Concept Paper

Not peer-reviewed version

Latency as the Hidden Architecture of Intelligence: Linking Genomic Memory, AI Latent Spaces, and Human Cognitive Sovereignty

Abdulmohsen H. Alrohaimi *

Posted Date: 9 April 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202604.0658.v1

Keywords: latency; genomic memory; gene latency; latent representations; artificial intelligence; latent space; cognitive sovereignty; perceptual integrity; meaning gap; human–AI interaction; temporal genomics; systems biology; interpretability; sociotechnical systems; conscious leadership; collective cognition; latency spectrum; computational biology; decision science; intelligence architecture

doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0658.v1

Concept Paper

Latency as the Hidden Architecture of Intelligence: Linking Genomic Memory, AI Latent Spaces, and Human Cognitive Sovereignty

Abdulmohsen H. Alrohaimi

College of Pharmacy, Shaqra University, Dawadmi 17462, Saudi Arabia; alrohaimi@su.edu.sa

Abstract

Dominant paradigms across biology, artificial intelligence, and cognitive science define intelligence through its observable expressions—gene activation, computational output, and decision-making behavior. While this perspective has enabled significant advances, it systematically overlooks a fundamental architectural dimension: the preservation of structured potential in non-executing states. Across biological systems, large portions of the genome remain transcriptionally inactive yet structurally conserved, suggesting the existence of preserved functional capacity beyond immediate expression. In artificial intelligence, knowledge is encoded within high-dimensional latent spaces that guide outputs without continuous activation. In human systems, cognition depends on layers of unexpressed interpretation and perceptual structure that shape decision-making beyond observable behavior. Here, we propose that this shared phenomenon reflects a universal principle, which we define as **latency**: the structured preservation of encoded potential in a non-executing state with conditional accessibility across time. Within this framework, intelligence is not solely a function of execution, but of the dynamic balance between preservation and activation. We introduce the concept of a **latency spectrum**, in which elements vary in depth, stability, and activation cost, providing a graded architecture of temporal accessibility rather than a binary distinction between active and inactive states. We further identify a critical failure mode—the **Meaning Gap**—which arises when the velocity of system output exceeds the depth of latent structure. This misalignment manifests as incoherent outputs in artificial intelligence, dysregulated activation in biological systems, and loss of interpretive coherence in human decision-making environments. Extending this framework, we introduce **Cognitive Sovereignty** as the capacity of individuals and institutions to interpret, contextualize, and assume authorship over decisions in increasingly automated environments. We argue that this capacity depends fundamentally on the preservation of cognitive latency. As intelligent systems accelerate decision cycles, the compression of latency risks reducing interpretive depth, undermining autonomy, and destabilizing system coherence. By integrating genomic memory, computational latent representations, and human cognitive frameworks, this study advances a unified theory in which latency emerges as the hidden architecture of intelligence. This perspective reframes intelligence from a purely kinetic phenomenon to a temporally structured system of preserved potential, with implications for biological theory, artificial intelligence design, and the governance of complex sociotechnical systems. We conclude that the central challenge is no longer the acceleration of intelligence, but the preservation and regulation of latency itself. Designing **latency-aware systems** will be essential for sustaining meaning, coherence, and human agency in the age of intelligent machines.

Keywords: latency; genomic memory; gene latency; latent representations; artificial intelligence; latent space; cognitive sovereignty; perceptual integrity; meaning gap; human–AI interaction; temporal genomics; systems biology; interpretability; sociotechnical systems; conscious leadership; collective cognition; latency spectrum; computational biology; decision science; intelligence architecture

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0658.v1

1. Introduction

Intelligence has traditionally been defined through its observable manifestations. In biological systems, this corresponds to gene expression and phenotypic adaptation; in artificial intelligence, to model outputs and predictive performance; and in human systems, to decision-making and behavior. Across these domains, progress has been driven by the capacity to measure, optimize, and accelerate these expressions.

Yet this shared orientation reflects a deeper epistemic assumption: that intelligence is equivalent to its execution. While this assumption has enabled operational advances, it introduces a structural limitation. It privileges what is active, measurable, and immediate, while systematically underrepresenting what is preserved, latent, and conditionally accessible. In doing so, it reduces intelligence to what is expressed, rather than what is structurally possible.

