

**Zeitschrift:** IABSE reports = Rapports AIPC = IVBH Berichte  
**Band:** 68 (1993)  
  
**Artikel:** AI and new computational models of design  
**Autor:** Gero, John S.  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-51839>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 05.09.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

## AI and New Computational Models of Design

Intelligence artificielle et nouveaux modèles de calcul  
KI und neue Berechnungsmodelle im Entwerfen

### John S. GERO

Prof. of Design Science  
Univ. of Sydney  
Sydney, Australia



John Gero holds degrees in eng., building science and architecture. He has been visiting professor at universities in the USA, UK and France. His current research is in artificial intelligence in design.

### SUMMARY

This paper very briefly reviews the state-of-the-art in the application of artificial intelligence in design before describing ten research and development areas which support new computational models of design. Two new computational models are introduced. The first case-based design is founded on the concept that it is possible to reason from specific precedents (called cases) rather than computing new results using compiled knowledge. The second creative design, introduces the notion of expanding the space of possible designs through various computational constructs.

### RÉSUMÉ

Après un résumé succinct de l'état actuel de la technique d'application de l'intelligence artificielle dans le domaine des projets, l'auteur décrit dix secteurs de la recherche et du développement assistés par de nouveaux modèles de calcul, dont deux font l'objet d'explications détaillées: projets rapportés au cas spécifique et projets créatifs. Le premier modèle se base sur le concept qu'il est possible d'opérer des déductions à partir de cas spécifiques précédents, sans devoir calculer de nouvelles solutions à partir de la banque de données. Le deuxième modèle repose sur l'idée que le domaine des projets possibles est extensible par diverses phases de calcul d'élaboration.

### ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Nach einem kurzen Ueberblick über den Stand der Technik in der Anwendung künstlicher Intelligenz im Entwerfen werden zehn Gebiete beschrieben, die in Forschung oder Entwicklung neue Berechnungsmodelle unterstützen. Auf zwei davon wird näher eingegangen: fallbezogenes und kreatives Entwerfen. Ersteres basiert auf dem Konzept, dass von spezifischen vorangegangenen Fällen geschlossen werden kann, ohne neue Lösung aufgrund der Datenbank zu berechnen. Das zweite Modell, kreatives Entwerfen, beruht auf der These, dass der Bereich möglicher Entwürfe durch unterschiedliche rechnerische Aufbauschritte erweiterbar ist.



## 1. INTRODUCTION

Among a nation's goals are competitive leadership in the international marketplace and excellence in industrial productivity. Superior design, a fundamental prerequisite for superior products and systems, is one of the important keys to achieving these goals. Computer-aided design has the potential to provide access to this key.

The early work on computer-aided design fell into two distinct and disparate groupings. The first was concerned with analysis methods embodied in computer programs. This has resulted in today's finite element method techniques and programs. The finite element method is, nowadays, a mature technology. The second was concerned with graphics, commencing with Ivan Sutherland's SKETCHPAD. For a long time this form of graphics led researchers to concentrate on data structures to support graphical image making. Later, the emphasis shifted away from graphical image making to the representation of models of objects leading researchers to concentrate on models and data structures for geometric modelling.

This work was and continues to be based on particular paradigms of the roles of the computer in the design process. In the work characterised by the finite element method the paradigm assumes that a sufficient representation can be encoded to allow analysis to be automated. In the work characterised by geometric modelling the paradigm assumes that the representation is the problem since the analysis is left to the designer. Neither of these is based on a paradigm which gives the computer a more active role in the entire process of designing.

From the beginning of the 1980s there has been a burgeoning interest in understanding and using approaches drawn from artificial intelligence. These approaches are often couched under such labels as information technology, knowledge-based systems, expert systems and so on. What they all have in common is the move from using the computer with algebraic models and numerical values for the variables in those models to symbolic models and symbolic values for the variables in those models. Along with the move to the use of knowledge-based systems has come an increasing interest in expanding the role of computers and redefining computer-aided design in the service of design.

