

LLM2FEA: Discover Novel Designs with Generative Evolutionary Multitasking

Melvin Wong¹, Jiao Liu¹, Thiago Rios², Stefan Menzel², Yew Soon Ong^{1,3}

¹College of Computing & Data Science (CCDS), Nanyang Technological University (NTU), Singapore

²Honda Research Institute Europe (HRI-EU), Offenbach am Main, Germany

³Centre for Frontier AI Research (CFAR), Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR), Singapore

{wong1357, jiao.liu, asysong}@ntu.edu.sg, {thiago.rios, stefan.menzel}@honda-ri.de

Abstract—The rapid research and development of generative artificial intelligence has enabled the generation of high-quality images, text, and 3D models from text prompts. This advancement impels an inquiry into whether these models can be leveraged to create digital artifacts for both creative and engineering applications. Drawing on innovative designs from other domains may be one answer to this question, much like the historical practice of “bionics”, where humans have sought inspiration from nature’s exemplary designs. This raises the intriguing possibility of using generative models to simultaneously tackle design tasks across multiple domains, facilitating cross-domain learning and resulting in a series of innovative design solutions. In this paper, we propose LLM2FEA as the first attempt to discover novel designs in generative models by transferring knowledge across multiple domains. By utilizing a multi-factorial evolutionary algorithm (MFEA) to drive a large language model, LLM2FEA integrates knowledge from various fields to generate prompts that guide the generative model in discovering novel and practical objects. Experimental results in the context of 3D aerodynamic design verify the discovery capabilities of the proposed LLM2FEA. The designs generated by LLM2FEA not only satisfy practicality requirements to a certain degree but also feature novel and aesthetically pleasing shapes, demonstrating the potential applications of LLM2FEA in discovery tasks.

Index Terms—Large Language Model, Generative AI, LLM Evolutionary Optimizers, Evolutionary Multitasking, text-to-3D, Creative Design, Design Discovery, Multi-Prompt Optimization

I. INTRODUCTION

With the rapid advancement of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), a diverse array of models has emerged to perform a broad spectrum of tasks [1]. Large language models (LLMs), for instance, are employed in applications such as conversational agents and question-answering systems [2]. Additionally, text-to-image and text-to-3D models are leveraged to generate images and three-dimensional shapes from textual prompts [3]–[5]. The remarkable generative capabilities of these models have not only profoundly impacted the field of artificial intelligence but have also showcased strong potential to other domains, such as engineering design in traditional industrial sectors, including automotive and aerospace [6], [7]. In this paper, we mainly focus on applying GenAI in conceptual design.

GenAI offers several advantages in the domain of engineering conceptual design, which we here exemplarily introduce

for aerodynamic design. Traditionally, aerodynamic design involves parameterizing the shape of an object, such as a car or an airplane, followed by optimizing the parameterized shape using a combination of physical simulators and black-box optimizers, such as Bayesian optimization [8] and evolutionary algorithms [9]. This process aims to obtain an aerodynamic shape with the optimal performance on one or several specific engineering indicator(s) and requirements. However, the current limitations of black-box optimizers in handling high-dimensional parameters [10] and the structured constraints implicit in the shape of the object often restrict designers to using a limited number of parameters [7]. As a result, modifications are typically confined to local adjustments on an existing, mature shape, thus impeding substantial alterations to the design. The introduction of generative models has transformed this approach. For instance, text-to-3D models [9], [11] can generate complex and diverse three-dimensional shapes from simple textual prompts. This capability enables engineers to explore and refine aerodynamic designs by iteratively adjusting the input prompts and recording high-quality 3D shapes generated by the model. This method facilitates a more flexible and expansive approach to aerodynamic design, allowing for significant modifications to the shape of the object beyond the constraints of traditional parameterization techniques. Notably, two prominent studies have explored and demonstrated the effectiveness of this approach in aerodynamic design [6], [12].

Existing research highlights the substantial potential of GenAI in the domain of engineering design. However, most studies predominantly focus on achieving optimal designs based on predetermined engineering criteria. In this paper, we propose to extend the exploration of generative models beyond conventional applications. We aim to leverage these models not only to generate standard and specific designs that meet predetermined engineering criteria but also to discover novel designs that integrate both visual and practical elements, a concept known as novelty search [13]. Historically, many innovative designs have drawn inspiration from nature’s exemplary creations, a practice referred to as “bionics” [14]. This historical precedent motivates us to explore whether generative models can simultaneously tackle design tasks across multiple domains, thereby facilitating cross-domain learning and resulting in a series of innovative design solutions.

