to a local hub-centered frame, rather than formation flying of multiple spacecraft relative to the libration point.

Future work may involve the study of higher order contributions, such as terms which are quadratic in the hub motion about \( L_2 \), as well as deviations from the circular restricted problem.
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RELATIVE TRAJECTORY ANALYSIS OF DISSIMILAR FORMATION FLYING SPACECRAFT

Shankar K. Balaji* and Adrian R. Tatnall†

This paper deals with the differential acceleration effects on spacecraft formation flying. A mathematical model is developed to analyze relative trajectory of spacecraft in the presence of significant perturbative forces. The equations of relative coordinates are derived as a precise solution to the formation geometry problem and are valid for both close and long distance formation patterns and for rendezvous analysis. The coordinates of motion are propagated forward in time for identical and dissimilar spacecraft for different initial conditions. The results of this paper provide a physical insight into the actual behavior of satellites in a cluster with differential drag area.

Nomenclature

\( a \) – semi-major axis
\( \mathbf{a}_r \) – acceleration along the position vector \( \mathbf{r} \)
\( \mathbf{a}_v \) – acceleration in the velocity vector direction
\( \mathbf{a}_n \) – acceleration in the normal direction
\( a_r \) – mean distance of the Earth from the sun
\( c \) – speed of light in vacuum
\( C_D \) – coefficient of drag
\( e \) – eccentricity
\( \mathbf{z}_r \) – unit vector along the satellite orbit radius vector direction
\( \mathbf{z}_v \) – unit vector along the local horizontal direction
\( \mathbf{z}_n \) – unit vector along the orbit normal direction
\( \mathbf{F} \) – solar energy flux at the spacecraft
\( h \) – angular momentum
\( i \) – inclination
\( J_2 \) – geo potential coefficient representing Earth's Oblateness, \( J_2 = 1082.64 \times 10^{-6} \)
\( m \) – mass of spacecraft
\( M \) – Mean anomaly
\( n \) – Mean motion
\( p \) – semilatus rectum

* Ph.D. Candidate, Astronautics Research Group, University of Southampton, Highfield, Southampton SO17 1BJ, England. E-mail: sbalaji@soton.ac.uk.
† Senior Lecturer, Astronautics Research Group, University of Southampton, Highfield, Southampton SO17 1BJ, England. E-mail: art4@soton.ac.uk.
\( \hat{r} \) – position vector of the satellite
\( r_e \) – Radius of earth, \( r_e = 6371 \times 10^4 \text{ km} \)
\( r_s \) – distance of the satellite from the sun
\( S' \) – projected area of the spacecraft in the direction of motion
\( t \) – time
\( [T_{OXYZ}] \) – transformation matrix from frame \( OXYZ \) to \( OPQR \)
\( [T_{Oxyz}] \) – transformation matrix from frame \( (Oxyz)_d \) to \( OXYZ \)
\( u \) – argument of latitude, \( u = 0 + \omega \)
\( \Omega \) – right ascension
\( \omega \) – argument of periapse
\( \delta \) – true anomaly
\( \mu \) – gravitational earth constant, \( \mu = 3.986 \times 10^{14} \text{ m}^3/\text{s}^2 \)
\( e \) – obliquity of the ecliptic
\( \lambda_0 \) – ecliptic longitude of the sun
\( \xi \) – constant of surface reflection

Subscripts
\( d \) – refers to the deputy satellite
\( m \) – refers to the master satellite
\( 0 \) – refers to the initial conditions

INTRODUCTION

Spacecraft flying in formation need not be necessarily identical. There is always a possibility of some drag area difference due to technical requirements like antenna pointing. Even a small difference in drag area will contribute to a significant secular growth of distance between the satellites in a constellation. Some authors have even considered this to be an advantage and have proposed special drag surfaces on spacecraft to control or reconfigure a Formation pattern.

