

# Optimal designs for experiments for scalar-on-function linear models

D. Michaelides<sup>1</sup>, M. Adamou, D. C. Woods & A. M. Overstall

Southampton Statistical Sciences Research Institute  
University of Southampton, United Kingdom

The aim of this work is to extend the usual optimal experimental design paradigm to experiments where the settings of one or more factors are functions. For these new experiments, a design consists of combinations of functions for each run of the experiment along with settings for non-functional variables. After briefly introducing the class of functional variables, basis function systems are described. Basis function expansion is applied to a functional linear model consisting of both functional and scalar factors, reducing the problem to an optimisation problem of a single design matrix.

Keywords: Design of Experiments; Functional Linear Model; Profile Factors; Basis functions

## 1 Introduction

In science and engineering, an increasing number of experiments involve the investigation of the relationship between a response and functional or profile variables, i.e. variables whose values can be varied as a function, usually of time, within a single run of an experiment. A common example of a profile variable is temperature, being varied monotonically or as a step function through the run. The statistical design problem then becomes choosing suitable functions that determine how each profile variable varies during each run. For ease of exposition, throughout this paper we shall assume time  $t \in [0, \mathcal{T}]$  is the continuous single input to functional variables. The methods extend naturally to situations where there are functional variables with multiple inputs, e.g. spatio-temporal studies.

Statistical modelling with functional data is well established in the statistics literature, see Ramsay and Silverman (1997) and Ramsay and Silverman (2005) for an introduction. However, the design of experiments for such models has received much less attention, with two main approaches being proposed: response surface methods using dimension-reduction techniques (Georgakis 2013, Roche 2015, Roche 2018 and Klebanov and Georgakis 2016) and optimal design for dynamic models, typically derived from differential equations (Balsa-Canto and Banga 2007 and Uciński and Bogacka 2007). We develop methodology related to the response surface approach to find optimal functions for profile variables assuming a scalar-on-function linear model. Our approach leverages the power of standard linear model optimal design methodology and its flexibility allows designs to be obtained for various different scenarios, including common experiments in the pharmaceutical industry, and using different optimality criteria.

In Section 2, with a view to model and design experiments involving profile factors, a functional linear model along with an optimal design strategy is developed. Models involving both profile and scalar factors are tackled and a basis function expansion is used for both the profile factors and functional parameters. Functional models turn out to be extension of the traditional linear model and the model developed is capable of incorporating an unlimited number of profile and scalar factors. In Section 3, examples with only profile and both profile and scalar variables are presented, for which it is assumed that control of the profile variables is represented by step functions. In

---

<sup>1</sup>Damianos Michaelides; dm3g15@soton.ac.uk; School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, UK.

Section 4, the set of possible functions for the profile variables is extended by the use of spline basis expansions and the performance of the designs is compared to the designs found under the step function basis. Section 5 provides a conclusion of the findings and future research goals.

## 2 The scalar-on-function linear model and optimal design

### 2.1 The scalar-on-function linear model

Let  $y_i$  denote a scalar response observed at time  $\mathcal{T}$ , the end of the experiment, for the  $i$ th run of the experiment ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ). An additive scalar-on-function linear model of the following form is assumed for  $y_i$ :

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{f_1} \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \beta_j(t) x_{ij}(t) dt + \sum_{k=f_1+1}^{f_1+f_2} \beta_k x_{ik} + \varepsilon_i, \quad (1)$$

where  $f_1$  is the number of functional variables involved in the experiment,  $f_2$  is the number of scalar variables involved in the experiment,  $\beta_j(t) : [0, \mathcal{T}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an unknown function of time  $0 \leq t \leq \mathcal{T}$ ,  $x_{ij}(t) : [0, \mathcal{T}] \rightarrow [u, v]$  the function controlling the  $j$ th functional variable in the interval  $[u, v]$ ,  $\beta_0, \beta_{f_1+1}, \dots, \beta_{f_1+f_2}$  are unknown constant parameters,  $x_{ik} \in [u_s, v_s]$  is the value for the  $k$ th scalar factor lying in the interval  $[u_s, v_s]$  and  $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ , with errors from different experiment runs assumed independent. The scalars  $u, v, u_s, v_s$  are constants representing the bounds for the functional and scalar variables, respectively.

