



Universiteit  
Leiden

The Netherlands

## Efficient constraint multi-objective optimization with applications in ship design

Winter, R. de

### Citation

Winter, R. de. (2024, October 8). *Efficient constraint multi-objective optimization with applications in ship design*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4094606>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4094606>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

# Efficient Constraint Multi-Objective Optimization with Applications in Ship Design

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van  
de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,  
op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr.ir. H. Bijl,  
volgens besluit van het college voor promoties  
te verdedigen op dinsdag 8 oktober 2024  
klokke 16.00 uur

door

**Roy de Winter**

geboren te Nisse, Nederland

in 1994

Promotor:

Prof.dr. T.H.W. Bäck

Co-promotor:

Dr. N. van Stein

Promotiecommissie:

Prof.dr. M.M. Bonsangue

Prof.dr. A. Plaat

Dr. H. Wang

Dr. Y. Fan

Prof.dr. K. Deb

(Michigan State University, USA)

Prof.dr. C.A.C. Coello

(National Polytechnic Institute, Mexico)

Copyright © 2024 Roy de Winter      All rights reserved.

This dissertation was made possible through the support of C-Job Naval Architects which provided me with a full-time research and development position, thereby facilitating my research and studies as a guest PhD candidate at the Leiden Institute Of Advanced Computer Science, Leiden University. This arrangement was essential in enabling the completion of my doctoral studies without grant funding.

Cover by: Jelle van de Ridder    [www.jellevanderidder.com/](http://www.jellevanderidder.com/)

# Contents

|          |                                                                |           |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>                                            | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1      | Research Questions . . . . .                                   | 3         |
| 1.2      | Outline . . . . .                                              | 3         |
| 1.3      | Publications of this thesis . . . . .                          | 4         |
| 1.4      | Other Work by the Author . . . . .                             | 5         |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Preliminaries</b>                                           | <b>7</b>  |
| 2.1      | Acronyms . . . . .                                             | 7         |
| 2.1.1    | Optimization Acronyms . . . . .                                | 7         |
| 2.1.2    | Ship Design Acronyms . . . . .                                 | 8         |
| 2.2      | Problem Notations . . . . .                                    | 8         |
| 2.2.1    | Pareto Optimal Solutions . . . . .                             | 10        |
| 2.3      | Expensive Black Box Optimization . . . . .                     | 11        |
| 2.3.1    | Design of Experiments . . . . .                                | 11        |
| 2.3.2    | Surrogate Models . . . . .                                     | 12        |
| 2.3.3    | Local Search Methodologies For Surrogate Exploration . . . . . | 17        |
| 2.4      | Benchmark Test Functions . . . . .                             | 18        |
| 2.5      | Algorithm Performance Metrics . . . . .                        | 19        |
| 2.5.1    | Multi-Objective Performance Metrics . . . . .                  | 19        |
| 2.5.2    | Optimization Result Visualizations . . . . .                   | 21        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Ship Design Problem Characteristics</b>                     | <b>29</b> |
| 3.1      | Introduction . . . . .                                         | 29        |
| 3.1.1    | Empirical Design Method . . . . .                              | 31        |
| 3.1.2    | Simulated Design Method . . . . .                              | 31        |
| 3.1.3    | Radical Design Choices . . . . .                               | 32        |

## Contents

---

|          |                                                                                    |           |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 3.2      | Holistic Ship Design Optimization . . . . .                                        | 32        |
| 3.2.1    | Ship Design and Evaluation Software . . . . .                                      | 33        |
| 3.2.2    | Optimization Problem Definition Guidelines . . . . .                               | 37        |
| 3.2.3    | Optimization Framework . . . . .                                                   | 39        |
| 3.3      | Illustrative Ship Design Optimization Problem . . . . .                            | 39        |
| 3.3.1    | Parametric Geometry . . . . .                                                      | 40        |
| 3.3.2    | Ship Design Constraints . . . . .                                                  | 42        |
| 3.3.3    | Ship Design Objectives . . . . .                                                   | 45        |
| 3.3.4    | Optimization of Ship Design Problem . . . . .                                      | 46        |
| 3.4      | Conclusions and Future Work . . . . .                                              | 46        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Empirical Design Optimization Approach</b>                                      | <b>49</b> |
| 4.1      | Introduction . . . . .                                                             | 50        |
| 4.2      | Data Description for Reference Studies . . . . .                                   | 50        |
| 4.2.1    | Visualizations . . . . .                                                           | 51        |
| 4.2.2    | Data Pre-processing . . . . .                                                      | 52        |
| 4.3      | New Empirical Design Methodology . . . . .                                         | 54        |
| 4.3.1    | Setup Design Challenge . . . . .                                                   | 54        |
| 4.3.2    | Random Forest Regression . . . . .                                                 | 55        |
| 4.3.3    | Isolation Forest . . . . .                                                         | 56        |
| 4.3.4    | Design Problem Optimization . . . . .                                              | 57        |
| 4.4      | Empirical Design Experiments . . . . .                                             | 58        |
| 4.4.1    | Random Forest Regression Experiment . . . . .                                      | 58        |
| 4.4.2    | Isolation Forest Experiment . . . . .                                              | 60        |
| 4.4.3    | NSGA-II Experiment . . . . .                                                       | 60        |
| 4.5      | Discussion . . . . .                                                               | 62        |
| 4.6      | Conclusion and Future Work . . . . .                                               | 63        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Multi Objective Simulation Based Optimization</b>                               | <b>65</b> |
| 5.1      | Constraint Multi-Objective Optimization . . . . .                                  | 66        |
| 5.1.1    | Related Work . . . . .                                                             | 67        |
| 5.1.2    | SAMO-COBRA . . . . .                                                               | 69        |
| 5.1.3    | Multi-Objective Optimization Experiments . . . . .                                 | 75        |
| 5.1.4    | Results . . . . .                                                                  | 77        |
| 5.1.5    | Discussion $\mathcal{P}_{hv}$ vs. $\mathcal{S}$ -metric Infill Criterion . . . . . | 81        |
| 5.1.6    | Conclusion and Future Work on Multi-Objective Optimization                         | 82        |
| 5.2      | Parallel Multi-Objective Optimization . . . . .                                    | 83        |