## 2. STATE-OF-THE-ART

During the 1980s computational approaches to the provision of design assistance were researched and developed using the knowledge-based view of design with its concomitant computational machinery derived from artificial intelligence. Although a wide variety of techniques and methods have been used most of them addressed one of the following categories:

- (i) representation of designed objects
  - (ii) analysis of designed objects
  - (iii) diagnosis of faults in designed objects
  - (iv) synthesis of designs
- 
- (i) *Representation of designed objects*—the object-oriented paradigm in which both data and methods are encapsulated has provided new ways of conceiving how to represent designed objects. Artificial intelligence concepts have allowed the possibility of representing and then reasoning about non-numeric features of a designed object.
  - (ii) *Analysis of designed objects*—analysis plays a pivotal role in design. New analysis processed using artificial intelligence approaches have been developed; for example the checking of a design against government design codes and codes of practice, where these contain requirements couched in logical rather than numerical terms.
  - (iii) *Diagnosis of faults in designed objects*—new model-based systems are now being used to diagnose design faults. Many of these are an outgrowth of diagnostic expert systems developed for use in medicine.

- (iv) *Synthesis of designs*—formation processes based on such strategies as decomposition, design grammars and symbolic optimization are available for use in the synthesis of designs. In some domains such as VLSI design considerable effort has been expended in automating or semi-automating these synthesis processes.

All of this work has one over-arching view in common. Namely, that the systems operate within the context of routine design.

*Routine design* can be defined as that class of design activity where everything about the design process is known a priori. The variables as well as the processes, i.e. the knowledge, needed to find values for those variables are known a priori. This concept of routine design is analogous to but is not meant to model an experienced human designer tackling a well-known task. Routine design is often equated with parametric design but it has a larger ambit. There is a large body of research and development with a smaller number of applications in this area. *Concurrent design*, which can be considered within the ambit of routine design, is attracting increasing attention. It aims to incorporate knowledge about processes downstream of design into the decision-making in design. The primary focus here is to include buildability and manufacturability into the design process.

The knowledge-based tools being developed often end up automating some design task. However, there is remarkably little work which addresses the difficult problems associated with such areas as conceptual or non-routine design and collaborative design. It might be said that knowledge-based approaches to design have so far concentrated on areas which are relatively well understood in computational terms. In order to obtain a quantum increase in design quality and performance increasing research effort will, in the future, have to be put into other areas.

### 3. RESEARCH AND NEW COMPUTATIONAL MODELS OF DESIGN

New computational models of design based on the artificial intelligence paradigm make use of the fundamental concepts of:

- symbolic variables
- separation of knowledge from control
- symbolic reasoning

Ten of the most significant research areas supporting these new design models will be briefly described before elaborating two models in more detail.

#### (i) *Representation in Design*

A fundamental problem for artificial intelligence and design remains the one of representation. What is it that a designer knows and how does it get represented in a computer? There are two disparate kinds of knowledge of interest here: that concerned with design processes and that concerned with the artefact as it is being designed. Even if there is no concern with what a human designer knows there is still the question of what knowledge a computational model of design needs and how to represent it.

Knowledge-based design has moved from being treated as a knowledge-lean problem to being treated as a knowledge-rich problem. Thus, increasing amounts of knowledge need to be formalised, structured and represented. Three kinds of knowledge need to be represented:

- case knowledge (episodes or precedents)
- generalised or compiled knowledge (derived from cases)
- first principles knowledge

#### (ii) *Design Semantics*

Two issues are mentioned here. The first issue is the coding-decoding problem. How does a system decode a representation that has been altered after it has been coded or if the representation is being decoded in a different context. One important aspect of design is the shifting context it creates for its own activities. Such changes in context offer the opportunity for *emergence*—where an interpretation



of the semantics of a representation is made which is different to that explicitly made in the representation. The second issue concerns how do you represent in an explicit and manipulable form the intentions, purposes or functions of the intended artefact in such a manner that they can be used. This has important implications for data exchange between designers and for data exchange standards.

