Evaluating the integrals and determining the constant of integration

\[ \sin \frac{\varphi}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \cos \frac{\psi}{2} \right)^{\alpha} \]

\[ \cos \frac{\varphi}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sin \frac{\psi}{2} \right)^{\alpha} \]

The drag coefficient \( C_D \), mass \( m \), and aerodynamic reference area \( A \) are all assumed to be constant, as is the local atmospheric density \( \rho \). Again, from Eqs. (4) the vehicle flight-path angle can be used as the independent variable to obtain a single first-order equation, viz.,

\[ \frac{dv}{d\psi} = f_1(\psi)v + f_2(\psi)v^3 \]

where

\[ f_1(\psi) = \alpha \csc \psi - \cot \psi \]
\[ f_2(\psi) = \beta \csc \psi \]

Equation (6) is a form of Bernoulli’s equation that has a closed-form solution. It can be demonstrated that the nonlinear equation can be transformed into a linear equation with an integrating factor through an appropriate variable transformation. The general solution is then given by

\[ (\alpha - \alpha^3) \frac{v^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \beta \csc^2 \psi = \kappa \exp \left( -2 \int f_1(\psi) d\psi \right) \]

\[ -2 \exp \left( -2 \int f_1(\psi) d\psi \right) \]

Evaluating the integrals and determining the constant of integration \( \kappa \) from the boundary conditions, the solution is found to be

\[ v(\psi)^{-2} = \kappa \exp \left( -2 \int f_1(\psi) d\psi \right) \]

\[ \times \left[ \int \exp \left( 2 \int f_1(\psi) d\psi \right) f_2(\psi) d\psi \right] \]

which clearly reduces to the vacuum case defined by Eq. (3) as \( \beta \to 0 \).

The velocity-flight-path-angle profile is shown in Fig. 2 for a range of drag parameters \( \beta \). It can be seen that as the effect of air drag increases, the trajectory curves more quickly toward the local vertical. Because the effect of drag is to increase the effective thrust-weight ratio of the vehicle, the descent maneuver may be completed with a lower thrust-induced acceleration than would be required for the vacuum descent case.

Conclusions

It has been demonstrated that the conventional solution for a gravity turn maneuver in vacuum may be extended to include descent to the surface of a body with an atmosphere. With the assumption of quadratic air drag, the resulting equations of motion are shown to be a form of Bernoulli’s equation, which has a closed analytical solution. With the vehicle velocity available as a function of flight-path angle, the solution for the altitude and time variables is then reduced, in principle, to a set of quadrature integrations.
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I. Introduction

C onsiderable interest had developed in the study of optimization theory as applied to the spacecraft system by the early 1960s. The basic theory in determining the extremum of the optimal control problems has been developed for nonsingular and singular controls. Computation difficulties have plagued the study of time- and fuel-optimal control problems, particularly for systems with nonlinear dynamics. However, there has been a resurgence of interest in the design of controllers for spacecraft reorientation maneuvers in the past decade.5–10 Among these studies, the optimization objectives have included the maneuver time,5,7,9 the fuel consumed,5,9,10 and the weighted fuel/time cost function.10 In addition, the singular controls of both time- and fuel-optimal controls have been analyzed for spacecraft reorientations.9,11

This Note addresses the problem of designing fuel/time-optimal controllers for spacecraft undergoing rest-to-rest maneuvers. A modified switch time optimization (STO) algorithm12 is used to solve the problem of reorienting an inertially symmetric spacecraft with weighted fuel/time cost function from an initial state of rest to a final state of rest. In this work, we do not study controls with singular arc and, therefore, assume that the fuel/time-optimal control profile is bang-off-bang.10,13,14 As the weight on the fuel, \( \alpha \), is increased from zero, it is shown that the number of switches in the control profiles, for an inertially symmetric spacecraft, varies from 5 to 10 to 9. Beyond a specific value of \( \alpha \), it is shown that the eigenaxis control with two switches is the optimum.

