

## AUTOTRIZ: ARTIFICIAL IDEATION WITH TRIZ AND LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS

**Shuo Jiang**

Singapore University of Technology and Design,  
Singapore  
shuo\_jiang@sutd.edu.sg

**Jianxi Luo**

Department of Systems Engineering,  
City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong  
jianxi.luo@cityu.edu.hk

### ABSTRACT

*Researchers and innovators have made enormous efforts in developing ideation methods, such as morphological analysis and design-by-analogy, to aid engineering design ideation for problem solving and innovation. Among these, the Theory of Inventive Problem Solving (TRIZ) stands out as one of the most well-known approaches, widely applied for systematic innovation. However, the complexity of TRIZ resources and concepts, coupled with its reliance on users' knowledge, experience, and reasoning capabilities, limits its practicality. Therefore, we explore the recent advances of large language models (LLMs) for a generative approach to bridge this gap. This paper proposes AutoTRIZ, an artificial ideation tool that uses LLMs to automate and enhance the TRIZ methodology. By leveraging the broad knowledge and advanced reasoning capabilities of LLMs, AutoTRIZ offers a novel approach for design automation and interpretable ideation with artificial intelligence. AutoTRIZ takes a problem statement from the user as its initial input, and automatically generates a solution report after the reasoning process. We demonstrate and evaluate the effectiveness of AutoTRIZ through consistency experiments in contradiction detection, and a case study comparing solutions generated by AutoTRIZ with the experts' analyses from the textbook. Moreover, the proposed LLM-based framework holds the potential for extension to automate other knowledge-based ideation methods, including SCAMPER, Design Heuristics, and Design-by-Analogy, paving the way for a new era of artificial ideation for design innovation.*

**Keywords:** Innovation, Design Ideation, Problem Solving, TRIZ, Large Language Models, Artificial Intelligence

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Intuitive or structured ideation methods such as brainstorming, morphological analysis, and mind-mapping [1–3] have been used to aid creative ideation of human designers for concept generation. Among these, the Theory of Inventive

Problem Solving (TRIZ) [4] stands out as one of the most well-known approaches, widely applied for systematic innovation. TRIZ is a knowledge-based ideation methodology that provides a structured framework for engineering problem solving by identifying and overcoming technical contradictions using inventive principles derived from a large-scale patent database. However, the complexity of TRIZ resources and concepts poses significant cognitive challenges to effectively learning and applying it. In addition, the problem-solving process in TRIZ is highly dependent on the reasoning capabilities of human users. While some researchers have employed natural language processing and machine learning techniques to support certain steps within TRIZ [5–7], the effectiveness still depends heavily on the users' proficiency with TRIZ.

Large Language Models (LLMs) such as OpenAI's GPT [8] and Meta's Llama [9] have not only acquired broad knowledge but also developed emergent abilities such as in-context learning [10], instruction following [10], and step-by-step reasoning [10]. These capabilities have been applied across various domains, including medicine [11], chemistry [12], and mathematics [13]. Recently, researchers have evaluated the capabilities of LLMs in engineering-related tasks [14,15] and reported the extensive engineering knowledge within these models as well as their wide applicability in engineering design and manufacturing. In terms of engineering problem solving and idea generation, there has been preliminary exploration using LLMs [16–19]. However, the lack of transparency and limited control over reasoning steps during ideation often leads to divergent results, requiring multiple heuristic attempts by users to achieve desired outcomes, which places significant demands on their domain-specific expertise. Besides, the interpretability of generated concepts remains challenging, as users obtain only the final results without understanding the ideation reasoning process.

In this work, we aim to leverage the broad knowledge and advanced reasoning capabilities of LLMs to automate the TRIZ method, showcasing the potential of LLMs in design automation

and interpretable innovation. We have developed an LLM-based intelligent tool, AutoTRIZ ([www.autotriz.ai](http://www.autotriz.ai)), capable of artificial ideation for problem solving with TRIZ-based interpretability. AutoTRIZ begins with a problem statement from the user and automatically generates a report that includes multiple solutions, strictly following the TRIZ thinking flow and reasoning process. In this paper, we also evaluate the effectiveness and performance of AutoTRIZ through quantitative comparison, as well as case studies involving human uses of TRIZ from TRIZ textbooks.

## 2. RELATED WORK

### 2.1 TRIZ

TRIZ is a knowledge-based systematic approach of inventive problem solving, developed in the 1960s by Genrich S. Altshuller and his colleagues [4]. Through a thorough analysis of over 40,000 patents, Altshuller and his collaborators identified repeated patterns of innovation and underlying innovative principles within these documents. By inductively analyzing these patterns, they proposed a comprehensive problem-solving framework, applying selected inventive principles for ideation. Since then, TRIZ has been developed continually and some modern TRIZ databases rely on the analysis of over 2 million patents. It has been widely applied in industries, research, and education with notable influence in many fields, such as energy, electrical, automotive industries, and mechanical engineering [20].

The TRIZ toolkit contains a series of theories and tools that cover all aspects of problem understanding and solving, including the trimming method, evolution trends, and 76 standard solutions [4]. In this paper, we focus on the best-known tool, the Method of Inventive Principles, which represents the basic reasoning logic behind TRIZ. Figure 1 shows the overview of its framework (adapted from [21]), which contains four steps:

(1) Identify the specific problem.