Viewed via an increasingly fine discretisation of  $t$ ,  $t_1, \dots, t_m$  with  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , model (1) has essentially an infinite number of unknowns  $\beta_j(t_k)$ . Hence, as the experiment only returns a finite amount of data, the system is underdetermined and there will be an infinite number of solutions  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T(t) = (\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1(t), \dots, \hat{\beta}_{f_1}(t), \hat{\beta}_{f_1+1}, \dots, \hat{\beta}_{f_1+f_2})$  that each give a perfect fit to the data. Hence, inference from a given experiment requires some restriction on the function space. We implicitly define spaces of functions  $\beta_j(t) \in \mathcal{B}_j[0, \mathcal{T}]$  and  $x_{ij}(t) \in \mathcal{X}_j[0, \mathcal{T}]$  via basis function expansions, with  $\mathcal{B}_j[0, \mathcal{T}]$  and  $\mathcal{X}_j[0, \mathcal{T}]$  the function spaces of the functional parameters and profile variables respectively, from time 0 to time  $\mathcal{T}$ . For the functional parameters

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_j(t) &= \sum_{l=1}^{n_{\beta,j}} \theta_{jl} b_{jl}(t) \\ &= \mathbf{b}_j(t)^T \boldsymbol{\theta}_j, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{b}_j(t)^T = [b_{j1}(t), \dots, b_{jn_{\beta,j}}(t)]$  are known basis functions with corresponding (unknown) coefficients  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^T = (\theta_{j1}, \dots, \theta_{jn_{\beta,j}})$ . Hence, we have reduced the problem of estimating an unknown function to the problem of estimating  $n_{\beta,j}$  coefficients. We can define the functions  $x_{ij}(t)$  via a similar expansion,

$$x_{ij}(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{n_{x,j}} \gamma_{ijl} c_l(t), \quad (3)$$

and for  $\mathbf{x}_j(t)^T = [x_{j1}(t), \dots, x_{jn}(t)]$  we have that  $\mathbf{x}_j(t) = \Gamma_j \mathbf{c}_j(t)$ , where  $\mathbf{c}_j(t)^T = [c_{j1}(t), \dots, c_{jn_{x,j}}(t)]$  are known basis functions,  $\Gamma_j$  is a  $n \times n_{x,j}$  coefficient matrix with  $il$ th entry  $\gamma_{ijl}$ . Where necessary, linear transformations of the basis expansions are used to ensure the desired image of the function  $x_{ij}(t)$  is obtained.

A substitution of the basis expansions into model (1) gives a familiar model form for the response vector  $\mathbf{y}^T = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{y} &= \beta_0 \mathbf{1}_n + \sum_{j=1}^{f_1} \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \beta_j(t) \mathbf{x}_j(t) dt + \sum_{k=f_1+1}^{f_1+f_2} \beta_k \mathbf{x}_k + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \\
&= \beta_0 \mathbf{1}_n + \sum_{j=1}^{f_1} \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_j \mathbf{c}_j(t) \mathbf{b}_j(t)^T \boldsymbol{\theta}_j dt + \sum_{k=f_1+1}^{f_1+f_2} \beta_k \mathbf{x}_k + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \\
&= \beta_0 \mathbf{1}_n + \mathbf{J}_{\gamma cb} \boldsymbol{\theta} + \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where  $\mathbf{1}_n$  is the  $n$ -vector with every entry equal to one,  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^T = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^T, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{f_1}^T)$ ,  $\mathbf{X}$  the  $n \times f_2$  model matrix for the scalar factors,  $\boldsymbol{\beta}^T = (\beta_{f_1+1}, \dots, \beta_{f_1+f_2})$  and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n)$ . The  $n \times \sum n_{\beta,j}$  matrix  $\mathbf{J}_{\gamma cb}$  is formed by column binding the  $f_1$  sub-matrices

