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Low-thrust technology is a key driver in current and upcoming space exploration missions due to their high specific impulse. A challenge when designing low-thrust trajectories is due to the inherent coupling of the power and propulsion subsystems with the trajectory, as the spacecraft mass greatly affects the obtainable acceleration by a given propulsion subsystem. To this end, this work proposes an approach for coupling the sizing process of the power and propulsion subsystems to a direct-transcription-based trajectory optimization problem, which enables a concurrent trade-space exploration of both the trajectory and the spacecraft design.

INTRODUCTION

With recent advances in electric propulsion (EP) technology, exploration of our solar system neighborhood has become far more accessible. EP’s characteristically high specific impulse ($I_{sp}$) enables larger payload fraction to be delivered, directly translating to more scientific outcome. In contrast to chemical thrusters, EP systems achieve their high $I_{sp}$ by accelerating their propellant to high exhaust velocities, which leads to large power consumption. For spacecraft applications, such large power requirement becomes a driving constraint on the power subsystem as well as the spacecraft as a whole. To meet such power-hungry requirements, a traditional approach has been to use radioisotope thermoelectric generator (RTG) such as NASA’s MMRTG\textsuperscript{1} for missions to the outer-solar system. However, recent developments in solar electric systems have opened ways for the use of solar-based power systems in such missions as well. Such solar electric propulsion (SEP) based missions include Deep Space 1, Dawn, Hayabusa 1 and 2,\textsuperscript{2,3} BepiColombo,\textsuperscript{4,5} Psyche,\textsuperscript{6} and DESTINY+.\textsuperscript{7} Table 1 shows a summary of past, present, and future SEP missions exploring the solar system.

On top of the aforementioned design constraint placed by the power requirements, with the radial and time dependence of the available power from a given solar electric system, the coupling of a trajectory for a SEP spacecraft with its power and propulsion subsystems cannot be neglected. Adding further complexity to the trajectory design is the multiple operational settings at which an EP system may be operated; these settings typically lead to thrust and $I_{sp}$ being nonlinear functions of power consumption. In such scenario, the optimal trajectory of an EP spacecraft may involve operating the thruster at differing settings along its transfer.
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### Table 1: Key figures from interplanetary missions employing solar electric propulsion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Destination SMA, AU</th>
<th>Wet mass, kg</th>
<th>Power at 1 AU, kW</th>
<th>Thrusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deep Space 1</td>
<td>9969 Braille</td>
<td>2.341</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1× NSTAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>1 Ceres</td>
<td>2.768</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3× NSTAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayabusa</td>
<td>25143 Itokawa</td>
<td>1.324</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4× μ10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayabusa 2</td>
<td>162173 Ryugu</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4× μ10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BepiColombo</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>4100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4× QinetiQ T6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psyche</td>
<td>16 Psyche</td>
<td>2.921</td>
<td>2608</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4× SPT-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESTINY+</td>
<td>3200 Phaethon</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4× μ10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As exploration of planets such as Venus and Mars as well as asteroids gain increasing attention, a method for concurrently optimizing the trajectory along with the relevant subsystems of a SEP spacecraft is pertinent. In the context of space mission planning and vehicle design, Isaji et al. considered an optimization problem with concurrent subsystem sizing, however only a fixed option for the trajectories have been considered. Recent literature on simultaneous design of spacecraft trajectory and system includes Nicholas et al., which decoupled the spacecraft sizing and trajectory design problems, and optimized these individually while ensuring that the mission as a whole (i.e. combination of spacecraft and its trajectory) to be feasible. Petukhov and Sang Wook studied the joint optimization of key parameters of the propulsion and power subsystems for optimizing nuclear electric propulsion trajectories via optimal control theory. Arya et al. later studied the trajectory design as an optimal control problem via a Composite Smoothing Control framework, with the power at beginning of life (BOL) as part of the state variables. In the context of Earth-based satellites, Ceccherini et al. studied the combined optimization of a GEO spacecraft and its transfer trajectory from injection by the launcher. Trajectory design with varying thruster mode has also been studied; Taheri and Arya et al. considered discrete thruster modes simultaneously.

