its growing shapes),
(b) analogous to stages of formal modeling methodologies (conceptualization → refinement → completion),
(c) a candidate for a standardized visual metaphor in its own right, akin to how UML or BPMN function but at a higher, more abstract level of representation.

Cognitive Science and Heuristic Problem-Solving

The Universal Matrix is fundamentally a **heuristic framework** – it provides rules of thumb (in visual form) for how to progress from a problem to a solution. In cognitive science, especially in studies of problem-solving and decision-making, **heuristics** are known as strategies or mental shortcuts that humans use to simplify complex tasks. A classic work in this area is George Pólya's *How to Solve It* (1945), which outlined a heuristic method for solving mathematical problems in four stages [11]:

1. *Understand the problem*,
2. *Devise a plan*,
3. *Carry out the plan*, and
4. *Review/extend* the solution.

These simple steps have influenced everything from math education to computer science, because they capture a fundamental problem-solving cycle. The Universal Matrix, with its 12-step visual logic, can be interpreted as a more granular expansion of a similar cycle. In fact, one can map Pólya's four phases onto groups of the Matrix's symbols (as we will see in the comparison table later). The value of such heuristics is that they provide **guidance without rigid formulas** – much like the matrix gives a direction ("add a point here, draw a line there") without requiring a strict mathematical derivation for why, yet reliably advancing the process.

Cognitive science also distinguishes between **algorithmic problem solving** (step-by-step procedures that guarantee a correct result) and **heuristic problem solving** (strategies that are efficient but not guaranteed). The Universal Matrix falls in the latter category – it's a *meta-strategy* for structuring any problem or project. By following its symbolic sequence, a user is encouraged to think in terms of certain stages: e.g., *establish the basics first (point, line)*, *close the loop (triangle)*, *define the boundaries (quadrilateral)*, *identify the core driving force (central point)*, *build a robust structure (hexagon)*, and so on [1]. These are intuitively sensible steps in many cognitive endeavors. For example, in creative design or invention, one might first generate basic elements of an idea, then connect them, then look for an encompassing structure or pattern, etc., which mirrors the Matrix's progression. This is analogous to how TRIZ (the Theory of Inventive Problem Solving) provides heuristics for innovation (e.g. "segmentation", "feedback", "dynamics") but leaves it to the problem-solver to choose and apply them [12]. The Universal Matrix formalizes one particular *logical chain of heuristic steps* that appears to recur across different contexts (original paper mentions that it was discovered while examining patterns from the life-cycle of ideas and even alludes to philosophical and mathematical precedents like Gurdjieff's enneagram or Leibniz's binary system [13]).

From a cognitive load perspective, having a **visual scaffold** like the Universal Matrix can greatly aid thinking. Research on distributed cognition and visual reasoning shows that external representations (diagrams, symbols) can function as a *"heuristic device"* to facilitate understanding [14]. In other words, a model or diagram that is not the problem itself but stands for it can help our minds comprehend the structure of the problem [15]. The Universal Matrix serves exactly this purpose: it's an external *model of a generic process*, onto which a person can map their specific problem, thus benefiting from the model's guidance. In cognitive psychology terms, it acts as a **schema** or template that imposes order on an ill-defined situation. This can prevent cognitive overwhelm by breaking a complex task into a series of manageable steps (twelve, in this case). Each step of the matrix also incorporates a **decision heuristic**: for instance, rule #5 says the fifth point should be placed at the center of the previous shape (to avoid ambiguity) [1] – cognitively, this encourages the problem-solver to *find a unifying center or focus at that stage* rather than continue expanding outward prematurely. Likewise, the rule for symbol 7 (first of the new layer) is to create a new point via intersection, echoing the very first step (a point appears) [1], which could be telling the thinker to *start a new iteration or perspective within the established structure*. These kinds of hints resonate with cognitive strategies like **means-ends analysis** (establish subgoals when stuck on a larger goal) or **analogical thinking** (repeat a successful pattern on a new level).

