The Unlocking Motif

A Cross-Domain Heuristic for Clinical Reasoning, and a Proposal for Inclusion in Foundational Medical Education

Huỳnh Mai Phúc (Plone Mraz)

Independent Researcher

Vietnam, 2026

ORCID: 0009-0009-0571-7151

WORKING DRAFT — Perspective essay for circulation to medical educators *Not peer-reviewed. Not a clinical recommendation. Contains no proposal for changes to therapeutic practice.*

Epistemic Status (read first)

This document is a proposal for a *structural heuristic* — a way of organizing clinical observation and reasoning — not a theoretical claim about disease mechanism, and not a recommendation for any change in clinical practice. The motif described below is offered for evaluation by medical educators who hold the standing and the responsibility to judge whether such a heuristic would aid foundational medical training, and to reject it if it would not.

The author holds no clinical credential or institutional affiliation and is therefore not positioned to introduce content into medical curriculum directly. This document is, in consequence, an *invitation for evaluation* by those who can.

The heuristic is presented honestly with its current limits: it has not been empirically validated as a teaching tool, its boundaries are partially mapped (Section 6) and require further analysis by clinicians with the relevant expertise, and the broader theoretical framework from which it derives (Section 2) is itself a recent, unvalidated structural proposal in working-paper form.

Table of Contents

Epistemic Status (read first) 1
1. Introduction 3
2. Theoretical Background: Aviplestos in Brief 4
3. The Unlocking Motif: Five Roles 5
4. Cross-Domain Illustration 7
  4.1 Major Depressive Disorder 7
  4.2 Mammalian Limb Regeneration 7
  4.3 Immune Checkpoint Inhibition in Oncology 8
5. The Role of the Clinician as Third Party 9
6. Boundaries of the Motif (Open Questions for Evaluation) 10
7. Proposed Educational Use 12
8. What This Is Not 13
9. The Author's Position and Boundary 15
10. Conclusion 16
References 17

1. Introduction

Foundational medical education devotes substantial effort to teaching disease mechanism, organ-system biology, and pharmacology. These constitute the substrate of clinical reasoning, and rightly form its core. Alongside this substrate, medical education has increasingly recognised the value of explicit **frameworks for clinical reasoning** — heuristics that help learners *organize* what they observe in a clinical encounter, beyond the specific facts they have memorised. Examples include the biopsychosocial model (Engel, 1977), the SOAP framework for clinical documentation, stress-diathesis models in psychiatry, and clinical pattern-recognition pedagogy in dermatology, radiology, and emergency medicine. These frameworks do not contain the medical facts; they shape how learners perceive and integrate those facts.

This essay proposes one additional structural heuristic, derived as an applied consequence of a broader theoretical framework on structural tendencies in entities (Aviplestos; Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026b). The proposal is deliberately bounded: the motif is offered as a *recognition pattern across therapeutic domains*, useful for training clinical observation and inter-domain analogical reasoning. It is not offered as a new theory of disease, nor as a new approach to treatment, nor as a claim about any underlying mechanism not already established in the relevant biomedical literatures.

The motif identifies a recurring **five-role structure** that appears in several otherwise dissimilar therapeutic situations — among them depressive disorder responding to combined pharmacological and psychotherapeutic intervention, mammalian limb regeneration as recently induced by sequential growth-factor signalling (Yu et al., 2026), and the action of immune checkpoint inhibitors in oncology. The structure is not novel as biology — the underlying mechanisms in each case are well described in their respective literatures by investigators working independently of this framework. What is offered as novel is the *organization*: the proposal that, across these otherwise unrelated clinical situations, the same five-role pattern recurs, and that explicit recognition of the pattern may help learners reason across domains, attend to patient-specific structure, and avoid characteristic errors of generic protocol application.

The essay also identifies candidate *boundaries* of the heuristic — clinical situations where the motif does not apply, or where attempting to apply it would mislead. These boundaries are presented as open questions for the medical-education community, not as settled conclusions of the author.