In this work, the low-thrust trajectory design and the subsystem sizing are considered simultaneously as a single optimization problem that can be solved by gradient-based optimization algorithms. Leveraging on the success of direct methods in conducting efficient trade-space search for spacecraft trajectories, this work extends this capability by incorporating key parameters of SEP spacecraft into the direct method-based trajectory optimization problem. Specifically, the power and propulsion subsystems are parameterized through a combination of previously adopted models and a novel interpolation scheme for sizing thrusters. The proposed method provides an effective tool for conducting architecture and trajectory trade-studies concurrently.

The paper is organized as follows: initially, the Sims-Flanagan Transcription, a direct method based trajectory optimization scheme, which forms the basis of the problem in this work, is introduced. Then, the model used to decompose the spacecraft is introduced. This also involves a discussion on the way in which the propulsion unit is scaled, based on data from existing EP systems. This is followed by a description on the integration of the spacecraft model into the trajectory design problem, resulting in the extend problem formulation. The introduced approach is employed for a case-study of a cargo mission to Mars.
OVERVIEW OF DIRECT LOW-THRUST TRAJECTORY OPTIMIZATION

The traditional Sims-Flanagan Transcription (SFT) problem decomposes a gravity-assist trajectory into a sequence of \( N \) legs, each beginning and ending at a node. The node typically represents a departure, fly-by, or arrival at a celestial body, while it is not limited to these and may just be a user-defined state osculating in time. Within each leg, the spacecraft state \( y = [r, v, m]^T \) is propagated forward from the earlier node and backward from the latter node. The mismatch of the spacecraft state at the end of the forward and backward propagation is incorporated as an equality constraint, denoted as \( h_{\text{mp}} \), given by

\[
h^i_{\text{mp}} = y^i_{\text{backward}} - y^i_{\text{forward}}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N
\]  

The propagation is typically done by discretization of the forward and backward portion of the leg to segments, where each segment approximates the net effect of continuous, low-thrust acceleration via a single impulse at the center of the segment. The total number of segments of the \( i^{\text{th}} \) leg is denoted as \( n^i \). For detailed illustration of this implementation, see Shimane and Ho.

The objective of a trajectory optimization problem typically involves the mass, time of flight, or some combination of the two. In this work, since the purpose is to explore a wide range of spacecraft architecture for achieving payload delivery to a given destination, a minimization of an aggregated sum of the initial mass at LEO, denoted as \( \text{IMLEO} \) (“Initial Mass at LEO”), and the time of flight, is considered; thus, the objective function \( f \) is given by

\[
f(x) = w_1 \text{IMLEO} + w_2 \text{TOF}_{\text{max}}
\]

where \( x \) is the decision vector, and \( w_i \) are the weights on each objective term. In addition, an inequality constraint on the total time of flight is imposed to restrict the design space when the optimizer attempts to prioritize the minimization of the IMLEO

\[
g_{\text{TOF}}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{N} \Delta t_i - \text{TOF}_{\text{max}} \leq 0
\]

In the case of planetary gravity assists, an additional constraint must be enforced to ensure the spacecraft does not intersect with a safety sphere around the planet, defined by a safety radius. This constraint takes the form

\[
g_{\text{gravity-assist}} = (r_{\text{planet}} + h_{\text{safe}}) - \frac{\mu_{\text{planet}}}{v_{\infty}^2} \left[ \frac{1}{\sin \left( \frac{\delta_{\text{turn-angle}}}{2} \right)} - 1 \right] \leq 0
\]

where \( \delta_{\text{turn-angle}} \) is obtained by

\[
\delta_{\text{turn-angle}} = \arccos \left( \frac{v_{\infty}^- \cdot v_{\infty}^+}{v_{\infty}^- v_{\infty}^+} \right) = \arccos \left( \frac{v_{\infty}^+}{v_{\infty}^2 \cdot v_{\infty}^+} \right)
\]