Based on the above considerations, we propose an LLM-driven Multi-Factorial Evolutionary Algorithm (LLM2FEA) as the first attempt to discover novel designs by transferring knowledge across multiple design domains. LLM2FEA is predicated on the observation that the choice of prompts significantly influences the outputs of generative models. We hypothesize that generative models can be guided to produce unexpectedly innovative designs by providing creatively designed prompts. In essence, LLM2FEA can be considered an ensemble of three primary components, each serving a specific purpose as outlined below:

- *Shape Generation Component*: This component is designed to generate specific shapes using a generative model. We employ a text-to-3D model for this task. The text-to-3D model generates a complete 3D shape that aligns with user expectations by providing an appropriate text prompt. Importantly, these models have the potential to synthesize novel 3D content based on creative text prompts that incorporate cross-domain information, thereby facilitating the discovery of innovative designs.
- *LLM-based Prompt Generation Component*: In recent years, LLMs have demonstrated remarkable natural language processing capabilities, profoundly impressing researchers and practitioners alike. The extensive knowledge embedded within LLMs makes them powerful tools for generating coherent and high-quality text prompts. Moreover, as highlighted in [15], the phenomenon of hallucination in LLMs is not always detrimental; it can also foster positive creativity. Based on these considerations, we employ an LLM to generate reasonable and creative text prompts in this component. These prompts guide the text-to-3D model in generating innovative and contextually relevant 3D shapes.
- *Evolutionary Multitask Searching Component*: While LLMs can generate reasonable prompts, they may not necessarily guide the text-to-3D model to produce shapes with optimal performance in terms of engineering metrics. Therefore, it is crucial to incorporate a search mechanism to identify the most effective prompt for the text-to-3D model. Evolutionary algorithms have proven effective tools for prompt optimization [16]; however, traditional approaches typically explore knowledge from a single internal task. Hence, such approaches lack the capability to integrate cross-domain knowledge from multiple tasks, which is essential for generating innovative designs. To address this limitation, we employ an evolutionary multitasking technique that leverages tasks from different domains, thereby facilitating the search for prompts that lead to creative designs guided by cross-domain knowledge. Specifically, we utilize the widely recognized Multi-Factorial Evolutionary Algorithm (MFEA) [17] as the search engine for this purpose. This approach enables the identification of optimal prompts that meet practicality criteria and inspire novel design solutions through synthesizing knowledge across multiple domains.

The contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- This paper introduces a novel approach by integrating

an LLM within an evolutionary multitasking framework, marking the first known attempt to leverage LLM capabilities for creative design optimization in this context.

- Our study demonstrates that the cross-domain learning capabilities of the MFEA can significantly enhance the creative exploration capabilities of the LLM. This synergy enables the generation of more innovative prompts, thereby guiding a text-to-3D model to produce designs with heightened novelty.
- The effectiveness of the LLM2FEA is verified on a set of aerodynamic design problems. The experimental results reveal that the proposed LLM2FEA not only excels in discovering designs with superior engineering performance but also fosters innovation in artistic vehicle designs.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section II reviews related work from the literature and provides an overview of key background concepts. Section III introduces the LLM2FEA framework in detail. Section IV presents the experimental studies and results. Finally, Section V concludes the paper and discusses future directions.

II. RELATED WORKS

In this section, we provide an overview of related work. First, we discuss the applications of *text-to-X* models in creative and engineering conceptual design domains. Next, we review techniques related to prompt engineering and optimization, which are primarily used to generate suitable prompts for *text-to-X* models. Finally, we examine how evolutionary algorithms can be employed to handle multi-prompt optimization tasks simultaneously, a recently conceptualized paradigm known as evolutionary multitasking (EMT).

A. Text-to-X Models in Creative & Engineering Conceptual Design

Recently, *text-to-X* models (where *X* represents various outputs such as languages, images, or 3D shapes), which allow the user to specify the design specification using free-form natural language explicitly as text prompts, have distinguished themselves among generative models due to their superior performance and significant impact. Pioneering work investigated the use of text-to-image generative models to synthesize novel artistic digital artifacts that best satisfy user preferences [18], creating new research opportunities in using GenAI for creative designs. On the other hand, Point-E [11] and Shap-E [19] were among the first models to generate 3D objects from text prompts. In contrast to Point-E, which is based on 3D point cloud representations, Shap-E provides more advanced features, such as a differentiable implementation of the marching cubes 33 algorithm [20] to synthesize 3D polygonal meshes, which are commonly used representation format in computer graphics or for computational simulation-based applications.

B. Prompt Engineering and Optimization

An interesting observation is that the provided prompt significantly influences the generated results of *text-to-X* models. Consequently, designing effective prompts is crucial for

leveraging the full potential of generative models to solve various tasks. Initially, scholars designed effective, prompt formats manually to accomplish their target tasks better, leading to the proposal of several state-of-the-art prompts in recent years [21], [22]. Moreover, prompt optimization techniques have been introduced to search for the optimal prompt by utilizing optimizers. Both black-box optimizers [23] and gradient-based optimizers [24], [25] are employed for this purpose.