2. Theoretical Background: Aviplestos in Brief

The motif derives from a broader theoretical framework, *Aviplestos*, developed independently by the author and published as a working paper (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026b). For the purposes of this essay, only the minimal definitions are required; readers are referred to the original paper for full development of the framework and discussion of its scope and limitations.

Aviplestos describes a *structural tendency* of an entity toward configurations that the entity's governing constraints render available but that the entity does not yet occupy. The tendency is treated as a vector quantity with two properties: a magnitude (how strongly the entity moves toward such configurations) and a direction (toward which available configurations). The gap between the entity's current configuration and the set of available unoccupied configurations is denoted $\vec{G}$. Crucially within the framework, $\vec{G}$ is not directly observable: it can only be *inferred* from observable signals that the entity emits in its current state, with irreducible uncertainty in the inference. The direction of the vector is not fixed in advance but is regulated by whichever gap is structurally available to the entity in its reference frame.

The present essay proposes that this abstract structural description, when applied to clinical situations, generates a recognisable *motif* — a recurring five-role pattern — across multiple medical domains. The motif is one applied consequence of the broader framework, restricted to clinical contexts; the framework's other consequences are outside the scope of this proposal and the present author makes no claim about them in a clinical setting.

3. The Unlocking Motif: Five Roles

In its general form, the motif consists of five roles. They are stated abstractly here; their instantiation in specific clinical domains is illustrated in Section 4.

Role 1 — The vector ($\vec{A}$). A capacity, function, or tendency that is *already present* in the affected entity and would, in the absence of obstruction, move it toward a more complete or functional configuration. The vector is constitutive of the entity, not introduced from outside. In clinical contexts, this corresponds to the patient's intrinsic capacity for the relevant recovery, regulation, or adaptive response.

Role 2 — The barrier (E_a). A force or condition that holds the vector inactive. The barrier may be *intrinsic* to the entity (e.g. a metabolic, signalling, or cognitive state), *externally maintained* by another agent (e.g. tumour-secreted immunosuppressive factors), or *structural* (e.g. a physical or topological constraint). The barrier's defining feature is that the vector remains present but cannot operate. The motif emphasizes a clinically important point: barriers may be active rather than passive — that is, they may be actively maintained by an agent or process, not merely a default condition of the system.

Role 3 — The intervention ($\vec{I}$) and directional signal. An external agent that does not introduce a new vector but rather reduces the barrier and/or provides directional input to the now-unlocked vector. The intervention does not supply the forward tendency; it permits the existing tendency to operate. This role admits internal differentiation: a single agent may both lower the barrier and provide direction, or these functions may be performed by distinct agents acting sequentially or in combination.

Role 4 — The gap ($\vec{G}$), inferred via emission channels ($\vec{D}$). The configuration the entity would move toward if its vector were unlocked. As stated in Section 2, $\vec{G}$ is not directly observable; it must be inferred from observable emission signals — somatic, behavioural, biochemical, functional — that the entity produces in its current locked state. The emission space, denoted $\vec{D}$, is necessarily incomplete; channels not measured contribute irreducible uncertainty to the estimate of $\vec{G}$. A central pedagogical implication: $\vec{G}$ is *patient-specific*, not domain-specific. Two patients with the same nominal diagnosis may have substantially different $\vec{G}$ vectors, inferred from different $\vec{D}$ channel profiles. The motif's clinical-pedagogical value lies partly in making this patient-specificity explicit, addressable, and resistant to template thinking.

Role 5 — System noise / environmental load. Factors in the surrounding system that may either obstruct the vector further or, when oriented appropriately, assist its operation. These constitute the reference frame within which Roles 1–4 are realized. The reference frame is selected, explicitly or implicitly, by the clinician or researcher; different frame selections yield different mappings of the same clinical situation.