The resulting optimization problem is given by

\[
\min_x \quad \text{eqn. (2)} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad h_{\text{mp}}(x) = 0 \\
\quad \quad g_{\text{TOF}}(x) \leq 0 \\
\quad \quad g_{\text{gravity-assist}}(x) \leq 0
\]
In traditional SFT problems, the value of IMLEO is simply taken as the initial mass $m^0$ of the spacecraft. The decision vector $\mathbf{x}$ for a traditional SFT problem takes the form

$$\mathbf{x} = [c_{\text{departure}}, c_1^{\text{gravity-assist}}, \ldots, c_{N-1}^{\text{gravity-assist}}, c_{\text{arrival}}, \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_N]^T$$

(7)

where $c$ is a collection of optimization variables of nodes, while $\tau$ is a collection of thrust controls of each leg. The node variables $c$ are given by

$$c_{\text{type}} = \begin{cases} [t_0, m^0, v_\infty^1, \alpha^1, \delta^1] & \text{if type is departure} \\ [\Delta t^i, m^i, v_{\infty}^{i+1}, \alpha^{i+1}, \delta^{i+1}], i \in [1, N-1] & \text{if type is gravity-assist} \\ [\Delta t^N, v_{\infty}^{N+1}, \alpha^{N+1}, \delta^{N+1}] & \text{if type is arrival} \end{cases}$$

(8)

where $t_0$ is the departure epoch, $\Delta t$ is the duration of a leg, and $\alpha$ and $\delta$ are the right-ascension and declination angles with respect to a celestial body, and $m$ is the spacecraft mass at the encounter with the celestial body. The subscripts $(\cdot)_-$ and $(\cdot)_+$ on $\alpha$ and $\delta$ indicate incoming and outgoing values when the spacecraft undergoes a gravity-assist. The superscripts denote the $i^{th}$ value of the specific type of variable. Note that the final node $c_{\text{arrival}}$ does not have an associated mass variable, since the final mass corresponds to the sum of the spacecraft bus and payload mass, which is considered to be fixed. The thrust control variables $\tau$ are given by

$$\tau^i = [\tau_i, 1, \ldots, \tau_{i,n}, \theta_{i,1}, \ldots, \theta_{i,n}, \beta_{i,1}, \ldots, \beta_{i,n}]$$

(9)

where $\tau \in [0, 1]$ is the duty cycle of the thruster, $\theta \in [-\pi, \pi]$ is the in-plane angle, and $\beta \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ is the out-of-plane angle of the thrust vector in the local-vertical-local-horizontal frame (LVLH). The resulting impulsive $\Delta V$ vector on the $j^{th}$ segment is given by

$$\Delta v_{i,j} = \frac{T}{m} \Delta t_{\text{seg}} T_{\text{EL}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}) \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\theta_{i,j}) \cos(\beta_{i,j}), \sin(\theta_{i,j}) \cos(\beta_{i,j}), \sin(\beta_{i,j}) \end{bmatrix}^T$$

(10)

where $T$ is the thrust, $\Delta t_{\text{seg}}$ is the duration of the segment, and the 3 by 3 matrix $T_{\text{EL}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v})$ transforms the vector from the LVLH frame into the inertial frame. Together with the velocity, the mass is also modified impulsively via

$$\Delta m_{i,j} = -\tau_{i,j} \dot{m} \Delta t_{\text{seg}}$$

(11)

where $\Delta m_{i,j}$ is the change in mass, and $\dot{m}$ is the mass-flow rate.

### SPACECRAFT MODELING

In order to capture the design parameters of the spacecraft that are directly coupled with the trajectory, the subsystem-decomposition by Petukhov et al\textsuperscript{11} is adopted. The model consists of decomposing the spacecraft mass into the useful mass $m_u$, the mass of the power supply and propulsion unit (PSPU) $m_{\text{PSPU}}$, and the mass of the power storage and feeding system (PSFS) $m_{\text{PSFS}}$. Hence, the IMLEO is expressed as

$$\text{IMLEO} = m_u + m_{\text{PSPU}} + m_{\text{PSFS}}$$

(12)

