
MULTI-OBJECTIVE OPTIMIZATION WITH DESIRABILITY AND MORRIS-MITCHELL CRITERION

AN EXPERIMENTAL ANALYSIS

A PREPRINT

Thomas Bartz-Beielstein 

Bartz & Bartz GmbH, 51643 Gummersbach, Germany

bartzbeielstein@gmail.com

Eva Bartz

Bartz & Bartz GmbH, 51643 Gummersbach, Germany

eva.bartz@bartzundbartz.de

Alexander Hinterleitner

Bartz & Bartz GmbH, 51643 Gummersbach, Germany

ahinterleitner@bartzundbartz.de

Christoph Leitenmeier

Everllence SE, Engineering Turbocharger, 86153 Augsburg, Germany

christoph.leitenmeier@everllence.com

Ihab Abd El Hussein

Everllence SE, Engineering Turbocharger, 86153 Augsburg, Germany

ihab.abd-el-hussein@everllence.com

December 29, 2025

ABSTRACT

Existing experimental designs in industry are often unplanned, biased, and lack optimal space-filling properties, making them unrepresentative of the input space. This article presents an approach to improve such designs by increasing coverage quality while simultaneously optimizing experimental results. We utilize the intensified Morris-Mitchell criterion (Φ^*), a size-invariant extension of the standard criterion, to quantify and improve input space coverage for existing designs. Using the Python package `spotdesirability`, we define a multi-objective desirability function that combines predictions from surrogate models (Random Forest) with the Morris-Mitchell improvement into

a single score. This approach is demonstrated using a case study from compressor development, optimizing two performance objectives alongside the space-filling criterion. The Python package `spotoptim` is used for the optimization, and infill-point plots are introduced to visualize the placement of new design points relative to existing ones. This methodology effectively balances the exploration-exploitation trade-off in multi-objective optimization.

Keywords desirability function • design of experiments • space-filling design • multi-objective optimization • surrogate modeling • Morris-Mitchell criterion • maximin criterion • sequential parameter optimization • infill-point plots

1 Introduction

For planned experiments, the design points, forming an experimental design X_p , can be chosen to optimally cover the input space. Depending on the model used, there are various approaches for this. Classical approaches are the optimality criteria used in Design of Experiments (DoE), which were developed for linear models (A-optimality, D-optimality, E-optimality, T-optimality). In the field of Design and Analysis of Computer Experiments (DACE), where models such as Kriging are used, space-filling designs have become established, which cover the input space uniformly (Santner, Williams, and Notz 2003). However, these optimality criteria are not directly applicable if already existing designs are available. In practice, results from unplanned, arbitrarily chosen designs, say X_u , that do not satisfy any optimality criteria are often already available. These designs are primarily based on the experience of the experimenters and usually cover only a small part of the input space and therefore do not meet the statistical optimality criteria. These designs are often biased, so that the results of the experiments are not representative of the input space. The question therefore arises as to how these designs can be improved to increase the quality of the coverage of the input space while simultaneously improving the results of the experiments.

We present an approach based on the Morris-Mitchell criterion Φ (Morris and Mitchell 1995). This criterion measures the distances between the design points in the input space to quantify the quality of the coverage of the input space. The criterion can be used to distribute the design points uniformly in the input space. However, Φ grows with the number of design points n , so that it is not directly applicable to existing designs. To address this issue, we use the extended version of the criterion that takes into account the number of design points (Bartz-Beielstein 2025b). This extended criterion is called intensified Morris-Mitchell criterion, denoted by Φ^* . In Section 4, we demonstrate how Φ^* can be used to improve the quality of the coverage of the input space. A comparison with the scaling properties of Φ shows that Φ^* is a more appropriate criterion for existing designs.

To demonstrate the applicability of our approach, we use a case study based on a problem from compressor development. In designs from industry, datasets (i.e., data rows = number of investigated designs) are always limited, yet statements should be made about all possible designs within the investigated input parameter space. The particular challenge is that individual input/output parameters often exhibit pronounced local minimum/maximum effects, so it is usually unclear whether this local design space has been discretized finely enough.

We define the multi-objective desirability function that combines the predictions from multiple surrogate models and the Morris-Mitchell improvement into a single desirability score. The problem used in the case study is a multi-objective optimization problem with nine different objectives. In practice, modeling using desirability functions is a common method to optimize multiple objectives simultaneously National Institute of Standards and Technology (2021). It was therefore natural to combine the intensified Morris-Mitchell criterion Φ^* with desirability functions to quantify the quality of the coverage of the input space and to distribute the design points uniformly in the input space as suggested by Bartz-Beielstein (2025b). Thus, a total of ten objectives are available that can be used in the case study. We limit ourselves here to the two objectives that have the greatest relevance in practice and add the third objective, the intensified Morris-Mitchell criterion Φ^* , as an additional objective, which is used to quantify the coverage of the search space and to distribute the design points uniformly in the input space.

This article demonstrates how to perform multi-objective optimization using `spotoptim`. We will optimize two target variables (y_1 and y_2) predicted by Random Forest models, while simultaneously maximizing the space-filling property of the design using the size-invariant Morris-Mitchell criterion (y_{mm}). To understand the impact of a new design point on existing design, we will use infill-point plots. As described in Bartz-Beielstein (2025b), infill-point plots visualize the location of new design points in the input space relatively to existing design points.

This article is structured as follows: Section 2 describes the dataset used in the case study. The surrogate models are described in Section 3. The Morris-Mitchell criterion is described in Section 4. Desirability functions are described in Section 5. Section 6 describes the multi-objective optimization approach. Section 7 describes the optimization without the Morris-Mitchell criterion, whereas Section 8 describes the optimization with the Morris-Mitchell criterion. This article concludes with presentation of the results and a discussion in Section 9.