A consequence worth stating explicitly: the motif does not specify the *content* of any role for any condition. The vector, the barrier, the intervention, the gap, and the environmental load must be identified separately for each clinical situation, with appropriate domain expertise, and re-identified for each patient where individual variation matters. The motif provides the structure of the inquiry, not the answers.

4. Cross-Domain Illustration

The motif is illustrated below across three clinical domains. The biological mechanisms in each case are established independently of this framework and are not original to the present proposal. What this essay proposes is the *recognition* that these otherwise unrelated clinical situations share a common five-role structure — and that explicit recognition of the structure may aid clinical learning.

4.1 Major Depressive Disorder

Depression frequently presents a state in which a patient's capacity for engagement, motivation, and life-directed action is *present but suppressed* rather than absent. Antidepressant pharmacotherapy, particularly in serotonergic and noradrenergic classes, does not introduce motivation but reduces the neurochemical barrier that holds it suppressed. Cognitive and psychotherapeutic intervention — including evidence-based modalities such as Behavioral Activation — provides directional reorientation toward configurations that the patient would, in the unobstructed state, occupy. The patient's specific gap $\vec{G}$ is inferred clinically from a profile of emission channels: somatic depletion, ruminative cognitive patterning, anhedonic loss of significance, relational withdrawal, and constraints on effort capacity. Two patients with the same nominal diagnosis often require substantially different combinations of intervention because their inferred $\vec{G}$ differs along these channels.

The motif's roles map straightforwardly to current evidence-based practice in psychiatry. The contribution claimed here is not new treatment knowledge but explicit pedagogical recognition of the structure of treatment — particularly that medication and psychotherapy occupy distinct roles in the motif (barrier-lowering and directional-signal, respectively) rather than being interchangeable modalities, a distinction valuable to early-stage learners.

4.2 Mammalian Limb Regeneration

Until recently, mammals were considered fundamentally incapable of structural limb regeneration, in contrast to amphibians and certain other vertebrates. Yu, Yan, and colleagues, in the Muneoka laboratory, recently demonstrated (Yu et al., 2026) that sequential treatment with FGF2 followed by BMP2 induces regeneration of bones, joints, ligaments, and tendons at digit-amputation sites in mice. Their finding, in their own framing, is that *regeneration-competent cells are already present* at non-regenerative wounds; FGF2 prevents fibrotic scarring and stimulates blastema formation, while subsequent BMP2 provides directional signalling for blastema differentiation toward structural elements.

The motif's roles map directly: the regenerative vector is constitutive of the cells, present even in tissues whose default response is fibrosis; the barrier is the fibrotic response that normally diverts the wound from regeneration; the intervention's first phase (FGF2) reduces the barrier and the second phase (BMP2) provides directional signal to the now-unlocked cells; the gap $\vec{G}$ — the configuration of the absent structural elements — is inferred from tissue position, cell lineage signalling, and the local developmental context. The structural homology with the depression illustration is immediate: both are barrier-lowering plus directional-signalling on a constitutive but locked vector.

4.3 Immune Checkpoint Inhibition in Oncology

Tumours are not, as a class, invisible to the immune system. T cells frequently recognise tumour antigens, but many tumours actively suppress this recognition through pathways including PD-L1 expression, TGF-β secretion, recruitment of regulatory T cells and myeloid-derived suppressor cells, and the establishment of a suppressive tumour microenvironment. The development of immune checkpoint inhibitors (anti-PD-1, anti-PD-L1, anti-CTLA-4 antibodies), recognized by the 2018 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine awarded to James Allison and Tasuku Honjo, established that releasing this active suppression allows the patient's own immune system to perform recognition and attack that had been actively prevented.

The motif's roles, once again, map directly. The immune attack vector is constitutive of the patient's adaptive immune system; the barrier is the actively maintained immune suppression — an externally maintained barrier in the motif's terminology, since the tumour rather than the immune system itself is the source of the holding force; the intervention removes the suppression without itself attacking the tumour; the directional information — which cells to attack — is recognized by the now-unlocked T cells via neoantigen presentation, with patient-specific $\vec{G}$ reflecting individual mutational and microenvironmental profiles.

