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Abstract: The problem of three-dimensional two-impulsive orbital maneuvers between two elliptical orbits with minimum fuel consumption, but having a time limit, is considered in the present paper. This limit in the time generates a new characteristic to the problem, which eliminates the majority of the methods available in the literature. Equations available in the literature are used and some new ones are developed to consider cases with different geometries. Those equations are then solved and a software is implemented to perform the orbital maneuvers. The original equations are presented in the literature without any numerical results, so, the new cases considered and the solutions and implementation of the method available in the literatures are the contributions shown here. The software was used with success in several different situations.
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1 Introduction

The majority of the spacecrafts that have been placed in orbit around the Earth use the basic concepts of orbital transfers. During the launch, the spacecraft is placed in a parking orbit distinct from the final one which it was designed. Therefore, to reach the desired final orbit, the spacecraft must perform orbital transfer maneuvers. Beyond this, the spacecraft orbit must be corrected periodically because there are perturbations acting on it.

There are many alternatives to solve this problem in the literature, considering different assumptions. An important field of solutions considers the low thrust maneuver, where a force with low magnitude is used during a finite time. So, to obtain the trajectory of the spacecraft, the equations of motion must be integrated by numerical algorithms. Some results using this model can be seen in references [1] to [15]. There is also an alternative approach, which uses the concept of an impulsive thrust. This is the situation where the thrust has an infinity magnitude and is applied during a negligible time. Several papers used this approach, like references [16] to [42].

In this work, we consider the problem of two-impulse orbital transfers between non-coplanar elliptical orbits with minimum fuel consumption, but with a time limit for this transfer. This time limit imposes a new characteristic to the problem that rules out the majority of the transfer methods available in the literature. Therefore, the transfer methods must be adapted to this new constraint. The equations presented by Eckel and Vinh [33] are used, but some new equations, to extend the method to cases with different geometry, are developed. Then, the problem is solved and those equations are used to develop a new software for orbital maneuvers.

2 Definition of the Problem

The orbital transfer of a spacecraft from an initial orbit to a desired final orbit consists in a change of state (position, velocity and mass) of the spacecraft, from initial conditions \( \mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{v}_0 \) and \( m_0 \) at time \( t_0 \) to the final conditions \( \mathbf{r}_f, \mathbf{v}_f \) and \( m_f \) at time \( t_f \) (\( t_f \geq t_0 \)), as shown in Fig. 1. The maneuver can be classified as: maneuvers partially free, when one or more parameter is free (for example, the time spent by the maneuver); or maneuvers completely constrained, when all the parameters are constrained. In this case the spacecraft performs an orbital transfer maneuver from a specific point in the initial orbit to another specific point in the final orbit (for example, the rendezvous maneuvers). In this work, based in Rocco [40], we consider the orbital transfer maneuvers partially free, and that the spacecraft propulsion system is able to apply an impulsive thrust. Therefore, we have the instantaneous variation of the spacecraft velocity.
3 Presentation of the Method

The bases for this method are the equations presented by Eckel and Vinh [33] that provides: the transfer orbit between non-coplanar elliptical orbits with minimum fuel and fixed transfer time; or the minimum transfer time for a prescribed fuel consumption. In the present work we consider only the problem with fixed transfer time. The equations were presented in the literature, but the method was not implemented neither tested in Eckel and Vinh [33], and it is valid only for a specific geometry. They used the plane of the transfer orbit as the reference plane but we decided to use the equatorial plane as the reference plane because, in this way, it is easy to obtain and to apply the results in real applications. Using the transfer orbit as the reference plane almost all the results obtained belongs to the same specific geometry, so we changed the reference system, adding the equations 1 to 6 to consider cases with more complex geometry. Thus, this modification, the implementation and the solutions using this method are contributions of this work. After that the method was implemented to develop a software for orbital maneuvers. By varying the time spent in the maneuver, the software developed provides a set of results that are the solutions of the problem of bi-impulsive optimal orbital transfer with time limit.