*(iii) Reasoning in Design*

Much of the reasoning machinery brought across from artificial intelligence has been concerned with monotonic logics, with consistency maintenance and with resolving conflicting constraints. These reasoning processes have been developed for a static world. The design world by its very nature is not static and the appropriate reasoning mode is abductive (i.e. what could be) rather than deductive (i.e. what must be). It is common in design to maintain inconsistent beliefs for a time and to resolve conflicting constraints by designing them away.

*(iv) Combinatorial Explosion in Design*

Abductive reasoning brings with it the very real likelihood of combinatorial explosion of potential inferences. As soon as a system deals with what could be rather than what must be it could go on indefinitely. Constraint propagation, planning and heuristics are common ways of addressing combinatorial explosion. However, alternate approaches based on evaluating the satisfaction of solutions or solution directions are likely to be more useful in design.

*(v) Indexing in Design*

Design occurs in a knowledge-rich and knowledge-intensive environment. However, the more knowledge that is coded into the system the harder it is to find what is useful. Much design knowledge can be placed into one of the three categories of: cases (episodes or precedences), generalised knowledge based on cases and first principles knowledge. When and how to index these still remains a difficult question to answer.

*(vi) Dynamic Modification—Learning in Design*

In design synthesis, unlike in fields which rely exclusively on deductive processes, obtaining the same solution each time for the same problem is considered a failure of design. Designers learn from doing design and learn from their own and other's designs. This learning results in a dynamic modification of both the knowledge and knowledge structures used to represent the knowledge. Understanding this dynamic modification is still a question yet to be adequately answered.

*(vii) Situation Recognition in Design*

An important research area for artificial intelligence in design is how to produce systems capable of recognising situations at a semantic (strategic) level rather than simply at the syntactical (tactical) level. Much of the interest in non-routine design lies in the emergence of newly recognised situations, situations which were not produced intentionally but by extension.

*(viii) Collaborative Design*

Designers rarely work alone, design has become so complex an activity that many specialist designers are involved. How to provide real-time computational support to improve collaboration between individuals in a design team has become a critical issue. Ideas from distributed artificial intelligence provide useful starting points but fundamental issues remain.

*(ix) Non-Routine or Creative Design*

Design and creativity are often treated synonymously by many people. Clear definitional distinctions have been drawn between routine and non-routine design with the acceptance that not all design is creative. Basic questions remain: are there principles of creativity; are there creative processes; what kind of computational support can be provided in a non-routine design context?



#### (x) *Evaluation in Design*

The evaluation processes in design include not only the evaluation of the a priori defined technical performance of the designed artefact but an assessment of emerging performance as well as the assessment of its socio-ethical value. This latter aspect currently eludes any formal description. However, these issues need to be addressed.

### 4. NEW COMPUTATIONAL MODELS OF DESIGN

A number of new computational models of design using artificial intelligence concepts are under development. Two of these will be described here.

#### 4.1 Case-Based Design

Case-based reasoning is a well-defined paradigm in artificial intelligence. It is based on the premise that humans reason from specific experiences rather than by following a set of general guidelines. For example, reasoning from precedents is one of the basic methodologies in law. Case-based reasoning relates a current situation to the closest most specific experience in memory and uses that experience to solve the problem at hand. It is thus a memory-based approach rather than a computation approach, whereby solutions to problems already solved need only be retrieved rather than computed again. The key factors in case-based reasoning are the storage of cases as complete patterns of experiences including the reasoning process, the ability to be reminded of the most appropriate case and the application of that case to the current situation. Application of the case may either be a direct application if the current situation and that of the case match exactly, or there may be a need for some modification of the case. This modification may be of various degrees of severity. Case-based reasoning uses the strategies of *modification* and *repair* to effect such modifications. New cases are thus produced either as variations on the previous case or, in extreme situations, as new cases if considerable modification took place. Case-based reasoning thus incorporates a learning capacity in the form of new cases being incorporated into a dynamic case base.