In recent years, prompt optimization techniques have also been applied in conceptual design optimization [6]. In that work, the authors proposed a fully automated evolutionary design optimization framework incorporating evolutionary strategy and performance-based guidance to seek novel 3D car designs in Shap-E text-to-3D generative model. However, the design search in the text-prompt space can potentially lead to many ill-defined designs as Shap-E was not trained specifically on a dataset of car shapes. To mitigate such issues, vision-language models [26], [27] were introduced to the framework that penalizes ill-defined designs [12]. The research demonstrated the possibility of optimizing generated designs via evolutionary methods that optimize only the prompts to satisfy both practicality and visual requirements. However, the optimized design often still highly resembles car shapes as the optimization objective solely focuses on seeking car designs.

Due to the powerful language comprehension and generation capabilities, LLMs are also considered effective tools for generating prompts and can even be employed as optimizers. For instance, Yang *et al.* [28] directly utilized an LLM as the optimizer for the prompt optimization task, demonstrating the feasibility and effectiveness of this approach. Guo *et al.* [16] combined evolutionary algorithms with an LLM to enhance prompt optimization, leveraging the strengths of both methods. Additionally, Yang *et al.* [29] employed evolutionary multiobjective optimization as a mechanism to search for Pareto-optimal prompts, illustrating a sophisticated approach to optimizing prompts across multiple objectives. However, most of the aforementioned methods focus on a single task. As discussed in Section I, we posit that incorporating cross-domain learning into the optimization process can lead to prompts that may yield innovative design solutions. Therefore, we propose to achieve prompt optimization by employing evolutionary multitasking techniques. This approach leverages knowledge from multiple domains to generate prompts that are not only effective but also capable of inspiring novel designs.

C. Evolutionary Multitasking

Traditionally, the primary focus of conventional evolutionary algorithms has been on generating a set of solutions for a single optimization task [9]. However, inspired by the human brain’s capability for parallel task processing, the EMT paradigm has recently emerged as a population-based search methodology specifically designed to address multiple optimization tasks concurrently [30]. In contrast to traditional evolutionary algorithms, EMT offers a significant advantage by exploiting latent synergies between distinct yet related optimization tasks, thereby enhancing search performance in

terms of solution quality and convergence rate. Over the past few years, several successful applications of EMT have been documented across various domains, including manufacturing process design [31], mobile edge computing [32], and vehicle routing [33]. These examples highlight EMT’s potential in efficiently solving complex, multi-faceted problems by leveraging cross-task knowledge sharing.

In recent advancements, there has been a growing interest in integrating evolutionary algorithms with LLMs to tackle optimization tasks, encompassing both traditional optimization tasks [34], [35] and prompt optimization tasks [16]. Despite these advancements, there has been no documented work on the integration of EMT with LLMs for optimization purposes. In this paper, we demonstrate that combining EMT with LLMs not only facilitates the optimization process but also promotes the discovery of novel and creative solutions.

III. LARGE LANGUAGE MODEL DRIVEN MULTI-FACTORIAL EVOLUTIONARY ALGORITHM

In this section, we will provide a detailed introduction to the proposed LLM2FEA framework. First, we will describe the problem setting of the multitask optimization problem under consideration. Next, we will delve into the details of each component of the LLM2FEA framework, explaining their roles within the system.

A. Problem Setting

In this paper, we adopt a multitasking framework based on the approaches described in [17] and [34] to guide LLMs in generating meaningful prompts for a text-to-3D generative model. This model is designed to synthesize novel designs that meet the objectives of the discovery task. Specifically, for the i -th task ($i \in \{1, \dots, I\}$), the corresponding prompt template is structured as follows:

$$\mathbf{z}_i = \text{“A } \langle \mathbf{t}_i \rangle \text{ in the shape of } \langle \boldsymbol{\rho}_i \rangle \text{”}$$

Here, the term “ \mathbf{t}_i ” refers to a language sequence that specifies the target of the discovery task (e.g., “ \mathbf{t}_i ” could be set to “car” or “airplane”). The variable $\boldsymbol{\rho}_i$ represents the part of the prompt that needs to be optimized. Based on this setting, the objective function for the i -th task is formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\boldsymbol{\rho}_i} : & \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}_i)} [f_{physics}(\mathbf{x}) + \alpha(1.0 - f_{visual}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{t}_i))] \\ \text{s.t. } & 0.5 \leq f_{visual}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{t}_i) \leq 1.0. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where α is a predefined weight, $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}_i)$ represents a *text-to-3D* model that generates 3D shapes \mathbf{x} based on the prompt \mathbf{z}_i . The function $f_{physics}(\cdot)$ is a physics evaluator that estimates the performance of the shape \mathbf{x} in terms of engineering indicators. Additionally, we employ a vision-language model $f_{visual}(\cdot|\mathbf{t}_i)$, as suggested by the findings in [12], to measure the probability that the generated 3D design visually aligns with the target task label \mathbf{t}_i . This setting of the objective function ensures that the optimized prompt generates shapes that not only meet optimal physical criteria but also adhere to the conceptual elements represented by \mathbf{t}_i .