There are now plans to use small inspector or Escort satellites to perform visual and thermal imaging of a Chief-target satellite. This enables diagnosis for repair in the case of a breakdown and anticipates any malfunctions for similar missions. The relative trajectory of the escort satellite around the target would entirely depend on the difference in drag area and the altitude of their orbits.

In this paper, we will analyze the relative trajectory of formation flying spacecraft with small differential drag-Area using a mathematical model developed in the following sections. The relative coordinates of the spacecraft are derived by a series of transformations and translations from the Earth-centred inertial frame to the spacecraft-centred rotating frame. Dynamical force models like \( J_2 \), atmospheric drag and solar radiation pressure are then introduced into the equations in order to obtain a realistic simulation model. The coordinates of motion are then propagated forward in time with different initial conditions. The Equations for the relative coordinates are derived as a precise solution to the Formation geometry problem and, unlike the traditional Clohessy-Wiltshire equations for relative trajectory analysis, impose no restrictions on eccentricity of the orbits of the spacecraft investigated. The equations are valid both for close and long distance formation-flying patterns and for rendezvous analysis. The results of this paper provide a physical insight into the actual behaviour of satellites in a cluster with a differential drag-Area. The assessment of the relative trajectory is imperative for selecting the actuators for station keeping, designing control laws and deciding the configuration of the spacecraft.

MATHEMATICAL MODELLING OF RELATIVE MOTION

The equations for the relative coordinates are derived as a precise solution to the formation geometry problem with the definition of orbital frames and orbital elements as shown in Figure 1. We will hereafter denote the reference satellite as the master satellite (subscript \( m \)) and the satellite to be observed as the deputy (subscript \( d \)). It should be noted that there could be many deputy spacecraft for a specific mission. But in our case we will assume that the formation consists of only two spacecraft namely the master and the deputy.

Figure 1 – Orbital Frames and elements

The origin of the spacecraft centered co-ordinate system is assumed to be at the master satellite's centre of mass. The origin of the coordinate system \( OXYZ \) is at the center of
the earth with the XY plane coinciding with the Earth’s equatorial plane and X-axis pointing in the direction of vernal eqinox \( \gamma \). The Z-axis points in the direction of the North Pole and the Y-axis is normal to the XZ plane and completes the right-handed frame of system. The origin of the system OPQR also lies at the center of the earth with the Z axis pointing in the direction of the master satellite’s Centre-of-Mass. The unit vectors of \( P \) is defined as

\[
P = \frac{r}{|r|} \tag{1}
\]

where \( r \) is the radius vector of the spacecraft. The Q-axis points in the direction of the angular velocity of the orbital plane (normal to the orbit) and R-axis completes the right-handed frame of system. The origin of the \( XYZ \) system lies at the master satellite’s center of mass and its unit vectors are

\[
x = P, \quad y = Q, \quad z = R \tag{2}
\]

Frame \( XYZ \) axes can be transformed to frame \( PQR \) axes by 3 successive rotations that are as follows:
1. Rotation about the \( Z \) axis by \( + \Omega \)
2. Rotation about the \( X \) axis by \( + i \)
3. Rotation about the \( Z \) axis by \( + u \) \( (u = \omega + \theta) \)

The new coordinates can now be represented as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
P \\
Q \\
R
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
T_{ui\Omega}\end{bmatrix}_{m} \begin{bmatrix}
X \\
Y \\
Z
\end{bmatrix} \tag{3}
\]

Where

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
T_{ui\Omega}\end{bmatrix}_{m} = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \Omega_{m} & \sin \Omega_{m} & 0 \\
-\sin \Omega_{m} & \cos \Omega_{m} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The coordinates of the deputy spacecraft (from Eq.3)) in the OPQR system are

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
P_d \\
Q_d \\
R_d
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
T_{ui\Omega}\end{bmatrix}_{m} \begin{bmatrix}
X_d \\
Y_d \\
Z_d
\end{bmatrix} \tag{5}
\]