(2) Transform the specific problem into a general problem by identifying physical contradictions. The contradictions involve an improving feature and a worsening feature. These features are drawn from Altshuller’s 39 engineering parameters.

(3) Search for selected inventive principles from the contradiction matrix using identified contradictions. The contradiction matrix is organized in the form of 39-improving features and 39-worsening features (a 39 by 39 matrix) with each cell entry listing the most often used principles (from TRIZ’s 40 inventive principles) that may be used to solve the problem.

(4) Use the selected principles to generate solutions to the problem.

Although TRIZ has demonstrated its effectiveness, it still suffers from drawbacks that hinder its practical applications. For instance, the complexity of TRIZ resources and concepts poses cognitive challenges to effectively learning and applying it, particularly for non-experts. Additionally, the efficacy of TRIZ is heavily constrained by the users’ reasoning capabilities and prior knowledge already acquired.




FIGURE 1: Four steps for problem solving using TRIZ

Recent advancements in machine learning and natural language processing have been applied in conjunction with TRIZ [5,7,22]. These efforts aim to automate the TRIZ reasoning process, thereby reducing the difficulty of use. For instance, Cascini and Russo [5] developed the PAT-ANALYZER system that can analyze patent texts and automatically extract the contradictory information underlying the innovation for the use of TRIZ. Similarly, Guarino et al. [7] proposed the PaTRIZ, combining the Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) and Conditional Random Fields (CRF) for word-level patent analysis and TRIZ contradiction mining. Li et al. [22] proposed an approach that leverages natural language processing techniques to assess patent innovations according to the level of invention as defined in TRIZ. Berdyugina and Cavallucci [23] proposed a methodology for the automatic extraction of inventive information from texts for formulating an inventive problem into TRIZ engineering parameters. Their method combined a series of text-mining techniques, including topic modeling, word embedding, and clustering. Hall et al. [6] proposed an approach that uses topic modeling and unsupervised machine learning to map TRIZ inventive principles to individual patents and detect the novelty.

However, most of these works focus on utilizing algorithms to improve specific steps of the TRIZ process. They still require innovators to dedicate much time and effort to extensive reasoning. Employing these methods does not directly assist users throughout the entire process, from analyzing a problem to creating practical solutions. In this paper, we aim to harness LLMs to automate the entire TRIZ reasoning process and minimize the cognitive requirements for users during its application.




FIGURE 2: The framework of AutoTRIZ

## 2.2 Large Language Models for Design and Innovation

Over the past years, many data-driven approaches have utilized machine learning and deep learning techniques to augment design and innovation [24,25]. Evolved from deep learning and pre-trained language models, LLMs typically refer to Transformer-based models that contain hundreds of billions of parameters for processing and generating natural language texts [10]. They are trained on extremely large-scale corpora, enabling them to acquire a wide range of knowledge and capabilities, including understanding context, generating coherent text, and step-by-step reasoning [10]. Some research has already explored the application of LLMs in engineering design and innovation within specific fields, including microfluidic devices [26], robotics [27], and the user interface of webpages [28]. However, most of these early efforts primarily utilize conversational interactions, such as those facilitated by ChatGPT Interface [8], to engage in the innovation process. Meanwhile, with the development of LLMs, there has been an increase in efforts to create LLM-driven methods and tools to offer more generalized innovation assistance and directly support users in rapid ideation.

For instance, several studies have harnessed LLMs for processing vast amounts of design documentation, representing designs in specific forms, and identifying user needs for product development [16,17,29]. Han et al. [17] introduced an LLM-based attribute-sentiment-guided summarization model to extract user needs from online product reviews. Qiu et al. [29] applied a transformer-based language model to distill design-related knowledge from extensive reports and documents. Moreover, Wang et al. [16] utilized LLMs to decompose conceptual design tasks into Function-Behavior-Structure (FBS) formats, assisting users in ideation across different aspects.

Recent studies have developed tools and methodologies utilizing LLMs to aid the design process, enhance human-computer collaborative innovation, or directly produce innovative concepts for users [18,19,30,31]. Ding et al. [31] conducted a systematic exploration of LLMs' potential to boost

cross-domain analogical creativity. Huang et al. [30] proposed CausalMapper, a system that combines LLMs with causal mapping to reason about the connections between problems and solutions. Ma et al. [32,33] evaluated the differences between LLM-generated and crowdsourced design solutions through multiple perspectives, including human expert evaluations and computational metrics. Zhu and Luo [19] presented GPT-based models with domain-specific tuning and task-specific learning, to generate original and useful design concepts. Notably, they applied their approach to automating bio-inspired design concept generation [18].

Although these recent idea-generation methods directly leverage the reasoning capabilities of LLMs, the lack of control over LLMs may hinder their effectiveness when assisting ideation. These approaches often lead to solutions that are too divergent to meet specific needs. Managing the problem-solving process to ensure that solutions are both innovative and practical, as well as understanding the reasoning process behind generated innovative solutions, remains a challenge. In this study, we address this issue by integrating TRIZ with LLMs, presenting AutoTRIZ as a tool that follows the TRIZ reasoning steps to generate inventive solutions with interpretability.

## 3. AUTOTRIZ

In this section, we introduce AutoTRIZ, an artificial ideation tool that automates TRIZ with LLMs. The architecture of AutoTRIZ is depicted in Figure 2. At the core of AutoTRIZ is the utilization of LLMs to learn the reasoning process of the TRIZ methodology, which engineers often find it challenging to learn and excel at.