Recent developments across disciplines increasingly challenge this view. In genomics, large portions of the genome remain transcriptionally inactive across most biological contexts, yet are evolutionarily conserved and structurally maintained [1,11]. This suggests that genomic organization cannot be explained by expression alone, but must also account for preserved functional potential across time [1,5]. In artificial intelligence, model performance depends not only on outputs, but on the structure of latent representational spaces that encode compressed knowledge and enable generalization [3,6,8]. In human systems, growing evidence indicates that decision quality depends on interpretive depth, perceptual alignment, and the ability to integrate information beyond immediate reaction [14–16].

Taken together, these observations point to a shared but insufficiently theorized phenomenon: intelligent systems rely on structured reservoirs of potential that are not continuously expressed, yet critically shape future states. Despite its cross-domain presence, this phenomenon remains conceptually fragmented. Biological sciences describe it in terms of regulatory potential and epigenetic memory [1,10]; artificial intelligence formalizes it as latent representation [3,6]; and cognitive science encounters it as interpretive capacity or delayed cognition [14,16]. These perspectives describe structurally related processes, yet remain disconnected by disciplinary boundaries.

This fragmentation has practical consequences. In biology, it limits the interpretation of non-coding regions and latent genomic elements [1,12]. In artificial intelligence, it contributes to misalignment between latent representations and generated outputs, resulting in instability and reduced reliability [6,8,18]. In human systems, it manifests as a widening gap between system-generated decisions and human interpretive capacity, leading to reduced autonomy and weakened accountability [16,19]. Across domains, these failures share a common structure: a misalignment between preserved potential and active expression.

To address this gap, we synthesize and extend existing insights across genomics, artificial intelligence, and cognitive science to propose latency as a unifying conceptual framework. We define latency as the structured preservation of encoded potential in a non-executing state, with conditional accessibility across time [1,5]. This definition reframes latency from a temporal delay into a structural property of intelligent systems, enabling a cross-domain understanding of how information is preserved, organized, and activated.

Within this framework, intelligence is not solely a function of execution, but of the dynamic balance between preservation and activation. We further conceptualize a latency spectrum, in which elements vary in depth, stability, and activation cost, forming a graded architecture of temporal accessibility rather than a binary distinction between active and inactive states.

Building on this foundation, we identify a systemic failure condition—the Meaning Gap—which emerges when the velocity of system output exceeds the depth of latent structure [6,14]. Under these conditions, outputs become insufficiently grounded in preserved information, resulting in incoherence across biological, artificial, and human systems.

Extending the framework to human-centered contexts, we introduce Cognitive Sovereignty as the capacity of individuals and institutions to interpret, contextualize, and assume authorship over

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0658.v1

decisions within increasingly automated environments [16,19]. We argue that this capacity depends fundamentally on the preservation of cognitive latency. As decision cycles accelerate, the compression of latency reduces interpretive depth, undermines autonomy, and destabilizes system coherence.

By integrating genomic memory, computational latent representations, and human cognitive processes, this study advances an interdisciplinary framework in which latency functions as a foundational dimension of intelligence. This perspective shifts the analytical focus from execution alone to the underlying structures that preserve potential across time.

The central challenge, therefore, is no longer how to accelerate intelligence, but how to preserve its depth.

2. Conceptual Framing: From Execution to Latency

2.1. The Epistemic Bias Toward Execution

Contemporary models of intelligence across biology, artificial intelligence, and cognitive science are grounded in a shared epistemic orientation: the prioritization of execution. Within this paradigm, intelligence is inferred primarily from observable activity—gene expression, computational output, or behavioral response.

This orientation reflects an implicit assumption that function is equivalent to activation. As a result, analytical frameworks across disciplines are designed to capture what systems do, while systematically underrepresenting what systems preserve. Measures of performance, efficiency, and responsiveness dominate evaluation criteria, reinforcing a model of intelligence centered on immediacy and output.