Given two non-coplanar terminal orbits we desire to obtain a transfer orbit with minimum fuel consumption and fixed time transfer. The orbits are specified by their orbital elements, as shown in Table 1 (subscript 1: initial orbit; subscript 2: final orbit; no subscript: transfer orbit).

| $a$ | Semi-major axis |
| $e$ | Eccentricity |
| $P$ | Sement-latus rectum |
| $\omega$ | Longitude of the periapsis |
| $i$ | Inclination |
| $\Omega$ | Right ascension of the ascending node |
| $M$ | Mean anomaly |
| $E$ | Eccentric anomaly |
| $\lambda$ | Angle between the planes of the initial and final orbits |
| $\beta_1$ | True anomaly of the ascending node $N$ obtained in the plane of the initial orbit |
| $\beta_2$ | True anomaly of the ascending node $N$ obtained in the plane of the final orbit |
| $I_1$ | Location of the first impulse |
| $I_2$ | Location of the second impulse |
| $\Delta$ | Transfer angle obtained in the plane of the transfer orbit |
| $\gamma_1$ | Plane change angle resulted from the first impulse |
| $\gamma_2$ | Plane change angle resulted from the second impulse |
| $V_1$ | Velocity increment generated by the first impulse |
| $V_2$ | Velocity increment generated by the second impulse |
| $V$ | Total velocity increment |
| $T$ | Time spent by the maneuver |
| $\alpha_1$ | True anomaly of the point $I_1$ obtained in the plane of the initial orbit |
| $\alpha_2$ | True anomaly of the point $I_2$ obtained in the plane of the final orbit |
| $r_1$ | Distance from point $I_1$ |
| $r_2$ | Distance from point $I_2$ |
| $f_1$ | True anomaly of the point $I_1$ obtained in the plane of the transfer orbit |
| $f_2$ | True anomaly of the point $I_2$ obtained in the plane of the transfer orbit |
| $x_1$ | Radial component of the first impulse |
| $x_2$ | Radial component of the second impulse |
| $y_1$ | Transverse component of the first impulse in the plane of the initial orbit |
| $y_2$ | Transverse component of the second impulse in the plane of the transfer orbit |
| $z_1$ | Component of the first impulse orthogonal of the initial orbit |
| $z_2$ | Component of the second impulse orthogonal of the transfer orbit |
| $h_i$ | Horizontal component of $V_i$ |
Depending on the intersection of the orbital planes, there are four possible geometries for the maneuvers, as shown in Figs. 2 to 5.

Figure 2 presents the geometry of the maneuver when $\Omega_f > \Omega_i$ and $i_f > i_i$. Figure 3 presents the geometry when $\Omega_i > \Omega_f$ and $i_i > i_f$.

![Diagram of Fig. 2](image1)

**Fig. 2 – Geometry of the Maneuver when $\Omega_f > \Omega_i$ and $i_f > i_i$.**

![Diagram of Fig. 3](image2)

**Fig. 3 – Geometry of the Maneuver when $\Omega_i > \Omega_f$ and $i_i > i_f$.**
Figure 4 presents the geometry of the maneuver when $\Omega_2 > \Omega_1$ and $i_2 > i_1$. Figure 5 presents the geometry when $\Omega_1 > \Omega_2$ and $i_2 > i_1$.

Depending on the locations of the impulses, there are three possible cases (shown in Figs. 6 to 8).

---

Fig. 4 – Geometry of the maneuver When $\Omega_2 > \Omega_1$ and $i_2 > i_1$.

Fig. 5 – Geometry of the maneuver When $\Omega_1 > \Omega_2$ and $i_2 > i_1$. 
Fig. 6 – Case 1: $I_1$ before $N$ and $I_2$ after $N$.