Overall, AutoTRIZ takes a problem statement from the user as its initial input, and automatically generates a solution report after the reasoning process. The report includes detailed information about the reasoning process based on TRIZ and the resulting solutions to the problem. Within AutoTRIZ, we have defined a four-step reasoning flow based on the classic TRIZ workflow. The system includes an inner fixed knowledge base

which consists of three segments related to TRIZ details, enabling controlled reasoning. It is noteworthy that our focus is on controlling the entire problem-solving reasoning process, while remaining open to the knowledge used in ideation. The problem-related knowledge applied during the problem-solving process is drawn from the knowledge base that the LLM has acquired through pre-training on the large-scale corpus.

### 3.1 Controlling the TRIZ Reasoning Flow

To ensure that the system strictly follows the TRIZ thinking flow and reasoning process, we have configured AutoTRIZ with four modules, each corresponding to the four steps in TRIZ. As depicted in Figure 2, Modules 1, 2, and 4, outlined by solid-line frames, are driven by LLMs, whereas Module 3, outlined by a dashed-line frame, is controlled by predefined functions without using LLMs. Specifically, we exploit the instruction-following capabilities of LLMs for backend reasoning control. In each module that incorporates LLMs, relevant instructions are engineered into the input as system and assistant prompts.

Specifically, in Module 1, AutoTRIZ identifies the problem to be solved from user input and converts it into descriptive text. Ideally, we hope that the content entered by the user is a clear problem statement. However, user inputs may include additional information such as scenario descriptions, background details, and even some redundant information. Therefore, in this module, AutoTRIZ is designed to identify and extract information related to the problem and then reorganize it into clear and concise text.

In Module 2, AutoTRIZ receives the processed problem description and detects its engineering contradiction, which is represented by a space constructed from two out of the 39 engineering parameters. At this stage, AutoTRIZ learns all the engineering parameters based on its inner knowledge base. The outputs of this module are presented in a structured format (i.e., the indexes of the improving and worsening features). It is important to note that for the same problem statement, the identified contradiction may differ with each execution of this module. On the one hand, a single problem may encompass multiple contradictory pairs, yet our system is designed to identify only one contradiction. On the other hand, there is an inherent randomness in the content generation by LLMs. In the next section, we will conduct experimental investigations to examine the efficacy of contradiction identification and the consistency of the outputs.

Once the contradiction is identified, Module 3 searches the contradiction matrix to find the indexes of relevant inventive principles and returns their descriptions. Following this, Module 4 synthesizes the original problem description, the identified engineering contradiction, and the inventive principles recommended by the system through TRIZ, to generate the final solutions.

LLMs can generate complex structured data, such as those in HTML and LaTeX formats [34]. In AutoTRIZ, we harness this capability to integrate all generated content and directly produce a reader-friendly problem-solving report in a structured format. We have engineered the format template directly into Module 4, enabling it to output documents formatted in LaTeX.

In practice, the template for the report generation can be adjusted as needed to suit specific requirements.

### 3.2 Learning from the Fixed Knowledge Base

AutoTRIZ acquires the necessary information to learn the prior knowledge of TRIZ, enabling it to handle various types of problems. We have curated a static knowledge base, which interacts with the modules we described above, thereby empowering AutoTRIZ to master and apply the relevant knowledge.

In AutoTRIZ, the internal fixed knowledge base includes three main components: (1) the TRIZ 39 Engineering Parameters [4], (2) the TRIZ Contradiction Matrix [4], and (3) the TRIZ 40 Inventive Principles [4]. Notably, the contradiction matrix here is identical to the traditional TRIZ contradiction matrix. The knowledge regarding engineering parameters and inventive principles includes titles and detailed descriptions for each entry.

For example, for the first engineering parameter:

```
[INDEX]1 [TITLE] Weight of moving object
[DESCRIPTION]The mass of the object in a
gravitational field, essentially the
force that the body exerts on its
support or suspension.
```

Similarly, for the first inventive principle:

```
[INDEX]1 [TITLE] Segmentation
[DESCRIPTION] The Segmentation principle
encourages consideration of the division
of an object or system into smaller
independent parts, making it sectional,
making it easy to assemble or
disassemble, and increasing the degree
of its divisibility or fragmentation.
```

All engineering parameters are configured into Module 2 as assistant information. The backend LLMs learn instructions and the output parameter space through in-context learning, enabling zero-shot reasoning. Regarding inventive principles, only selected contents are delivered to the system based on the position in the contradiction matrix. This process is very similar to LLMs' Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) [35]. By retrieving additional information related to the query from external databases, RAG incorporates these external texts into LLM prompts to address the hallucination problem, leading to better generation [35]. Whereas in our system, the problem-solving process involves precise search-augmented generation, effectively bridging the gap between the prior TRIZ knowledge from experts and the reasoning capabilities of LLMs derived from large-scale pre-training. Simultaneously, all solutions generated are interpretable because each solution is derived from the application of selected inventive principles.

### 3.3 System Implementation

We developed a web-based tool for public users to test and use AutoTRIZ, available at: <https://www.autotriz.ai/>. Figure 3 shows the user interface of the tool. Throughout the deployment of this tool and all experiments conducted in this study, we utilized *GPT-4 (Version: 20231106)*, the state-of-the-art model at the time this work was done) as the backend LLM. However, it is important to note that since the proposed AutoTRIZ is a general framework, the backend LLM can be replaced with any other closed-source LLM (e.g., Claude) or open-source LLM (e.g., Llama) with minimal effort required for adapting the corresponding prompts. For the TRIZ knowledge base in AutoTRIZ, we adopt the TRIZ definitions and descriptions in an engineering design textbook [36].