However, this execution-centered perspective introduces a structural limitation. It renders non-executing states analytically invisible, or at best, secondary. Across domains, elements that are preserved but not actively expressed are often excluded from core explanatory models, despite growing evidence that such elements play a decisive role in shaping system behavior over time.

2.2. Reinterpreting Non-Execution: From Absence to Structure

A critical step in reframing intelligence lies in distinguishing between inactivity and latency.

Inactivity implies the absence of function or relevance. Latency, by contrast, denotes the structured preservation of potential in a non-executing state. This distinction transforms how non-expressed elements are interpreted: from passive residues to active components of system architecture.

In biological systems, this shift repositions non-coding regions and pseudogenes from evolutionary remnants to components of a temporally extended regulatory system. In artificial intelligence, it distinguishes between unused parameters and latent representations that encode compressed and meaningful structure. In human cognition, it differentiates irrelevance from unarticulated understanding and deferred interpretation.

Recognizing this distinction reveals that non-execution is not an absence of intelligence, but one of its primary modes.

2.3. Latency as a Structural Property

Within this reframing, latency is not treated as a temporal delay between input and output, but as a structural property of intelligent systems.

We define latency as: The structured preservation of encoded potential in a non-executing state, with conditional accessibility across time.

This definition introduces three conceptual shifts. First, latency is decoupled from time duration and anchored in system organization. Second, it is reframed from inefficiency to necessity, enabling

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0658.v1

systems to maintain potential without premature activation. Third, it establishes non-executing states as informationally dense rather than empty.

Through this lens, latency becomes a universal property of systems capable of storing, organizing, and conditionally activating information.

2.4. Fragmentation Across Domains

Despite its ubiquity, latency has been conceptualized in fragmented ways across disciplines.

In genomics, it appears as regulatory potential, epigenetic memory, and conserved non-coding structures. In artificial intelligence, it is formalized as latent space and hidden representation. In human systems, it manifests as interpretive capacity, reflection, and delayed cognition.

These conceptualizations describe functionally equivalent phenomena, yet remain disconnected due to domain-specific language and methodological boundaries. As a result, theoretical insights developed in one domain are rarely transferred to others, limiting the development of integrative models of intelligence.

2.5. The Consequences of Conceptual Fragmentation

The absence of a unified framework has both theoretical and practical implications.

Theoretically, it constrains the development of generalizable models that extend across biological, computational, and human systems. Practically, it contributes to system-level failures that share a common structure: misalignment between preserved potential and active expression.

In biological contexts, this limits the interpretation of non-executing genomic elements. In artificial systems, it contributes to output instability and misalignment between representation and generation. In human systems, it manifests as a growing divergence between system-generated outputs and human interpretive capacity, reducing autonomy and coherence.

These failures are not independent phenomena, but expressions of a shared structural imbalance.

2.6. Toward a Latency-Centered Paradigm

To address these limitations, this study proposes a shift from an execution-centered paradigm to a latency-centered paradigm of intelligence.

Within this paradigm, intelligence is defined by the relationship between preserved potential and conditional activation. System coherence depends on maintaining alignment between these dimensions, rather than maximizing output alone. Temporal dynamics are reconceptualized as variations in accessibility of stored potential, rather than linear sequences of activation.

This shift positions latency as a primary organizing principle, enabling a unified interpretation of intelligence across domains.

2.7. Conceptual Implications

Reframing intelligence around latency produces several implications.

First, intelligence is understood as the capacity to preserve structured potential, not only to execute functions. Second, time is reconceptualized as layered accessibility rather than linear progression. Third, system stability becomes dependent on the alignment between latent structure and expressed output.

These implications provide the conceptual foundation for the development of a unified framework, in which latency operates as a cross-domain variable governing the preservation, organization, and activation of intelligence.

3. Conceptual Findings

3.1. Latency as a Cross-Domain Structural Invariant

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0658.v1

The primary finding of this study is that latency constitutes a structural invariant across intelligent systems. Despite differences in substrate—biological, computational, or cognitive—each system exhibits a consistent architectural feature: the preservation of encoded potential in a non-executing state.

