Performance comparison of the notable acceleration- and angle-based guidance laws for a short-range air-to-surface missile
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Abstract: Short-range air-to-surface missiles have become globally popular in the last two decades. As a performance driver, the type of guidance law gains importance. In this study, proportional navigation, velocity pursuit, and augmented proportional navigation guidance laws, whose resulting guidance commands take the form of lateral acceleration, are applied to a short-range air-to-surface missile against both stationary and maneuvering ground targets. Body pursuit and linear homing guidance laws, which yield angular commands, are additionally applied. Having completed the relevant computer simulations, we conclude that none of the acceleration- and angle-based guidance laws are absolutely superior to the others.
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1. Introduction

In recent years, the attack concept has evolved from mass destruction to point-hitting. In this context, guided munitions, including homing missiles and guided bombs, have gained more significance. When the range to the aimed target point becomes large, homing missiles are preferred to guided bombs. Here, the selection of a proper guidance law comes into the picture depending on the target type and certain operational requirements such as final miss distance goal, maximum acceleration demand, and total energy consumption [1–3]. Derived from the engagement geometry between the munition and target, guidance laws can be categorized in different manners. Among them, one classification is based on the type of guidance commands [1,4–6]. Namely, the guidance laws whose commands are generated in the form of lateral acceleration components of the munition can be called “acceleration-based guidance laws”, while those whose commands are in the form of selected orientation angles are termed as “angle-based guidance laws” [4,7].

In this study, the performance comparison of notable acceleration- and angle-based guidance laws is investigated. As the proportional navigation guidance (PNG), velocity pursuit guidance (VPG), and augmented proportional navigation guidance (APNG) laws are handled in the former class, the body pursuit guidance (BPG) and linear homing guidance (LHG) laws are evaluated within the second category of guidance laws. The results of the computer simulations conducted in MATLAB Simulink are submitted for the guidance and control scheme constructed. The most significant contribution of this work to the literature is its evaluation of the widely...
used acceleration- and angle-based guidance laws on a suitably selected missile model in a comparative manner and in accordance with quantitative results.

2. Missile dynamic model

The governing equations of motion of the air-to-surface missile under consideration are shown in Figure 1, where \( C_M \) and \( \delta_i \) denote the mass center of the missile. Deflection of control fin \( i \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3, \) and 4 can be determined using the Newton–Euler approach in the body-fixed frame of the missile \( (F_b) \), as given below \([4,8]\):

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{u} - r v + q w &= (X + X_T) / m + g_x \\
\dot{v} + r u - p w &= (Y + Y_T) / m + g_y \\
\dot{w} - q u + p v &= (Z + Z_T) / m + g_z \\
\dot{p} &= (L + L_T) / I_a \\
\dot{q} - p r &= (M + M_T) / I_t \\
\dot{r} + p q &= (N + N_T) / I_t
\end{align*}
\]

As \( m, I_a, \) and \( I_t \) stand for the mass, axial, and lateral moment of the inertia components of the missile, the parameters in Eqs. (1)–(6) are defined in the directions of the unit vectors of \( F_b \), i.e. \( \vec{u}_1^{(b)}, \vec{u}_2^{(b)}, \) and \( \vec{u}_3^{(b)} \), in the following manner:

- \( p, q, \) and \( r \): Roll, pitch, and yaw components of the missile angular velocity
- \( u, v, \) and \( w \): Linear velocity components of the missile
- \( X, Y, \) and \( Z \): Aerodynamic force components acting on the missile mass center
- \( L, M, \) and \( N \): Roll, pitch, and yaw components of the aerodynamic moment
- \( X_T, Y_T, \) and \( Z_T \): Thrust force components on the missile at its mass center
- \( L_T, M_T, \) and \( N_T \): Thrust misalignment moment components on the missile
- \( g_x, g_y, \) and \( g_z \): Gravity components acting on the missile at its mass center