The Coordinates \( X_d, Y_d, Z_d \) can also be represented by the Matrix as given below

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
X_d \\
Y_d \\
Z_d
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
T_{ui\Omega}\end{bmatrix}_{d} \begin{bmatrix}
R_d \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix} \tag{6}
\]

Where

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
T_{ui\Omega}\end{bmatrix}_{d} = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \Omega_d & -\sin \Omega_d & 0 \\
\sin \Omega_d & \cos \Omega_d & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Substituting Eq.(6) in Eq.(5), we get the Coordinates \( X_d, Y_d, Z_d \) in the OPQR frame as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
P_d \\
Q_d \\
R_d
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
T_{ui\Omega}\end{bmatrix}_{m} \begin{bmatrix}
T_{ui\Omega}\end{bmatrix}_{d} \begin{bmatrix}
R_d \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix} \tag{8}
\]

Now shifting the origin of the OPQR frame to the master satellite’s Centre-of-mass gives us the relative coordinates of the deputy spacecraft with respect to the master spacecraft in the oxzy plane.

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
x_d \\
y_d \\
z_d
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
T_{ui\Omega}\end{bmatrix}_{m} \begin{bmatrix}
T_{ui\Omega}\end{bmatrix}_{d} \begin{bmatrix}
R_d \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
R_m \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix} \tag{9}
\]

Combining the two transformations in to one then gives

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
x \\
y \\
z
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
A_1 & A_2 & A_3 \\
A_4 & A_5 & A_6 \\
A_7 & A_8 & A_9
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
R_d \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
R_m \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix} \tag{10}
\]

where \( \begin{bmatrix}
A 
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
T_{ui\Omega}\end{bmatrix}_{m} \begin{bmatrix}
T_{ui\Omega}\end{bmatrix}_{d} \) and \( \begin{bmatrix}
A 
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
A_{11} & A_{12} & A_{13} \\
A_{21} & A_{22} & A_{23} \\
A_{31} & A_{32} & A_{33}
\end{bmatrix} \)

The elements of matrix \( A \) are given in the appendix 1 of this paper.
After evaluating the left hand side terms of Eq.(10), we get the coordinates of the deputy spacecraft relative to the master spacecraft in the xyz frame, at any time t, as

\[ x(t) = \left( cu_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) - cu_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \right) \]

\[-su_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) + su_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \right) \]

\[ + cu_x(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) + cu_x(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \right) \]

\[ + su_x(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot R_x(t) \right) - R_y(t) \right) \]

\[ y(t) = \left( -su_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) + su_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \right) \]

\[-cu_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_x(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) - cu_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \right) \]

\[-su_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) + su_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \right) \]

\[ + cu_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) + cu_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \right) \]

\[ + cu_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot R_y(t) \right) \]

\[ z(t) = \left( su_z(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) - sinu(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \right) \]

\[-sinu(t) \cdot c\Omega_x(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) - sinu(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \right) \]

\[ + sinu(t) \cdot s\Omega_x(t) \cdot s\Omega_y(t) \cdot c\Omega_y(t) \cdot R_z(t) \right) \]

where \( R_x(t) = \frac{a_x(t)(1-e_x(t)^2)}{1+e_x(t)\cos\theta_x(t)} \) and \( R_y(t) = \frac{a_y(t)(1-e_y(t)^2)}{1+e_y(t)\cos\theta_y(t)} \)

c and s in Eq.(11) represent cosine and sine functions respectively.

Since Eq.(11) has all the orbital properties of both the master and deputy satellites, it can be used to analyze any type of formation pattern with any number of satellites acting as the deputy.