It's also worth relating the matrix to known **cognitive frameworks for innovation and design**. Methods like *design thinking* (empathize → define → ideate → prototype → test) and *scientific inquiry* (observe → hypothesize → experiment → conclude) are essentially heuristics to guide human thought in creative and analytical tasks. The Universal Matrix could be seen as a more domain-neutral and visually-driven counterpart to these. The matrix is explicitly positioned as a tool for "cognition/mindset" development [1] – in other words, it's not just about diagramming processes *out there* in the world, but also about shaping the way a person approaches problems *in their head*. By internalizing the 12-stage heuristic, a person might develop a **cybernetic mindset**, oscillating between divergent steps (expanding points into structures) and convergent steps (finding centers and optimal intersections) in a balanced way. This mirrors how expert problem-solvers alternate between brainstorming and evaluating, or between generating hypotheses and testing them. In summary, the Universal Matrix aligns with cognitive science in its use of **heuristic rules and visual metaphors to augment thinking**. It provides a structured yet flexible guide for the problem-solving cycle, much like established cognitive heuristics (Pólya's principles, design thinking stages, etc.), but distilled into a universal symbolic sequence.

Process Mining and Information Design Standards

One domain where the Universal Matrix's impact could be directly felt is **process mining and process modeling**. Process mining involves extracting process models from event logs (e.g., data from IT systems that record steps of business operations) and typically represents these processes as flowcharts, Petri nets, BPMN diagrams, or similar formal models [15-16]. While these representations are powerful, they can be **complex for end-users**. For example, BPMN has dozens of symbols (various types of events, gateways, etc.) and Petri nets require understanding token dynamics. The Universal Matrix offers an alternative *high-level visual language* for processes. According to the original publication (preprint), one of the goals of the matrix is to **"make process mining accessible to users without [a] computer science, data science, IT or process mining background."** [1]**.** By using just a dozen intuitive symbols, a process with many steps can be sketched in a way that is easy to grasp, trading off some precision for clarity – a common trade-off in information design.

It's useful to compare this to existing **information design and standardization approaches**. We've already mentioned UML, BPMN, and OPM as standards; there are also ISO/IEC standards for graphical symbols in user interfaces (e.g., ISO 80416 for icon design) and the entire field of **visual notations** in HCI which deals with interface metaphors. The Universal Matrix can be thought of as a *visual metaphor for any process*: the way a *folder icon* on a computer is a metaphor for file storage, the matrix's 12-point star could be a metaphor for a *completed process*. In practice, a process mining tool could implement the Universal Matrix as a **diagram overlay or navigation aid**: each symbol could be clickable to drill down into that stage of the actual process model (if we imagine layering the matrix on top of a BPMN diagram, for instance, segmenting it into twelve phases). This would effectively create a **multi-level interface**, where the matrix provides the *"You are here"* overview and users can zoom into details as needed. Such multi-level visual heuristics have precedent – for example, the "**zoomable interface**" in some process modelers or the use of **Treemaps** in visualizing hierarchies. The matrix could similarly act as a *map of a process*.

Moreover, the Universal Matrix might inspire **new standards or extensions**. Consider the possibility of an **ISO standard for heuristic process visualization**: it could standardize the 12 symbols, their meanings, and how to use them to ensure consistency (much as BPMN was standardized to unify process notations [8]). If multiple organizations adopt the Universal Matrix to depict processes, having a standard would ensure one's "Matrix diagram" can be understood by others. There is historical precedent for this kind of standardization of a visual language – UML's adoption by ISO in 2005 lent it wider credibility and usage [17]. Similarly, OPM's elevation to ISO 19450 shows that novel methodologies can become internationally recognized [7]. The Universal Matrix, being in early stages, might not yet be formalized, but its **simplicity is a strength** in terms of standardization potential.

In the realm of **process improvement** and *business process management*, a number of heuristic frameworks exist (sometimes called *best practices or redesign heuristics*). For example, Reijers & Mansar (2005) catalogued common successful heuristics for process redesign (like task elimination, resequencing, parallelism) [18]. The Universal Matrix could complement such heuristics by providing a **visual checklist**: one could overlay improvement ideas onto the matrix stages (e.g., questioning at each symbol "Can this stage be skipped or optimized?"). Its regular structure might also help in **comparing processes** – two very different workflows could still be mapped to the 12-stage pattern and then analyzed where one diverges from the other (perhaps one completes in 9 stages vs. another needing all 12, indicating complexity differences). Process mining often deals with **variants** of a process; the Universal Matrix might act as a common reference model to align variants on a comparable timeline or structure. Microsoft's process mining documentation, for instance, emphasizes generating *visual maps of process variants* for comparison [15] – the matrix could serve as a template for such maps.