|          |                                                                 |            |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 5.2.1    | Related Work . . . . .                                          | 85         |
| 5.2.2    | Multi-Point Acquisition function . . . . .                      | 88         |
| 5.2.3    | Multi-Point Acquisition Function Experiments . . . . .          | 92         |
| 5.2.4    | Results . . . . .                                               | 93         |
| 5.2.5    | Discussion on Parallelization . . . . .                         | 97         |
| 5.2.6    | Conclusion and Future Work on Parallel Optimization . . . . .   | 98         |
| 5.3      | Expensive and Inexpensive Function Optimization . . . . .       | 99         |
| 5.3.1    | Related Work . . . . .                                          | 100        |
| 5.3.2    | Inexpensive Function Exploitation . . . . .                     | 102        |
| 5.3.3    | IOC-SAMO-COBRA Experiments . . . . .                            | 104        |
| 5.3.4    | Results . . . . .                                               | 105        |
| 5.3.5    | Discussion of inexpensive function use . . . . .                | 112        |
| 5.3.6    | Conclusion and Future Work on Inexpensive Function Exploitation | 113        |
| 5.4      | Overall Conclusions and Future Work . . . . .                   | 114        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Real World Applications</b>                                  | <b>115</b> |
| 6.1      | Trailing Suction Hopper Dredger . . . . .                       | 115        |
| 6.1.1    | Results of Trailing Suction Hopper Dredger Design Experiment    | 116        |
| 6.1.2    | Analysis of the TSHD Results . . . . .                          | 116        |
| 6.1.3    | Conclusion from Trailing Suction Hopper Dredger Study . . . . . | 117        |
| 6.2      | Wind Feeder Vessel . . . . .                                    | 118        |
| 6.2.1    | Results of Wind Feeder Design Experiment . . . . .              | 120        |
| 6.2.2    | Analysis of Wind Feeder Optimization Results . . . . .          | 122        |
| 6.2.3    | Conclusion for Wind Feeder Vessel . . . . .                     | 122        |
| 6.3      | Single Hold Cargo Ship Damage Stability Optimization . . . . .  | 122        |
| 6.3.1    | Results of Cargo Vessel Design Experiment . . . . .             | 124        |
| 6.3.2    | Analysis of Cargo Vessel Design Results . . . . .               | 125        |
| 6.3.3    | Conclusion Cargo Vessel . . . . .                               | 126        |
| 6.4      | Roll-on/Roll-off Ferry Hull Optimization . . . . .              | 126        |
| 6.4.1    | Results of Ferry Hull Optimization Experiment . . . . .         | 128        |
| 6.4.2    | Analysis of Ferry Hull Results . . . . .                        | 128        |
| 6.4.3    | Conclusion on Ferry Hull Optimization . . . . .                 | 130        |
| 6.5      | Bulb Optimization Problem . . . . .                             | 131        |
| 6.5.1    | Results of Bulb Design Experiment . . . . .                     | 132        |
| 6.5.2    | Analysis of Bulb Design Results . . . . .                       | 133        |
| 6.5.3    | Conclusion on Bulb Optimization . . . . .                       | 133        |

## Contents

---

|          |                                                               |            |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 6.6      | Real World Optimization Conclusions and Future Work . . . . . | 134        |
| <b>7</b> | <b>Conclusions and Future Work</b>                            | <b>135</b> |
| 7.1      | Summary . . . . .                                             | 135        |
| 7.2      | Conclusions . . . . .                                         | 137        |
| 7.3      | Future Work . . . . .                                         | 138        |
| <b>A</b> | <b>Appendix</b>                                               | <b>139</b> |
| A.1      | Empirical Attainment Difference Functions . . . . .           | 139        |
| <b>B</b> | <b>Appendix</b>                                               | <b>147</b> |
| B.1      | Expensive Single Objective Optimization . . . . .             | 147        |
| B.2      | Modular Optimization Framework . . . . .                      | 147        |
| B.2.1    | Input parameters . . . . .                                    | 147        |
| B.2.2    | Design of Experiments . . . . .                               | 148        |
| B.2.3    | Evaluation of the solutions . . . . .                         | 149        |
| B.2.4    | Radial Basis Functions . . . . .                              | 151        |
| B.2.5    | Acquisition Function Optimization . . . . .                   | 151        |
| B.3      | Experiments . . . . .                                         | 152        |
| B.3.1    | G-Problem experimental setup . . . . .                        | 152        |
| B.4      | Results . . . . .                                             | 154        |
| B.5      | Conclusion and Future Work . . . . .                          | 155        |
|          | <b>Bibliography</b>                                           | <b>157</b> |
|          | <b>Summary</b>                                                | <b>173</b> |
|          | <b>Samenvatting</b>                                           | <b>175</b> |
|          | <b>Acknowledgements</b>                                       | <b>177</b> |
|          | <b>About the Author</b>                                       | <b>179</b> |