At any time t, the value of any orbital element under the influence of perturbative forces can be found out from the following equations:

\[ a(t) = a(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{da}{dt} \cdot dt \]

\[ e(t) = e(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{de}{dt} \cdot dt \]

\[ i(t) = i(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{di}{dt} \cdot dt \]

\[ \Omega(t) = \Omega(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{d\Omega}{dt} \cdot dt \]

\[ \omega(t) = \omega(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{d\omega}{dt} \cdot dt \]

\[ M(t) = M(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{dM}{dt} \cdot dt \]

Eq.(12), when substituted in Eq.(11) with respective subscripts m and d, portray the relative trajectory of any deputy satellite as seen from the master satellite.

Gauss equations can be used to find the rate of change of orbital elements in Eqn.(12). The Gauss perturbation equations are a group of equations that describe the change of all orbital elements with time in the presence of perturbations. They are well suited to study long-term evolution of orbital elements under perturbation influence. The Gauss perturbation equations are given as:

\[ \frac{da}{dt} = \frac{2e \sin \theta}{a} \cdot a_i + \frac{2a_x}{nr} \cdot a_i \]

\[ \frac{de}{dt} = \frac{x \sin \theta}{na} \cdot a_i + \frac{x}{na^2 e} \cdot \left( \frac{a^2}{r} - r \right) \cdot a_i \]

\[ \frac{d\Omega}{dt} = \frac{r \cos \mu}{na \sin \mu} \cdot a_i \]

\[ \frac{d\omega}{dt} = \frac{r \sin \mu}{na \sin \mu} \cdot a_i \]

\[ \frac{dM}{dt} = \frac{1}{nae} \cdot a_i + \frac{P}{eh} \cdot \left[ \sin \theta \left( \frac{1}{1+e \cos \theta} \right) \cdot a_i - \frac{r \cos \theta \sin \mu}{na^2 e} \cdot a_i \right] \]

where \( a_i = \sqrt{1-e_i^2} \), \( u = \omega + \theta \), \( p = a(1-e_i^2) \), \( h = \sqrt{\mu p} \)

The overall rate of change of orbital elements due to perturbing accelerations like atmospheric drag, solar radiation pressure and J2 can be found by introducing their acceleration components in the gauss equations.

MODELLING OF EXTERNAL FORCES

The following perturbing accelerations are modeled in the simulation.

Drag: The magnitude of acceleration induced by atmospheric drag depends on the altitude of the satellite orbit and to a great extent depends on the satellite's surface area and mass. The drag deceleration can be written as

\[ a_{drag} = \frac{C_d S P V^2}{2m} \] (14)

Unlike other perturbative forces, drag force has acceleration component only along the negative velocity vector direction.

Solar radiation pressure: The perturbing acceleration of an earth satellite due to solar radiation pressure effects can be computed with the following equation.

\[ a_{SRP} = \frac{1}{m} \cdot \rho \cdot \frac{A}{m} \cdot \frac{1}{c} \] (15)

Where SRP = F/c
The components of Solar-radiation pressure can be expressed as:

\[
\left[ \begin{align*}
\frac{\mathbf{e}_s}{\mathbf{e}_s} & = \cos \frac{1}{2} \cos \frac{1}{2} \cos \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_0 - u - \Omega) - \sin \frac{1}{2} \sin \frac{1}{2} \cos \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_0 - u + \Omega) \\
- \sin \frac{1}{2} \sin \frac{1}{2} \cos \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_0 - u - \Omega) - \cos \frac{1}{2} \cos \frac{1}{2} \cos \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_0 - u + \Omega) \\
- \sin \frac{1}{2} \sin \frac{1}{2} \cos \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_0 + u + \Omega) - \cos \frac{1}{2} \cos \frac{1}{2} \cos \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_0 + u - \Omega)
\end{align*} \right]
\]