Lastly, it's important to note that using the Universal Matrix in process mining does not mean abandoning precision modeling. Instead, it can be an **intermediate, user-friendly representation**. Think of it as analogous to using the **scientific method's simple steps** when communicating an experiment's flow, even though the actual experiment might be described with detailed statistics and protocols. The matrix gives a *high-level narrative* of the process ("first something happens, then things connect, then a cycle forms, then it stabilizes, then it recenters, etc.") which can then be backed by the rigorous model for those who need it. This two-layer approach (heuristic overview + formal model) could improve communication between data scientists and domain experts in process mining projects.

Comparison with Other Structured Methodologies

To better understand how the 12 symbolic steps of the Universal Matrix relate to existing problem-solving and process frameworks, we can compare them side-by-side with a few well-known methodologies. **Table 1** below maps the Universal Matrix's stages (simplified descriptions of each symbol's logic) to:

(a) steps in the **TRIZ** problem-solving algorithm (specifically, the ARIZ 85C algorithm by Altshuller),
(b) the phases of the **Design Thinking** approach,
(c) a generic **Scientific Method** sequence.

These frameworks were chosen because they each represent a structured, stepwise approach from problem to solution: TRIZ/ARIZ from the engineering innovation domain, Design Thinking from creative design, and the Scientific Method from empirical inquiry. Each has a different number of steps (ARIZ has 9 main steps [12], Design Thinking typically 5 stages [19], Scientific Method about 5 steps [20]), so the mapping is not one-to-one. Instead, the table indicates **which Matrix stage(s) correspond in spirit** to each stage of the other frameworks:

Universal Matrix Stage(symbol & heuristic)	TRIZ / ARIZ (Inventive Problem Solving)	Design Thinking Process	Scientific Method
1. Point: A single element appears (define existence of a problem or goal) [1].	Step 1: **Analyze the Problem**– identify the vague problem and state it clearly aitriz.org (recognize the issue to solve).	**Empathize** – understand user needs or context (observe the initial situation).	**Observation/Question** – notice a phenomenon or problem and ask a question about it vaia.com https://www.simplypsychology.org/steps-of-the-scientific-method.html .
2. Line: Two points connected (establish a relationship or continuity) [1].	Step 1 (continued): Identify key **contradiction or relationship** causing the problem aitriz.org . This is analogous to connecting two key factors that conflict.	**Empathize (continued)** – identify pain points and relationships in user context; or transition to **Define** – articulate the core problem (connecting findings to a clear problem statement).	**Question/Hypothesis** – Formulate the specific problem and initial guess; essentially drawing a link between cause and effect that you will investigate vaia.com https://www.simplypsychology.org/steps-of-the-scientific-method.html .
3. Triangle: Three points making a closed loop (emergence of a stable triad or feedback cycle) [1].	Step 2: **Model the Problem's Conflict** – represent the interacting elements and feedback in the "Operating Zone" aitriz.org . (In TRIZ, this is often a triangle of substance-field model, analogous to a triangle of forces resolving the contradiction).	**Define** – clearly frame the problem in terms of three key aspects: user, need, insight (often a statement that has a triadic structure). A stable problem definition sets the stage for idea generation.	**Hypothesis** – Propose a tentative explanation that links variables in a loop ("if X, then Y, resulting in Z"). This is creating a mental model of the cause-effect cycle to be tested.