When Eqs. (4)–(6) are examined, it is seen that the cross-products of the moment of inertia components are not considered; instead, only moment of inertia terms on the main diagonal of the inertia matrix are taken into account. This is because the considered missile model schematized in Figure 1 has rotational symmetries in both orthogonal lateral planes.
Eqs. (1)–(6) can be simplified for the after-boost guidance phase as

\[\dot{u} - r v + q w = (X/m) + g_x\]  
(7)

\[\dot{v} + r u - p w = (Y/m) + g_y\]  
(8)

\[\dot{w} - q u + p v = (Z/m) + g_z\]  
(9)

\[\dot{p} = L/I_a\]  
(10)

\[\dot{q} - p r = M/I_t\]  
(11)

\[\dot{r} + p q = N/I_t\]  
(12)

3. Missile aerodynamic model

Aerodynamic force and moment terms in Eqs. (7)–(12) can be approximated in terms of dynamic pressure \(q_\infty\), missile cross-sectional area \(S_M\), and missile diameter \(d_M\), as follows [4,9]:

\[X = C_x q_\infty S_M\]  
(13)

\[Y = C_y q_\infty S_M\]  
(14)

\[Z = C_z q_\infty S_M\]  
(15)

\[L = C_l q_\infty S_M d_M\]  
(16)

\[M = C_m q_\infty S_M d_M\]  
(17)

\[N = C_n q_\infty S_M d_M\]  
(18)

Here \(q_\infty\) and \(S_M\) can be determined using air density \(\rho\) at the related altitude. \(v_M\) stands for the magnitude of the missile velocity for \(\pi \approx 3.14\), as in [10]

\[q_\infty = (1/2) \rho v_M^2\]  
(19)

\[S_M = (\pi/4) d_M^2\]  
(20)

Aerodynamic coefficients \(C_x, C_y, C_z, C_l, C_m,\) and \(C_n\) can be expressed as the functions of angle of attack \((\alpha)\), side-slip angle \((\beta)\), aileron, elevator, rudder deflections \((\delta_a, \delta_e,\) and \(\delta_r)\), \(p, q,\) and \(r\) in the following manner [4]:

\[C_x = C_{x0}\]  
(21)

\[C_y = C_{y\alpha} \beta + C_{y\delta_a} \delta_a + C_{y\delta_e} \delta_e + C_{y\delta_r} \delta_r\]  
(22)
\[ C_z = C_{z_0} + C_{z_\delta} \delta + C_{z_q} q \]  

(23) 

\[ C_l = C_{l_\delta} \delta + C_{l_p} p \]  

(24) 

\[ C_m = C_{m_\alpha} + C_{m_\delta} \delta + C_{m_q} q \]  

(25) 

\[ C_n = C_{n_\alpha} \beta + C_{n_\delta} \delta + C_{n_r} r, \]  

(26) 

where \( \tau = \frac{d_M}{2 v_M} \) and \( C_{x_0} \) is the static axial aerodynamic force component.

Stability derivatives \( C_{y_\beta}, C_{y_\delta}, C_{y_\gamma}, C_{z_\alpha}, C_{z_\delta}, C_{z_q}, C_{l_\alpha}, C_{l_\delta}, C_{m_\alpha}, C_{m_\delta}, C_{m_q}, C_{n_\beta}, C_{n_\delta}, \) and \( C_{n_r} \) are dependent on the Mach number (\( M_\infty \)) and are updated during the flight in the simulations. Here \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) can be defined as in Figure 2 [10]:

\[ \alpha = \arctan \left( \frac{w}{u} \right) \]  

(27) 

\[ \beta = \arcsin \left( \frac{v}{v_M} \right) \]  

(28) 

Deflection angles \( \delta_\alpha, \delta_e, \) and \( \delta_r \) are introduced in terms of the fin deflections with respect to the fin arrangement given in Figure 3, as follows [4]:

\[ \delta_\alpha = \frac{(\delta_1 + \delta_3)}{2} \]  

(29) 

\[ \delta_e = \frac{(\delta_2 - \delta_4)}{2} \]  

(30) 

\[ \delta_r = \frac{(\delta_1 - \delta_3)}{2} \]  

(31)
4. Guidance laws

The guidance laws that are utilized to steer the missile towards the predefined target are dealt with according to the type of guidance command. Namely, the guidance laws yielding commands in the form of lateral acceleration components of the missile and relevant orientation angles are chosen as the acceleration- and angle-based guidance laws, respectively.