This illustration carries one feature worth noting for pedagogy: it makes vivid the distinction between *passive* barriers (intrinsic to the entity) and *actively maintained* barriers (sustained by another agent in the system). The two cases require different intervention strategies, and the distinction is, in the author's submission, valuable for learners forming intuition about therapeutic action.

5. The Role of the Clinician as Third Party

The motif explicitly positions the clinician or clinical researcher as a *third party* whose function is to *decode* the patient's situation — specifically, to infer the patient's gap $\vec{G}$ from available emission channels $\vec{D}$, and to design intervention that addresses the barrier and provides directional signal appropriate to that inferred gap.

This positioning, made explicit, carries several pedagogical consequences worth stating:

The patient is identified as the agent of recovery, not the clinician. The clinician's contribution is to address what holds the patient's intrinsic capacity inactive; the recovery itself proceeds from the patient's own constitutive vector. This is a structural statement, not a romantic one — it does not invoke patient willpower or motivation as causal — and it carries the practical consequence that interventions are evaluated by whether they remove barriers and provide direction, not by whether they "give" capacity that was absent.

Patient-specific inference is structurally required by the motif. The clinician cannot apply a domain-level template to an individual patient with confidence; each patient's $\vec{G}$ must be inferred from their specific $\vec{D}$. This requirement is not external moralism about individualised care; it is a consequence of how the motif is structured. The patient-specificity of $\vec{G}$ is the reason two patients with the same diagnosis may require different interventions even when the motif applies to both.

Inference carries irreducible uncertainty. Any omission of observable channels propagates to uncertainty about $\vec{G}$ and therefore about appropriate intervention. The clinician is, in this framework, always operating under conditions of incomplete observation, and explicit awareness of this fact is treated as a feature of competent practice rather than a defect.

These three consequences are, individually, already present in good clinical practice — and recognized in current pedagogy on patient-centred care, clinical reasoning under uncertainty, and avoiding diagnostic anchoring. The motif does not introduce them de novo; what it offers is a unified structural address that may help early-stage medical learners form clinical reasoning habits in which these principles cohere rather than appearing as separate rules to remember.

6. Boundaries of the Motif (Open Questions for Evaluation)

The motif is not universally applicable to medical conditions, and identifying its boundary is part of evaluating its educational value. The author proposes the following candidate boundary, with the explicit acknowledgement that determining its precise location requires further analysis by clinicians with relevant domain expertise — which the author does not possess. The candidate boundary is offered as an open question for the medical-education community, not as a settled conclusion.

The motif appears to apply most cleanly to clinical situations satisfying four conditions: a constitutive vector toward a recoverable configuration is present in the patient; a definable barrier — whether intrinsic, externally maintained, or structural — holds the vector inactive; an intervention exists or is conceivable that can address the barrier; and the gap $\vec{G}$ can be inferred, even imprecisely, from observable emission channels.

The motif's applicability becomes uncertain in clinical situations that may include the following categories, each of which deserves separate analysis by qualified clinicians:

Conditions where the constitutive vector itself may be absent or compromised. Some congenital genetic disorders may fall here, but the analysis is non-trivial and depends on the reference frame chosen. A patient with phenylketonuria, for example, has no vector toward intact phenylalanine hydroxylase function at the level of enzyme replacement — but may have a recoverable vector toward stable metabolic configuration at the level of dietary management. Whether the motif applies depends on which reference frame is selected, and the framework requires that the choice of reference frame be made explicit rather than implicit.

Conditions characterised by ongoing structural damage rather than locked function. Some neurodegenerative diseases involving progressive protein toxicity may fit this description: the question for the motif is whether the relevant vector is *being held inactive* or *being actively destroyed*, and whether interventions in such conditions correspond to barrier-lowering or to a structurally different category of action (protection, replacement, compensation) not captured by the present motif.