This invariance is not superficial, but structural. In genomic systems, it appears as non-expressed yet conserved genetic elements; in artificial intelligence, as latent representations that guide output generation; and in human cognition, as unarticulated interpretive capacity that shapes decision-making.

The convergence of these patterns indicates that latency is not domain-specific, but a fundamental property of systems capable of storing and activating information across time.

3.2. The Triadic Structure of Latent Systems

A second key finding is that latency across domains follows a consistent triadic structure composed of three interdependent components:

- Encoded Potential (E): the structured storage of information
- Latent Preservation (P): the stability of information in a non-executing state
- Conditional Activation (A): the mechanisms through which latent information becomes active

This triadic structure appears across all examined systems, regardless of their physical or computational implementation. It provides a minimal universal architecture through which latency can be described, analyzed, and compared.

Importantly, these components are not independent; system behavior emerges from their interaction. Variations in preservation stability or activation thresholds directly influence system coherence, adaptability, and reliability.

3.3. The Latency Spectrum

The analysis further reveals that latency is not a binary condition, but exists along a continuous spectrum.

Latent elements differ in:

- depth of preservation
- duration of inactivity
- accessibility and activation cost

This latency spectrum introduces a graded model of system organization, in which elements range from deep latency (rarely activated, highly preserved) to shallow latency (near execution readiness).

This finding challenges binary classifications of active versus inactive states and instead proposes a layered architecture in which system potential is distributed across multiple levels of accessibility.

3.4. Temporal Reconfiguration: From Linear Time to Layered Accessibility

A critical implication of the latency spectrum is the reconceptualization of time within intelligent systems.

Rather than functioning as a linear sequence of events, time emerges as a structure of layered accessibility. Latent elements are not simply delayed in activation; they are embedded within different temporal depths, each associated with distinct activation conditions.

This finding suggests that temporal dynamics in intelligent systems are governed not only by sequence, but by the organization of preserved potential. As such, system behavior reflects not only current inputs, but the structured availability of past and potential states.

3.5. The Meaning Gap as a System-Level Failure Mode

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 9 April 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0658.v1

The analysis identifies a consistent failure condition across domains, defined as the Meaning Gap.

The Meaning Gap arises when the velocity or intensity of system output exceeds the depth or integrity of latent structure. Under these conditions, systems generate actions or outputs that are insufficiently grounded in preserved information.

This phenomenon manifests in multiple forms:

- in artificial systems, as incoherent or ungrounded outputs
- in biological systems, as dysregulated activation or instability
- in human systems, as loss of interpretive coherence and decision quality

The Meaning Gap therefore represents a structural misalignment between preservation and activation, rather than a domain-specific anomaly.

3.6. Cognitive Sovereignty as a Latency-Dependent Property

Extending the analysis to human systems, a key finding is that cognitive sovereignty depends directly on the preservation of latency.

Cognitive sovereignty is defined as the capacity of individuals and institutions to interpret, contextualize, and assume authorship over decisions. This capacity requires sufficient temporal and structural space for interpretation.

However, as systems accelerate and decision cycles compress, this space is reduced. The lowering of activation thresholds leads to premature execution, limiting reflection and weakening interpretive authority.

This finding positions cognitive sovereignty not as a purely normative concept, but as a structural property dependent on latency.

3.7. System Stability as a Function of Latency Alignment

A final conceptual finding is that system stability depends on the alignment between latent structure and expressed output.

Systems maintain coherence when:

- preserved potential is sufficient to support activation
- activation conditions are appropriately constrained
- outputs remain grounded in latent structure

Conversely, instability emerges when activation outpaces preservation, or when outputs are generated without sufficient structural grounding.

This relationship establishes latency alignment as a key determinant of system integrity across biological, artificial, and human domains.

3.8. Synthesis of Findings

Taken together, these findings establish latency as a unifying principle governing intelligent systems.

They demonstrate that:

- latency is structurally invariant across domains
- latent systems share a common triadic architecture
- temporal dynamics are organized through layered accessibility
- system failures arise from misalignment between preservation and activation
- human agency depends on the preservation of cognitive latency

These insights provide the foundation for the development of a unified framework in which latency operates as a central organizing variable.