4.1. Acceleration-based guidance laws

4.1.1. Proportional navigation guidance law

For the engagement geometry in Figure 4, where $\vec{u}_1^{(w)}$ and $\vec{u}_1^{(r)}$ stand for the first unit vectors of the wind frame ($F_w$) and line-of-sight (LOS) frame ($F_r$) along the missile velocity vector ($\vec{v}_{M/O_m}$) and LOS vector ($\vec{r}_{T/M}$), the command accelerations, i.e. $a_{w2}^c$ and $a_{w3}^c$, drawn in Figures 5 and 6, can be found as in [4,6,9,11–13]:

\[ a_{w2}^c = N_2 v_M \left[ \dot{\lambda}_y \cos (\gamma_m) - \dot{\lambda}_p \sin (\gamma_m) \sin (\lambda_y - \eta_m) \right] \]  
\[ a_{w3}^c = -N_4 v_M \dot{\lambda}_p \cos (\lambda_y - \eta_m) \]

Figure 4. Engagement geometry between the missile and target.

Figure 5. Horizontal plane of the wind frame.

Figure 6. Vertical plane of the wind frame.
Here \( N_2 \) and \( N_3 \) denote the effective navigation ratios in the pitch and yaw planes, \( \lambda_y \) and \( \lambda_p \) are the yaw and pitch angles of the LOS vector, \( \gamma_m \) and \( \gamma_m \) indicate the flight path angles of the missile in the yaw and pitch planes, and \( a_{w_2} = a_yd \) and \( a_{w_3} = a_zd \) represent the desired values of the missile lateral accelerations.

### 4.1.2. Velocity pursuit guidance law

The VPG law, which dictates the alignment of \( \vec{v}_{M/O_s} \) with \( \vec{r}_{T/M} \), can be derived from the PNG law by treating \( N_2 \) and \( N_3 \) as unified in Eqs. (32) and (33) [7].

### 4.1.3. Augmented proportional navigation guidance law

Accounting the product of half of the relevant lateral acceleration component of the target by the corresponding effective navigation ratio in Eqs. (32) and (33), the acceleration commands can be found according to the APNG law as shown below [1,4,6]:

\[
a_{w_2} = N_2 \left\{ v_M \left[ \dot{\lambda}_y \cos (\gamma_m) - \dot{\lambda}_p \sin (\gamma_m) \sin (\lambda_y - \eta_m) \right] + \left[ a_{T}^n \cos (\eta_m - \eta_t) - a_{T}^t \sin (\eta_m - \eta_t) \right] / 2 \right\}
\]

\[
a_{w_3} = -N_3 \left\{ v_M \dot{\lambda}_p \cos (\lambda_y - \eta_m) + \left[ a_{T}^t \cos (\eta_m - \eta_t) + a_{T}^n \sin (\eta_m - \eta_t) \right] \sin (\gamma_m) / 2 \right\},
\]

where \( a_{T}^n \) and \( a_{T}^t \) are the normal and tangential components of the target acceleration vector, and \( \eta_t \) shows the heading angle of the target.