B. LLM2FEA Framework Overview

The framework of LLM2FEA, as presented in Algorithm 1, is similar to that of the classic MFEA [17]. In addition, we introduce several modifications to the algorithm that transform it into an effective generative evolutionary algorithm for discovery, which we present in this section.

Algorithm 1 LLM2FEA

Input: Discovery tasks $\mathbf{T} = \{\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_I\}$, Size of population N , the physics evaluator $f_{physics}$, the vision-language model f_{visual} , and weight α

Output: Archive dataset \mathcal{D} and S_t set of prompt and its corresponding generated solution and *skill factor* tuples

- 1: $t \leftarrow 0$, $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \emptyset$
 - 2: **Initialize** a population of individuals as *current-pop* $S_t = \{(\rho_1, \mathbf{x}_1, \tau_1), \dots, (\rho_N, \mathbf{x}_N, \tau_N) \mid \tau_{\{1, \dots, N\}} \in \mathbf{T}\}$
 - 3: Evaluate every individual in *current-pop* (S_t) for every discovery task objective in the multi-task environment.
 - 4: **while** terminating condition not met **do**
 - 5: Apply genetic LLM generative operators on *current-pop* to generate an *offspring-pop*.
 - 6: **Evaluate** individuals in *offspring-pop* for selected discovery tasks.
 - 7: **Archive** unique designs in *offspring-pop* and its corresponding fitness scores to dataset \mathcal{D} .
 - 8: **Merge** *current-pop* and *offspring-pop* to form an *intermediate-pop*.
 - 9: **Select** fittest individuals from *intermediate-pop* to form the next generation *current-pop* (S_{t+1}).
 - 10: $t \leftarrow t + 1$
 - 11: **end while**
-

1) *Population Initialization:* The LLM2FEA algorithm starts with generating an initial population of individual prompts. Drawing learnings from [12], we employ LLM with the aim of instantiating the following prompt template, $\mathbf{z}_i = \langle \mathbf{t}_i \rangle$ in the shape of $\langle \rho_i \rangle$, by completing the sentence for a given discovery task i . Here, the *skill factor* τ , an algorithmic feature defined in classical MFEA to represent an individual’s cultural bias, is effectively the discovery task itself. Furthermore, LLM is instructed to generate prompts for all I discovery tasks, each with N/num_tasks prompts. These prompts are then served to the text-to-3D generative model $p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}_i)$ for synthesizing corresponding 3D designs. It is worth highlighting that this prompt template is used throughout our algorithm for multi-prompt optimization.

2) *LLM-based Crossover and Mutation for the Offspring Generation:* As highlighted in [18], conventional evolutionary algorithms typically employ simple genetic crossover operators and probabilistic models, such as Gaussian distributions, as mutation operators. However, these traditional crossover and mutation techniques exhibit several limitations when applied to prompt optimization. Firstly, performing crossover and mutation necessitates embedding a prompt into a vector space, wherein the search for the optimal prompt is conducted. Given that prompts are often natural language sequences, the dimensionality of the embedded vector space can become exceed-

ingly large. Unfortunately, evolutionary algorithms generally struggle with high-dimensional search spaces, leading to low efficiency in the prompt optimization process. Secondly, meaningful prompts in natural language often entail implicit constraints inherent in language sequences. Traditional crossover and mutation operators fail to account for these implicit constraints, potentially resulting in nonsensical prompts that may not effectively generate reasonable 3D shapes. Thirdly, considering that LLMs contain extensive prior knowledge [34], leveraging them for crossover and mutation could facilitate the generation of more coherent and contextually appropriate prompts by utilizing this embedded knowledge.

Based on the above consideration, we employ the LLM to implement the crossover and mutation on our algorithm. Specifically, the following three assortative mating operators are designed [17]:

- *Self-Mating:* We instruct the LLM to select an individual parent prompt from *current-pop* (S_t) and randomly replace some words with other words in the prompt with respect to the discovery task objective.
- *Inter-tasks Mating:* The LLM is instructed to first randomly select one individual parent prompt of discovery task i and one individual parent prompt of discovery task j from *current-pop* (S_t). The LLM will instantiate the prompt template by picking some words from both parents. The instantiated prompt is then mutated by the LLM by randomly replacing some words with other words in the prompt with respect to the discovery task objective.
- *Intra-task Mating:* The LLM will randomly select two individual parent prompts of the same discovery task i to instantiate the prompt template by picking some words from both parents. This instantiated prompt is mutated by the LLM by randomly replacing some words with other words in the prompt with respect to the discovery task objective.

We assign a mating operator of each offspring individual by first randomly selecting two parents in the *current-pop*. If the two randomly selected parent candidates possess the same *skill factor*, the intra-task mating operator is selected. Conversely, if their *skill factor* differ, the inter-tasks mating operator is assigned where crossover only occurs as per a predefined *random mating probability* (*rpm*) [17]. Otherwise, the self-mating operator is assigned.