Developmental conditions in which a configuration has been formed differently from the outset, rather than having reached a locked state from which recovery is structurally available. Whether the motif's framing fits here, or whether such conditions require a different organizational framework altogether, is a question the author cannot resolve and which is offered for examination by clinical educators in developmental medicine.

The reason for stating these boundaries openly is that a motif that applies everywhere describes nothing. The structural content of the motif lies partly in its having identifiable boundary cases. The author considers it pedagogically and intellectually preferable to mark

these boundaries as open questions for examination than to claim universal applicability, which the motif cannot honestly bear.

7. Proposed Educational Use

The motif is not proposed as a replacement for any content currently in medical education. It is proposed as a candidate for inclusion as a *structural reasoning heuristic* — a framework that helps learners organize their observation across clinically disparate situations, complementing rather than competing with existing mechanistic and procedural curricula.

Concrete possibilities for educational use are offered below for consideration by medical educators. Each is presented as a candidate to be evaluated against the practical realities of medical curriculum design, which the author is not positioned to assess.

The motif could function as a *cross-domain pattern-recognition exercise*: learners might be asked to identify the five roles in clinical cases drawn from different specialties — a depressed patient, a regenerating wound, a checkpoint-inhibitor responder — and to articulate where the structure recurs and where it does not. Such exercises may strengthen analogical clinical reasoning and reduce the siloing of knowledge across specialties.

It could function as a *tool for teaching patient-specific reasoning*. The explicit requirement to infer $\vec{G}$ for each patient from their individual $\vec{D}$, rather than apply a diagnostic template, may help learners resist over-applying generic protocols and may make the structure of patient-centred care visible at a more fundamental level than checklist-based instruction tends to achieve.

It could function as a *structured way to discuss treatment selection and mechanism of action*. The distinction the motif draws between interventions that *remove a barrier* and those that *introduce a new function* — the latter outside the motif's current scope — may help learners reason more precisely about pharmacological and procedural mechanisms.

It could function as a *framework for explicit discussion of clinical reasoning boundaries*. Considering where the motif does not apply may itself be educationally valuable, training learners to examine the limits of any framework they apply rather than reaching for the first available pattern.

None of these uses requires curricular revolution. They could be introduced as small additions to existing clinical-reasoning instruction, or as case-discussion organizers in problem-based learning modules. Their educational value remains to be evaluated empirically by educators, not by the author.

8. What This Is Not

Because misreading of this proposal at any of the following points could cause harm — including harm to patients via clinicians misled by a misread heuristic — the author considers it essential to be explicit about what the proposal does not claim.

This is not a new theory of disease mechanism. The biological and clinical mechanisms in each domain referenced (depression treatment, regeneration biology, immune checkpoint inhibition) are described, advanced, and tested by their respective established sciences. The motif is a recognition pattern across those domains, not a competing or complementary mechanism within any of them.

This is not a clinical treatment recommendation. No clinical action is proposed, endorsed, or modified. The motif is offered for *educational* use — as an organizing framework for clinical reasoning instruction — and explicitly not for application at the bedside as a treatment selection tool.

This is not a claim of universal applicability. The motif has boundaries (Section 6) that are part of its structural content. A motif that applies everywhere explains nothing; the motif's having identifiable boundary cases is offered as evidence that it carries structural content rather than functioning as a label.

This is not a claim of having generated the underlying biological findings. All clinical and biological findings cited — including evidence for Behavioral Activation in depression, the regeneration work of Yu et al., and the development of immune checkpoint inhibition — were established independently of the framework presented here, by investigators working in their respective fields. The motif's only claim is the structural recognition that these findings share a pattern.

This is not a finished work. The motif's boundaries are partially mapped and require expert refinement; its proposed educational utility has not been empirically evaluated; the broader theoretical framework from which it derives remains a working draft. This document is a proposal for evaluation, not a completed contribution.