4. Quadrangle: Four points forming a boundary (establish scope or constraints) [1].	Step 3: **Formulate Ideal Final Result (IFR)** – envision the perfect outcome without internal contradictions aitriz.org . (The IFR sets a *boundary* of what an ideal solution should achieve, analogous to defining the solution space's edges).	**Define (continued)** – set constraints and criteria for success (what the solution *must* accomplish, the "boundary conditions" of the project). Possibly begin transitioning to ideation by outlining the problem space.	**Experiment Design** – define the parameters and controls for testing (essentially drawing a boundary around what will be examined and what will be held constant).
5. Center (within shape):A new point at the intersection of prior structure – introduces a focal point or driving force [1].	(Often part of TRIZ Step 3 IFR or Step 4) **Identify the Physical Contradiction** – pinpoint the central conflict to overcome aitriz.org . (This is the "core" of the problem that the ideal solution must resolve – akin to finding a central leverage point.)	**Ideate (begin)** – center on the key user insight or "How might we…" statement that drives ideation. This focal question or insight is the center that all brainstorm ideas will revolve around.	**Hypothesis (refinement)** – zero in on the key claim or variable to test; identify the central hypothesis to focus experiments on (the core assumption).
6. Hexagon: Six points in a perfect hexagonal arrangement (a robust structure with no ambiguity) [1].	Step 4/5: **Utilize Resources & Knowledge Base** – consider all available resources and apply known solution patterns aitriz.org . (By leveraging existing "components," one builds a full robust solution concept – analogous to completing a structured hexagon). Often by end of Step 5, a viable concept ("solution structure") is formed.	**Ideate (expanded)** – generate a broad range of ideas and start seeing a complete solution take shape. By the end of ideation, you have a "full palette" of solution elements (like the six points of the hexagon covering all angles of the problem).	**Experimentation** – carry out the experiment or series of experiments, effectively constructing the full test of the hypothesis. In doing so, ensure the setup is solid and covers necessary conditions (a well-designed experiment is like a stable hexagon).
7. New Dot (inside hexagon): A point emerges from intersections within the existing structure (start of a new iteration or subsystem) [1].	*If solution not reached by earlier steps:* Step 6: **Reframe the Problem** – go back or zoom out to the supersystem aitriz.org . (This often means starting a **new cycle** of problem solving within the context of the larger system – much like a new "dot" appears inside the prior solution, indicating a sub-problem).	**Prototype** – begin a new cycle of making tangible solutions (a prototype) based on the ideas. This often uncovers sub-problems or new insights (equivalent to diving one level deeper – a new point of focus inside the solution space).	**New Observation** – sometimes experiments reveal unexpected phenomena; this leads to new questions. Here the process "loops" and a new inquiry starts within the old one. (Stage 7 corresponds to noticing something new emerging from your initial results, prompting further investigation).

8. Dual Axes: Two perpendicular lines crossing inside (introducing a second focal point, complexity through interaction of two centers) [1].	Step 7: **Analyze the Solution**that removed the contradiction – check how it works aitriz.org . (This introspection can reveal secondary problems: effectively introducing a *second center* of attention – e.g., does the solution create another issue? TRIZ then addresses these). This parallels adding another axis/force to consider.	**Prototype (continued)** – test multiple prototypes or a prototype addressing multiple factors. For example, you might prototype two critical aspects of the solution in parallel (introducing a "second axis" in development – perhaps functionality vs. usability).	**Additional Experimentation**– if initial results are inconclusive or highlight multiple factors, run follow-up experiments targeting those factors. This is akin to adding another dimension to the testing (two lines crossing: investigating factor A vs factor B).
9. Combined Shape: Mix of previous internal patterns yielding a new dot (synthesis of prior steps into a new quality) [1].	Step 8: **Utilize the Found Solution & Effects** – analyze implications and side effects of the solution on the broader system aitriz.org . (Here TRIZ looks at how the solution can be combined with or applied to other problems – a synthesis step). This corresponds to integrating the multiple aspects resolved in steps 7–8 into one combined outcome (the new quality that emerges).	**Test** – evaluate the prototypes and integrate feedback. Often, multiple tested aspects are *synthesized* into a refined solution. (For example, combine the best features of different prototypes into one solution – a new "emergent" solution quality.)	**Analysis/Conclusion** – analyze experimental data to see if the hypothesis is confirmed. At this point, you synthesize all observations into a coherent conclusion – essentially distilling a new understanding or "new quality" from the work vaia.com .
10. Inner Rhombus: Two smaller intersections inside form a rhombus (optimization and fine-tuning of the inner structure) [1].	Step 9: **Analyze the Steps** that led to the solution – reflect and generalize aitriz.org . (TRIZ ends with learning: what could be improved or done next time? This is like fine-tuning the understanding of the process itself, analogous to adjusting the small internal shape for optimal form.)	**Implement** (sometimes included as a 6th stage in design thinking) – finalize and deploy the solution in the real context, which requires fine-tuning details for practicality. This corresponds to optimizing the solution (making sure all internal components align perfectly, like the rhombus symmetry).	**Conclusion (extended)** – if the conclusion suggests further questions or improvements, refine the hypothesis or procedure for future experiments. Essentially, optimize your theory or process based on what was learned (tidying up the internal logic of the solution).
11. Inner Point: Another intersection point within the rhombus (last detail falls into place, self-reference) [1].	(After ARIZ main steps, one might iterate back or use the solution in new contexts, but ARIZ proper ends at step 9.) In inventive practice, this could be seen as **post-solution optimization**, ensuring no loose ends in the design. (Symbol 11 can be thought	**Implement (continued)** – ensure that the solution works in all envisioned scenarios, addressing any final "corner cases". At this stage, the design is essentially complete with all critical details resolved.	**Peer Review/Communication** – a parallel in science: the final point could be the step of reviewing the results (by self or peers) and communicating them, which often refines any last ambiguities in the explanation. All pieces of the explanation must now consistently fit (the final point adds consistency).