FIGURE 3: AutoTRIZ web-based tool

## 4. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

In this section, we evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed AutoTRIZ through quantitative experiments and comparative studies. Specifically, we collected several case studies analyzed by human experts from TRIZ textbooks, constructing a case base. Then, we explored the consistency of the system in identifying engineering contradictions, as well as its overlap with human analysis. Finally, we selected a specific problem from the case base, then compared and discussed the solutions generated by AutoTRIZ against the results of human experts.

### 4.1 Constructing the TRIZ Case Base

To evaluate the performance of AutoTRIZ, we first constructed a case base containing TRIZ problem-solving cases developed by human experts. Initially, we gathered several TRIZ-related textbooks, some of which are focused on general design innovation, while others are specifically about TRIZ. From 7 of these textbooks [4,36–41], we collected 10 initial cases. The selection criteria include: (1) the content of the case contains all elements of the TRIZ reasoning process, including problem description, contradiction identification, inventive principle positioning, and solutions; (2) the problem is defined clearly and comprehensively; (3) the cases do not contain similar problems. All cases are stored in JSON format. For more details on collected cases, please refer to our GitHub repository<sup>1</sup>.

The initial 10 cases cover various domains, including environmental engineering, transportation, manufacturing, material science, aerospace technology, and so on. The

evaluation of these cases can serve as a preliminary benchmark, enabling users to understand and experience the usage protocol and performance of AutoTRIZ. In the future, we will continue to expand the case base for more robust testing. Beyond serving experimental purposes in this study, the curated case base can also store the results generated by users with AutoTRIZ. As the size of the base expands, we can also explore the interaction between the reasoning module and the existing case base, enabling AutoTRIZ's innovative capabilities to be scalable.

### 4.2 Assessing the Contradiction Identification

Detecting contradictions is an essential step in the entire TRIZ problem-solving process. Accurate identification of the contradictions within a problem can effectively assist the system in recommending the appropriate inventive principles for the next step. Within LLMs, randomness is incorporated into the text generation process. These models often use sampling methods (e.g., top-k sampling) or temperature adjustments to control the generation process, leading to a variety of possible outputs rather than repeating the same response every time. Because of this inherent variability, LLMs may suffer from instability during inference. As a result, some LLM-based agents adopt self-consistency techniques that create several reasoning paths and then perform an ensemble on all generated answers, selecting the most consistent one through majority voting [42]. However, in traditional TRIZ, analyzing the same problem from different perspectives can yield different possible contradictions. Such stochastic nature of LLM-based generation can be useful for increasing the diversity of generated ideas [32]. Based on this, we maintain the setting of producing a single contradiction in each entry. To assess the performance and consistency of this setting, we conducted the following experiments.

For each given problem statement, we performed the analysis 100 times, resulting in 100 pairs of identified parameters (contradictions). Then, we counted all results and calculated their respective proportions. In cases of high consistency, a particular contradiction could be dominant. In some cases, one parameter in the contradiction may have higher certainty than the other, leading to more dispersed results.

We used information entropy as the uncertainty score, where smaller entropy value indicates greater confidence in the model's output. The information entropy metric is widely used for uncertainty measurement [43]. Given a probability distribution  $X$  generated by the model, we can calculate the entropy by:

$$H(X) = - \sum_{i=1}^n P(x_i) \log P(x_i)$$

where  $P(x_i)$  represents the frequency probability of the  $i$ -th class in a total 100 trials and  $n$  is the number of possible classes. Since we have 100 trials in our experiments, the entropy value ranges from 0 to 6.64, where a smaller value indicates higher consistency.

Furthermore, we examined the overlap between AutoTRIZ's detection and the analysis results of human experts

<sup>1</sup> <https://github.com/shuojiangcn/AutoTRIZ-DETC24>

from textbooks, categorizing them into three scenarios: complete match, half match, and no match. It is important to note that since human expert analysis also includes subjectivity and bias, it cannot be considered a golden standard. The main purpose of this experiment is to showcase and quantitatively compare AutoTRIZ against human uses of TRIZ.

Figure 4 shows the experimental results, where the bar chart for each case illustrates the top 3 detections by proportion. The top 3 detections represent the output results corresponding to the three classes with the highest probabilities in the probability distribution obtained from the 100 trials. The use of top 3 detections enables us to account for both the model accuracy and the randomness in its predictions. In the chart, green bars represent *complete match*, blue bars indicate *half match*, and yellow bars denote *not match*. The table at the bottom shows the entropy of each case and whether the top 3 detections match the reference from textbooks, with symbols ( $\checkmark$ ,  $\surd$ ,  $\times$ ) indicating *complete match*, *half match*, and *not match*, respectively.