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{J}_{\gamma cb_j} &= \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_j \mathbf{c}_j(t) \mathbf{b}_j(t)^T dt \quad j = 1, \dots, f_1 \\
&= \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_j \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{c}_j(t) \mathbf{b}_j(t)^T dt,
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

with the integral of the matrix defined as the matrix of integrals, i.e. the integral of a vector  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t)^T = [\alpha_1(t), \dots, \alpha_n(t)]$  is defined as

$$\int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t) dt = \left[ \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \alpha_1(t) dt, \dots, \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \alpha_n(t) dt \right]^T.$$

Hence model (4) takes the form of the familiar linear model,

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\nu} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon},$$

with  $n \times (\sum n_{\beta,j} + f_2 + 1)$  model matrix

$$\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{1} \quad \mathbf{J}_{\gamma cb} \quad \mathbf{X}], \tag{6}$$

and  $(\sum n_{\beta,j} + f_2 + 1)$ -vector  $\boldsymbol{\nu}$  of coefficients

$$\boldsymbol{\nu}^T = [\beta_0 \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \quad \boldsymbol{\beta}^T]. \tag{7}$$

The least squares estimator for  $\boldsymbol{\nu}$  hence takes the form

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = (\mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{y}. \tag{8}$$

with variance-covariance matrix

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) &= \text{Var} \left[ (\mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{y} \right] \\
&= \sigma^2 (\mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{Z})^{-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

## 2.2 The reduced design problem

Representation of the functional variables and parameters via basis function expansions in model (2.1) reduces the problem of finding a functional optimal design to one of choosing coefficient matrices  $\Gamma_j$ , together with values for the scalar inputs, to minimise a functional of equation (9). Here, we focus on point estimation of  $\theta$  using  $A$ -optimality, and find designs that lead to information matrices  $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{Z}$  that minimise

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_A(\mathbf{M}) &= \text{tr}\{\text{Var}(\hat{\nu})/\sigma^2\} \\ &= \text{tr}\{\mathbf{M}^{-1}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Clearly, an  $A$ -optimal design will depend on the choice of bases for both the functional parameters and inputs, as well as the number of functions in each of these bases. In what follows, we investigate the impact of these choices for a number different scenarios.

For two designs with the same size  $n$  resulting in information matrices  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ , we define the relative  $A$ -efficiency of design 2 with respect to design 1 as  $\Psi_A(M_1)/\Psi_A(M_2)$ .

## 3 Optimal designs using step functions

For the examples to be considered in this section, control of a functional variable is obtained via choice of step functions defined as

$$x_{ij}(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{n_{x,j}} \gamma_{ijl} \mathbf{1}_{\lambda_l}(t),$$

for breakpoints  $\lambda_0 = 0 < \lambda_1 < \dots < \lambda_{n_{x,j}} = \mathcal{T}$  and

$$\mathbf{1}_{\lambda_l}(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \lambda_{l-1} < t < \lambda_l \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

An example of such a function with two interior break points, and hence  $n_{x,j} = 3$ , is given in Figure 1.

$A$ -optimal designs are found for two choices of power series bases for  $\beta_j(t)$ , a linear basis

$$\beta_j(t) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 t, \quad (11)$$

and a quadratic basis

$$\beta_j(t) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 t + \alpha_2 t^2. \quad (12)$$

See Figure 2. Designs are sought for two experiments: (i) with a single functional variable, and (ii) with one functional variable and three scalar variables.

### 3.1 Example 1: Single profile factor

Under this example,  $f_1 = 1$  and  $f_2 = 0$  and model (4) is simplified such that

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \beta(t) x_i(t) dt + \varepsilon_i, \quad (13)$$




Figure 1: Step function for  $x_{ij}(t)$  with two interior breakpoints,  $n_{x,j} = 3$ .