Fig. 7 – Case 2: $I_1$ and $I_2$ after $N$. 
Combining these three cases with the four possible geometries for the transfer maneuver, there is a set of twelve cases that can be solved by the software developed. Thus, from the geometry of the maneuver, we obtain $\beta_1$, $\beta_2$, $\lambda$ and the transfer angle $\Delta$ by [42]:

$$
\beta_1 = \arctan \left[ \frac{\sin(\Omega_2 - \Omega_1)\tan(180^\circ - i_2)}{\sin i_1 + \tan(180^\circ - i_1)\cos i_1 \cos(\Omega_2 - \Omega_1)} \right] - \omega_1
$$

(1)

$$
\beta_2 = \arctan \left[ \frac{\sin(\Omega_2 - \Omega_1)\tan i_1}{\sin i_2 + \tan i_2 \cos(180^\circ - i_2) \cos(\Omega_2 - \Omega_1)} \right] - \omega_2
$$

(2)

$$
\lambda = \arcsin \left[ \frac{\sin(\Omega_2 - \Omega_1)\sin i_1}{\sin(\omega_2 + \beta_2)} \right] = \arcsin \left[ \frac{\sin(\Omega_2 - \Omega_1)\sin i_2}{\sin(\omega_1 + \beta_1)} \right]
$$

(3)

$$
\cos \Delta = \cos(\beta_1 - \alpha_1)\cos(\alpha_2 - \beta_2) + \\
+ \sin(\beta_1 - \alpha_1)\sin(\alpha_2 - \beta_2)\cos(180^\circ - \lambda)
$$

(4)

$$
\sin \Delta = \frac{\sin(\alpha_2 - \beta_2)\sin(180^\circ - \lambda)}{\sin B}
$$

(5)

Consider that the spacecraft propulsion system is able to apply an impulsive thrust and that the maneuver is bi-impulsive, the total velocity increment is:

$$
V = V_i + V_2 = F(X)
$$

where $X$ is an arbitrary variable for the transfer.

The time of the transfer is:

$$
T = G(X)
$$

(8)

Therefore, the problem is the minimization of $V$ for a prescribed $T$. If the transfer time is prescribed as being equal to a value $T_0$, we have the constraint relation:

$$
T - T_0 = 0
$$

(9)

Thus, we have the performance index:

$$
J = V + k(T - T_0)
$$

(10)
From Eckel and Vinh [33], we have that the solution of the problem depends on three variables: the semi-latus rectum \( p \) of the transfer orbit and the true anomalies \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) that define the position of impulses in the initial and final orbits. Therefore, we have the necessary conditions:

\[
\frac{\partial V}{\partial p} + k\frac{\partial T}{\partial p} = 0
\]
\[
\frac{\partial V}{\partial \alpha_i} + k\frac{\partial T}{\partial \alpha_i} = 0
\]
\[
\frac{\partial V}{\partial \alpha_2} + k\frac{\partial T}{\partial \alpha_2} = 0
\]

By eliminating the Lagrange’s multiplier \( k \) from equations 11, there is a set of two equations:

\[
\frac{\partial V}{\partial p} \frac{\partial T}{\partial \alpha_i} - \frac{\partial V}{\partial \alpha_i} \frac{\partial T}{\partial p} = 0
\]
\[
\frac{\partial V}{\partial p} \frac{\partial T}{\partial \alpha_2} - \frac{\partial V}{\partial \alpha_2} \frac{\partial T}{\partial p} = 0
\]

Evaluating the partial derivatives in these equations and doing some simplifications, the final optimal conditions are:

\[
(X_1 + Y Z \sin f_1)\{S_1 q_1 - T_1 \sin f_1\} + S_1 T_1 +
+ W_1\left[\frac{W_z - W_s}{\sin \Delta} q_1 - W_1 \tan \frac{\Delta}{2}\right] - \frac{W_z e r e_1}{q_1 p_1} \sin \alpha_i \sin \gamma_i = 0
\]