Overall, 7 out of 10 cases match or half-match the textbook's analysis within the top 3 detections, indicating that AutoTRIZ's inference overlaps with the human experts' results to a certain degree. A minority of the cases show relatively higher consistency (cases 5, 6, 7, 8), where the proportion of the top 1 detection is significantly higher than the other detections, including two complete match detections. For these cases, utilizing self-consistency may be beneficial to enhance performance. For other cases, the experimental results show greater diversity, indicated by higher information entropy. By examining the content of the top 3 detections of contradiction for each case, we observe that for almost all cases, one parameter is fixed while the other varies. Moreover, when using the textbook's analysis as a reference, a pattern emerges across all cases where outputs with higher probabilities (within the top 3 detections) show a better match in alignment. These findings can serve as the initial benchmark for assessing the performance of AutoTRIZ's contradiction identification. As the case base expands in the future, we can explore these patterns in a more fine-grained way with greater statistical significance. For example, we can examine the differences between various themes, leveraging techniques such as self-consistency reasoning in conjunction with the identified patterns to improve overall performance.


### 4.3 Comparing AutoTRIZ and Human Expertise

In this section, we select one of the collected cases (case 7) to compare AutoTRIZ's generated report with humans' analysis results from the textbook. The reasons for choosing case 7 are two-fold: (1) This case exhibits relatively high consistency in identifying engineering contradictions, with one dominant outcome (Figure 4); (2) The top 3 detections of contradiction are all half-match with the reference. This ensures a certain degree of reliability while allowing the distinction between the subsequent reasoning paths of AutoTRIZ and humans.

The problem of case 7 is about the pneumatic transportation of metal shots through a system of plastic piping [39]. Here is the original problem statement:

*We are faced with a challenge involving the pneumatic transportation of metal shots through a system of plastic piping originally intended for plastic pellets. The transition to metal shots, despite their advantages for production purposes, has led to significant wear and damage, particularly at the pipe's elbows. This issue arises from the incompatibility between the metal shots and the existing plastic elbow design. The task is to identify and implement a solution that resolves this conflict, ensuring the system's durability and effectiveness for transporting metal shots.*

In the textbook, the identified improving parameter is "*Speed*" (Parameter 9), and the worsening parameter is "*Stability of the object's composition*" (Parameter 13). According to the contradiction matrix, the author selects "*Mechanical Substitution*" (Principle 28) from the obtained inventive principles. Applying this principle, the author describes the solution as *placing a magnet at the elbow to bind the metal shots*



Case Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Entropy of detections	4.54	3.95	3.16	4.59	1.19	1.64	2.83	3.24	3.33	2.87
Whether the top 3 detections hit the reference*	X	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓

FIGURE 4: Experimental results about contradiction detection

to a plastic material, thereby creating a blanket of shots that absorb the energy.

Figure 5 shows the problem-solving report generated by AutoTRIZ, containing the reasoning process and solutions. The same problem statement is used as the input. Firstly, we can see that AutoTRIZ simplifies the original problem statement, identifying the main issue that needs to be addressed. Regarding the identification of contradictions, AutoTRIZ diverges from human expertise. Both AutoTRIZ and the textbook's analysis consistently recognize the "*Stability of the object's composition*" (Parameter 13) as the worsening feature. However, concerning the improving feature, AutoTRIZ detects "*Area of stationary object*" (Parameter 6), while the textbook's analysis considers it to be "*Speed*" (Parameter 9). From the original problem statement, we understand that the key issue is to avoid wear on the plastic elbows by the metal shots to ensure durability, which clearly indicates that one of the contradictory parameters involves stability. Whereas the identification of the other parameter is not directly mentioned, leading to a variety of possible interpretations. AutoTRIZ reasons that the surface area needs improvement to withstand the impact and wear of the metal shot, while the expert asserts speed as the system's top priority. These two analyses highlight different needs, thereby guiding subsequent innovative directions differently.

In the textbook's analysis, the author selected a single inventive principle (28, 'Mechanical Substitution') and created a solution by positioning a magnet at the piping's elbow, which magnetically attaches metal shots to the plastic, forming an energy-absorbing layer. This approach represents a direct and effective innovation. However, based on the identified parameter pair, the contradiction matrix could yield four inventive principles (i.e., (28, 'Mechanical Substitution'), (33, 'Homogeneity'), (1, 'Segmentation'), (18, 'Mechanical Vibration')). Some principles may be challenging to apply, as the outcomes are directly influenced by the users' reasoning ability, experience, and familiarity with TRIZ materials. This step also requires the most human effort in TRIZ. By comparison, AutoTRIZ can effectively overcome this issue. After identifying the contradiction (Parameter 6 vs. Parameter 13), AutoTRIZ identifies two inventive principles from the contradiction matrix (i.e., (2, 'Extraction'), (39, 'Strong Oxidants')). For each principle, AutoTRIZ applies it and generates a corresponding solution. Both proposed solutions demonstrate feasibility and innovation. Solution 1 implements a physical alteration to prevent direct contact between the metal shots and the piping. Solution 2, integrating 'Strong oxidants', involves a surface treatment to improve the piping's durability against metal shots through a protective coating.

In summary, both the textbook's solution and the solutions automatically generated by AutoTRIZ are practical, originating from different inventive principles and leading to different approaches. In the previous section, we performed 100 trials on each case for contradiction detection. We randomly selected one trial's solutions to compare and discuss with humans' analysis results from the textbook in this section. We only randomly chose one result because the solutions and the complete report are

relatively lengthy and complex. Besides the case study exploration, we will also seek computational evaluation methods and metrics [44] regarding the quality of generated solutions in future work. It is important to note that these solutions are relatively preliminary and can serve as foundational directions for innovators to further develop and refine their designs. On this basis, we will continue to develop AutoTRIZ to produce more detailed solutions for the given problem.