II. Problem Formulation

The Euler’s rotational equations of motion for an inertially symmetric rigid spacecraft with principal body axes at the center of mass are

\[ \dot{\omega} = u \]

where \( \omega^T = [\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3] \) is the angular velocity vector and \( u^T = [u_1, u_2, u_3] \), the control vector, is subject to the constraints

\[ -1 \leq u_i \leq 1 \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \]

Received Oct. 17, 1995; revision received Nov. 13, 1996; accepted for publication Nov. 23, 1996. Copyright © 1996 by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc. All rights reserved.

*Graduate Student, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering.
†Assistant Professor, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. Member AIAA.
The associated kinematic equations of motion are
\[ \dot{q} = \Omega \Delta q \]  
(3)

where
\[
\Omega = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & -\omega_1 & -\omega_2 & -\omega_3 \\
\omega_1 & 0 & \omega_3 & -\omega_2 \\
\omega_2 & -\omega_3 & 0 & \omega_1 \\
\omega_3 & \omega_2 & -\omega_1 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]  
(4)

and \( q^T = [q_0, q_1, q_2, q_3] \) are the quaternions that represent orientation between the Euler axis and the body-fixed reference frame. The problem of design of weighted fuel/time-optimal controllers for spacecraft reorientation can be stated as follows: Determine the controls that drive the system states (\( \omega, q \)) described by Eqs. (1) and (3) from their specified initial conditions (\( \omega_0, q_0 \)) to their final conditions (\( \omega_f, q_f \)) while minimizing the cost function
\[ J = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \left(1 + \alpha \sum_{i=1}^{3} |u_i| \right) dt \]  
(5)

subject to control constraints [Eq. (2)]. A modification of the STO algorithm that constructs an optimal solution based on the first-order gradient method by integrating the state equations forward in time using initial guesses of the final time and switch times of the controls, and the costates backward in time, is used to determine the optimal control profile. The errors in the terminal constraints are used to update the estimated values of the switch times and the maneuver time for each iteration until convergence. In the fuel/time optimal problem, we assume the control profiles are bang-off-bang so that we have to investigate only the behavior close to the switch times as the STO algorithm does for the time-optimal control problem.

III. Numerical Examples

The problem addressed in this study is the design of a weighted fuel/time-optimal controller for an inertially symmetric spacecraft undergoing a 180-deg rest-to-rest reorientation. The problem is subject to the following boundary conditions.
1) Initial conditions:
\[ \omega_1(0) = \omega_2(0) = \omega_3(0) = 0 \]
and
\[ q_0(0) = 1, \quad q_1(0) = q_2(0) = q_3(0) = 0 \]
2) Terminal conditions:
\[ \omega_1(t_f) = \omega_2(t_f) = \omega_3(t_f) = 0 \]
and
\[ q_0(t_f) = q_1(t_f) = q_2(t_f) = 0, \quad q_3(t_f) = 1 \]
Fig. 3 Controls, states, and costates for a 180-deg rest-to-rest maneuver with $\alpha = 0.08$.

Fig. 4 Comparison using three-axis and eigenaxis controls.

and control constraints:

1) $-1 \leq u_i \leq 1$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ for three-axis control;

2) $-1 \leq u_3 \leq 1$ for eigenaxis control.

The modified STO algorithm will be used to solve both the time-optimal and fuel/time-optimal control problems. A comparative study of three-axis and eigenaxis control will also be carried out.

The time-optimal control profile is solved and the maneuver time is shown to be $t_f = 3.243$, which is the same as that shown in Refs. 4 and 10. Figure 1 illustrates the time histories of controls, states, and costates. The switching function, $\delta H/\delta u_i$, is the same as the costate of the associated angular velocity in this application.

Because the time-optimal control consists of 5 switches, including fuel into the cost function should lead to a control profile that is characterized by 10 switches. This conjecture is verified for the case of $\alpha < 0.053$, where the control profile maintains 10 switches for the three-axis control. A typical set of time responses for $\alpha = 0.02$ is shown in Fig. 2. When $\alpha$ is in the range 0.053–0.0806, there are only nine switches for the three-axis control. Figure 3 illustrates the nine-switch control with the corresponding states and costates for the case of $\alpha = 0.08$.