For the LLM to effectively accomplish the aforementioned assortative mating operations, we need to provide the LLM with the relevant context information. To this end, we present the list of individual prompts in *current-pop* (S_t) to the LLM and instruct the LLM to reflect upon the list before performing the assortative mating. This reflection mechanism helps the LLM take the context into account while performing these mating operations, ensuring the generic variation is performed according to the algorithm. Thereafter, LLM will perform the assigned mating operation.

3) *Evaluations:* As explained in Section III-A, the optimization problem corresponding to the i -th task is defined by (1). Given that this formulation represents an expected value, the Monte Carlo method is commonly used for its




Fig. 1. We provided the above instructions to condition the large language model (LLM) in generating the population of prompts for text-to-3D model.

estimation. However, because the physics simulator is often computationally intensive and time-consuming, this process becomes prohibitively expensive. To simplify the evaluation, in this paper, we generate only one 3D shape for each prompt using the text-to-3D model. We then directly employ its $f_{physics}$ and f_{visual} values to calculate the objective function, which is given by $f_i(\mathbf{z}_i) = f_{physics}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) + \alpha(1.0 - f_{visual}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{t}_i))$. Here, f_i represents the objective value considered in the evaluation process, and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ is a sample generated based on the prompt \mathbf{z}_i . On a separate note, notice that the offspring of inter-tasks mating is inherited from parents of different discovery tasks. As such, during evaluation, we randomly select one parent as the primary discovery task with the offspring inheriting its *skill factor*, and we use this parent's objective to evaluate the offspring.

4) *Archival of Novel Designs*: The implicit behavior of LLM2FEA generates populations of 3D designs that, through its evolutionary processes, can lead to the discovery of designs that different user groups regard as novelty. While some of these novel designs satisfy the practicality and visual specification to a certain degree, these designs may not survive through the evolutionary run. As such, we archive all unique generated 3D designs for later use in offline novelty search algorithms [13] to select novel designs based on user preferences.

5) *Environmental Selection*: The evolutionary discovery process may uncover design offsprings that are highly similar to the ones in *current-pop* due to the nuances of the input prompts in a single iteration. Concatenating both *current-pop*

and *offspring-pop* with such designs, following the classic MFEA [17] may lead to having highly similar designs survive through the tournament selection process, resulting in degradation of the discovery performance. To mitigate such issues, we prune highly similar designs before entering the tournament selection process by selecting the ones that yield better fitness scores. As such, the *current-pop* and *offspring-pop* merge to contain only unique designs. We then employ the classic tournament selection algorithm [36] to select N individuals that form the population for the next generation.

C. Advantages of LLM2FEA in Discovering Novel Designs

In LLM2FEA, the implicit genetic transfer occurring during inter-task mating facilitates the creation of hybrid designs that combine the advantageous traits of each individual parent task. On a separate note, LLM and text-to-X generative models known for its hallucination synthesize outputs that may deviate from the factual or the input prompt. This unintentional design serves as a catalyst for synthesizing creativity in GenAI [15], leading to interesting designs that defy our common knowledge. Both of these algorithmic properties create the opportunity for emerging design trends, facilitating the discovery of novel designs.

IV. EXPERIMENTS AND DISCUSSION

Investigations conducted in [12] have shown the effectiveness of physics and visual evaluation in synthesizing 3D

Car Prompt Parent:

“A car in the shape of a sleek shark dagger soaring through streamlined foils and sharp peaks to minimize aerodynamic resistance.”

**Airplane Prompt Parent:**

“A airplane in the shape of an agile wing with elegant silhouette, optimized for minimal profile and speed.”

**Crossover Prompt:**

“A car in the shape of a sleek shark dagger soaring through streamlined foils wing with elegant silhouette and sharp peaks to minimize aerodynamic resistance.”

Mutated Prompt Offspring:

“A car in the shape of a streamlined shark silhouette employing sleek spear wing refinement for optimal aerodynamic efficiency.”



Fig. 2. Randomly selecting one parent as **primary** and the other as **secondary**, inter-tasks mating allows crossover of genetic material between parents with different *skill factor*. In this paper, the genetic material is captured in the form of words. Here, the crossover prompt inherits the design properties of both **secondary discovery task** (“airplane”) and **primary discovery task** (“car”). The use of LLM, with its extensive knowledge as the mutation operator, replaces words in the crossover prompt with the aim of generating more coherent and contextually appropriate prompts to yield a fitter design while still retaining parents’ genetic properties. The resulting mutated prompt offspring inherits the *skill factor* of the **primary discovery task**.

designs from a text-to-3D model. We seek novel designs that not only satisfy the performance metrics to a certain degree but also have unconventional body shapes. We also employ a vision-language model (VLM), BLIP-2 [27], for dual purposes: 1) Leveraging on the learnings in [12], VLM serves as a visual evaluator, contributing to the objective instead of treating it as a penalty. 2) We utilize VLM to create embeddings of generated designs in archived dataset \mathcal{D} for computing similarity between designs, with the aim of identifying unique designs and randomly selecting one of the highly similar ones. In addition, we include a 3D volumetric evaluation of the generated 3D designs, ensuring the discovered 3D designs satisfy certain practical specifications. The resulting objective presented in Equation 1 aims to discover novel 3D designs that have minimum drag yet are practical and visually resemble the target tasks.