FIGURE 5: AutoTRIZ generated solution report for case 7

## 5. DISCUSSION

So far, we have presented a new methodology that integrates LLMs and the systematic innovation method, TRIZ, to automatically generate inventive solutions for any given problem in an interpretable way. This methodology has been implemented into a web-based tool, AutoTRIZ. We have demonstrated its effectiveness and practicality through experiments and case studies.

Prior studies [14,15] have assessed LLMs' capabilities across a broad range of engineering-related tasks, revealing that these models (especially GPT-series models) hold extensive engineering knowledge, such as design and manufacturing. Therefore, in our framework, we only control the reasoning flow, without limiting the knowledge involved in the ideation process,



**FIGURE 6:** The multi-input usages of AutoTRIZ

to fully leverage the general knowledge and capabilities of LLMs. In this study, our case base of 10 problems spans multiple distinct domains, and AutoTRIZ has effectively generated inventive solutions in each case.

The proposed method significantly reduces the entry barrier to TRIZ. AutoTRIZ can generate a multitude of solutions in a short period of time because it leverages the computational power and vast knowledge base of LLMs. This efficiency is further enhanced by its user-friendly interface, allowing for easy configuration and use, significantly reducing the time needed to generate ideas and refine problem-solving strategies. In contrast, mastering the traditional TRIZ method for professional use typically requires months of training and substantial intellectual and cognitive efforts [45].

In the comparative study of case 7, we observed that the problem statement contains information related to the desired direction of improvement, which is relevant to the contradiction. Such information aids in aligning AutoTRIZ's detections with those of human experts. Accordingly, as demonstrated in Figure 6, we can incorporate multi-input configurations into the system, enabling AutoTRIZ to generate solutions that fully consider detailed requirements from users. The user interaction settings with AutoTRIZ are also a topic worth exploring. We currently keep it simple to ensure accessibility for all users, including those without an understanding of TRIZ. We plan to investigate user interaction with TRIZ, AutoTRIZ, and vanilla LLMs, examining the differences to identify the most effective methods for improving the overall user experience and system performance.

Although this study focuses on automating the TRIZ reasoning process using LLMs, the proposed framework can be extended to automate other knowledge-based innovation methods. For instance, Yilmaz et al. [46] identified 77 design heuristics from over 3,000 design process outcomes, and suggested a subset of heuristics to designers, which when selected at random, has produced improved design outcomes [47]. By applying our framework to this research, one could treat the identified heuristics as an internal knowledge base for the LLM-based agent, determining how to utilize these heuristics in the backend. Moreover, to develop a more powerful tool, one

could also integrate various knowledge-based idea generation methods into the reasoning modules of LLMs, such as SCAMPER [48], IDEO Method Cards [49], Bio-inspired Design [50], and Design-by-Analogy [51–53].

The proposed AutoTRIZ framework has several limitations. Firstly, the solutions generated by LLMs may contain hallucinations or erroneous information. We plan to include fact-check modules to ensure the accuracy of the solutions. Additionally, there is no objective mechanism to evaluate the effectiveness of generated solutions. Users must independently assess solution quality and rank them for practical use. The evaluation studies conducted in this paper compared results solely from textbooks, which usually represent the analysis of a single expert or a small group of experts. Future studies will involve many more experts analyzing the same problems for comparison, making the conclusions more robust. Moreover, this study was demonstrated on a limited set of problem cases, providing only an initial insight into AutoTRIZ that might introduce some bias. In future research, we aim to apply this method to a broader and more diverse range of problems, systematically evaluating AutoTRIZ's performance.

## 6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose AutoTRIZ, an artificial ideation workflow and tool that leverages LLMs to automate the TRIZ methodology and enhance its applications. AutoTRIZ is constructed by multiple LLM-based reasoning modules and a pre-defined function module, interacting with the inner fixed knowledge base. It takes problem statements from users as initial inputs and automatically produces an interpretable solution report by following the step-by-step TRIZ reasoning process. The efficacy of this method is demonstrated and evaluated through quantitative and comparative experiments, as well as case studies involving human uses of TRIZ from TRIZ textbooks. Although this paper primarily focuses on integrating LLMs with TRIZ, the proposed framework holds the potential to be extended to other knowledge-based ideation methods, including SCAMPER, Design Heuristics, and Design-by-Analogy. Despite its current limitations, we invite interested innovators to test and use AutoTRIZ at: <https://www.autotriz.ai/>.