	of as securing the last internal degree of freedom.)		
12. Star: Six-pointed star within hexagon – a complete, harmonized system with all parts integrated (no ambiguity remaining) [1].	(No direct ARIZ step; this corresponds to having a fully resolved inventive solution.) **Result:** an innovative solution that ideally meets the IFR and has no contradictions. It's the "12th symbol" – the invention is complete and robust.	**Test/Feedback Loop End** – the solution has been implemented and vetted; user needs are met, and the design can be considered "final". (Often design thinking is iterative, but a successful cycle ends when requirements are satisfied – the star metaphor fits a solution that shines in meeting its purpose).	**Verified Theory/New Knowledge** – in science, this is when a theory or finding is solid enough to be accepted as knowledge. The process concludes with a robust conclusion that withstands scrutiny, analogous to a star – a fixed light or truth in the domain.

Table 1: *Mapping the 12 stages of the Universal Matrix to analogous steps in TRIZ (ARIZ algorithm)* [12]*, Design Thinking* [19]*, and a generic Scientific Method* [20]*. The mappings are approximate and based on conceptual similarity (e.g., both Stage 3 and a hypothesis involve forming a basic closed-loop explanation).*

As Table 1 suggests, the **overall trajectory** of the Universal Matrix – from identifying a starting point, establishing relationships, forming a loop, expanding structure, finding a core, achieving a stable form, then iterating internally and finally reaching completion – mirrors the general pattern of many problem-solving methodologies. TRIZ's ARIZ, for instance, starts with problem analysis and ends with implementing and analyzing the found solution [12], which can be seen in the matrix as well (Stages 1–4 roughly problem analysis, Stages 5–6 ideal solution framing, Stages 7–9 implementing and combining solution elements, Stages 10–12 analyzing and finalizing the solution). Design Thinking's empathize→define→ideate→prototype→test cycle is shorter, but it fits into the matrix by grouping steps (the matrix essentially breaks ideation and prototyping into finer sub-steps, and includes an extra emphasis on establishing structure and core that design thinking implies but doesn't explicitly separate). The Scientific Method's observe→hypothesize→experiment→conclude is also a cycle that can iterate; the matrix elongates the single "experiment" phase into multiple stages of development and reflection, which is often what happens in practice (scientific investigations branch into sub-experiments and require optimization – analogous to Matrix stages 7–11 – before a strong conclusion is reached).

The benefit of this kind of comparison is twofold:

(1) It provides validation for the Universal Matrix by showing that it covers similar ground to respected frameworks in various domains (nothing crucial seems to be missing in its 12-step logic that, say, design thinking or TRIZ consider important).
(2) It highlights the matrix's unique contribution: a *unified, visual sequence* that could potentially be applied in *any* context – technical invention, creative design, or scientific research – whereas other frameworks are usually domain-specific.

In essence, the Universal Matrix could serve as a *common reference model* to facilitate cross-disciplinary thinking. A team composed of an engineer (familiar with TRIZ), a designer (familiar with design thinking), and a scientist (familiar with experimental method) might use the matrix as a "lingua franca" to discuss a problem, each recognizing their own process in the different parts of the matrix, but now able to align their perspectives on a single timeline of 12 steps.