\[
(X_2 + Y Z \sin f_1)\{S_1 q_2 - T_2 \sin f_2\} + S_2 T_2 -
- W_2\left[\frac{W_z - W_s}{\sin \Delta} q_2 - W_1 \tan \frac{\Delta}{2}\right] + \frac{W_z e r e_2}{q_1 p_2} \sin \alpha_i \sin \gamma_2 = 0
\]

which use the following relations:

\[
r_i = \frac{p_i}{1 + e_i \cos \alpha_i}
\]

\[
f_i = \arctan \left[\cot \Delta - \frac{r_i (p - r_i)}{r_i (p - r_i) \sin \Delta}\right]
\]

\[
f_2 = \arctan \left[\frac{r_2 (p - r_i)}{r_i (p - r_i) \sin \Delta} - \cot \Delta\right]
\]

\[
e = \frac{r_2 - r_i}{r_1 \cos f_1 - r_i \cos f_2}
\]

\[
\gamma_1 = \arcsin \left[-\frac{\sin (\beta - \alpha_i) \sin \phi}{\sin \Delta}\right]
\]

\[
\gamma_2 = \arcsin \left[\frac{\sin (\beta - \alpha_2) \sin \phi}{\sin \Delta}\right]
\]

\[
S_i = \frac{x_i}{V_i}
\]

\[
T_i = \frac{y_i}{V_i}
\]

\[
W_i = \frac{z_i}{V_i}
\]

\[
q_i = \frac{p}{r_i}
\]

\[
X_1 = \frac{S_1 \cos \Delta - S_2}{\sin \Delta} + T_1
\]

\[
X_2 = \frac{S_1 - S_2 \cos \Delta}{\sin \Delta} + T_2
\]

\[
Y = \frac{1}{(1 - e^2) \sin \Delta} \left[3 e^2 T + \frac{\mu}{\mu - 2e} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_1 \sin f_2}\right) + \cot g f_2 - \cot g f_1\right]
\]

\[
Z = \frac{q_2 X_2 - q_1 X_1 + (S_1 + S_2) \tan \frac{\Delta}{2}}{\cot g f_1 - \cot g f_2 + Y\left[1 + e^2 \sin \Delta + 2e (\sin f_2 - \sin f_1)\right]}
\]

The semi-latus rectum, the semi-major axis and the components of the impulses are given by equations 26 to 31. The necessary velocity increment to perform the maneuver can be obtained using equation 32.
The total time spent in the maneuver can be obtained using the following equations:

\[ E_i = \arccos \left( \frac{e + \cos f_i}{1 + e \cos f_i} \right) \]  
(33)

\[ \sin E_i = \frac{\sqrt{1 - e^2} \sin f_i}{1 + e \cos f_i} \]  
(34)

\[ M_i = E_i - e \sin E_i \]  
(35)

\[ T = \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{a^3}} \left( M_{i2} - M_{i1} + 2\pi N \right) \]  
(36)

Therefore, there is an equation system composed by equations 9, 13 and 14. Solving this equation system by the Newton Raphson Method [43] we obtain the transfer orbit that performs the maneuver spending a minimum fuel consumption, but with a specific time.

\[ a = \frac{p}{1 - e^2} \]  
(27)

\[ x_i = \sqrt{\mu} \left( \frac{e \sin f_i - e \sin \alpha_i}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \]  
(28)

\[ x_2 = \sqrt{\mu} \left( \frac{e_2 \sin \alpha_2 - e \sin f_2}{\sqrt{p_2}} \right) \]  
(29)

\[ y_i = \sqrt{\mu} \left( \sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p_i} \cos \gamma_i \right) \]  
(30)

\[ z_i = \sqrt{\mu} \left( \frac{1}{r_i} - \sin \gamma_i \right) \]  
(31)

\[ h_i = (y_i^2 + z_i^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \]  
(32)

\[ V_i = (x_i^2 + h_i^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \]  
(33)

4- RESULTS

Figures 9 to 26 present some of the results obtained in Rocco [40] and [41] with the software developed. They not show only the tendency of the parameters, but they also quantify the evolution of the variables studied. The graphs were obtained through the variation of the total time spent in the maneuver. Thus, each point was obtained by executing the software with a given time. The points were joined by a line that shows the behaviour of that orbital element.

