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#### **Abstract**

This document presents a significant architectural evolution from a monolithic generation model to a multi-stage cognitive workflow, formally defined as the "Plan, Synthesize, Review" model. This enhancement addresses the observed limitations in generating complex, high-abstraction artifacts, where the agentic system exhibited cognitive overload and a tendency to default to concrete implementation details rather than theoretical synthesis. The new architecture decomposes the generation process into three distinct phases: proactive cognitive structuring (Planning), focused iterative content generation (Synthesis), and high-level narrative validation (Holistic Review). This model is explicitly supported by external research on deep research agents, which emphasizes the necessity of breaking down complex queries into manageable sub-tasks to be executed by a reasoning module. By structuring the agent's reasoning process, this new architecture enhances logical coherence, improves error attribution, and enables the system to tackle significantly more complex and abstract tasks.

#### **1. The Limitations of Monolithic Agentic Generation**

The previous architecture, while effective for discrete tasks, revealed limitations when faced with prompts requiring high levels of abstraction and complex narrative construction. The retrieve -> generate -> reflect loop, though sound for simple artifacts, proved too monolithic. Key failure modes included:

* **Cognitive Overload:** Asking the agent to retrieve, plan, synthesize, and structure a full report in a single generative step resulted in a loss of focus and a failure to maintain a consistent level of abstraction.
* **Loss of Narrative Coherence:** The agent struggled to build a coherent narrative across multiple sections, often creating repetitive or disjointed content.
* **Difficulty in Error Attribution:** When the final output was flawed, it was difficult to determine if the error originated in faulty retrieval, poor synthesis, or a flawed structural plan, as all were conflated in one step.

#### **2. The "Plan, Synthesize, Review" Cognitive Workflow**

To overcome these limitations, we introduce a more sophisticated cognitive workflow that mimics a structured human research process. This aligns with findings that effective deep research agents first create a plan, then execute it iteratively.

* **2.1. The Planning Phase: Proactive Cognitive Structuring** This initial phase is dedicated to deconstructing a complex user query into a structured, manageable plan. Instead of immediately generating content, the agent first creates a detailed outline or table of contents. This plan is stored in the agent's state and serves as the explicit roadmap for the entire generation process. This step forces the agent to reason about the holistic structure of the artifact before committing to content generation.
* **2.2. The Iterative Synthesis Phase: Focused Content Generation** This phase replaces the monolithic generation step with a loop that executes for each item in the previously created plan. In each iteration, the agent is given a single, focused task: to generate the content for one specific section of the plan. This involves a micro-cycle of targeted information retrieval relevant only to that sub-task, followed by content synthesis. The generated content for each section is stored in a "working memory". This dramatically reduces the cognitive load of each language model call, leading to higher-quality and more contextually accurate content for each section.
* **2.3. The Holistic Review Phase: Narrative and Coherence Validation** After the synthesis loop has assembled the full draft from the working memory, this final phase is initiated. A high-level review is performed on the *entire assembled document*. Unlike the earlier reflection step, which focused on a single block of generated text, this review assesses global properties: narrative flow, consistency between sections, removal of redundancies, and overall adherence to the initial user prompt. This step ensures that the individually generated parts form a single, coherent whole.

#### **3. Conceptual and Algorithmic Formulation**

The new workflow necessitates an update to the agent's state definition and the introduction of new conceptual nodes.

* **State Definition (S):** The state is expanded to include the plan and working memory. S = (P, D, M, T\_m, K, E, R\_n, L, plan, working\_memory) where:  
  1. plan: An ordered list of tasks or section headings for generation.
  2. working\_memory: A dictionary mapping plan items to their synthesized content.
* **New Node Operations (f):**
  1. f\_create\_plan(S) -> S': Analyzes prompt P and returns a new state S' where plan is populated.
  2. f\_execute\_synthesis(S, plan\_item) -> S': Generates content for a single plan\_item and returns a new state S' where working\_memory is updated with the new content.
  3. f\_holistic\_review(S) -> S': Analyzes the complete artifact assembled from working\_memory and populates the critique field K in the new state S'.
* **Graph Edges (T(S)):** The primary workflow path is redefined.  
  1. T(S\_route) -> f\_create\_plan
  2. T(S\_create\_plan) -> Loop(f\_execute\_synthesis for each item in S.plan)
  3. T(End of Loop) -> f\_holistic\_review
  4. The constitutional cross-critique and refinement cycle is then applied to the output of f\_holistic\_review.

#### **4. Conclusion**

The transition to a "Plan, Synthesize, Review" architecture represents a fundamental maturation of the agent's reasoning capability. It directly addresses the scaling challenges of monolithic generation and aligns the system with state-of-the-art designs for deep research agents. This structured cognitive workflow enhances robustness, improves the quality of complex artifacts, and provides a more scalable and debuggable framework for future development.