2 The Dataset from Compressor Development

2.1 Data Loading and Preparation

The project is based on dimensionless characteristic numbers from various numerically executed compressor designs, which were collected in an industrial context. More than two hundred designs were available. Here, each row corresponds to a unique design, and each column to an individual variable. We consider independent input variables or features (equivalent to geometric parameters such as dimensions and angles) and several target variables or outputs (mainly resulting performance parameters). All data, i.e., input and target variables, are normalized to a range of [0,1].

The independent (feature) variables are stored in the CSV file `data/csv/df_x_normalized.csv`. The dependent (target) variables are stored in the CSV file `data/csv/df_z_normalized.csv`. For the nine target variables, the desirabilities for the optimal values shown in Table 1 are used. Two target variables are selected for the multi-objective optimization problem discussed in this article: the 8th and the first column (index 7 and 0, i.e., column z_8 and z_1) of the target data frame y . Therefore, we will use x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{27} as feature names and z_8 , and z_1 as target names. These desirabilities are derived from practical application and reflect the requirements for the target variables. Since the data are provided in the accompanied dataset, the reader can perform similar case studies with different target variables and desirabilities.

Table 1: Target variables and desirabilities

Index	Label	Desirability	Used
0	z_1	max	yes
1	z_2	max	
2	z_3	max	
3	z_4	max	
4	z_5	max	
5	z_6	0.5	
6	z_7	min	
7	z_8	max	yes
8	z_9	min	

The visualization of the Pareto front of the original data is performed using the function `plot_mo` from the software package `spotoptim`. This function creates a 2D visualization of the Pareto fronts for the target variable pairs. When viewing the Pareto front (Figure 1), points 4 and 13 stand out due to high z_8 values and could be classified as outliers. Since these are real-world data, stemming from existing designs, it is not clear whether these points are truly outliers or not. Thus, we did not remove these points. But further investigation of this data may be useful.




Figure 1: Pareto front of the original data. Both functions should be maximized

3 Surrogate Models

To accomplish the goal of this study, we will use surrogate models to predict the target variables. Based on these predictions, we will perform multi-objective optimization to determine the next infill point. This point will be proposed to the experimenter, who will evaluate it and provide the corresponding target values. Before performing these costly experiments, the information from the surrogate models will be used to estimate its quality. New in our approach is the use of desirability functions to estimate the quality of the next infill point in combination with the intensified Morris-Mitchell criterion.

We have selected two surrogate models for this study: a Random Forest Regressor and a Gaussian Process Regressor.

3.1 Random Forest Regressor

We use a Random Forest Regressor from `scikit-learn`. For the Random Forest Regressor we use the default parameters. Important parameters are the number of trees in the forest (`n_estimators`), the maximum depth of the trees (`max_depth`), and the random state for reproducibility (`random_state`). `RandomForestRegressor` models from `scikit-learn` can natively handle multiple-target problems, see the discussion in https://scikit-learn.org/stable/auto_examples/ensemble/plot_random_forest_regression_multioutput.html. So, we can alternatively train one single model for the two target variables `z8` and `z1`, or one multi-objective model for both variables. We have chosen the latter approach to guarantee compatibility with other algorithms which do not allow multi-target computations.

3.2 The Evaluation Function for Multiple Models

The function `mo_eval_models()` from the `spotoptim` package is used to evaluate multiple models for multi-output regression. The data set is split into training and test sets, where `X_train` and `y_train` are used for training the models, and `X_test` and `y_test` are used for evaluation. The `test_size` parameter defines the proportion of the data used for testing. It is set to 0.3 here.

Figure 2 and Figure 3 show the predictions for the target variables `z8` and `z1` of the random forest surrogate model compared to the original data. The Pareto fronts of the predictions and the original data are shown in Figure 4. From Figure 7 we can conclude that the surrogate-model based approach is able to “rediscover” the original Pareto front.




Figure 2: Predictions for z8 of the multi-objective RF model compared to the original data




Figure 3: Predictions for z1 of the multi-objective RF model compared to the original data




Figure 4: Pareto front of the Random Forest surrogate model predictions and the original Pareto front (with possible outliers)

3.3 Gaussian Process Regressor

To enable multi-output regression for Gaussian Process models (similar to Random Forest), we fit a separate GP (optionally with Nystroem kernel approximation) for each target variable and stack the predictions. Similar to the visual analysis of the Random Forest model, we can plot the predictions for both target variables z_8 and z_1 , which are shown in Figure 5 and Figure 6, respectively.




Figure 5: Predictions for z_8 of the multi-objective GP model compared to the original data




Figure 6: Predictions for z_1 of the multi-objective GP model compared to the original data

The Pareto fronts of the predictions of the Gaussian Process model and the original data are displayed in Figure 7.




Figure 7: Pareto front of the Gaussian Process model predictions

3.4 Cross-validation comparison of the models

Because the evaluation on the train-test-split data is not a good indicator for the generalization performance of the models, a cross-validated comparison of the Random Forest and Gaussian Process models is shown in the appendix (Section 10.1). The cross-validated comparison shows that the Random Forest model outperforms the Gaussian Process

model and generates more robust solutions. In addition, the Random Forest model is also much faster to train. Therefore, we decided to use the Random Forest model for the further analysis.

4 An extended Morris-Mitchell criterion

The Morris-Mitchell criterion describes the quality of an experimental design based on the distances between sample points. It aims to maximize the minimum distance between any two points in the design (Morris and Mitchell 1995). This ensures that no two points are too close to each other, which promotes better coverage. The Morris-Mitchell criterion is widely used in various fields, including:

- Global sensitivity analysis: For creating sampling designs to estimate sensitivity indices that quantify the influence of individual input variables on the model response.
- Uncertainty quantification: For generating samples to propagate uncertainties in input variables through the model and assess the resulting uncertainty in the output.
- Experimental design: For constructing experimental designs that efficiently explore the design space and provide reliable information about system behavior.