The first example (Figures 9 to 14, 25 and 26) used here is a maneuver of small amplitude between an initial orbit with semi-major axis of 12030 km, eccentricity 0.02, inclination 0.00873 rad, longitude of the periapse 3.17649 rad, longitude of the ascending node zero and a final orbit with semi-major axis of 11994.7 km, eccentricity 0.016, inclination 0.00602 rad, longitude of the periapse 3.05171 rad, right ascension of the ascending node 0.15568 rad. This maneuver shows that the method applied here is suitable for maneuvers of stationkeeping. In this example we used as initial values \( l = 12033.55 \) km, \( \alpha_1 = 4.03575149 \) rad, and \( \alpha_2 = 5.94012897 \) rad.

As a second example (Figures 15 to 24), we performed a maneuver between an initial orbit with semi-major axis of 15000 km, eccentricity 0.05, inclination 0.08726646 rad, longitude of the periapse 0.52359878 rad, right ascension of the ascending node 0.17453293 rad, and a final orbit with semi-major axis of 20000 km, eccentricity 0.06, inclination 0.17453293 rad, longitude of the periapse 0.78539816 rad, right ascension of the ascending node 0.34906585 rad. This maneuver shows that the method can be applied in transfers involving larger amplitudes. In this example we used as initial values \( l = 17500 \) km, \( \alpha_1 = 0.78539816 \) rad, and \( \alpha_2 = 1.04719755 \) rad.

The Figures show the behaviour of some orbital elements versus time spent in the maneuver, in seconds. Figures 9 and 15 show the behaviour of the semi-major axis of the transfer orbit, in km. Figures 10 and 16 show the behaviour of the eccentricity of the transfer orbit. Figures 11 and 17 show the transfer angle in degrees. Figures 12 and 18 show the behaviour of the inclination of the transfer orbit, in degrees. Figures 13 and 19 show the plane change angle resulted from the first and second impulses, in degrees. Figures 14 and 20 show the velocity increment \( V_1 \) and \( V_2 \), and the total velocity increment \( V \) in km/s. Figures 21 and 22 show the plane change angle generated by the
impulses for the second example in more detail. Figures 23 and 25 show the resultant of the plane change ($\gamma_1 + \gamma_2$), and Figures 24 and 26 show the total plane change ($|\gamma_1| + |\gamma_2|$) in degrees for the first and second example, respectively.