A particular caution requires explicit statement. The author cautions against reading the motif as implying anything about the role of patient willpower, motivation, or psychological "fighting spirit" in recovery from organic disease. The patient's constitutive vector in this framework is a structural feature of the entity in question, not a psychological property of the patient, and the motif explicitly does not attribute clinical outcomes to the strength of patient will. Frameworks that have historically done so — particularly in oncology — have caused documented harm by implying that patients who do not recover have failed in some inner respect. This proposal is constructed specifically to avoid that mode of failure. Any future application or extension of the motif that drifts toward attributing outcomes to

patient willpower would constitute a misuse of the framework and is rejected in advance by this document.

9. The Author's Position and Boundary

The author of this proposal is an independent researcher without clinical training, without institutional affiliation, and without standing to introduce content into medical education directly. This document is therefore an *invitation for evaluation* by medical educators and clinical researchers who hold the relevant authority — not, and not intended to function as, an autonomous educational proposal.

What an author in this position can produce is a structural framework, articulated clearly enough that those with the relevant authority can evaluate, modify, accept, or reject it. The decision of whether the motif merits inclusion in foundational medical education belongs to those educators — based on their judgement of the heuristic's pedagogical value, the boundaries identified in Section 6, the practical constraints of curriculum design, and the empirical evidence that would need to be gathered to validate the heuristic as a teaching tool.

The author welcomes critique, correction, and rejection of any aspect of this proposal. The boundaries identified in Section 6 are particularly open to revision — the author has insufficient clinical-domain expertise to determine precisely where each boundary lies, and would expect substantial revision in dialogue with specialists. The motif itself, and the underlying framework, are likewise open to substantive critique; the author commits to treating such critique as input to be acted upon, not as opposition to be defended against.

10. Conclusion

This essay has proposed the *unlocking motif* — a five-role structural heuristic that recurs across clinically dissimilar situations, illustrated here through depression treatment, mammalian limb regeneration, and immune checkpoint inhibition — as a candidate addition to foundational medical-education frameworks for clinical reasoning.

The motif has been presented as a recognition pattern, not as a theory of disease, not as a treatment recommendation, and not as a claim of universal applicability. Its boundaries are partially mapped (Section 6) and offered as open questions for examination by qualified clinical educators. Its proposed educational uses (Section 7) are offered as candidates for evaluation, not as a prescribed implementation.

The author hopes the proposal merits the consideration of the medical-education community. Whatever the outcome of that consideration — adoption with modification, partial integration into specific contexts, or rejection in whole — the proposal is offered in explicit awareness that medical curriculum decisions affect human lives, and that such decisions belong to those with the standing to make them rather than to the proposer.

References

- Engel, G. L. (1977). The need for a new medical model: a challenge for biomedicine. *Science*, 196(4286), 129–136.
- Huỳnh Mai Phúc. (2026b). *Aviplestos: The Structural Tendency Toward the Not-Yet*. Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444
- Yu, L., Yan, M., Scaturro, K. Z., Qureshi, O., Lin, Y.-L., Bartelle, B. B., Smith, C. A., Hurtado, D. O., Cai, J. J., Dawson, L. A., Brunauer, R., Suva, L. J., Han, M., Dolan, C. P., & Muneoka, K. (2026). Digit regeneration in mice is stimulated by sequential treatment with FGF2 and BMP2. *Nature Communications*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-026-72066-8

Note on references. This is a perspective essay drawing on established clinical literatures — Behavioral Activation in depressive disorder, the development of immune checkpoint inhibition in oncology, regeneration biology in mammals — that are not exhaustively cited here. A full literature review establishing those background claims with current peer-reviewed citations is an explicit open task before this document is circulated beyond a critique context. The author has not provided specific citations for clinical claims that have not been personally verified against the original literature, consistent with the standard of citation honesty this document holds itself to.