### 4.2. Angle-based guidance laws

#### 4.2.1. Body pursuit guidance law

BPG law must coincide the longitudinal axis of the missile, i.e. \( \vec{u}_1^{(b)} \) axis, with the LOS. Therefore, the guidance commands in the pitch and yaw planes (\( \theta^c \) and \( \psi^c \)) can be derived, as \( \theta \) and \( \psi \) denote the pitch and yaw angles of the missile [1,4]:

\[
\theta^c = \lambda_p
\]

\[
\psi^c = \lambda_y
\]

#### 4.2.2. Linear homing guidance law

LHG law aims to maintain the missile on the collision triangle shaped by the missile, target, and predicted intercept point, as depicted in Figure 7. In Figure 7, M, T, and P stand for the missile, target, and predicted intercept point, respectively. \( \vec{v}_{M/\text{actual}} \) and \( \vec{v}_{M/\text{ideal}} \) demonstrate the velocity vector of the missile at the beginning of the guidance and desired velocity vector, by orienting the missile velocity vector towards the predicted intercept point, where the collision of the missile with the target will occur afterwards [4].

As \( \Delta t \) indicates the time interval between initial time (\( t_0 \)) and end of the intercept (\( t_F \)), the desired position vectors of the missile and target at point P can be written as

\[
\vec{r}_j (t_F) = \vec{r}_j (t_0) + \vec{v}_{j/O_s} \Delta t,
\]
where for $j = M$ and $T$, $\vec{r}_j = \vec{r}_j^{O_e}$.

Using Eq. (38), the guidance command to the flight path angle of the missile in the yaw plane ($\gamma_m^c$) is obtained as follows, provided that $\cos(\gamma_m) \neq 0$ [4,14]:

$$\eta_m^c = \arctan \left[ \frac{v_{Ty} \Delta t - \Delta y}{v_{Tx} \Delta t - \Delta x} \right]$$

(39)

Similarly, the guidance command in the pitch plane ($\gamma_m^c$) can be derived as in [4,14]:

$$\gamma_m^c = \arctan \left[ \frac{\Delta z - v_{Tz} \Delta t}{(v_{Tx} \Delta t - \Delta x) \cos(\eta_m) + (v_{Ty} \Delta t - \Delta y) \sin(\eta_m)} \right]$$

(40)

Here $\Delta x$, $\Delta y$, and $\Delta z$ are the components of the relative position vector between the missile and target, and $v_{Tx}$, $v_{Ty}$, and $v_{Tz}$ are the velocity components of the target.

5. Missile control system

Two different missile control systems, i.e. missile autopilots, are modeled for the pitch and yaw planes of the missile, in order to convert the commands yielded by the considered guidance laws. It is assumed that the roll motion of the missile is compensated by means of a faster roll autopilot at the beginning of the motion. Here the pitch and yaw dynamics of the missile are decoupled by prior roll compensation. In order to maintain the stability of both types of control systems, an adaptive control strategy is constructed, which updates the relevant controller gains by changing the aerodynamic coefficients instantaneously in accordance with the present values of $M_\infty$, $\alpha$ or $\beta$, and altitude.

5.1. Acceleration control system

The acceleration control systems are designed to realize the guidance commands generated by the PNG, VPG, and APNG laws for both the pitch and yaw planes.
The closed loop transfer function between the desired and actual lateral accelerations in the pitch plane ($a_{zd}$ and $a_z$) can be written with regard to the block diagram of the control system, based on the classical proportional plus integral (PI) control action with the pitch damping term, as given in Figure 8 [4,15]:

\[
\frac{a_z(s)}{a_{zd}(s)} = \frac{(T_p s + 1) \left(n_{p2} s^2 + n_{p1} s + 1\right)}{a_{p3} s^3 + a_{p2} s^2 + a_{p1} s + 1},
\]

(41)