To demonstrate the performance of LLM2FEA, we set up the multitasking experiments as two discovery tasks to uncover novel car and airplane designs in text-to-3D model. As such, we use the target label “A car in the picture” for the car discovery task and the target label “An airplane in the picture” for the airplane discovery task. Following [34] and [12], we employ the Shape-E model [19] as the text-to-3D generative model, and ChatGPT [37] as the genetic LLM evolutionary operators. In addition, We evaluate the fitness of 3D designs conforming to the visual specification using the VLM and set the α hyperparameter weight to 0.55. On the other hand, we investigate the discovery performance of various physics solvers combinations. Specifically, in one set of experiments, we evaluate the projected frontal area (PFA) of the 3D designs.

$$f_{physics}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv f_{PFA}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (2)$$

Furthermore, we also investigate the drag aerodynamics performance of the generated 3D designs using OpenFoam simulation [38], and the cabin++ space of the 3D designs by measuring the volumetric space as illustrated in Fig. 3.

$$f_{physics}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv f_{drag}(\mathbf{x}) + \beta \log \left[1.0 + \frac{1.0}{f_{volume}(\mathbf{x})} \right] \quad (3)$$

where β is the hyperparameter weight to ensure equivalent magnitude with the drag fitness score. In our experiments, we set the weight to 0.10. Finally, we set the *rmp* hyperparameter to 1.0, and use a population size of $N = 20$ and the same random seeds throughout the evolutionary run in all our experiments for consistency and reproducibility.




Fig. 3. $f_{volume}(\mathbf{x})$ measures the volumetric space of the generated 3D designs, **cabin++** highlighted in cyan color.

We performed the optimization and simulations in parallel on a single shared compute node with a configuration comprised of Intel Xeon Silver 64 CPU cores, clocked at 2.10 GHz, 128GB of RAM, and 3 Nvidia Quadro GV100 GPUs (32 GB each). The GPUs are used by the Shape-E text-to-3D model and the BLIP-2 vision-language model to generate new design candidates and assess the feasibility of the design with respect to the discovery tasks’ label.

A. LLM Settings

In order for LLM2FEA to drive the LLM, we adapt the strategies in [34] to construct the instructions for LLM in a zero-shot manner. As illustrated in Fig. 1 (a), for every LLM call, we provide a description of the problem LLM needs to solve and the following instructions for various stages in the evolutionary run.

1) *Population Initialization*: As discussed in Section III-B1, we provide the instruction in Fig. 1 (b) to generate the initial population of prompts for all discovery tasks. We reinforce LLM to pay attention on the relationship between the

prompt and fitness scores by enforcing the LLM to predict the scores.

2) *Genetic Crossover and Mutation Operations*: One of the LLM2FEA key features is using the LLM to perform the crossover and mutation operations, as highlighted in Section III-B2. In our experiments, we instruct LLM to reflect upon the contextual exemplars, as shown in Fig. 1 (c), before following the steps of various mating instructions (as presented in Fig. 1 (d), (e), and (f)).

3) *Hallucination Control*: We employ a self-adaptive temperature adjustment strategy, similar in [34], to control LLM hallucination in generating the population of prompts. This strategy increases or decreases the temperature according to the performance of LLM in following instructions and text-to-3D model in generating fitter 3D designs.

B. Experiment Results and Discussion

We present the investigation of our experimental results and analysis in this section. In the experiments conducted using the minimum projected frontal area as the physics objective stated in Equation 2, we observed significant implicit genetic transfer of airplane aerodynamics properties to 3D car designs during the evolutionary run, as shown in Fig. 6. This results in novel designs having a hybrid body of an airplane and a car. In addition, airplane designs that survived tend to have a sleek and long design that is similar to engineless gliders with highly efficient aerodynamic bodies.

We examined the implicit genetic transfer of design properties from the secondary discovery task to the primary discovery task. As shown in Fig. 2, in the crossover operation, LLM randomly selects words in both parents, with the primary discovery task having more selected words than the secondary. LLM proceeds to mutate the crossover prompt, keeping certain keywords from both parents in the mutated prompt. This demonstrated LLM capability in performing proper implicit genetic transfer during inter-tasks mating, resulting in the mutated 3D design having the hybrid design look of the parents.

We also investigated the LLM2FEA performance in discovering designs that satisfy minimum aerodynamics drag and maximum cabin++ space objective using Equation 3. As presented in Fig. 7, we observed the designs that survived




Fig. 4. Examples of novel designs that, although did not survive through the evolutionary run, are archived in dataset \mathcal{D} .

the evolutionary run have properties of wide and long bodies. While some novel designs are discovered during the evolution iteration, the majority of surviving airplane and car designs still have a conventional body.