The useful mass consists of the payload as well as the primary subsystems of the spacecraft bus that does not concern the electric propulsion system (EPS). The EPS, on the other hand, consists of the PSPU and the PSFS.
The PSPU consists of the power-supply system, PPU for the EPS, and the thrusters. The PSPU mass can be expressed as

$$m_{\text{PSPU}} = \gamma_1 P_{\text{BOL}} + \gamma_2 s P_{\text{EPS}}^{\text{max}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)$$

where \(P_{\text{BOL}}\) is the power produced by the SA at the beginning of life (BOL), and \(P_{\text{EPS}}^{\text{max}}\) is the maximum power handled by a reference propulsion system, and \(s\) is a scalar to model variable propulsion systems, which will be further explained in the Propulsion Subsystem Modeling section. The coefficient \(\gamma_1\) is the specific mass of the solar arrays (SA) in kg/kW, and \(\gamma_2\) is the specific mass of the power regular unit, the part of the solar array drives of the PSS used for the EPS as well as the EPS itself in kg/kW.

The PSFS mass is given by

$$m_{\text{PSFS}} = m_0^{\text{propellant}} (1 + a_t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)$$

where \(a_t\) is the ratio of tank to initial propellant mass.

Substituting these expressions back into (12),

$$\text{IMLEO} = m_u + \gamma_1 P_{\text{BOL}} + \gamma_2 s P_{\text{EPS}}^{\text{max}} + m_0^{\text{propellant}} a_t + m_0^{\text{propellant}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)$$

Note that the PSFS term has been expanded out to isolate the last propellant mass; now, the mass of the spacecraft at time \(t\) along the mission can be expressed as

$$m(t) = m_u + \gamma_1 P_{\text{BOL}} + \gamma_2 s P_{\text{EPS}}^{\text{max}} + m_0^{\text{propellant}} a_t + m_{\text{propellant}}(t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)$$

where \(m_{\text{propellant}}(t)\) is the remaining propellant mass at time \(t\).

**Power Subsystem Modeling**

Due to the radial dependence of the available solar power and the inherent degradation of power cells, the power delivered by the solar arrays is a function of both the radius \(r\) and elapsed time \(t\)

$$P_{\text{generated}}(r(t), t) = \min \left( \frac{P_{\text{BOL}}}{r^2}, \left[ \frac{d_1 + d_2 r^{-1} + d_3 r^{-2}}{1 + d_4 r + d_5 r^2} \right] \left( \frac{100 - D}{100} \right)^t, P_{\text{max}}^{\text{solar-array}} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)$$

where \(D\) is the degradation rate, in units \%/year, and \(P_{\text{max}}^{\text{solar-array}}\) is an upper-bound on the power generated due to component’s limitations. While the propulsion system is the most power-hungry component in a SEP spacecraft, a portion of the power must also be diverted to other purposes on the spacecraft bus. The power available to the propulsion system is thus given by

$$P_{\text{available propulsion}} = \begin{cases} \min(P_{\text{max}}^{\text{EPS}}, P_{\text{max}}^{\text{ppu}}) & \text{if } P_{\text{generated}} \geq P_L + P_{\text{ppu}}^{\text{max}} \\ \min(P_{\text{max}}^{\text{EPS}}, (P_{\text{generated}} - P_L)) & \text{if } P_{\text{generated}} < P_L + P_{\text{ppu}}^{\text{max}} \end{cases} \hspace{1cm} (18)$$

where \(P_L\) is the power required to operate the spacecraft bus and payload.

**Propulsion Subsystem Modeling**

The propulsion subsystem is modeled by scaling a reference thruster performance profile, and a propellant tank that is assumed to scale in mass with the required amount of propellant via a scaling factor \(a_t\).
Thruster Modeling  The thruster performance can typically be modeled as polynomials of the power used by the thruster. In particular, third-order polynomials are used such that

\begin{align}
T(P_{\text{propulsion}}) &= c_{T,0} + c_{T,1}P_{\text{propulsion}} + c_{T,2}P_{\text{propulsion}}^2 + c_{T,3}P_{\text{propulsion}}^3 \\
\dot{m}(P_{\text{propulsion}}) &= c_{\dot{m},0} + c_{\dot{m},1}P_{\text{propulsion}} + c_{\dot{m},2}P_{\text{propulsion}}^2 + c_{\dot{m},3}P_{\text{propulsion}}^3
\end{align}

(19)  

(20)

In this work, the NEXT thruster currently in development by NASA Goddard Space Flight Center is modeled using third-order polynomials.