Small values of the Morris-Mitchell criterion indicate a better design. We use the implementation of the Morris-Mitchell criterion from the `spotoptim` package, which provides the function `mmphi()`, which is based on the discussion in Forrester, Sóbester, and Keane (2008).

Figure 8 visualizes a design of industrial data with $n=213$ sample points. It shows a scatter plot of the normalized input variables x_2 and x_4 . This visualization was presented by the industrial partner to illustrate the problem with non-space-filling designs. Experimenters proceed with great caution to avoid machine failure or unfeasible settings that result in unpredictable system behavior. The design does not exhibit good space-filling properties, as there are clusters of points and large empty regions. For comparison, Figure 9 shows an optimized space-filling design with the same number of points ($n=213$). This design was computed using the Morris-Mitchell criterion, which is used as an objective function in an optimization algorithm. The `best1h()` function searches for a sampling design that maximizes the criterion, resulting in a well-distributed set of sample points.




Figure 8: Design of Industrial Data. Typical clusters and “lanes” are visible. These data have a relatively high Morris-Mitchell value.




Figure 9: Optimized design. Same design size as in the industrial data.

4.1 The Standard Morris-Mitchell Criterion

The Morris-Mitchell criterion is a widely used criterion for evaluating the space-filling properties of a sampling plan (also known as a design of experiments). It combines the concept of maximizing the minimum distance between points with minimizing the number of pairs of points separated by that distance. The standard Morris-Mitchell criterion, Φ_q , is defined as:

$$\Phi_q = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m J_i d_i^{-q} \right)^{1/q}$$

where:

- $d_1 < d_2 < \dots < d_m$ are the distinct distances between all pairs of points in the sampling plan.
- J_i is the number of pairs of points separated by the distance d_i .
- q is a large positive integer (e.g., $q = 2, 5, 10, \dots$).

As $q \rightarrow \infty$, minimizing Φ_q is equivalent to maximizing the minimum distance d_1 , and then minimizing the number of pairs J_1 at that distance, and so on.

4.2 The Size-Invariant (Intensive) Criterion

One limitation of the standard Φ_q is that its value depends on the number of points in the sampling plan. This makes it difficult to compare the quality of sampling plans with different sample sizes. To address this, we can use a size-invariant or intensive version of the criterion. This is achieved by normalizing the sum by the total number of pairs, $M = \binom{n}{2} = \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$. The intensive criterion is defined as:

$$\Phi_{q,\text{intensive}} = \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^m J_i d_i^{-q} \right)^{1/q}$$

This normalization allows for a fairer comparison between designs of different sizes. A lower value still indicates a better space-filling property.

4.2.1 Using `mmphi_intensive` in `spotoptim`

The `spotoptim` library provides the `mmphi_intensive` function to calculate this criterion.

Example 4.1 (Example Usage of `mmphi_intensive`). We create a simple 3-point sampling plan in 2D and calculate the intensive space-fillingness criterion with $q=2$, using Euclidean distances ($p=2$).

```
X3 = np.array([
    [0.0, 0.0],
    [0.5, 0.5],
    [1.0, 1.0]
])
quality, J, d = mmphi_intensive(X3, q=2, p=2)
print(f"Quality (Phi_q_intensive): {quality}")
print(f"Multiplicities (J): {J}")
print(f"Distinct Distances (d): {d}")
```

```
Quality (Phi_q_intensive): 1.224744871391589
Multiplicities (J): [2 1]
Distinct Distances (d): [0.70710678 1.41421356]
```

The returned `quality` is the $\Phi_{q,\text{intensive}}$ value. Lower is better. The array `J` contains the multiplicities for each distinct distance, and `d` contains the distinct distances found in the design. There are three points, resulting in three distances, d_{12} , d_{13} , and d_{23} . The smallest distance is $d_{12} = d_{23}$, and it occurs twice, so $J_1 = 2$. The largest distance is d_{13} , and it occurs once, so $J_2 = 1$.

The intensified Morris-Mitchell criterion is particularly useful when we are optimizing the sample size itself, or when comparing designs from different literature sources that use different n .

4.3 Efficient Updates with `mmphi_intensive_update`

When constructing a design sequentially (e.g., adding one point at a time), recalculating the full distance matrix and criterion from scratch can be inefficient. The `mmphi_intensive_update` function from the `spotoptim` package allows updating the criterion efficiently by only computing distances between the new point and the existing points.

Example 4.2 (Example Usage of `mmphi_intensive_update`). Assume we have the state from the previous example: `X`, `quality`, `J`, `d`, and we want to add a new point.

```
new_point = np.array([0.1, 0.1])
new_quality, new_J, new_d = mmphi_intensive_update(X3, new_point, J, d, q=2, p=2)
print(f"Updated Quality: {new_quality}")
```

```
Updated Quality: 3.115613474919968
```

The function `mmphi_intensive_update` returns the updated criterion, multiplicities, and distinct distances, which can be used for the next update step.

Figure 10 shows the results of the Morris-Mitchell criterion and the extended criterion versus the number of samples (n) for Latin Hypercube Sampling (LHS) designs in a 2-dimensional space. It was generated with the function `plot_mmphi_vs_n_lhs` from the `spotoptim` package. Figure 10 shows that the Morris-Mitchell criterion, Φ , is sensitive to the number of samples, while the extended criterion, Φ^* , is less sensitive to the number of samples. The former raises from 50 to 300, while the extended criterion raises only from 2.5 to 4.5, i.e., the extended criterion is less sensitive to the number of samples n .




Figure 10: Morris-Mitchell criterion and extended criterion vs. number of samples (n) for LHS designs. Note the different scales of the y-axes.