Interestingly, we found many novel designs archived in the dataset \mathcal{D} , as illustrated in Fig. 4. These findings have shown the importance of the LLM2FEA archival feature and the capability of the algorithm to explore global optima search regions and discover novel designs that satisfy the practicality and visual specification to a certain degree. On a separate note, we learned that the physics specification in the objective significantly impacts the exploration of designs. Hence, it is necessary for careful consideration of the objective design.

Finally, we conducted experiments to investigate LLM2FEA capability in creative design exploration. Leveraging on the hallucination behavior in LLM and text-to-3D model, we designed the discovery tasks to seek artistic vehicles - *banana car* and *banana airplane*. This leads to the discovery of creative designs as presented in Fig. 8. Both the LLM and text-to-3D models are able to hallucinate, generating prompt descriptions of a banana vehicle and generating designs that possess the visual look of a banana (in terms of colors or shape) and, at the same time, satisfying the physics specification. In a few iterations, we observed that LLM2FEA is able to have LLM evolve prompts that discover novel artistic designs as illustrated in Fig. 5, showing the potential applications of LLM2FEA in discovery tasks.




Fig. 5. Examples of novel artistic designs discovered in a few iterations of LLM2FEA.

V. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In this paper, we proposed a novel LLM-driven multifactorial evolutionary algorithm (MFEA) that employs LLM to evolve the population of prompts in a multitasking set. The basic structure of our proposed algorithm is the classic MFEA, thereby inheriting the convergence and implicit genetic transfer properties. Our modifications to the MFEA allow the archival of generated 3D designs during the evolutionary run, retaining the novel designs that did not survive in the selection pressure process. We also introduced various physics solvers that can be considered as the physics objective and demonstrated the discovery performance in our experiments.

Our experimental investigations demonstrated our proposed technique’s effectiveness and our algorithm’s potential in discovery tasks. The findings presented a promising research direction in the use of evolutionary techniques in GenAI for

discovery. We envision the potential applications of LLM2FEA in accelerating the conceptual design process and improving the accessibility of such solutions in different industry domains.

Nevertheless, we hope our pioneering work will open up new research opportunities and solidify the possibility of using evolutionary methods in GenAI for discovery tasks. We recommend further investigations on the use of prompt evolution paradigm [18] in multitasking settings and the feasibility of 3D printing the discovered novel designs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Melvin Wong gratefully acknowledges the financial support from Honda Research Institute Europe (HRI-EU). This research is also partly supported by the College of Computing & Data Science (CCDS), Nanyang Technological University (NTU).