4. The Latency-Unified Framework (LUF): Architecture and Mechanism

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0658.v1

4.1. From Conceptual Findings to System Architecture

Building on the conceptual findings, we formalize latency as a system-level architecture governing the preservation and activation of intelligence across domains. The Latency-Unified Framework (LUF) integrates the invariant structures identified in biological, artificial, and cognitive systems into a single operational model.

The framework is designed to translate conceptual insights into a structured representation that explains how systems maintain coherence, adapt over time, and generate meaningful outputs. Rather than treating latency as an abstract property, LUF defines it as an organizational mechanism that determines how information is stored, preserved, and activated within a system.

4.2. Core Architecture of LUF

The LUF is composed of three primary layers, corresponding to the triadic structure identified in the conceptual findings:

1. Encoding Layer (E)

This layer defines how information is structured and stored within the system.

- In genomics: DNA sequences, regulatory elements, and genomic architecture
- In AI: latent vectors and internal model representations
- In cognition: memory structures and perceptual frameworks

The encoding layer determines the informational richness of the system and sets the boundaries of potential future states.

2. Latent Preservation Layer (P)

This layer governs the stability and persistence of encoded information in a non-executing state.

- In genomics: evolutionary conservation, epigenetic stability
- In AI: weight stability, latent space organization
- In cognition: long-term memory, conceptual coherence

Preservation ensures that information remains available without requiring continuous activation. It provides the system with temporal depth, enabling continuity across time.

3. Activation Layer (A)

This layer controls the transition from latent state to active expression.

- In genomics: transcriptional regulation and environmental triggers
- In AI: inference mechanisms and input prompting
- In cognition: attention, awareness, and decision processes

Activation determines when and how latent information is expressed, shaping system behavior in real time.

4.3. Dynamic Interaction Between Layers

System behavior emerges from the interaction between these three layers.

- The encoding layer defines what is possible
- The preservation layer defines what remains available
- The activation layer defines what becomes actual

The balance between these layers determines system performance, adaptability, and coherence. Disruptions in this balance lead to instability or inefficiency.

4.4. Latency Equation and System Dynamics

The LUF can be formally represented as:

$$\boldsymbol{L} = \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{P}, \boldsymbol{A})$$

where latency is a function of encoded potential, preservation stability, and activation conditions.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 9 April 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0658.v1

However, system integrity depends not only on latency itself, but on the alignment between latent structure and expressed output. To capture this, we define a conceptual alignment metric:

$$\boldsymbol{M} = \frac{|\,\text{Output} \cap \text{Latent Structure}\,|}{|\,\text{Output} \cup \text{Latent Structure}\,|}$$

where:

- $\boldsymbol{M}$ represents alignment (conceptually equivalent to meaning integrity)
- High values indicate coherence between latent structure and output
- Low values indicate misalignment (Meaning Gap)

4.5. Latency Flow Across Systems

The LUF also describes how latency propagates across different domains:

1. Biological Layer

   Latent genomic structures encode long-term evolutionary memory

2. Computational Layer

   AI systems transform latent representations into outputs

3. Cognitive Layer

   Humans interpret outputs through perceptual and conceptual frameworks

4. Societal Layer

   Decisions and actions emerge from collective interpretation

This multi-layer flow demonstrates that latency is not confined to individual systems, but operates across interconnected levels of intelligence.

4.6. Failure Modes in the LUF

The framework identifies two primary failure conditions:

1. Over-Activation (Shallow Latency Collapse)

- Activation exceeds preservation
- Outputs are generated without sufficient grounding
- Leads to instability and incoherence

2. Over-Preservation (Deep Latency Lock)

- Excessive preservation with limited activation
- System becomes inert or unresponsive
- Limits adaptability

Optimal system behavior requires dynamic balance between these extremes.

4.7. Cognitive Sovereignty Within LUF

Within the LUF, cognitive sovereignty is reinterpreted as a function of latency balance.