The quantities \( \mathbf{e}_s, \lambda_0 \), and \( \lambda/\mathbf{r}_s \) (in Eq. (16)) can be computed with sufficient accuracy from the following expressions:

\[
d = MJD - 15019.5, \text{ Modified Julian Day (MJD)} = \text{Julian day} - 2400000.5
\]

\[
\varepsilon = 23.44
\]

\[
M_0 = 358.48 + 0.9856072d
\]

\[
\lambda_0 = 279.70 + 0.9856473d + 1.92 \sin M_0
\]

\[
a_0/\mathbf{r}_s = [1 + 0.01672 \cos(M_0 + 1.92 \sin M_0)]/0.99972
\]

**Simulated data:**

The zonal harmonic \( J_2 \) is responsible for the secular rates of the right ascension of the ascending node \( \Omega \), the argument of perigee \( \omega \), and a small correction to the mean motion of the orbit. \( J_2 \) induced accelerations can be given in the spherical coordinate system as:

\[
\mathbf{a}_{\text{H}} = -\frac{3J_2 \mu \rho^3}{r^4} \left[ \mathbf{e}_s (0.5 - 1.5 \sin^2 \mathbf{e}_s u) + \mathbf{e}_s \sin^2 \mathbf{e}_s \cos u + \mathbf{e}_s \sin \mathbf{e}_s \sin \mathbf{e}_s \cos u \right]
\]

**Simulation and Results:**

Based on the mathematical model developed in the previous sections, numerical simulations of relative motion are presented for different test cases of the Leader-Follower formation pattern. As the name implies, the Leader-Follower configuration has satellites lying on the same orbital plane and separated only by mean anomaly. Simulations are conducted for the leader-follower pattern at 600 km and 800 km near-circular, polar orbits. The separation distance of the spacecraft for all the test cases is initialised to 1000 meters. Test cases are simulated with 0%, 5% and 10% more drag area for the deputy satellite than the master satellite. In order to isolate the effect of various forces, simulations are carried out with and without solar radiation pressure and \( J_2 \). In all the test cases, atmospheric drag is considered to be the principal perturbing factor. The differential solar radiation pressure effects are also modelled in the simulations. In the calculations for drag and solar radiation pressure the normal drag area of the satellites is assumed to be 0.1225 m\(^2\) and the drag coefficient \( C_D = 2.2 \). The summary of initial conditions used for simulation is given below.

- **Epoch:** 1\(^{st}\) January 2004
- **Orbit altitude:** 600 km and 800 km
- **Type:** Circular and Polar
- **Perturbations:** Atmospheric drag, Solar radiation pressure, \( J_2 \)
- **Atmosphere:** Jacchia Roberts
- **Numerical method:** Runge-Kutta 8\(^{th}\) order
- **Initial step size:** 1 second
- **Propagation duration:** 1 orbit
- **Physical properties:** Mass=25 kg, \( C_D = 2.2 \), Surface-area=0.1225 m\(^2\)
- **Initial separation:** 1000 metres

Figure 2 portrays the relative motion of the identical spacecraft in the xy plane with all perturbing factors including drag, solar radiation pressure and \( J_2 \) for one complete orbit. It can be seen that the relative motion is a 2 x 1 ellipse with the ellipse spiraling inwards with time. The cause of oscillations in the radial, along-track and cross-track directions can be attributed to \( J_2 \). The amplitude of the oscillations is in the order of few meters for the along-track and radial directions and a few millimeters for the cross-track direction. \( J_2 \) also induces a minor drift of a few centimeters/orbit in both the along-track and radial directions. Due to the spacecraft being identical in cross-section area, there is no drift caused by atmospheric drag and this was verified by disengaging \( J_2 \) from the simulation. The blue solid line in figures 3-6 is the trajectory of the deputy satellite in the xy plane with 5% more differential drag area than the master satellite. The red dotted lines in the figures represent the trajectory for 10% more differential drag area. Figures 3 and 5 illustrate the relative motion in the presence of solar radiation pressure and drag with no \( J_2 \) effects for 600 km and 800 km altitudes respectively for 1 complete orbit. The 5% differential area caused a net secular drift of 19 cm/orbit, in the along-track direction, for the 600 km altitude and 0.75 cm/orbit for the 800 km altitude. The total drifts doubled in magnitude with the doubling of the differential drag area. Figures 4 and 6 represent the trajectory simulated only with atmospheric drag for 1 complete orbit. It can be seen that the net drift in the along-track direction for such a test case is 22 cm/orbit for the 600 km altitude and 2.5 cm/orbit for the 800 km altitude. The values doubled for 10% differential drag area.