4.3.1 Determination of the Morris-Mitchell Criterion

First, calculate the quality of the current design X_u , which contains the entire compressor dataset, using the Morris-Mitchell criterion Φ_q^* . The initial design has a value of $\Phi_q^* \approx 136$, which is used as a reference for the optimization. Figure 11 shows the Morris-Mitchell criterion versus the number of added points. Randomized points are added to the entire dataset. By adding ten random points, the Morris-Mitchell criterion decreases to $\Phi_q^* \approx 130$.




Figure 11: Morris-Mitchell criterion vs. number of added points. Randomized points are added to the entire dataset, which results in a decrease of the criterion.

In contrast to the previous example, the Morris-Mitchell criterion is calculated for a planned and optimimized experimental design, i.e., random points are added to an existing design X_p , which is nearly optimal. Figure 12 shows the values of the Morris-Mitchell criterion Φ_q^* after adding random points to the existing design X_p . Here, the Morris-Mitchell criterion increases from $\Phi_q^* \approx 0.41$ to $\Phi_q^* \approx 0.43$ after adding 10 random points.




Figure 12: Morris-Mitchell criterion vs. number of added points. Randomized points are added to an LHD, which results in an increase of the criterion.

If a “good point” is added to a “bad design”, the Morris-Mitchell value is reduced, so that the difference between the Morris-Mitchell value of the current design and the Morris-Mitchell value of the design with the added point is positive and should be maximized. This was illustrated in Figure 11. Otherwise, if a “bad point” is added to a “good design”, the Morris-Mitchell value is slightly increased, as illustrated in Figure 12.

5 Desirability functions

The “National Institute of Standards and Technology/SEMATECH e-Handbook of Statistical Methods” describes desirability functions as follows:

Desirability functions are among the most commonly used methods in industry for optimizing processes with multiple objectives. This approach is based on the idea that the “quality” of a product or process with multiple quality characteristics is unacceptable if one of these characteristics falls outside certain “desired” limits. The method determines operating conditions that provide the “most desirable” target values (National Institute of Standards and Technology 2021).

The desirability function approach for simultaneous optimization of multiple equations was originally proposed by Harrington (1965). Essentially, the approach consists of transforming the functions to a common scale ([0, 1]), combining them using the geometric mean, and optimizing the overall criterion. The equations can represent model predictions or other equations (Kuhn 2016), (Bartz-Beielstein 2025a). Desirability functions are popular, for example, in response surface methodology Myers, Montgomery, and Anderson-Cook (2016) as a method for simultaneously optimizing a series of quadratic models. A response surface experiment can use measurements on a series of outcomes. Instead of optimizing each outcome separately, settings for the predictor variables are sought to satisfy all outcomes simultaneously. Also in drug discovery, prediction models can be created to relate the molecular structures of compounds to properties of interest (e.g., absorption properties, efficacy, and selectivity for the intended target). Given a set of prediction models built using existing compounds, predictions can be made about a large set of virtual compounds that have been designed but not necessarily synthesized. Using the model predictions, a virtual compound can be evaluated based on how well the model results match the required properties. In this case, ranking compounds based on multiple endpoints may be sufficient to meet the scientist’s needs.

Originally, Harrington used exponential functions to quantify desirability. We will use the simple discontinuous functions of Derringer and Suich (1980). Suppose there are R equations or functions to be optimized simultaneously, denoted as $f_r(\vec{x})$ ($r = 1 \dots R$). For each of the R functions, an individual “desirability” function is created that is high when $f_r(\vec{x})$ is at the desired level (e.g., a maximum, minimum, or target), and low when $f_r(\vec{x})$ has an undesirable value. Derringer and Suich (1980) proposed three forms of these functions corresponding to the type of optimization objective. For maximizing $f_r(\vec{x})$, the function

$$d_r^{max} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } f_r(\vec{x}) < A \\ \left(\frac{f_r(\vec{x})-A}{B-A}\right)^s & \text{if } A \leq f_r(\vec{x}) \leq B \\ 1 & \text{if } f_r(\vec{x}) > B \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

can be used, where A , B , and s are chosen by the investigator. If the equation is to be minimized, they proposed the function

$$d_r^{min} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } f_r(\vec{x}) > B \\ \left(\frac{f_r(\vec{x})-B}{A-B}\right)^s & \text{if } A \leq f_r(\vec{x}) \leq B \\ 1 & \text{if } f_r(\vec{x}) < A \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

and for “target-is-best” situations

$$d_r^{target} = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{f_r(\vec{x})-A}{t_0-A}\right)^{s_1} & \text{if } A \leq f_r(\vec{x}) \leq t_0 \\ \left(\frac{f_r(\vec{x})-B}{t_0-B}\right)^{s_2} & \text{if } t_0 \leq f_r(\vec{x}) \leq B \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

These functions are on the same scale and are discontinuous at the points A , B , and t_0 . The values of s , s_1 , or s_2 can be chosen so that the desirability criterion is easier or more difficult to satisfy:

- For example, if s in Equation 2 is chosen to be less than 1, d_r^{Min} is close to 1 even if the model $f_r(\vec{x})$ is not low.
- As the values of s move closer to 0, the desirability reflected by Equation 2 becomes higher.
- Similarly, values of s greater than 1 will make it more difficult to satisfy d_r^{Min} in terms of desirability.

These scaling factors are useful when one equation is more important than the others. It should be noted that any function can be used to reflect the desirability of a model.

We are using the implementation of Bartz-Beielstein (2025b), which is based on the original implementation in R of Kuhn (2016). The desirability package (Kuhn 2016), which is written in the statistical programming language R, contains S3 classes for multivariate optimization using the desirability function approach of Harrington (1965) with functional forms described by Derringer and Suich (1980). It is available on CRAN, see <https://cran.r-project.org/package=desirability>. A newer version, the desirability2 package, improves on the original desirability package by enabling in-line computations that can be used with dplyr pipelines (Kuhn 2025). It is also available on CRAN, see <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/desirability2/index.html>.