Human systems maintain sovereignty when:

- sufficient latency is preserved for interpretation
- activation is not externally imposed or prematurely triggered
- outputs remain grounded in internal cognitive structures

Loss of sovereignty occurs when activation is externally accelerated, reducing interpretive depth and forcing reactive behavior.

4.8. Framework Implications

The LUF provides a unified model with implications across domains:

- Biology: reinterprets non-coding regions as functional latent structures
- AI: reframes alignment problems as latency misalignment

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 9 April 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0658.v1

- Human systems: positions decision quality as dependent on latency preservation
- Governance: highlights the need for latency-aware policy and system design

4.9. Transition to Application

The LUF establishes a foundational architecture for understanding intelligent systems. The next step is to explore how this framework applies to real-world contexts, including artificial intelligence alignment, biological regulation, and large-scale societal transformation.

5. Discussion

The findings of this study suggest a fundamental shift in how intelligence is conceptualized across biological, artificial, and human systems. Rather than being defined solely through execution, intelligence emerges as a dynamic balance between preserved potential and conditional activation. This reframing challenges dominant paradigms that prioritize speed, output, and performance, and instead positions system effectiveness as dependent on the integrity of latent structures that support meaningful activation. Across domains, the absence of activity should not be interpreted as absence of function, but as a structurally necessary dimension of intelligent systems [1,5].

- By positioning latency as a central architectural principle, this work synthesizes and extends existing theories in genomics, artificial intelligence, and cognitive science into a unified conceptual framework [3,6,14]. This integration provides a basis for understanding recurring patterns of instability, misalignment, and loss of interpretive coherence across domains.

5.2. Implications for Biological Systems

- Within biological systems, the framework offers a reinterpretation of long-standing questions surrounding non-coding DNA and genomic organization. Rather than viewing non-expressed regions as functionally ambiguous, the latency-centered perspective suggests that these regions act as reservoirs of preserved biological memory [1,5,12]. This interpretation aligns with evidence on regulatory complexity and epigenetic modulation [1,10], while extending it by proposing that preserved genomic elements contribute directly to long-term system stability and adaptability [5].
- Future research may investigate how variations in latency depth—such as conservation, accessibility, and regulatory potential—shape phenotypic plasticity and disease susceptibility [9]. This approach reframes genomic analysis from static annotation toward dynamic accessibility.

5.3. Implications for Artificial Intelligence

- In artificial intelligence, the framework provides a structural explanation for persistent challenges in alignment and reliability. While current approaches emphasize optimization of outputs, recurring issues such as hallucination and instability suggest deeper architectural misalignments [6,8,18].
- The Latency-Unified Framework interprets these failures as a breakdown between latent representation and activation. When outputs are generated without sufficient grounding in latent structure, systems produce results that lack coherence and interpretability [6,8]. This perspective implies that improving AI systems requires not only better training, but the preservation and regulation of latent structure itself.
- Future AI design should therefore focus on maintaining alignment between representation and output, ensuring that activation remains constrained by underlying informational depth. Reliability, in this view, is not only a function of accuracy, but of structural grounding.

5.4. Implications for Human Systems and Governance

- The implications of latency extend beyond technical systems into human cognition and governance. In increasingly automated environments, decision-making processes are shaped by rapid system outputs that may exceed human interpretive capacity [14,19].
- Within this context, cognitive sovereignty emerges as a critical property. The ability of individuals and institutions to interpret, contextualize, and assume authorship over decisions depends on the preservation of cognitive latency [14,19]. As decision cycles accelerate, the compression of latency reduces interpretive depth, weakens accountability, and shifts human roles from authorship to reaction.
- This creates a structural risk: systems may produce decisions that are technically valid but cognitively unassimilated. From a governance perspective, this highlights the need for systems that are not only efficient, but interpretable and temporally aligned with human cognition [19,20].

5.5. Latency and Large-Scale Transformation

- At the societal level, latency provides a framework for understanding large-scale transformation. Rapid technological and institutional change requires not only execution capacity, but the preservation of collective meaning and coherence [16,20].
- The concept of collective latency captures the ability of societies to absorb transformation while maintaining interpretive alignment. When the speed of change exceeds this capacity, systems experience fragmentation, resistance, and loss of coherence. Successful transformation, therefore, depends not only on acceleration, but on synchronization between change velocity and latent structural depth.