Bilimoria and Wie have shown that the eigenaxis control is not the time-optimal control for the prescribed maneuver. Here, we study the variation of the fuel/time cost as a function of $\alpha$ for eigenaxis control. The variation of costs and final maneuver times for different $\alpha$ for three-axis and eigenaxis controls are shown in Fig. 4. Results indicate that the eigenaxis control turns out to be the optimal control for $\alpha \geq 0.063$. The reason for this is that the final maneuver time is increasing more sharply with $\alpha$ for the three-axis control compared to the eigenaxis controller.

IV. Conclusions

A modified STO algorithm to solve the weighted fuel/time optimal control problem has been developed. An inerter symmetric spacecraft undergoing a rest-to-rest reorientation maneuver with three independent bounded impulsive controls is investigated. Solutions to both time-optimal and fuel/time-optimal control problems are analyzed using the modified STO algorithm.

Results from this study illustrate the variation of the switch-time of the control profile from a 5-switch for the time-optimal case to a 10-switch for small $\alpha$. Increasing $\alpha$ beyond 0.053 results in a transition from the 10-switch profile to a 9-switch profile. For $\alpha > 0.063$, it is shown that the eigenaxis control with two switches is the optimum.
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The following discrete ECA tracking filter model is considered:

$$\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & -1/\tau
\end{bmatrix}
= Q(T_\tau) =
\begin{bmatrix}
q_{11} & q_{12} & q_{13} \\
q_{12} & q_{22} & q_{23} \\
q_{13} & q_{23} & q_{33}
\end{bmatrix}$$

$$\Phi(T_\tau) =
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & \tau\theta & \tau^2\phi_1 \\
0 & 1 & (1 - \psi_3) \\
0 & 0 & \phi_3
\end{bmatrix}$$

$$\Phi^{-1}(T_\tau) =
\begin{bmatrix}
1 - \tau\theta & -\tau^2\psi_1 \\
0 & 1 & (1 - \psi_3) \\
0 & 0 & \psi_3
\end{bmatrix}$$

$$H =
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}$$

$$R(T_\tau) =
\begin{bmatrix}
R_1 & 0 \\
0 & R_2
\end{bmatrix}$$

with

$$\tilde{x}(k|k) = \tilde{x}(k|k - 1) + K[z(k) - H\tilde{x}(k)]$$

where the Kalman gain matrix $$K$$ is given by

$$K = PH^2R^{-1} =
\begin{bmatrix}
p_{11}/R_1 & p_{12}/R_2 \\
p_{21}/R_1 & p_{22}/R_2 \\
p_{31}/R_1 & p_{32}/R_2
\end{bmatrix}$$

where $$P$$ is the a posteriori covariance matrix of the estimation error.

The five parameters used to describe this problem are rms target acceleration $$a$$, correlation time of target acceleration $$\tau$$, sampling time $$T_s$$, rms position measurement error $$\sigma_{mp}$$, and rms velocity measurement error $$\sigma_{mv}$$.

In Eq. (3), $$R_1 = \sigma_{mp}^2$$, $$R_2 = \sigma_{mv}^2$$, and we define the three dimensionless parameters as

$$p_1 = \tau/T_s$$

$$p_2 = \frac{T_s^2\sigma_a}{\sigma_{mp}}$$

$$p_3 = \frac{T_s\sigma_{mv}}{\sigma_{mp}}$$

We restrict $$p_1$$ (Ref. 3) to a few simple multiplies of the critical value $$p_1c = \tau/T_s$$. The critical value maximizes the power and velocity errors of the filter. Values determined empirically are well approximated by the equation

$$p_1c = \frac{\tau}{T_s} = \left[0.56 + 3.4p_2^{-0.85}\right]$$

III. Macfarlane–Potter–Fath Eigensystem Method

The steady-state solution of the time-invariant matrix Riccati equation was discovered independently by MacFarlane et al. The solution $$P(\infty)$$ of the steady-state matrix Riccati equation in discrete time is formalized as Lemma 1.

Lemma 1 (Ref. 5). If $$W_{11}$$ and $$W_{21}$$ are $$n \times n$$ matrices such that $$W_{21}$$ is nonsingular and

$$H_{1} W_{11} W_{21} = W_{11} W_{21} D$$

$$\begin{bmatrix}
W_{11} & W_{21}
\end{bmatrix}$$
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