5- CONCLUSIONS

From Figures 9 to 26 and from other examples studied in Rocco [40], we can verify that, in a general way, when the maneuver spends less time the semi-major axis and the eccentricity of the transfer orbit increases, and when the maneuver spends more time the velocity increment decreases and the transfer angle increases. These behaviors occur because, when the maneuver is performed with less time, the transfer orbit approaches to a hyperbolic orbit, so the semi-major axis and eccentricity tend to increase. When the maneuver is performed with more time the transfer angle can be greater and the impulse directions approach the direction of the motion of the spacecraft. However, the impulse directions will never be in the direction of the motion, because there is always a component orthogonal to the orbital plane. This component provides a plane change, as shown in Figures 13 and 19. We can verify, in Figure 13, that, when the maneuver spends less time the plane change angle increases. In the second example, shown in Figure 19, this fact also occurs, as shown in more details in Figures 21, 22, 23 and 24. Figure 21 and 22 show the plane change angle resulted from the first and second impulse, respectively. In these figures, it is easy to verify that there is a small variation in the value of the plane change angle along the time. In Figure 21 we have a curve that initially decreases with the time, but around 2950 seconds the curve turns to increase. However, Figure 22 show that the value of the plane change angle resulted from the second impulse has a clear tendency to decrease with time. Therefore the resultant of the plane change, shown in Figure 23, and the total plane change angle, shown in Figure 24, decrease along the time. In the first example, although the resultant of the plane change increases along the time, as shown in Figure 25, the total plane change angle, shown in Figure 26, presents the same tendency of Figure 24, regarding the second example. The small increase in the value of the total plane change angle, observed in Figure 26, is due to a change of geometry of the maneuver that happens about 2600 seconds. Comparing these figures with Figures 14 and 20, it is possible to verify that, for a high plane change, there is a high value of the velocity increment. This is expected because changes in inclination, in general, spend more fuel. The increase in the plane change angle occur because when the fixed time is small, the spacecraft have to perform the maneuver very fast, then there is a great plane change in the first impulse and another great plane change in the second impulse. But the sum of the plane changes angles almost remains constant because the second impulse reverse part of the plane change angle resulted from the first impulse. But the resultant of the plane change is not equal to the difference among the inclinations of the initial and final orbits, because these orbits usually do not cross, because the maneuver does not correct just the difference in inclination, but also correct the eccentricity, the longitude of the periapside, the right ascension of the ascending node and the semi-major axis. Beyond this, we can verify that, for the first example, the semi-major axis and the eccentricity of the transfer orbit increases. When the maneuver is performed with more time the semi-major axis and the eccentricity of the transfer orbit increases, and the semi-major axis and the eccentricity of the transfer orbit approaches to a hyperbolic orbit, so the semi-major axis and eccentricity tend to increase. When the maneuver is performed with more time the transfer angle can be greater and the impulse directions approach the direction of the motion of the spacecraft. However, the impulse directions will never be in the direction of the motion, because there is always a component orthogonal to the orbital plane. This component provides a plane change, as shown in Figures 13 and 19. We can verify, in Figure 13, that, when the maneuver spends less time the plane change angle increases...
Fig. 9 – Semi-Major Axis vs. Time Spent in the Maneuver (1° example).

Fig. 10 – Eccentricity vs. Time Spent in the Maneuver (1° example).

Fig. 11 – Transfer Angle vs. Time Spent in the Maneuver (1° example).

Fig. 12 – Inclination vs. Time Spent in the Maneuver (1° example).

Fig. 13 – Plane Change Angle vs. Time Spent in the Maneuver (1° example).

Fig. 14 – Velocity Increment vs. Time Spent in the Maneuver (1° example).
Fig. 15 – Semi-Major Axis vs. Time Spent in the Maneuver (2° example).

Fig. 16 – Eccentricity vs. Time Spent in the Maneuver (2° example).

Fig. 17 – Transfer Angle vs. Time Spent in the Maneuver (2° example).

Fig. 18 – Inclination vs. Time Spent in the Maneuver (2° example).

Fig. 19 – Plane Change Angle vs. Time Spent in the Maneuver (2° example).

Fig. 20 – Velocity Increment vs. Time Spent in the Maneuver (2° example).
Besides that, we should advise that the software developed can not supply the solution for all combinations of the input parameters. For certain values of time, it can be impossible to obtain one solution because, for a very small or very large values of the time spent in the maneuver, the solution can not exist, or the numerical algorithms used in the software do not converge for...
the solution, because the initial values used are too far from the solution. So, it is recommended a physical analysis of the problem, which takes into account the periods of the initial and final orbits, to find the range of values for the time spent in the maneuver, which is possible to accomplish the maneuver.

Another question to be solved is if the solution is a local or global minimum. Up to where we verified, the solution obtained seems to be a global minimum, because for the same input parameters, but using different initial values, it was not possible to obtain better results. It is important to notice that the software tests automatically all the results, verifying if the maneuver obtained is just a mathematical solution or if it can really be implemented. When we use numerical methods there are some solutions, which satisfy the equations, however, in practice, they are impossible. Due to this fact, all the points shown in the graphs were tested and they represent solutions capable of being implemented. Thus, the developed software was tested with success.
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