Figure 2: (a) Linear and (b) Quadratic basis functions for  $\beta(t)$ .

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . We enforce the constraint  $-1 \leq x_i(t) \leq 1$  via linear transformation and construct step functions assuming  $n_x + 2$  equally-spaced breakpoints on  $[0, 1]$ . To ensure identifiability of model (13), we restrict the number of basis functions in the expansion of  $x_i(t)$  to be  $n_x$  *ge2* when finding designs for the linear  $\beta(t)$  basis and  $n_x \geq 3$  when considering the quadratic  $\beta(t)$  basis.

Designs for different combinations of  $n$  and  $n_x$  are found under both basis expansions (11) and (12) using 1000 random starts of a coordinate exchange algorithm (Goos and Jones 2011). The results are given in Table 1 for the linear basis and Table 2 for the quadratic basis.

Some general findings can be observed from the results. For both functional parameter bases, the  $A$ -optimality objective function values decrease with experiment size  $n$ , as expected, with typically, the designs for  $n = 8$  and  $n = 12$  containing replicates of the functions from the  $n = 4$  design. Also, the  $A$ -efficiency of the designs (within each experiment size) generally decrease with  $n_x$ . The exception is for the case  $n_x = 3$  for the linear functional parameter basis, where the inability to make a step change in the centre of the interval  $[0, 1]$  (as  $\lambda = 0.5$  is not included in the set of breakpoints) leads to an increase in the average variance compared to the design for  $n_x = 2$ . Again, increasing design performance with  $n_x$  is generally expected, as increasing the breakpoints enlarges the set of possible functions from which the design can be chosen. Changes in design performance with  $n_x$  are greater for the quadratic  $\beta(t)$  basis, as more complex functions are chosen in the  $A$ -optimal design. Representative example designs are shown in Figures 3 and 4 for the linear and quadratic bases respectively.

	$n = 4$		$n = 8$		$n = 12$	
$n_x$	A-opt	A-eff	A-opt	A-eff	A-opt	A-eff
2	8.750	0.961	3.958	0.981	2.583	0.972
3	8.828	0.952	4.287	0.906	2.778	0.904
4	8.750	0.961	3.903	0.995	2.570	0.977
8	8.493	0.990	3.902	0.995	2.539	0.989
16	8.427	0.997	3.887	0.999	2.520	0.997
100	8.404	1.000	3.882	1.000	2.512	1.000

Table 1: Objective function values and  $A$ -efficiency values with  $n = 4, 8, 12$  for the linear basis for  $\beta(t)$  and step basis for  $x(t)$ .




Figure 3: Four run optimal design for  $n_x = 16$ , linear basis for  $\beta(t)$  and step basis for  $x(t)$ .

	$n = 4$		$n = 8$		$n = 12$	
$n_x$	A-opt	A-eff	A-opt	A-eff	A-opt	A-eff
3	386.408	0.535	189.766	0.510	126.409	0.499
4	246.869	0.838	103.553	0.934	67.735	0.931
8	218.479	0.947	99.109	0.976	65.217	0.966
16	208.843	0.991	97.408	0.993	63.610	0.991
100	206.884	1.000	96.709	1.000	63.028	1.000

Table 2: Objective function values and A-efficiency values with  $n = 4, 8, 12$  for the quadratic basis for  $\beta(t)$  and step basis for  $x(t)$ .




Figure 4: Four run optimal design for  $n_x = 8$ , quadratic basis for  $\beta(t)$  and step basis for  $x(t)$ .