Searching for a case is based on indexing cases with regards to various factors, e.g. goals and attributes. The more efficient the indexing, the more efficient the search. Retrieval is a matter of pattern matching, i.e. matching a required pattern of requirements to an existing set. This match may be exact or partial. In the case of partial matches, some criteria are required to determine the 'best' partial match. Matches may be made to parts of several cases and a new case results from combining elements from these cases, if consistency is satisfied.

The processes involved in case-based design are search, match, retrieve, select, modify, repair and store.

*Search.* Given a problem description of requirements including functions to be achieved, required behaviour performances, the design environment and even constraints on values of structure variables, the case base must be searched to find an appropriate design case. The utility of case-based designing is strongly dependent on the efficiency of the search procedure. Searching could be sequential, parallel or direct using an indexing mechanism. Indexing must be done on the function, behaviour, structure and context features.

*Match.* An appropriate case for consideration is found with regards to the matching of above mentioned features. Perfect matching, i.e. where the required features are found exactly in a case, is unusual. Partial matching occurs when some of the features are matched or the features are matched to some degree.

*Retrieve.* A case which matches to some defined degree needs to be retrieved for consideration. This may or may not involve display of these cases to the users for perusal and consideration.

*Select.* A selection of a single case as the basis for determining the design solution has to be made. Alternatively, if only part of a design case is required, then several design cases may require to be selected, and the necessary parts of each extracted. In either situation, the 'best' matching design case



should be selected. Selection of the 'best' design case can be on the basis of the most similar or the most useful match. Selection can be carried out by the system or by users after consideration of an appropriate set of candidates retrieved by the system. Selection by the system based on partial matching entails such factors as the importance of the features matched as well as how close they are matched.

*Modify.* Where a design case is selected which does not match the design requirements sufficiently, some modifications will be necessary. This may involve the replacement of variables with other variables or simply the alteration of some values of variables.


*Repair.* In many situations, a modification to an existing design case based on substitution of variables or modification of values will cause some performance failure in some other behaviour or function. For example, decreasing the cross-sectional area of a column to satisfy some new spatial requirement may cause buckling. Other modifications may be considered but none may be satisfactory. One of two directions now needs to be taken. Either an alternative design case is selected based on the new information known regarding the necessity for modifications and the effects of modifications or the current selected design case is modified in such a way as to make it acceptable. This latter process is known as the process of *repair* in case-based reasoning.

*Store.* After a design case has been modified or repaired, a new design case has been generated. If this new design case is considered to be sufficiently important as a design experience different to existing design cases, then it must be stored in the case base with appropriate indexing. Where the failure of solutions is seen as an important piece of information to the anticipation of future problems, this must be noted in the design case.

## 4.2 Non-Routine or Creative Design


*Non-routine design* or *creative design* can be defined as that class of design activity when all the variables which define the structure and behaviour are not known a priori nor necessarily are all the processes needed to produce them. The implication of this conceptualisation of non-routine design is that the focus is on processes for the introduction of new variables into the design and their integration into the existing variable structure. It is suggested that this is one basis for the production of potentially creative designs.

For a given set of variables and processes operating within a bounded context any model will construct a bounded state space. Creative design can be represented in such a state space by a change in the state space. Routine design does not change the state space, it simply searches within it. There are two classes of change to the state space possible: addition and substitution. The *additive class of state space change* is represented in Figure 1 where the new state space,  $S_n$ , totally contains the original state space,  $S_o$ . The implication of the additive class of state space change is that new variables are added to the existing stock of variables.