6 Optimization

6.1 Simulating the Ground-Truth

Because only a limited number of data points are available in practice, a surrogate model is used to simulate the ground truth. This allows to evaluate the objective function at any point in the design space and to generate as many synthetic data points as desired. As discussed in Section 3, the random forest model showed the best performance. Therefore, the random forest model, fitted on the entire dataset is used as the ground truth. Using a fit on the entire dataset is feasible here, because we want to use the complete information available and we are not testing the performance of the surrogate model.

The objective function evaluation is performed using a surrogate model trained on the entire dataset (X and y). Since we are considering two-objectives, $z8$ and $z1$, two separate random forest models are trained, one for each target variable: $z8_ground_rf$ and $z1_ground_rf$ ¹.

¹As mentioned above, alternatively one random forest model could be trained for both target variables.

6.2 Search Boundaries

The search space should be extended by 10%. However, in this case, we are handling normalized data, so the boundaries remain unchanged. Alternatively, the boundaries could be set to $[-0.1, 1.1]$ for each feature, which corresponds to a 10% extension in both directions beyond the normalized range of $[0, 1]$. In our experiment, we use the normalized range of $[0, 1]$ for the search space.

7 The Multi-Objective Case: Combining the two Objectives z_8 and z_1 without Morris-Mitchell

As the first objective function maximizing the first target variable, z_8 , is used. The second objective is given by the z_1 target variable. In general, if x denotes a k -dimensional input vector and $f_i(x)$ is the objective function for the i -th target variable that we want to maximize:

$$x^* = \arg \max_{x \in X} f_i(x), i = 1, \dots, p.$$

If $p = 2$, we are facing a bi-objective problem. Using a desirability function, the p criteria are combined to obtain an overall desirability z . The optimizer uses the desirability z as a combination of the p objective functions for the search:

$$z = D_{\text{overall}}(f_1(x), \dots, f_p(x)). \quad (4)$$

7.1 Determination of Desirabilities for Target Variables

For the desirability ranges, i.e., the intervals in which the desirabilities are greater than zero, the boundaries z_{min} and z_{max} are used. We first determine the boundaries for the target variable z_8 , which is to be maximized. There are several ways of setting the boundaries for the desirability functions. For example, we can set the lower boundary to 90% of the maximum value and the upper boundary to 110% of the maximum value. In our case, where the data is normalized, this results in $z_8_{\text{min}} = 0.9$ and $z_8_{\text{max}} = 1.1$.

We do not choose this approach, because it results in a large, flat (plateau-like) desirability function, which makes optimization difficult. Instead, we use the shape parameters of the desirability functions to adjust the steepness of the desirability functions. Therefore, we can use the actual minimum and maximum values of the target variables to set the boundaries for the desirability functions. The maximum is extended by 10% to allow for better optimization. Summarizing, we determine the boundaries as follows: low = 0.0, high = 1.1. Furthermore, we will use the scale $s = 5$ for the desirability functions.

Figure 13 shows the histogram of the target variable z_8 with the boundaries for the desirability indicated as dashed lines. The boundaries for the target variable z_1 , which is also to be maximized, are set to identical values as for z_8 . Figure 14 shows the histogram of the target variable z_1 with the boundaries for the desirability indicated as dashed lines.




Figure 13: Histogram of Target Variable with Desirability Bounds




Figure 14: Histogram of Target Variable with Desirability Bounds

The desirabilities defined for maximization can be parameterized in two ways:

- Via the “support”, i.e., via the interval in which the desirability is greater than zero. This is given in Equation 1 by the parameters A and B .
- Via the “steepness”, i.e., via the parameter s in Equation 1. Here we have chosen $[5, 5]$, which pushes the desirability functions to be more steep.

We have two target variables, z_8 and z_1 , each with its own desirability function. They are visualized in Figure 15 and Figure 16.




Figure 15: First desirability function for target variable z_8




Figure 16: Second desirability function for target variable z1

The optimizer uses the desirability z as a combination of the two objective functions for the search, i.e., $z = D_{\text{overall}}(f_1(x), f_2(x))$. Using the `DOverall` function from the `spotdesirability` package, the two desirabilities are combined into a single overall desirability. The combined desirability is then used in the optimization process.

7.2 Using the Combined Desirability in Multi-Objective Optimization

In Section 8, we will use the Morris-Mitchell criterion as an additional objective in multi-objective optimization. Here, we first consider the case without the Morris-Mitchell criterion, which allows us a comparison with the case including the Morris-Mitchell criterion. That is, we optimize the combined desirability of the two target variables $z8$ and $z1$. The argument `mm_objective=False` indicates that the Morris-Mitchell criterion is not considered as an additional objective. It will be considered in Section 8. After running the multi-objective optimization, we can calculate the best target function values for $z8$ and $z1$ (here: `y_best_z8_z1`), i.e., the best predicted values from multiobjective optimization of $z8$ and $z1$, the best input values for $z8$ and $z1$ (here: `best_x_z8_z1`), and the best desirability (here: `best_desirability_z8_z1`), i.e., the best desirability from multiobjective optimization of $z8$ and $z1$. Figure 17 shows the Pareto front of the original data and the optimized point `y_best_z8_z1` (shown in “red”) for the multi-dimensional case ($z8$ versus $z1$). We can also add the `callback_values`, i.e., the values of the desirability function at each iteration, to the plot. This is shown in Figure 18.

```
Input values of the best point (z8 + z1):
[0.39548891 0.2975602 0.47146286 0.91560323 0.97752799 0.95076821
 0.0417576 0.73545255 0.09873861 0.2034151 0.78476783 0.449791
 0.2049879 0.5464364 0.32869122 0.69458953 0.11339255 0.58536107
 0.0961439 0.46809015 0.14596973 0.96919353 0.92669816 0.43049546
 0.58234219 0.74364316 0.66257321]
Best desirability (z8 + z1): 0.4937
Target values of the best point (z8 + z1): [[0.91851207 0.99333333]]
```




Figure 17: Pareto front of the original data and the optimized data for the multi-dimensional case (z_8 vs. z_1)




Figure 18: Pareto front of the original data and the optimized data for the multi-dimensional case (z_8 vs. z_1)

8 The Morris-Mitchell Criterion as an Additional Objective

By including the improvement of the search space coverage, the reduction of the value of the Morris-Mitchell criterion y_{mm} is added as the $p + 1$ st target variable to existing multi-objective optimization problems with p target variables, which should be maximized.