### 3.2 Example 2: Single profile and three scalar factors

For this example, the model is extended to include a single profile factor and  $f_2 = 3$  scalar factors. The functional linear model takes the form,

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \int_0^T \beta_1(t)x_{i1}(t) dt + \mathbf{f}^T(\mathbf{x}_i)\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon_i, \quad (14)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , assuming  $-1 \leq x_i(t) \leq 1$  and,

$$\mathbf{f}^T(\mathbf{x}_i)\boldsymbol{\beta} = \begin{cases} \beta_2x_{i2} + \beta_3x_{i3} + \beta_4x_{i4} & \text{Case 1} \\ \beta_2x_{i2} + \beta_3x_{i3} + \beta_4x_{i4} + \beta_5x_{i2}^2 + \beta_6x_{i3}^2 + \beta_7x_{i4}^2 & \text{Case 2} \end{cases}$$

being the model for scalar factors, i.e. main effects or main and quadratic effects. Control of the single profile factor is assumed to be represented by a step function basis, the functional parameter  $\beta_1(t)$  is assumed to be represented by both a linear and quadratic basis, similar to Section 3.1, and  $n = 12$  runs is chosen. In this example, the sensitivity study raised is partly similar to the study in Section 3.1. The number of basis functions for the profile factor and functional parameters are varied as before and additionally the scalar part with main and main and quadratic effects is considered. The optimal designs for the single profile factor are exactly the same as the designs found in Section 3.1, so no further elaboration is required.

What is interesting to investigate is how the designs for the scalar factors behave from main to main and quadratic effects. For the Case 1 model, i.e. the model with main effects, the optimal choices of the scalar factors are those at the boundaries. This is similar to the profile factor behaviour with linear basis for the parameters, where the function of the profile factor changes at most once. For the Case 2 model, i.e. the model with both main and quadratic effects, the optimal design for the scalar factors include boundary points and centre points in order to be able to estimate the curvature. This is similar to the profile factor behaviour with quadratic basis for the parameters, where the function of the profile factor changes at most twice. For the Case 2 model, the columns for the scalar factors are orthogonal. The optimal designs for the scalar factors with a linear basis function for the functional parameter and  $n_x = 4$  are given in Table 3.

Case 1				Case 2			
$i$	$x_{i2}$	$x_{i3}$	$x_{i4}$	$i$	$x_{i2}$	$x_{i3}$	$x_{i4}$
1	-1	1	-1	1	1	1	1
2	-1	1	1	2	0	0	-1
3	1	1	-1	3	1	0	0
4	-1	-1	1	4	0	-1	1
5	-1	-1	-1	5	-1	0	1
6	-1	1	1	6	0	1	1
7	1	-1	1	7	-1	-1	0
8	1	-1	-1	8	-1	0	0
9	1	1	1	9	0	0	0
10	1	-1	1	10	0	1	0
11	1	1	-1	11	0	0	0
12	-1	-1	-1	12	-1	1	-1

Table 3: Optimal designs for main effects (Case 1) and main & quadratic effects (Case 2) for linear basis function for the functional linear model.

## 4 Spline basis functions

To assess whether design performance is improved by widening the set of possible functions from which we choose the runs for the functional variable, we now use a spline basis expansion for  $x_{ij}(t)$ . A spline is a piecewise polynomial with continuity, and possibly continuity of derivatives, defined at the breakpoints. We use a B-spline basis expansion (see De Boor et al. 1978) of degree 1 on the interval  $[0, 1]$ . B-splines have a number of desirable properties as a spline basis, see Dierckx (1995, Chapter 1), including ease of computation through recursive formulae, they sum to unity for any  $t$  in the domain, and they are more numerically stable than alternative bases, e.g. the truncated power basis.