## REFERENCES

- [1] Zwicky, F., 1967, “The Morphological Approach to Discovery, Invention, Research and Construction,” *New Methods of Thought and Procedure*, A.G. Zwicky Fritz and Wilson, ed., Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 273–297.
- [2] White, C. K., Wood, K. L., and Jensen, D., 2012, “From Brainstorming to C-Sketch to Principles of Historical Innovators: Ideation Techniques to Enhance Student Creativity,” *J STEM Educ*, **13**(5).
- [3] Camburn, B., Arlitt, R., Anderson, D., Sanaei, R., Raviselam, S., Jensen, D., and Wood, K. L., 2020, “Computer-Aided Mind Map Generation via Crowdsourcing and Machine Learning,” *Res Eng Des*, **31**, pp. 383–409.
- [4] Altshuller, G. S., 1999, *The Innovation Algorithm: TRIZ, Systematic Innovation and Technical Creativity*, Technical innovation center Inc.
- [5] Cascini, G., and Russo, D., 2007, “Computer-Aided Analysis of Patents and Search for TRIZ Contradictions,” *International Journal of Product Development*, **4**(1–2), pp. 52–67.
- [6] Hall, S., Mollan, C., Pandey, V., and Mourelatos, Z., 2022, “TRIZ Mapping and Novelty Detection of Engineering Design Patents Using Machine Learning,” *International Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*, p. V006T06A044.
- [7] Guarino, G., Samet, A., and Cavallucci, D., 2022, “PaTRIZ: A Framework for Mining TRIZ Contradictions in Patents,” *Expert Syst Appl*, **207**, p. 117942.
- [8] Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F. L., Almeida, D., Altenschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., and others, 2023, “GPT-4 Technical Report,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774.
- [9] Touvron, H., Lavril, T., Izacard, G., Martinet, X., Lachaux, M.-A., Lacroix, T., Rozière, B., Goyal, N., Hambro, E., Azhar, F., and others, 2023, “Llama: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971.
- [10] Wei, J., Tay, Y., Bommasani, R., Raffel, C., Zoph, B., Borgeaud, S., Yogatama, D., Bosma, M., Zhou, D., Metzler, D., and others, 2022, “Emergent Abilities of Large Language Models,” *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- [11] Singhal, K., Azizi, S., Tu, T., Mahdavi, S. S., Wei, J., Chung, H. W., Scales, N., Tanwani, A., Cole-Lewis, H., Pfohl, S., and others, 2023, “Large Language Models Encode Clinical Knowledge,” *Nature*, pp. 1–9.
- [12] Boiko, D. A., MacKnight, R., Kline, B., and Gomes, G., 2023, “Autonomous Chemical Research with Large Language Models,” *Nature*, **624**(7992), pp. 570–578.
- [13] Romera-Paredes, B., Barekatin, M., Novikov, A., Balog, M., Kumar, M. P., Dupont, E., Ruiz, F. J. R., Ellenberg, J. S., Wang, P., Fawzi, O., and others, 2024, “Mathematical Discoveries from Program Search with Large Language Models,” *Nature*, **625**(7995), pp. 468–475.
- [14] Makatura, L., Foshey, M., Wang, B., Hähnlein, F., Ma, P., Deng, B., Tjandrasuwita, M., Spielberg, A., Owens, C. E., Chen, P. Y., and others, 2023, “How Can Large Language Models Help Humans in Design and Manufacturing?,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.14377.
- [15] Picard, C., Edwards, K. M., Doris, A. C., Man, B., Giannone, G., Alam, M. F., and Ahmed, F., 2023, “From Concept to Manufacturing: Evaluating Vision-Language Models for Engineering Design,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12668.
- [16] Wang, B., Zuo, H., Cai, Z., Yin, Y., Childs, P., Sun, L., and Chen, L., 2023, “A Task-Decomposed AI-Aided Approach for Generative Conceptual Design,” *International Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*, p. V006T06A009.
- [17] Han, Y., Nanda, G., and Moghaddam, M., 2023, “Attribute-Sentiment-Guided Summarization of User Opinions From Online Reviews,” *Journal of Mechanical Design*, **145**(4), p. 41402.
- [18] Zhu, Q., Zhang, X., and Luo, J., 2023, “Biologically Inspired Design Concept Generation Using Generative Pre-Trained Transformers,” *Journal of Mechanical Design*, **145**(4), p. 41409.
- [19] Zhu, Q., and Luo, J., 2023, “Generative Transformers for Design Concept Generation,” *J Comput Inf Sci Eng*, **23**(4), p. 41003.
- [20] Spreafico, C., and Russo, D., 2016, “TRIZ Industrial Case Studies: A Critical Survey,” *Procedia CIRP*, **39**, pp. 51–56.
- [21] Silverstein, D., DeCarlo, N., and Slocum, M., 2008, “How to Achieve Competitive Excellence Using TRIZ,” NW: Taylor&Francis Group.
- [22] Li, Z., Tate, D., Lane, C., and Adams, C., 2012, “A Framework for Automatic TRIZ Level of Invention Estimation of Patents Using Natural Language Processing, Knowledge-Transfer and Patent Citation Metrics,” *Computer-aided design*, **44**(10), pp. 987–1010.
- [23] Berdyugina, D., and Cavallucci, D., 2023, “Automatic Extraction of Inventive Information out of Patent Texts in Support of Manufacturing Design Studies Using Natural Languages Processing,” *J Intell Manuf*, **34**(5), pp. 2495–2509.
- [24] Luo, J., 2022, “Data-Driven Innovation : What Is It?,” *IEEE Trans Eng Manag*, pp. 1–19.
- [25] Jiang, S., Sarica, S., Song, B., Hu, J., and Luo, J., 2022, “Patent Data for Engineering Design: A Critical Review and Future Directions,” *J Comput Inf Sci Eng*, **22**(6), p. 060902.
- [26] Nelson, M. D., Goenner, B. L., and Gale, B. K., 2023, “Utilizing ChatGPT to Assist CAD Design for