Let

$$f_3(x) = \Phi^*(X^+) - \Phi^*(X), \text{ where } X^+ = X \cup \{x\} \text{ and } X \text{ is the current search space.}$$

This is in our case ($p = 2$) the third objective function to be maximized, and it represents the improvement in the intensified Morris-Mitchell criterion when adding the new point x to the existing design X_u . Using a desirability function, the three criteria are combined to obtain an overall desirability.

8.1 Determination of Desirability for the Morris-Mitchell Criterion

We start with the calculation of the quality of the current design X_u , which contains the entire dataset X , using the Morris-Mitchell criterion. This criterion is used as a baseline to evaluate the quality of the design.

```
mmpfi_base (known design): 136.33458506472726
```

If another point is added, the Morris-Mitchell value is reduced so that the difference between the Morris-Mitchell value of the current design and the Morris-Mitchell value of the design with the added point is positive and should be maximized. In our case, we have chosen a relative reduction between 0.1% and 2.5%. The minimal and maximal values for the desirability function of the Morris-Mitchell criterion are therefore set as follows:

```
mmpfi_min: 0.13633458506472726, mmpfi_max: 3.408364626618182
```

Next, we combine the minimal and maximal values for the Morris-Mitchell criterion with the minimal and maximal values for the z_8 and z_1 criteria and generate, as above, the overall-desirability function.

```
target z8: min: 0.0, max: 1.1, scale: 5
target z1: min: 0.0, max: 1.1, scale: 5
target mm: min: 0.13633458506472726, max: 3.408364626618182, scale: 5
```

The desirability functions for the target variables z_8 and z_1 were already shown in Figure 15 and Figure 16, respectively. Figure 19 shows the third desirability function for the Morris-Mitchell criterion.




Figure 19: Third desirability function (Morris-Mitchell criterion)

8.2 Optimization with Three Objectives

Now we have three desirability functions that are combined into an overall desirability function `overallD`. We can consider the optimization including the Morris-Mitchell criterion as an additional objective. Running optimization for

`z8, z1 and MM with mo_mm_desirability_function and mm_objective=True. By setting verbose=True in the function mo_mm_desirability_optimizer, the Morris-Mitchell values during optimization can be printed.`

```
Best point (z8 + z1 + MM): [0.28027716 0.29456943 0.03756832 0.93531449 0.80759415 0.79445252
0.0271186 0.58218244 0.65496983 0.77059285 0.63064058 0.74832165
0.55140013 0.30511244 0.50696361 0.37962069 0.02204829 0.51947151
0.17594492 0.10209916 0.14336522 0.65657562 0.36430724 0.71812427
0.53752024 0.65782437 0.00540104]
Best Desirability (z8 + z1 + MM): 0.1998
y_best (z8, z1): [[0.88213699 0.97166667 1.89376328]]
```

Similar to the results in Section 7, we get the best point for z_8 and z_1 , its desirability and the corresponding target values for z_8 and z_1 . There are three combinations of the Morris-Mitchell criterion with z_8 and z_1 , i.e., we can plot the Pareto front for z_8 vs. z_1 , z_8 vs. mm and z_1 vs. mm :

- Figure 20 shows the Pareto front of the original data and the optimized data for the multi-dimensional case (z_8 vs. z_1) with Morris-Mitchell criterion. The best point is colored in “red”.
- In addition to the plot of Pareto front of the original data and the optimized data for the multi-dimensional case (z_8 vs. z_1) with MM, the Pareto front of the optimized data for the multi-dimensional case (z_8 vs. mm) is plotted. In this case, no original data is available, since the Morris-Mitchell criterion is only calculated for the optimized points. Figure 21 shows the Pareto front of the optimized data for the multi-dimensional case (z_8 vs. mm).
- In addition to the plot of Pareto front of the original data and the optimized data for the multi-dimensional case (z_8 vs. mm), the Pareto front of the optimized data for the multi-dimensional case (z_1 vs. mm) is plotted. Figure 22 shows the Pareto front of the optimized data for the multi-dimensional case (z_1 vs. mm).




Figure 20: Pareto front of the original data and the optimized data for the multi-dimensional case (z_8 vs. z_1) with MM




Figure 21: Pareto front of the optimized data for the multi-dimensional case (z8 vs. mm). For the original data, no mm values are available.




Figure 22: Pareto front of the optimized data for the multi-dimensional case (z1 vs. mm). For the original data, no mm values are available.

9 Results and Discussion

The two case studies show how to determine the next design point for a given, unplanned design space X_u . A surrogate model was trained on the existing data from the original design space X_u and used to predict promising infill points. This is a standard approach in surrogate-model based optimization (Forrester, Sóbester, and Keane 2008). Similar to the expected improvement criterion, which balances the trade-off between exploration and exploitation, the Morris-Mitchell criterion can be used to determine the next design point. The Morris-Mitchell criterion balances the trade-off between good design points and the space-fillingness of the updated design space $X_u \cup x$.