We repeat the example of Section 3.1 and find  $A$ -optimal designs for model (13) with a single functional variable but assuming a linear B-spline for  $x_i(t)$ . We find designs for a linear functional parameter,  $n = 4, 8, 12$  runs and choose the breakpoint vector such that  $n_x = 3, 4, 8, 16, 100, 201$ , assuming equally spaced breakpoints. Results are given in Table 4, and example designs are displayed in Figures 5 and 6. As in the previous section, design performance increases with  $n_x$  for all values of  $n$ , but with much smaller increases for  $n > 16$ . The functions chosen for the design actually become somewhat simpler for larger values of  $n_x$ , e.g. for  $n_x = 8$  the chosen functions commonly have four changes in slope (see Figure 5) whereas each function has only two changes when  $n_x = 16$  (Figure 6). This difference demonstrates the importance of the location of the breakpoints, as with

$n_x$	$n = 4$		$n = 8$		$n = 12$	
	A-opt	A-eff	A-opt	A-eff	A-opt	A-eff
3	12.471	0.674	6.224	0.624	4.123	0.609
4	9.314	0.902	4.168	0.931	2.759	0.910
8	8.594	0.978	3.940	0.985	2.571	0.977
16	8.433	0.997	3.895	0.997	2.528	0.994
100	8.405	1.000	3.882	1.000	2.512	1.000
201	8.404	1.000	3.882	1.000	2.512	1.000

Table 4: Objective function values and A-efficiency values with  $n = 4, 8, 12$  for the linear basis for  $\beta(t)$  and B-spline basis for  $x(t)$ .

larger values of  $n_x$  there is more flexibility in the location of the changes in slope. For larger  $n_x$ , each chosen function consists of two constant sections, at the extremes of the design space, joined by a linear component with finite slope. However, comparison of the objective function values for the designs found assuming step functions (Table 1) shows that the added complexity of the linear spline basis did not result in better designs.




Figure 5: Four run optimal design for  $n_x = 8$ , linear basis for  $\beta(t)$  and B-spline basis for  $x(t)$ .




Figure 6: Four run optimal design for  $n_x = 16$ , linear basis for  $\beta(t)$  and B-spline basis for  $x(t)$ .

## 5 Conclusions

We have demonstrated a general methodology for finding optimal designs for experiments involving functional variables and a scalar response. The methodology uses basis function expansions of the functional variable and the functional parameters in a scalar-on-function linear model. It is flexible and can be applied assuming a variety of different bases for both functional variables and parameters. For simple functional parameters, e.g. linear, only simple forms for the functional variable are required.

Ongoing work is extending the results to different criteria tailored to estimation of the functional parameters, finding designs for scalar-on-function generalised linear models, and developing methods for choosing optimal functions for inputs into dynamic models.

## References

- Balsa-Canto, Eva, M. R.-F. and Banga, J. R. (2007), ‘Optimal design of dynamic experiments for improved estimation of kinetic parameters of thermal degradation’, *Journal of Food Engineering* **82**(2), 178–188.
- De Boor, C., De Boor, C., Mathématicien, E.-U., De Boor, C. and De Boor, C. (1978), *A practical guide to splines*, Vol. 27, springer-verlag New York.
- Dierckx, P. (1995), *Curve and surface fitting with splines*, Oxford University Press.
- Georgakis, C. (2013), ‘Design of dynamic experiments: A data-driven methodology for the optimization of time-varying processes’, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research* **52**(35), 12369–12382.
- Goos, P. and Jones, B. (2011), *Optimal design of experiments: a case study approach*, John Wiley & Sons.
- Klebanov, N. and Georgakis, C. (2016), ‘Dynamic response surface models: a data-driven approach for the analysis of time-varying process outputs’, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research* **55**(14), 4022–4034.
- Ramsay, J. O. and Silverman, B. W. (1997), *Functional Data Analysis*, 1 edn, Springer.
- Ramsay, J. O. and Silverman, B. W. (2005), *Functional Data Analysis*, 2 edn, Springer.
- Roche, A. (2015), ‘Response surface methodology for functional data with application to nuclear safety’.
- Roche, A. (2018), ‘Local optimization of black-box functions with high or infinite-dimensional inputs: application to nuclear safety’, *Computational Statistics* **33**(1), 467–485.
- Uciński, D. and Bogacka, B. (2007), ‘A constrained optimum experimental design problem for model discrimination with a continuously varying factor’, *Journal of statistical planning and inference* .