Thruster Scaling  Given the performance profile of a thruster as a polynomial, the capability of the propulsion system is scaled by the optimizer through a scalar variable $s$. A scaled polynomial $q_s(\cdot)$ is given by

\[ q_s(p) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } p < sP_{\text{min}}^{\text{EPS}} \\
sp \left( \frac{p}{s} \right) & \text{if } sP_{\text{min}}^{\text{EPS}} \leq p \leq sP_{\text{max}}^{\text{EPS}} \\
sp \left( \frac{sP_{\text{max}}^{\text{EPS}}}{s} \right) & \text{if } p > sP_{\text{max}}^{\text{EPS}} 
\end{cases} \]

(21)

where $q(\cdot)$ is the polynomial representing the thrust or mass flow-rate, given by expressions (19) or (20) respectively, such that

\[ \tilde{T}(P_{\text{propulsion}}) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } p < sP_{\text{min}}^{\text{EPS}} \\
sT \left( \frac{p}{s} \right) & \text{if } sP_{\text{min}}^{\text{EPS}} \leq p \leq sP_{\text{max}}^{\text{EPS}} \\
sT \left( \frac{sP_{\text{max}}^{\text{EPS}}}{s} \right) & \text{if } p > sP_{\text{max}}^{\text{EPS}} 
\end{cases} \]

(22)

\[ \tilde{\dot{m}}(P_{\text{propulsion}}) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } p < sP_{\text{min}}^{\text{EPS}} \\
sp \left( \frac{p}{s} \right) & \text{if } sP_{\text{min}}^{\text{EPS}} \leq p \leq sP_{\text{max}}^{\text{EPS}} \\
sp \left( \frac{sP_{\text{max}}^{\text{EPS}}}{s} \right) & \text{if } p > sP_{\text{max}}^{\text{EPS}} 
\end{cases} \]

(23)

Figures 1 and 2 show the variation of the thrust and mass-flow rate profile against power, for values of $s$ ranging between 1 and 10. In the case of $s = 1$, the profile corresponds to a single NEXT thruster. The actual power used by the propulsion system, $p$, is allowed to vary at each segment along a leg based on a power setting parameter $\eta_{i,j}$, such that

\[ p_{i,j} = \eta_{i,j}P_{\text{available}}^{\text{propulsion}} \]

(24)

where $p_{i,j}$ is the power used on the $i^{\text{th}}$ leg during the $j^{\text{th}}$ segment.

EXTENDED PROBLEM FORMULATION

Taking into account the propulsion and power subsystem models, the decision vector to the optimization problem outlined in (6) becomes

\[ \tilde{x} = \left[ \tilde{c}_{\text{departure}}, \tilde{c}_1^{\text{gravity-assist}}, \ldots, \tilde{c}_N^{\text{gravity-assist}}, \tilde{c}_{\text{arrival}}, \tilde{\tau}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\tau}_N, P_{\text{BOL}}, s \right]^T \]

(25)
Figure 1: Variation of thrust against power for varying propulsion factor $s$

Figure 2: Variation of mass-flow rate against power for varying propulsion factor $s$
where the modified node variables $\tilde{c}$ are given by

$$
\tilde{c}_{\text{type}} = \begin{cases} 
[t_0, m^0_\text{propellant}, \gamma, \alpha^1, \delta^1] & \text{if type is departure} \\
[\Delta t^i, m^i_\text{propellant}, v^{i+1}_\infty, \alpha_{-i}^{i+1}, \delta_{-i}^{i+1}, \alpha_{+i}^{i+1}, \delta_{+i}^{i+1}] & , \, i \in [1, N-1] \text{ if type is gravity-assist} \\
[\Delta t^N, v^N_\infty, \alpha^{N+1}, \delta^{N+1}] & \text{if type is arrival} 
\end{cases}
$$

(26)

The difference appears at the mass variable, where the remaining propellant mass rather than the entire spacecraft mass is tuned by the optimizer. Note that since no propellant mass is left at arrival, $\tilde{c}_{\text{arrival}}$ is identical to $c_{\text{arrival}}$. The modified thrust control variables $\tilde{\tau}$ are given by

$$
\tilde{\tau}^i = [\tau^i_1, \ldots, \tau^i_n, \theta^i_1, \ldots, \theta^i_n, \beta^i_1, \ldots, \beta^i_n, \eta^i_1, \ldots, \eta^i_n]
$$

(27)

Now, the expressions for the impulsive $\Delta v$’s and $\Delta m$ from expressions (10) and (11) are modified to include implicit dependence on $p_{i,j}$

$$
\Delta v_{i,j} = \frac{T(p_{i,j})}{m} \Delta t_{\text{seg}} T_{\text{EL}}(r, v) \left[ \cos(\theta_{i,j}) \cos(\beta_{i,j}), \sin(\theta_{i,j}) \cos(\beta_{i,j}), \sin(\beta_{i,j}) \right]^T
$$

(28)

$$
\Delta m_{i,j} = -\tau_{i,j} \dot{m}(p_{i,j}) \Delta t_{\text{seg}}
$$

(29)

where $T(p_{i,j})$ is the thrust polynomial based on expression (22), and $\dot{m}(p_{i,j})$ is the mass-flow rate polynomial based on expression (23).

By considering the spacecraft mass breakdown according to equation (12), the spacecraft mass at the encounter with the $i$th body is given by

$$
m^i = \begin{cases} 
m_u + \gamma_1 P_{\text{BOL}} + \gamma_2 s P_{\text{max}}^{\text{EPS}} + m^0_\text{propellant}a_t & , \, 1 \leq i \leq N \\
m_u + \gamma_1 P_{\text{BOL}} + \gamma_2 s P_{\text{max}}^{\text{EPS}} + m^0_\text{propellant}a_t & , \, i = N + 1 
\end{cases}
$$

(30)

In summary, the optimization problem is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\min \quad & \text{eqn. (2)} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & h_{\text{mp}}(\tilde{x}) = 0 \\
& g_{\text{TOF}}(\tilde{x}) \leq 0 \\
& g_{\text{gravity-assist}}(\tilde{x}) \leq 0
\end{align*}
$$

(31)

**OPTIMIZATION METHOD**

Due to the highly constrained nature of the problem at hand, gradient-based methods are known to be suitable for driving an initial guess that likely violates some if not all the constraints, to a feasible, local optimal solution. As such, well-established routines such as SNOPT and IPOPT are useful in this type of problems. One drawback to keep in mind when using gradient-based solvers is the fact that these converge to local optimal solutions, within a design-space that contains multiple, isolated clusters of these local optima. To overcome this challenge, Monotonic Basin Hopping (MBH), a pseudo-algorithm initially introduced by Wales and Doye that wraps local optimal solvers and performs global search, has been found to be particularly effective by multiple authors for interplanetary trajectory design problems, and is also employed in this work.
Table 2: Earth-Mars Cargo Mission Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earliest launch date, UTC</td>
<td>2030-01-01 00:00:00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest launch date, UTC</td>
<td>2033-03-01 00:00:00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Time of Flight, year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful mass, kg</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base thruster</td>
<td>NEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounds on $s$</td>
<td>[1, 10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max departure $v_\infty$, km/s</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max arrival $v_\infty$, km/s</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_1$</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_2$</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_t$</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective weights $w_1$, $w_2$</td>
<td>1, 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

The proposed method for formulating the concurrent optimization problem is implemented in Julia, leveraging a set of codes previously developed by the authors. This is tested for an Earth-Mars cargo mission scenario, where an aggregate objective function of the IMLEO and time of flight is considered to explore the possible design space of the spacecraft together with the trajectories. This problem is solved using MBH together with SNOPT.

Case Study: Earth-Mars Cargo Mission

The scenario consists of a cargo mission to deliver a 5000 kg useful mass to Mars at a rendezvous velocity of 0 km/s with a direct transfer from Earth. The mission parameters are summarized in Table 2. Values for $\gamma_1$, $\gamma_2$ and $a_t$ are due to Arya et al.