To investigate the impact of adding the Morris-Mitchell criterion to the optimization, we compare the Pareto front of the original data and the optimized data for the multi-dimensional case (z8 vs. z1) with Morris-Mitchell criterion to the Pareto front of the original data and the optimized data for the multi-dimensional case (z8 vs. z1) without Morris-Mitchell criterion. This comparison reveals no significant difference in the optimization with and without Morris-Mitchell criterion, which gives rise to two considerations.

- On the one hand, it should be noted that the underlying dataset was already extensively optimized manually and therefore already represents the Pareto front and optimum quite well.
- On the other hand, it would be interesting to repeat this study with a significantly reduced dataset that does not contain the already existing optima. This would help answer whether the current Pareto front and optimum would still be found under such conditions.

A benefit of adding the Morris-Mitchell criterion to the classical multi-objective optimization is that it considers the space-fillingness of the updated design space $X_u \cup x$.

We claim that the results of this optimization can give the practitioner valuable information where to place the next design point. As an additional diagnostic, we generate infill-point histograms (ip-histograms) and infill-point boxplots (ip-boxplots) to visualize the distribution of the existing data points and the newly suggested best point in the context of the existing data.

9.1 Infill-point Diagnostics

Infill-point diagnostic plots were introduced by Bartz-Beielstein (2025b) as comprehensive tools to visualize the location of the newly suggested best point in the context of the existing data. In the following figures, the best points from the optimization with (red) and without (blue) Morris-Mitchell criterion are visualized.

Considering the first input variable, x_1 , in Figure 23, we can see that a reduction of its value is recommended. Including the Morris-Mitchell criterion, the best value is $x_1 \approx 0.3$, whereas the optimization without Morris-Mitchell criterion leads to $x_1 \approx 0.4$. For x_2 , both optimization result in the same recommendation ($x_2 \approx 0.3$). Figure 24 uses the same data as Figure 23 but shows histograms instead of boxplots.




Figure 23: Boxplots with the new setting with mm (red) and without mm (blue)




Figure 24: Histograms with the new setting with mm (red) and without mm (blue). Histogram plotted in red indicate a small number of distinct values.

Finally, we reconsider the initial motivation of this study: the clustered design space X_u as shown in Figure 8. Figure 25 shows the updated design space $X_u \cup x$, i.e., the location of the newly suggested best point in the context of the existing data.




Figure 25: Updated Design. Original data is marked in grey (as shown above). The newly suggested best point using Morris-Mitchell criterion is marked in red. The best point without Morris-Mitchell criterion is marked in blue.

9.2 Improvement of the Morris-Mitchell Criterion by Adding Points

Comparing the results from the two studies (optimization with Morris-Mitchell criterion and without Morris-Mitchell criterion), one might conclude that the Morris-Mitchell criterion has only a minor effect on the outcome. For a further analysis, we consider in this section the Morris-Mitchell criterion for different numbers of added points.

Figure 11 shows the values of the intensified Morris-Mitchell criterion, Φ^* versus the number of added points. We can see from this figure, that by adding ten points to the existing design, the Morris-Mitchell criterion reduced from approximatively 136 to 130, indicating an improvement in the space-filling property of the design.

```
mmpfi_base (known design): 136.33458506472726
mmpfi_base extended with 10 random points: 130.20722225113013
```

This reduction in the Φ^* value motivated the usage of the Morris-Mitchell criterion as an additional objective in the optimization. If this reduction is large, a better design is found. But how large can this reduction be? Is it a good indicator for an multi-objective optimization algorithm? Instead of adding several points to the existing design, we can also consider adding one point several times and compare the results.

Now we consider updating the Morris-Mitchell criterion by adding ten times one point instead of adding all ten points at once, which can be referred to as “single-point injection”. This allows us to see the effect of adding each point individually on the Morris-Mitchell criterion. Note, not the same point is added several times, but different points, each randomly generated. Adding a random point to the existing design reduces the Morris-Mitchell criterion by approximatively 0.64, no matter, which point is injected. This indicates that adding any random point improves the Φ^* value by a similar value. There is nearly no variance in adding different random points, because all random points approach the maximum possible improvement in the intensified Morris-Mitchell criterion.

The reason is that the existing points are not very well distributed in the design space, so that adding any random point improves the space-filling property of the design significantly.

To analyze this effect further, we inject points that are close to existing points. Now we consider updating the Morris-Mitchell criterion by adding ten times one point that is close to existing points instead of adding random points that are not close to the existing design. This allows us to see the effect of adding each point individually on the Morris-Mitchell criterion. We add small noise to the existing points to create new points that are close to the existing points, but its distance to the existing points is modified by the noise added. Figure 26 reveals some interesting insights. Points close to the existing design improve the Morris-Mitchell criterion only by a small amount, but the variance is higher than for random points. By moving further away from the existing design, the improvement increases and reaches its maximum at 0.64. This value is identical to the improvement of randomly added points as discussed above.




Figure 26: Effect of Noise (Sigma) on Morris-Mitchell Improvement. Higher noise (sigma) values generate infill points that are further away from existing points.

We will consider the following steps to further improve the approach presented in this paper:

- Expected Improvement (EI) is a well-known criterion used in Bayesian optimization to improve the quality of the coverage of the input space (Forrester, Sóbester, and Keane 2008). It is based on statistical assumptions and uses the variance of the model to quantify the uncertainty of the predictions. EI can be used to improve the quality of the coverage of the input space by combining the uncertainty in the experimental space and improvement of the results for proposing the next design point. Although EI requires certain model assumptions that are not always met in practice, it might be worth looking at an EI-based approach.
- Hyperparameter tuning should be applied to the model to improve the quality of the predictions.
- To avoid problems with local optima, it is useful to perform restarts. Although we did not use restarts in our experiment, we recommend its generation in the context of extending unplanned industrial designs X_u . The set of restart points can be generated using the Latin Hypercube Sampling (LHS) algorithm in combination with the Morris-Mitchell criterion.