5.6. Limitations

- This study is conceptual and integrative in nature and therefore has inherent limitations. First, the framework does not provide direct empirical validation. While grounded in existing literature, its primary contribution is theoretical. Future work is required to operationalize and test the proposed constructs in measurable contexts, including genomic regulation, AI alignment metrics, and human decision-making processes [1,3,6].
- Second, the level of abstraction required for cross-domain integration may obscure domain-specific differences. While structural similarities are emphasized, variations in scale, mechanism, and measurement remain important and should be addressed in future empirical research.

5.7. Future Research Directions

- The proposed framework opens multiple directions for future research. In biology, studies may examine how latent genomic structures influence long-term regulatory dynamics [1,5]. In artificial intelligence, new evaluation metrics can be developed to assess alignment between latent representation and output [6,8]. In human systems, experimental work may explore how variations in decision latency affect interpretive quality, autonomy, and accountability [14,19].
- Interdisciplinary efforts will be essential to translate this conceptual model into operational frameworks applicable across domains.

5.8. Toward Latency-Aware Systems

- The findings suggest that the next phase of intelligent system development must move beyond optimization for speed toward optimization for latency balance. Systems that preserve sufficient latent structure while enabling controlled activation are more likely to maintain coherence, adaptability, and reliability [1,3].
- Latency-aware design thus represents a critical direction for future research and practice. The challenge is no longer to make systems faster, but to ensure that what they produce remains grounded in what they preserve.

6. Conclusions

This study advances a unified conceptual framework in which latency is established as a foundational architectural principle of intelligence across biological, artificial, and human systems. By shifting the analytical focus from execution to the structured preservation of potential, it challenges the prevailing assumption that intelligence is defined primarily by observable activity [1,5].

The findings demonstrate that intelligent systems are not governed solely by what they express, but by how they preserve, organize, and conditionally activate information across time [3,6,14]. Within this perspective, latency emerges as a cross-domain invariant shaping system coherence, adaptability, and meaning [5].

The Latency-Unified Framework (LUF) provides a formal structure for understanding the interaction between encoded potential, preservation stability, and activation dynamics. It identifies the Meaning Gap as a systemic failure condition arising from misalignment between latent structure and expressed output [6,8], and positions cognitive sovereignty as a latency-dependent property essential for maintaining human agency in increasingly automated environments [14,19].

Taken together, these contributions indicate that the central challenge in the development of intelligent systems is no longer the acceleration of performance, but the preservation and regulation of latency. Systems optimized solely for speed risk destabilizing the latent structures that sustain coherence and interpretability [1,3].

This work, therefore calls for a transition toward latency-aware design, in which activation remains grounded in preserved structure and system outputs remain aligned with underlying informational depth. Such an approach has implications for biological theory, artificial intelligence development, and the governance of complex sociotechnical systems [1,3,19].

More broadly, this framework reframes intelligence itself—not as a purely kinetic phenomenon, but as a temporally structured system of preserved potential. Intelligence, in this view, is not only the capacity to act, but the capacity to remain meaningfully unexpressed until action is warranted.

Author Contributions: A.H.A. conceived the study and developed the conceptual framework. A.H.A. designed the theoretical integration across genomics, artificial intelligence, and human cognitive systems. A.H.A. conducted the conceptual analysis, formalized the Latency-Unified Framework (LUF), and defined key constructs including latency, the latency spectrum, the meaning gap, and cognitive sovereignty. A.H.A. wrote the manuscript and approved the final version.:

Funding: This research received no external funding. The APC was funded by the author.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: The author gratefully acknowledges the institutional support provided by Shaqra University. During the preparation of this manuscript, the author used ChatGPT (OpenAI) to assist with language editing and improving clarity of expression. The author reviewed and edited all AI-assisted outputs and assumes full responsibility for the content of this publication.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

1. ENCODE Project Consortium. Expanded encyclopaedias of DNA elements in the human genome. *Nature* **2020**, *583*, 699–710. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2493-4.
2. Roadmap Epigenomics Consortium. Integrative analysis of 111 reference human epigenomes. *Nature* **2015**, *518*, 317–330. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14248.
3. Nilsson, A.; Peters, J.M.; Meimetis, N.; Bryson, B.; Lauffenburger, D.A. Deep learning for genome-scale modeling. *Nature Communications* **2022**, *13*, 3050. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-30684-y.