It is also interesting to note that the inclusion of differential solar radiation pressure effects in the model actually reduces the total drift caused by differential drag by a few centimeters. Solar radiation pressure causes the spacecraft to accelerate or decelerate depending upon whether the spacecraft is moving towards or away from the sun. This effect when combined with the differential area effects causes a decrease in the net secular drift. The solar radiation pressure effects also vary for different types of orbits, for different altitudes and for different periods of the year. The comparison of figure 3
and 5 shows that solar radiation pressure has significant effects on the satellite relative motion at higher altitudes. Although in the figures 2-6, the along track displacement seems to increase with the progress of the orbit, it actually decreases as the value shown in the figures are just an absolute value of the original value. Due to the reason that the deputy spacecraft has more drag area than the master spacecraft, it dissipates more kinetic energy into heat through drag than the master. The decrease in the orbital velocity of the deputy satellite slows it and makes it enter an elliptic inward spiral. As it looses height, it starts to accelerate and tries to catch up with the master spacecraft if its motion is not controlled. Based on the simulation values, the $\Delta V$ required to compensate for the secular drifts in the along-track and radial directions are 0.5 m/sec/year for 5% drag area difference for the 600 km altitude and 0.08 m/sec/year for 5% drag area difference for the 800 km altitude. The values are twice the values of 5% for 10% drag area difference. It should be noted that these values are just a rough conservative estimate of the $\Delta V$ requirements only to compensate the differential drag effect.

Figure 2. Relative motion of the deputy spacecraft with respect to the master spacecraft in the xy plane with zero percent differential drag area and in the presence of atmospheric drag, solar radiation pressure and $J_2$ for 600 km altitude.

Figure 3. Relative motion of the deputy spacecraft with respect to the master spacecraft in the xy plane with 5% and 10% differential drag area with atmospheric drag and solar radiation pressure and ignoring $J_2$ for 600 km altitude.

Figure 4. Relative motion of the deputy spacecraft with respect to the master spacecraft in the xy plane with 5% and 10% differential drag area with atmospheric drag and ignoring solar radiation pressure and $J_2$ for 600 km altitude.

Figure 5. Relative motion of the deputy spacecraft with respect to the master spacecraft in the xy plane with 5% and 10% differential drag area with atmospheric drag and solar radiation pressure and ignoring $J_2$ for 800 km altitude.

Figure 6. Relative motion of the deputy spacecraft with respect to the master spacecraft in the xy plane with 5% and 10% differential drag area with atmospheric drag and solar radiation pressure and ignoring $J_2$ for 800 km altitude.
CONCLUSION

In this paper, we develop a precise mathematical model to analyze the relative trajectory of formation flying spacecraft. The equations for relative motion are derived using the geometry of the formation-flying problem. Based on the mathematical model, the relative trajectory is simulated for the leader follower formation pattern for two different altitudes and for two different differential drag values. Spacecraft relative motion is compared and analyzed for different force conditions. Finally, the ΔV requirements are estimated for the secular drifts induced by the differential drag effects. The mathematical developed in this paper can be used to analyze the relative trajectory of any type of formation configuration with any number of spacecraft.
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APPENDIX 1

\[
[A] = \begin{bmatrix}
T_{w_0}I_\alpha \\
T_{Qiu}I_\alpha \\
A_{11} & A_{12} & A_{13} \\
A_{21} & A_{22} & A_{23} \\
A_{31} & A_{32} & A_{33}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( s \) and \( c \) represent sine and cosine functions respectively.