9.3 Summary

The surrogate-model based approach in combination with desirability and the Morris-Mitchell criterion generates results that can easily be understood and used by practitioners. Infill-point diagnostics can guide the user during the search for the next design point given an unplanned design. The contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- *Intensified Morris-Mitchell Criterion:* Introduction of a new criterion for measuring the quality of infill points based on the Morris-Mitchell criterion.
- *Desirability Functions:* Application of multi-objective optimization using desirability functions, which yield easily interpretable results.
- *Infill-Point Diagnostics:* Development of new visualization tools, termed “infill-point diagnostics,” utilizing boxplots and histograms.

10 Appendix

10.1 Cross-Validated Comparison of the Models

```
Cross-validating target 1/2...
Cross-validating target 2/2...
CV Scores Mean:
  NMSE: ['-0.01', '-0.02']
  NMAE: ['-0.05', '-0.07']
{'NMSE': [array([-0.02544725, -0.01070213, -0.00615892, -0.00200423, -0.00515429,
-0.00184124, -0.0018364, -0.00016535, -0.00606084, -0.01767685]),
array([-5.68432765e-02, -5.42990530e-02, -1.92291667e-03, -7.03432540e-03,
-1.21242295e-01, -3.93197751e-03, -3.86904762e-06, -2.97619048e-07,
-4.19973545e-06, -4.07076720e-05])],
 'NMAE': [array([-0.14088838, -0.07975433, -0.06261109, -0.04021204, -0.04006683,
-0.02364017, -0.01617348, -0.0057511, -0.06246796, -0.05003097]),
array([-2.02689394e-01, -1.00833333e-01, -2.98484848e-02, -5.73015873e-02,
-2.76626984e-01, -3.64682540e-02, -5.95238095e-04, -1.19047619e-04,
-9.12698413e-04, -3.29365079e-03])]}
```



```
Cross-validating target 1/2...
Cross-validating target 2/2...
CV Scores Mean:
  NMSE: ['-0.01', '-0.10']
  NMAE: ['-0.05', '-0.14']
{'NMSE': [array([-0.00475374, -0.01147077, -0.00359219, -0.00212195, -0.00228756,
-0.00241933, -0.00137747, -0.00100189, -0.00498646, -0.01932792]),
array([-1.73456423e-01, -4.48058293e-02, -1.63886746e-02, -3.05684754e-02,
-6.09002507e-01, -1.31982699e-02, -2.01402696e-04, -6.88187784e-05,
-8.45869809e-02, -8.68199106e-04])],
 'NMAE': [array([-0.05689746, -0.08698482, -0.04246295, -0.03898255, -0.03110178,
-0.02985872, -0.02870363, -0.0244118, -0.05694898, -0.05781126]),
array([-0.35512687, -0.13219135, -0.08506782, -0.12089055, -0.56614646,
-0.05669851, -0.01118955, -0.00712298, -0.04476572, -0.02620163])]}
```

Target	Model	Metric	Mean	Std	Min	Max
z8	Random Forest	MSE	0.0077	0.0077	0.0002	0.0254
z8	Gaussian Process	MSE	0.0053	0.0055	0.001	0.0193
z8	Random Forest	MAE	0.0522	0.0366	0.0058	0.1409
z8	Gaussian Process	MAE	0.0454	0.0183	0.0244	0.087
z1	Random Forest	MSE	0.0245	0.0386	0	0.1212
z1	Gaussian Process	MSE	0.0973	0.178	0.0001	0.609
z1	Random Forest	MAE	0.0709	0.0911	0.0001	0.2766
z1	Gaussian Process	MAE	0.1405	0.1716	0.0071	0.5661




Figure 27: Cross-validated comparison of Random Forest and Gaussian Process models (MSE and MAE). Smaller values are better.

Bartz-Beielstein, Thomas. 2025a. "Surrogate Model-Based Multi-Objective Optimization Using Desirability Functions." In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion*, 2458–65. GECCO '25 Companion. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3712255.373433> 1.

———. 2025b. "Multi-Objective Optimization and Hyperparameter Tuning With Desirability Functions." *arXiv e-Prints*, March, arXiv:2503.23595. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2503.23595>.

Box, G. E. P., and K. B. Wilson. 1951. "On the Experimental Attainment of Optimum Conditions." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* 13 (1): 1–45.

Derringer, G., and R. Suich. 1980. "Simultaneous Optimization of Several Response Variables." *Journal of Quality Technology* 12: 214–19.

Forrester, Alexander, András Sóbester, and Andy Keane. 2008. *Engineering Design via Surrogate Modelling*. Wiley.

Harington, J. 1965. "The Desirability Function." *Industrial Quality Control* 21: 494–98.

Kuhn, Max. 2016. "Desirability: Function Optimization and Ranking via Desirability Functions." https://doi.org/10.32614/CRA_N.package.desirability.

———. 2025. "Desirability2: Desirability Functions for Multiparameter Optimization." https://doi.org/10.32614/CRA_N.package.desirability2.

Morris, Max D., and Toby J. Mitchell. 1995. "Exploratory Designs for Computational Experiments." *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 43 (3): 381–402. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3758\(94\)00035-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3758(94)00035-T).

Myers, Raymond H, Douglas C Montgomery, and Christine M Anderson-Cook. 2016. *Response Surface Methodology: Process and Product Optimization Using Designed Experiments*. John Wiley & Sons.

National Institute of Standards and Technology, ed. 2021. "NIST/SEMATECH e-Handbook of Statistical Methods." <https://doi.org/10.18434/M32189>.

Santner, T J, B J Williams, and W I Notz. 2003. *The Design and Analysis of Computer Experiments*. Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer.