force is essentially the lift generated by the local apparent angle of attack due to roll rate, Fig. 2 shows that, for the case of the submarine sail, the lift and hence the roll damping should vary with aspect ratio approximately in the same way as in steady-state flow. Consequently, the use of two-dimensional airfoil theory is, as just pointed out, greatly in error, and it would seem that the close agreement between the experimental and theoretical data of Ref. 1 is fortuitous. Perhaps there is a large error in the data used for the calculation, or perhaps other fins or diving planes that contribute to the roll damping were not taken into account.

References

¹ Regan, F. J., "Roll damping of a fleet ballistic-missile submarine." J. Aerospace Sci. 29, 230 (1962).

marine," J. Aerospace Sci. 29, 230 (1962).

² Goodman, A. and Tisher, L. R., "Investigation at low speeds of the effect of aspect ratio and sweep on rolling stability derivatives of untapered wings," NACA Rept. 968 (1950).

³ Donely, P., "Summary of information relating to gust loads on airplanes," NACA Rept. 997 (1950).

Extension of an Optimum Transfer Note by H. Munick

John D. Mulholland*
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio

Nomenclature

 C_1 = circular velocity at r_1 e = eccentricity of outer orbit G = gravitational constant

G = gravitational constantM = total two-body mass

p = semilatus rectum of outer orbit

 r_1 = transfer departure radius r_2 = transfer terminal radius

 r_p = pericentron distance of outer orbit

 $x_f = \text{positional circumferential velocity component at}$ r_2 after second thrust impulse

 $X_p = \text{nondimensional velocity at } r_p$

 λ = nondimensional characteristic velocity $\Delta V/C_1$

IT is shown that the recent paper by Munick¹ has more general validity than that which is claimed for it. The result is that the problem of absolute minimum-energy two-impulse transfer between a circular orbit and an external, coplanar, nonintersecting orbit is solved completely. Munick's interpretation of the solution is incorrect, however, in that no absolute minimum exists for $e \ge 1$.

Munick discusses the question of optimum transfer to hyperbolic orbits. The present note is essentially a commentary on that paper, serving to extend its generality. Few equations will be required other than those appearing in Ref. 1; therefore, the equation numbers here will begin with (25),† so that concise and unambiguous reference may be made to Munick's derivation without unnecessary repetition of his equations.

The problem to be considered is that of minimum-energy two-impulse transfer between a circular orbit and an external, coplanar but nonintersecting orbit of unspecified eccentricity. The hyperbolic case is considered by Munick¹ and the circular and elliptic cases by Horner.² In all cases, Eq. (1) is the function to be minimized, the nondimensionalized characteristic velocity. The hypotheses assure that the conditions (2 and 4–6) are satisfied. Equation (7), which represents the conservation of energy and angular momentum in the outer orbit, is valid for all possible two-body trajectories.

It might be added parenthetically that $\rho = r_1/r_2$ appears in this relation only because the velocities are nondimensionalized by means of

$$C_1 = (GM/r_1)^{1/2} (25)$$

Since the formal expression for λ is not dependent on the type of conic which defines the outer orbit, it is certainly true that the relations (8–13) are valid without need to specify the nature of this orbit. As in Ref. 1, the solution of the minimization problem leads one to consider the expression

$$2X_pb^3 - X_p^2b^2 - 2b^2 + 1 \tag{26}$$

The quantities X_p and b are related, however, by Eq. (10), which is repeated here for convenience:

$$b = r_1/r_p X_p$$

In the present nondimensional variables, the conservation of angular momentum (area integral) has the form

$$X_p^2 = (r_1/r_p)(p/r_p) = (r_1/r_p)(1+e)$$
 (27)

or

$$X_p = b (1 + e)$$

which is Eq. (14) and is valid for all e. Thus, for all possible outer orbits, (26) can be written in the form of Eq. (16):

$$[b^2(1+e)-1][b^2(1-e)-1]$$

Horner² has shown that contradictions arise if this quantity is zero, corresponding to an extremal value of λ somewhere other than at the apsides of the outer orbit. He also demonstrated that transfer to the pericentron cannot minimize λ . Thus, λ must be monotonic increasing in x_I , which requires that (16) be positive. As noted by Munick, the first factor of (16) can be written as

$$b^{2}(1+e)-1=(r_{1}/r_{p})-1<0 (28)$$

which is negative due to the initial hypotheses. On the other hand, since e is always non-negative,

$$b^{2}(1-e) - 1 = [b^{2}(1+e) - 1] - 2b^{2}e \le b^{2}(1+e) - 1 < 0$$
 (29)

Both factors of (16) are negative; hence, for all conic section orbits.

$$d\lambda_{\rm abs\,min}/dx_f > 0$$

Considering this result, it is possible to state the following conclusions:

- 1) For transfer between a circular orbit and an external, coplanar, nonintersecting orbit, an absolute minimum-energy two-impulse transfer exists only if e < 1, i.e., for those outer orbits that possess a finite maximum distance. In this case, the optimum transfer is the Hohmann ellipse between the circular orbit and the apocentron of the outer orbit, as demonstrated by Horner.²
- 2) For any given $e \ge 1$, where the outer trajectory has no apocentron, no absolute minimum-energy two-impulse transfer exists, but there does exist a family of transfers for which λ decreases monotonically as r_2 increases. This family consists of those trajectories that give minimum-energy transfer between the circular orbit and fixed points on the outer orbit.

The discussion in Ref. 1 headed "Transfer Orbit Characteristics" can be extended to cover parabolic outer orbits without modification, except that in the final sentence Eq. (28), of course, should be Eq. (23).

References

Received January 2, 1963.

^{*} Instructor of Aerospace Engineering. Member AIAA.

[†] Equations (1-24) are in Ref. 1.

¹ Munick, H., "Optimum transfer between circular and hyper-

bolic orbits," ARS J. 32, 1739–1740 (1962).

² Horner, J. M., "Optimum impulsive orbital transfers between coplanar orbits," ARS J. 32, 1082–1089 (1962).