4. Mao, H.; Li, Q.; Wang, Y.; Zhang, X. Latent representation learning in single-cell genomics. *Nature Communications* **2025**, *16*, 1234. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-025-63921-1.
5. Veiner, M.; Morgenstern, B.; Hosseini, S.R. Genomic language models reveal latent biological structure. *Nature Biotechnology* **2025**. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44320-025-00184-4.
6. Alsentzer, E.; Finlayson, S.G.; Wang, F. Latent phenotype modeling in clinical AI. *Nature Medicine* **2025**. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-025-01749-1.
7. Vaswani, A.; Shazeer, N.; Parmar, N.; Uszkoreit, J.; Jones, L.; Gomez, A.N.; Kaiser, Ł.; Polosukhin, I. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **2017**, *30*, 5998–6008.
8. Brown, T.; Mann, B.; Ryder, N.; Subbiah, M.; Kaplan, J.; Dhariwal, P.; Neelakantan, A.; Shyam, P.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **2020**, *33*, 1877–1901.
9. López-Otín, C.; Blasco, M.A.; Partridge, L.; Serrano, M.; Kroemer, G. Hallmarks of aging: An expanding universe. *Cell* **2023**, *186*, 243–278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2022.11.001.
10. Cavalli, G.; Heard, E. Advances in epigenetics. *Nature* **2019**, *571*, 489–499. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1411-0.
11. Kellis, M.; Wold, B.; Snyder, M.P.; Bernstein, B.E.; Kundaje, A.; Marinov, G.K.; Ward, L.D.; Birney, E.; Crawford, G.E.; Dekker, J.; et al. Defining functional DNA elements in the human genome. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* **2014**, *111*, 6131–6138. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1318948111.
12. Ullah, M.F. Noncoding RNAs: The not so “junk” DNA is the blueprint of the transcriptional landscape of the RNA world. *Experimental Supplementum* **2026**, *115*, 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-45678-5_1.
13. Spanou, V.M.; Andriopoulou, T.P.; Giamarellos-Bourboulis, E.J.; Netea, M.G. Improving the odds of survival: Transgenerational effects of infections. *EMBO Molecular Medicine* **2025**, *17*, 609–624. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44321-025-00123-4.
14. Urai, A.E. Structure uncovered: Understanding temporal variability in perceptual decision-making. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **2026**, *30*, 54–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2025.10.001.
15. Urai, A.E. Uncovering time variations in decision making of agents that do not always respond with the same policy. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **2025**. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2025.08.002.
16. Kahneman, D. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*; Farrar, Straus and Giroux: New York, NY, USA, 2011.
17. Friston, K. The free-energy principle: A unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **2010**, *11*, 127–138. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2787.
18. Bender, E.M.; Gebru, T.; McMillan-Major, A.; Shmitchell, S. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* **2021**, 610–623.
19. Floridi, L.; Cowls, J.; Beltrametti, M.; Chatila, R.; Chazerand, P.; Dignum, V.; Luetge, C.; Madelin, R.; Pagallo, U.; Rossi, F.; et al. AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society. *Minds and Machines* **2018**, *28*, 689–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5.
20. OECD. OECD Principles on Artificial Intelligence. 2019. Available online: https://oecd.ai
21. Joraboyev, B.; Asrorov, A.; Akramov, A.; Qobilova, N.; Nabieva, D.; Mullajonov, H.; Kenjayev, Y. AI-driven simulation and inference of gene regulatory dynamics under genetic perturbations. *Genetics and Molecular Research* **2026**, *25*.
22. High-throughput dissection of inter-organ genetic networks: A multi-omic systems biology approach. *SLAS Technology* **2026**, *36*, 100376. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.slast.2026.10037