**Figure 1.** The change in state space due to the addition of new variables.

The *substitutive class of state space change* is represented in Figure 2 where the new state space,  $S_n$ , does not cover the original state space,  $S_o$ . The implication of the substitutive class of state space change is that some (or in the extreme case all) of the existing variables are deleted and new ones are added to the remaining stock of variables.



**Figure 2.** The change in the state space due to the substitution of new variables.

Whilst the additive and substitutive classes of state space change have been presented as if the variables being used are structure or behaviour variables only, this need not be the case. Modifications to the knowledge structures and to the contents of knowledge structures fall into these classes also and have the potential to be part of the creative process. For example, take a rule-based system for the production of a design. A design is produced by a defined sequence of executions of the rules, i.e. the plan or control, for a given set of rules. Concern with determining which is the best plan for the given rules places that endeavour in the realm of routine design. However, if there is a process for modifying the rules themselves within the planning process then it is possible to produce designs with behaviours or structures outside the original state spaces. Computational systems which exploit this concept are now being developed.

Such computational systems make use of a variety of processes, chief amongst them are the following:

- (i) combination
  - (ii) mutation
  - (iii) analogy
  - (iv) first principles
  - (v) emergence
- (i) *Combination*—as a creative design process combination involves the addition of components from two separate designs. This combination is expressed in terms of the addition of variables. One common computational model for carrying out this combination is based on modelling the design process as a genetic algorithm. Here the genetic process of cross-over is the analog of combination. Novel designs can be produced this way.
  - (ii) *Mutation*—as a creative design process mutation involves a modification to an existing design variable to produce a new design variable. Typical mutation operators include the algebraic and set theoretic operators. Thus, division, for example, divides a single variable into two like variables. Such an operation can affect the resultant topology of the artefact. Mutation is also a process in genetic algorithms.
  - (iii) *Analogy*—analogy is defined as the product of a process in which specific coherent aspects of the conceptual structure of one design are matched with and transferred to another design. Based on the nature of the knowledge transferred to the new design, analogical reasoning





processes can be placed into one of the two classes of transformational analogy or derivational analogy. Transformational analogy adapts the structure of a previous design to be useful in the present design. Derivational analogy applies the design process used in a previous design to the production of the current design. The effect of transformational analogy is the introduction of new variables into the current design.

- (iv) *First principles*—first principles relies on causal, qualitative or computational knowledge used abductively to relate intentions (functions) to behaviour and behaviour to structure without the use of compiled knowledge. Design using first principles is the least developed of the processes described so far.
- (v) *Emergence*—emergence is the process whereby extensional properties of a design are recognised beyond its intentional ones, i.e. properties which were not intentionally explicit are recognised and made explicit. Computational models of emergence are only now being developed concentrating on shape emergence.

These two models of design—case-based design and creative design—are developments founded on concepts from artificial intelligence which have allowed an expansion of the possible roles of computers in the design process. This is the beginning of a redefinition of computer-aided design.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, D. and Chandrasekaran, B. (1989). *Design Problem Solving: Knowledge Structures and Control Strategies*, Morgan Kaufmann, San Mateo, CA.
- Coyne, R. D., Rosenman, M. A., Radford, A. D., Balachandran, M. and Gero, J. S. (1990). *Knowledge-Based Design Systems*, Addison-Wesley, Reading.
- Gero, J. S. (ed.) (1991). *Artificial Intelligence in Design '91*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
- Gero, J. S. (ed.) (1992). *Artificial Intelligence in Design '92*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Gero, J. S. and Maher, M. L. (eds) (1992). *Modeling Creativity and Knowledge-Based Creative Design*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Green, M. (ed.) (1992). *Knowledge Aided Design*, Academic Press, London.
- Tong, C. and Sriram, D. (eds) (1992). *Artificial Intelligence in Engineering Design, Vols I and II*, Academic Press, Boston.
- Rychener, M. (ed.) (1988). *Expert Systems for Engineering Design*, Academic Press, San Diego.