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Jo, "The promise and peril of generative ai," *Nature*, vol. 614, no. 1, pp. 214–216, 2023.
- [2] Y. Chang, X. Wang, J. Wang, Y. Wu, L. Yang, K. Zhu, H. Chen, X. Yi, C. Wang, Y. Wang *et al.*, "A survey on evaluation of large language models," *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 2023.
- [3] T. Qiao, J. Zhang, D. Xu, and D. Tao, "Mirrorgan: Learning text-to-image generation by redescription," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 1505–1514.
- [4] B. Poole, A. Jain, J. T. Barron, and B. Mildenhall, "Dreamfusion: Text-to-3d using 2d diffusion," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14988*, 2022.
- [5] Z. Chen, F. Wang, Y. Wang, and H. Liu, "Text-to-3d using gaussian splatting," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 21 401–21 412.
- [6] T. Rios, S. Menzel, and B. Sendhoff, "Large language and text-to-3d models for engineering design optimization," in *2023 IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence (SSCI)*, 2023, pp. 1704–1711.
- [7] Z. Guo, H. Liu, Y.-S. Ong, X. Qu, Y. Zhang, and J. Zheng, "Generative multimodal bayesian optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 2022.
- [8] D. R. Jones, M. Schonlau, and W. J. Welch, "Efficient global optimization of expensive black-box functions," *Journal of Global optimization*, vol. 13, pp. 455–492, 1998.
- [9] T. Bartz-Beielstein, J. Branke, J. Mehnen, and O. Mersmann, "Evolutionary algorithms," *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 178–195, 2014.
- [10] M. Binois and N. Wycoff, "A survey on high-dimensional gaussian process modeling with application to bayesian optimization," *ACM Transactions on Evolutionary Learning and Optimization*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 1–26, 2022.
- [11] A. Nichol, H. Jun, P. Dhariwal, P. Mishkin, and M. Chen, "Point-e: A system for generating 3d point clouds from complex prompts," 2022.
- [12] M. Wong, T. Rios, S. Menzel, and Y. S. Ong, "Generative ai-based prompt evolution engineering design optimization with vision-language model," 2024.
- [13] J. Gomes, P. Mariano, and A. L. Christensen, "Devising effective novelty search algorithms: A comprehensive empirical study," in *Proceedings of the 2015 Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*, 2015, pp. 943–950.
- [14] M. H. Dickinson, "Bionics: Biological insight into mechanical design," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 96, no. 25, pp. 14 208–14 209, 1999.
- [15] X. Jiang, Y. Tian, F. Hua, C. Xu, Y. Wang, and J. Guo, "A survey on large language model hallucination via a creativity perspective," 2024.
- [16] Q. Guo, R. Wang, J. Guo, B. Li, K. Song, X. Tan, G. Liu, J. Bian, and Y. Yang, "Connecting large language models with evolutionary algorithms yields powerful prompt optimizers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08532*, 2023.
- [17] A. Gupta, Y.-S. Ong, and L. Feng, "Multifactorial evolution: Toward evolutionary multitasking," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 343–357, 2015.
- [18] M. Wong, Y. Ong, A. Gupta, K. Bali, and C. Chen, "Prompt evolution for generative ai: A classifier-guided approach," in *2023 IEEE Conference on Artificial Intelligence (CAI)*. IEEE Computer Society, 2023, pp. 226–229. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/CAI54212.2023.00105>
- [19] H. Jun and A. Nichol, "Shap-E: Generating Conditional 3D Implicit Functions," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02463*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.02463>
- [20] M. Cubes, "Construction of topologically correct isosurface," 1995.
- [21] J. Wei, X. Wang, D. Schuurmans, M. Bosma, F. Xia, E. Chi, Q. V. Le, D. Zhou *et al.*, "Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 35, pp. 24 824–24 837, 2022.
- [22] S. Yao, D. Yu, J. Zhao, I. Shafran, T. Griffiths, Y. Cao, and K. Narasimhan, "Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [23] S. Diao, Z. Huang, R. Xu, X. Li, Y. Lin, X. Zhou, and T. Zhang, "Black-box prompt learning for pre-trained language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08531*, 2022.
- [24] R. Pryzant, D. Iter, J. Li, Y. T. Lee, C. Zhu, and M. Zeng, "Automatic prompt optimization with" gradient descent" and beam search," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03495*, 2023.
- [25] Y. Wen, N. Jain, J. Kirchenbauer, M. Goldblum, J. Geiping, and T. Goldstein, "Hard prompts made easy: Gradient-based discrete optimization for prompt tuning and discovery," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [26] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark, G. Krueger, and I. Sutskever, "Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision," in *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, M. Meila and T. Zhang, Eds., vol. 139, PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021, pp. 8748–8763. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/radford21a.html>
- [27] J. Li, D. Li, S. Savarese, and S. Hoi, "Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12597*, 2023.
- [28] C. Yang, X. Wang, Y. Lu, H. Liu, Q. V. Le, D. Zhou, and X. Chen, "Large language models as optimizers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03409*, 2023.
- [29] H. Yang and K. Li, "Instoptima: Evolutionary multi-objective instruction optimization via large language model-based instruction operators," 2023.
- [30] A. Gupta, Y.-S. Ong, and L. Feng, "Insights on transfer optimization: Because experience is the best teacher," *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 51–64, 2017.
- [31] H. Liu, F. Zhao, L. Wang, T. Xu, and C. Dong, "Evolutionary multitasking memetic algorithm for distributed hybrid flow-shop scheduling problem with deterioration effect," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2024.
- [32] C. Yang, Q. Chen, Z. Zhu, Z.-A. Huang, S. Lan, and L. Zhu, "Evolutionary multitasking for costly task offloading in mobile edge computing networks," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 2023.
- [33] L. Feng, Y. Huang, L. Zhou, J. Zhong, A. Gupta, K. Tang, and K. C. Tan, "Explicit evolutionary multitasking for combinatorial optimization: A case study on capacitated vehicle routing problem," *IEEE transactions on cybernetics*, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 3143–3156, 2020.
- [34] S. Liu, C. Chen, X. Qu, K. Tang, and Y.-S. Ong, "Large language models as evolutionary optimizers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19046*, 2023.
- [35] F. Liu, X. Lin, Z. Wang, S. Yao, X. Tong, M. Yuan, and Q. Zhang, "Large language model for multi-objective evolutionary optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12541*, 2023.
- [36] B. L. Miller, D. E. Goldberg *et al.*, "Genetic algorithms, tournament selection, and the effects of noise," *Complex systems*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 193–212, 1995.
- [37] OpenAI, "Chatgpt 3.5." [Online]. Available: <https://platform.openai.com/docs/api-reference>
- [38] H. G. Weller, G. Tabor, H. Jasak, and C. Fureby, "A tensorial approach to computational continuum mechanics using object-oriented techniques," *Computers in physics*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 620–631, 1998.




Fig. 6. LLM2FEA under minimal projected frontal area objective leads to the discovery of minimalistic airplane designs and significant implicit transfer of airplane aerodynamics properties to car designs during the evolutionary run.




Fig. 7. LLM2FEA satisfies minimum drag, and maximum cabin++ space objective favors designs with wide and long body.




Fig. 8. LLM2FEA demonstrated its capability in discovering creative banana airplane/car 3D designs that satisfy the visual specification, drag aerodynamics, and volumetric space objective.