Toward a Formal Cyber-Cognitive Framework

Bringing all the threads together, how might the Universal Matrix be formalized as a **cyber-cognitive framework**? The term *cyber-cognitive* implies a fusion of computational or cybernetic structures with cognitive (human-like) processes. The Universal Matrix can act as the scaffold for such a fusion by providing a **symbolic interface between human reasoning and machine execution**. For example, each of the 12 symbols could be implemented as a module in a software system (AI or decision-support system) that corresponds to a cognitive function: identifying a problem, connecting data, forming a hypothesis, framing the context, focusing on the key driver, establishing a model, iterating internally, and so on. This essentially would create a *cybernetic architecture* that mirrors human problem-solving steps – a concept reminiscent of cognitive architectures in AI, but guided by the matrix's heuristic sequence. Because the matrix was designed to be intuitive for humans, a system built around it could interact with humans more naturally: a user could, say, fill in content for each symbolic stage (perhaps through a visual interface) and the AI could assist in performing that stage's function (like suggesting connections at stage 2 or checking consistency at stage 12). In this way, the Universal Matrix becomes a **mediator between human intuitive thinking and formal computational processes** – truly a cyber-cognitive tool.

From the perspective of formal scientific frameworks, one could envisage developing a **meta-model** or ontology based on the Universal Matrix. Each stage would be a class of action or transformation, and any given methodology (TRIZ, design thinking, etc.) could be mapped onto this meta-model. This would allow researchers to analyze and compare processes from different fields in a uniform way. It could also pave the way for *automated process generation*: given a particular problem and some domain-specific knowledge, an AI could use the Universal Matrix meta-heuristic to propose a sequence of steps to solve it (essentially creating a custom method on the fly by following the universal pattern). This aligns with initial vision of a set of *connected heuristic-based tools existing as a "glue" in several domains* [1]. The matrix could serve as that glue – a foundational framework into which various tools plug in at appropriate stages. For instance, a brainstorming tool might plug into stages 5–6 (to generate options for the core and structure), a simulation tool might plug into stages 7–9 (to test internal variations), and an analytics tool into stages 10–12 (to optimize and finalize the solution).

In terms of **standardization and validation**, formalizing the Universal Matrix would likely involve case studies across cybernetics, systems science, cognitive psychology, and process engineering to test its applicability. Each symbol and transition would be scrutinized: do real-world successful processes follow this pattern? Is any type of step missing or redundant? Over time, this could lead to an ISO-like standard or at least a widely recognized model in the literature for describing processes. The framework might also incorporate measures or indices – for example, one could develop a maturity index of a project based on which Universal Matrix stage it has reached (similar to Technology Readiness Levels in engineering). A process mining algorithm might automatically detect which stage of the Matrix a given case is in by analyzing event log patterns, thus providing insight into where bottlenecks occur (e.g., many processes never get past the "triangle" stage – indicating organizations get stuck in forming feedback loops).

To conclude, the Universal Matrix concept is richly connected to existing scientific frameworks: it resonates with the **circular causality of cybernetics**, the **emergent hierarchies of systems science**, the **intuitive rules of cognitive heuristics**, and the **visual languages of process design**. By bridging these areas, it holds promise as a truly transdisciplinary **cyber-cognitive framework** – one that could unify how we represent and navigate processes whether they occur in a machine, a mind, an organization, or an ecosystem. As research into cybernetic systems and cognitive augmentation advances, such a unified heuristic model could play a key role in designing interfaces and algorithms that are both powerful and human-friendly. The Universal Matrix is at an early stage of development, but situating it in the context of peer-reviewed knowledge (as we have done here) is an important step toward its maturation and formalization. Future work may involve empirical validation, software implementations, and standard-setting discussions, but the conceptual groundwork shows that this visual logical chain is not an isolated idea – it is **deeply interwoven with longstanding scientific frameworks** of how we understand processes and solve problems in a structured way [1].