- Microfluidic Devices,” *Lab Chip*, **23**(17), pp. 3778–3784.
- [27] Stella, F., Della Santina, C., and Hughes, J., 2023, “How Can LLMs Transform the Robotic Design Process?,” *Nat Mach Intell*, pp. 1–4.
- [28] Li, A., Wu, J., and Bigham, J. P., 2023, “Using LLMs to Customize the UI of Webpages,” *Adjunct Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pp. 1–3.
- [29] Qiu, Y., and Jin, Y., 2023, “Document Understanding-Based Design Support: Application of Language Model for Design Knowledge Extraction,” *Journal of Mechanical Design*, **145**(12), p. 121401.
- [30] Huang, Z., Quan, K., Chan, J., and MacNeil, S., 2023, “CausalMapper: Challenging Designers to Think in Systems with Causal Maps and Large Language Model,” *Proceedings of the 15th Conference on Creativity and Cognition*, pp. 325–329.
- [31] Ding, Z., Srinivasan, A., MacNeil, S., and Chan, J., 2023, “Fluid Transformers and Creative Analogies: Exploring Large Language Models’ Capacity for Augmenting Cross-Domain Analogical Creativity,” *Proceedings of the 15th Conference on Creativity and Cognition*, pp. 489–505.
- [32] Ma, K., Grandi, D., McComb, C., and Goucher-Lambert, K., 2024, “Exploring the Capabilities of Large Language Models for Generating Diverse Design Solutions,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.02345.
- [33] Ma, K., Grandi, D., McComb, C., and Goucher-Lambert, K., 2023, “Conceptual Design Generation Using Large Language Models,” *International Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*, p. V006T06A021.
- [34] Tang, X., Zong, Y., Zhao, Y., Cohan, A., and Gerstein, M., 2023, “Struc-Bench: Are Large Language Models Really Good at Generating Complex Structured Data?,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08963.
- [35] Lewis, P., Perez, E., Piktus, A., Petroni, F., Karpukhin, V., Goyal, N., Küttler, H., Lewis, M., Yih, W., Rocktäschel, T., and others, 2020, “Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive Nlp Tasks,” *Adv Neural Inf Process Syst*, **33**, pp. 9459–9474.
- [36] Childs, P., 2013, *Mechanical Design Engineering Handbook*, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- [37] Orloff, M. A., 2006, *Inventive Thinking through TRIZ: A Practical Guide*, Springer Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [38] Orloff, M. A., 2012, *Modern TRIZ: A Practical Course with Easytriz Technology*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- [39] Savransky, S. D., 2000, *Engineering of Creativity: Introduction to TRIZ Methodology of Inventive Problem Solving*, CRC press.
- [40] Silverstein, D., DeCarlo, N., and Slocum, M., 2007, *Insourcing Innovation: How to Achieve Competitive Excellence Using TRIZ*, CRC Press.
- [41] Fey, V., and Rivin, E., 2005, *Innovation on Demand: New Product Development Using TRIZ*, Cambridge University Press.
- [42] Wang, X., Wei, J., Schuurmans, D., Le, Q., Chi, E., Narang, S., Chowdhery, A., and Zhou, D., 2023, “Self-Consistency Improves Chain of Thought Reasoning in Language Models,” *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, Kigali, Rwanda.
- [43] Zhang, X., Chen, F., Lu, C.-T., and Ramakrishnan, N., 2019, “Mitigating Uncertainty in Document Classification,” arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.07590.
- [44] Regenwetter, L., Srivastava, A., Gutfreund, D., and Ahmed, F., 2023, “Beyond Statistical Similarity: Rethinking Metrics for Deep Generative Models in Engineering Design,” *Computer-Aided Design*, **165**, p. 103609.
- [45] Ilevbare, I. M., Probert, D., and Phaal, R., 2013, “A Review of TRIZ, and Its Benefits and Challenges in Practice,” *Technovation*, **33**(2–3), pp. 30–37.
- [46] Yilmaz, S., Daly, S. R., Seifert, C. M., and Gonzalez, R., 2016, “Evidence-Based Design Heuristics for Idea Generation,” *Des Stud*, **46**, pp. 95–124.
- [47] Daly, S., Yilmaz, S., Christian, J. L., Seifert, C. M., and Richard Gonzalez, 2012, “Design Heuristics in Engineering Concept Generation,” *Journal of Engineering Education*, **101**(4), pp. 602–628.
- [48] Eberle, B., 1996, *Scamper on: Games for Imagination Development*, Prufrock Press Inc.
- [49] IDEO., 2003, *IDEO Method Cards: 51 Ways to Inspire Design*, William Stout.
- [50] Fu, K., Moreno, D., Yang, M., and Wood, K. L., 2014, “Bio-Inspired Design: An Overview Investigating Open Questions From the Broader Field of Design-by-Analogy,” *ASME Journal of Mechanical Design*, **136**(11, SI), p. 111102.
- [51] Jiang, S., Hu, J., Wood, K. L., and Luo, J., 2022, “Data-Driven Design-By-Analogy: State-of-the-Art and Future Directions,” *ASME Journal of Mechanical Design*, **144**(2), p. 020801.
- [52] Murphy, J., Fu, K., Otto, K., Yang, M., Jensen, D., and Wood, K., 2014, “Function Based Design-by-Analogy: A Functional Vector Approach to Analogical Search,” *ASME Journal of Mechanical Design*, **136**(10), p. 101102.
- [53] Hey, J., Linsey, J., Agogino, A. M., and Wood, K. L., 2008, “Analogies and Metaphors in Creative Design,” *International Journal of Engineering Education*, **24**(2), pp. 283–294.