Figure 3 shows the Pareto front of the time of flight against the required IMLEO. Due to expression (15), the IMLEO scales linearly with $P_{\text{EPS}}^{\text{max}}$, which in turn scales linearly with the propulsion factor $s$. This is clearly visible from the color scale, where propulsion factor increases as IMLEO increases. Analyses with the same axes in Figure 3 appears commonly in mission analysis literature, as a trade-off tool between IMLEO and TOF. However, the present plot also provides an additional design dimension, where trajectories corresponding to each point on the plot do not necessarily correspond to the same spacecraft architecture. Note also that due to the nature of the low-thrust trajectory optimization containing many local minima, there are many non-dominant solutions that have been detected. The trade-off of interest is at the lower-left corner of the Figure, where the time of flight may be traded-off with IMLEO. Specifically, it is possible to observe an initial trend of decreasing TOF with increasing IMLEO due to increasing propulsion factor. This region corresponds to solutions achieving faster transfers due to the increasing capability of the propulsion system. Then, beyond an IMLEO of around 7400 kg, the TOF starts to increase again for increasing IMLEO. Here, the design space corresponds to a region where as the propulsion factor increases, the propulsion system becomes prohibitively heavy and the increase in achievable acceleration does not balance out the additional inertia, thus leading to longer TOF.

With the formulation introduced, it is also possible to identify the optimal subsystem sizes neces-
Figure 3: Pareto front of time of flight and IMLEO

Table 3: Summary of IMLEO-optimal and TOF-optimal solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Launch epoch, UTC</th>
<th>Arrival epoch, UTC</th>
<th>Time of flight, day</th>
<th>Initial mass, kg</th>
<th>Final mass, kg</th>
<th>Propulsion Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min-TOF solution</td>
<td>2033-03-01 00:00:00.000</td>
<td>2033-12-27 21:50:18.562</td>
<td>301.91</td>
<td>7146.35</td>
<td>6296.08</td>
<td>7.0466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sary to minimize classic trajectory design objectives, such as IMLEO and TOF. Figure 4 shows the IMLEO against the propulsion factor, where the minimizing solution is found to have \( s \approx 4.5 \). Due to the linear contribution of \( s \) on the IMLEO as given in equation (15), the relationship between the IMLEO and \( s \) is generally linear, as it is visible from this Figure. However, the contribution of the propellant to achieve an Earth-Mars transfer must also be taken into account, and this is not necessarily a linear scaling; a larger propulsion system would require larger amount of propellant to achieve its full thrust, but require less burn time to provide the spacecraft with a certain amount of acceleration. As a result, the minimum IMLEO solution isn’t achieved with the minimum \( s \) solution. It is also possible to observe generally similar TOF solutions (similar color scale) along the diagonal direction of both increasing IMLEO and propulsion factor.

In contrast to Figure 4, from Figure 5, the solution that minimizes the time of flight is found with \( s \approx 7.2 \). This is again a result of the trade-off between propulsion systems that provide more thrust but has a heavier penalty on the IMLEO, corresponding to larger \( s \), against propulsion systems that provide less thrust but is lighter, corresponding to smaller \( s \); \( s \approx 7.2 \) corresponds to the balance that has been found to minimize TOF. Table 3 shows key variables of the minimum-IMLEO and minimum-TOF solutions, respectively, and Figure 6 shows the corresponding trajectories.
Figure 4: IMLEO against propulsion factor $s$

Figure 5: Time of flight against propulsion factor $s$
CONCLUSION

This work explored a novel optimization formulation that simultaneously considers the trajectory of a low-thrust interplanetary spacecraft with SEP. The Sims-Flanagan transcription has been extended to also include variables dictating the size and performance of the power and propulsion subsystems, as well as the mode on the power at which the propulsion system is to be operated at a given time along the transfer. Compared to trajectory-only problem formulations, the introduced method can identify the scale of the SEP system necessary to meet mission objectives such as payload mass and time of flight. Furthermore, it provides insight into the trade-off between the trajectory and the spacecraft design itself along Pareto fronts having direct consequences to the high-level mission design. This enables a concurrent trade-off of both the spacecraft trajectory and the vehicle sizing. As the frontier of both human and robotic space exploration expands, increased carrying capacity enabled by SEP will become an indispensable piece of logistics, and the proposed analysis provides a quantitative approach for considering different mission designs.
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