Sources:

1. Kraskov, A. (2024). *Universal Matrix: Definition & Visual Proof, Visual Heuristic, Logical Chain*. (White paper introducing the Universal Matrix concept and its rules, with examples in process mining and AI.)
2. Cybernetics, Wikipedia https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cybernetics#:~:text=Cybernetics%20is%20the%20transdisciplinary%20study,concerned%20with%20general%20principles%20that
3. Cyber-cognitive system https://joernlengsfeld.com/en/definition/cyber-cognitive-system
4. Cassenti, D. et al. (2016). "Multi-level Cognitive Cybernetics in Human Factors." *Advances in Neuroergonomics and Cognitive Engineering*, pp. 315–326 link.springer.com

link.springer.com . (Proposes integrating cognitive processes with cybernetic feedback control, illustrating the kind of human-machine synergy the Universal Matrix aspires to support.)
5. Sterman, J. (2000). *Business Dynamics: Systems Thinking and Modeling for a Complex World*. (Diagram https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Fig-1-Steps-of-SD-modeling-Sterman-2000_fig1_323507429) (System dynamics textbook outlining the steps of model development https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Fig-1-Steps-of-SD-modeling-Sterman-2000_fig1_323507429#:~:text=tool%2C%20system%20dynamics%20allows%20us,of%20SD%20modeling%20and%20analysis and the importance of feedback loops in understanding complex processes.)
6. UML https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unified_Modeling_Language#:~:text=The%20unified%20modeling%20language%20,1 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unified_Modeling_Language#:~:text=In%201997%2C%20UML%20was%20adopted,4 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unified_Modeling_Language#:~:text=The%20unified%20modeling%20language%20,1
7. ISO Object-Process Methodology https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/en/#iso:std:iso:19450:ed-1:v1:en:en%23
8. BPMN Wiki https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business_Process_Model_and_Notation#:~:text=Business%20Process%20Model%20and%20Notation,2%2C%20published%20in%20January%202014
9. BPMN IBM https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/bpmn#:~:text=What%20is%20Business%20Process%20Modeling,as%20International%20Standard%20ISO%2FIEC%2019510%3A2013
10. BPMN 2.0 https://axelor.com/bpmn-standard/#:~:text=Understanding%20the%20BPMN%20standard%20,ISO%2FIEC%2019510%3A2013%20since%20July%202013
11. Pólya, G. (1945). *How to Solve It*. Princeton University Press https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/How_to_Solve_It#:~:text=How%20to%20Solve%20It%20suggests,when%20solving%20a%20mathematical%20problem . (Classic four-step heuristic for problem solving, an inspiration for structured approaches like the Universal Matrix.)
12. Altshuller, G. (1985). *ARIZ-85C: Algorithm of Inventive Problem Solving* https://www.aitriz.org/articles/40p_triz.pdf. (TRIZ methodology defining a stepwise approach to solve technical contradictions, comparable to the Matrix stages.)
13. Kraskov A. (2024). Mondada Dominion: Conceptual Philosophy of Time https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382975001_Monada_Dominion_Conceptual_Philosophy_of_Time#:~:text=worldview
14. Heuristic device https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heuristic#:~:text=A%20heuristic%20device%20is%20used,concerning%2C%20some%20other%20entity%20Y
15. Hughes D. (2024) What is process mining? A beginner's guide https://mindzie.com/process-mining-software/what-is-process-mining https://mindzie.com/process-mining-software/what-is-process-mining/#:~:text=Process%20mining%20tools%20typically%20generate,depict%20how%20processes%20are%20executed
16. Glisic S. (2024) Visualize, Analyze, Improve: A Guide to Process Mining https://www.insightful.io/blog/process-mining-breakdown#:~:text=Steps%20www,These
17. UML adoption history https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unified_Modeling_Language#:~:text=In%201997%2C%20UML%20was%20adopted,4
18. p. 303, Best practices in business process redesign_an overview and qualitative evaluation of successful redesign heuristics -- H.A. Reijers; S. Liman Mansar -- Omega, #4, 33, pages 283-306, 2005 aug
19. Interaction Design Foundation - IxDF. (2016, May 25). What is Design Thinking (DT)?. Interaction Design Foundation - IxDF. https://www.interaction-design.org/literature/topics/design-thinking . (Overview of the 5-stage design thinking process: Empathize, Define, Ideate, Prototype, Test.)
20. Vaia Learning. "Five Steps of the Scientific Method" vaia.com , https://www.simplypsychology.org/steps-of-the-scientific-method.html. (Educational summary of the scientific method steps: Observation, Question, Hypothesis, Experiment, Conclusion.)