where $K_p$, $T_p$, and $K_q$ stand for the proportional, integral, and pitch damping gains, respectively. The following definitions are introduced: $n_{p1} = n_z/n_{z0}$, $n_{p2} = n_z/n_{z0}$, $a_p = [T_p (d_{q0} + K_q n_{q1} + K_{q1} n_{q2}) + K_{q1} n_{q2}] / (K_{q1} n_{q2})$, $a_{p2} = [T_p (d_{p1} + K_q n_{q1} + K_{q1} n_{q2}) + K_{q1} n_{q2}] / (K_{q1} n_{q2})$, $a_{p3} = T_p (1 + K_q n_{q2}) / (K_{q1} n_{q2})$; $n_{z0} = Z_\alpha M_\delta - Z_\delta M_\alpha$, $n_{z1} = Z_q M_\delta - Z_\delta M_q$, $n_{z2} = Z_\delta$, $n_{q0} = (Z_\delta M_\alpha - Z_\alpha M_\delta) / u$, $n_{q1} = M_\delta$; $Z_\alpha = c_F C_{z\alpha}$, $Z_\delta = c_F C_{z\delta}$, $Z_{q} = (c_F d_M C_{z_q}) / (2v_M)$, $M_\alpha = c_M C_{m\alpha}$, $M_\delta = c_M C_{m\delta}$, and $M_{q} = (c_M d_M C_{m_q}) / (2v_M)$ for $c_F = q_m S_M / m$ and $c_M = q_m S_M d_M / I_t$.

The characteristic polynomial of the transfer function in Eq. (41) is

\[
D_p(s) = a_{p3} s^3 + a_{p2} s^2 + a_{p1} s + 1
\]

(42)

$K_p$, $T_p$, and $K_q$ can be calculated using the third-order Butterworth polynomial in Eq. (43) by placing the three poles of the control system at the desired locations specified by the desired bandwidth value ($\omega_c$), with a damping ratio of 0.707 [4]:

\[
B_3(s) = \left(1/\omega_c^2\right) s^3 + \left(2/\omega_c^2\right) s^2 + (2/\omega_c) s + 1
\]

(43)

Defining $\sigma_p = T_p / K_p$ and $\eta_p = T_p K_q / K_p$, $\sigma_p$, $\eta_p$, and $T_p$ can be found by matching Eqs. (42) and (43) term by term as follows:

\[
\bar{r}_p = M_p^{-1} \bar{b}_p,
\]

(44)

where $\bar{r}_p = [\sigma_p \quad \eta_p \quad T_p]^T$, $M_p = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & n_{z2} \\ d_{p1} & n_{q1} & n_{z1} \\ d_{p0} & n_{q0} & n_{z0} \end{bmatrix}$, and $\bar{b}_p = \begin{bmatrix} n_{z0} / \omega_c^2 \\ (2 n_{z0} / \omega_c^2) - n_{z2} \\ (2 n_{z0} / \omega_c) - n_{z1} \end{bmatrix}$.

Regarding the rotational symmetry of the missile, as $K_y$, $T_y$, and $K_r$ show the proportional, integral, and yaw damping gains, and $n_{y1}$, $n_{y2}$, $a_{y1}$, $a_{y2}$, and $a_{y3}$ as well as $K_y$, $T_y$, and $K_r$ are functions of the geometrical, dynamic, and aerodynamic parameters of the missile, the yaw plane transfer function between the desired and actual accelerations in the $(a_{yd}$ and $a_y)$ can be obtained as follows for $a_{zd} = a_x'$ and $a_{yd} = a_y'$ [4,15]:

\[
\frac{a_y(s)}{a_{yd}(s)} = \frac{(T_y s + 1) \left(n_{y2} s^2 + n_{y1} s + 1\right)}{a_{y3} s^3 + a_{y2} s^2 + a_{y1} s + 1}
\]

(45)
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5.2. Angle control system

A state feedback-type angle control system is introduced for the guidance commands generated by the BPG and LHG laws, by accounting the integral of the error between the reference and actual, or measured, values of the controlled state variable, i.e. flight path angle ($\gamma_i$). In this scheme, the guidance commands of the BPG law about the orientation angles of the missile with respect to the ground are converted into flight path angles, as given below. LHG law commands to the flight path angles are directly utilized in the same angle control system:

$$\gamma_m^c = \theta^c - \alpha$$  \hspace{1cm} (46)

$$\eta_m^c = \psi^c + [\beta / \cos(\theta)]$$  \hspace{1cm} (47)

Taking gravity as an external disturbance, the next state feedback control law can be designated in the pitch plane to control $\gamma_m$:

$$u = \delta_c = k_\gamma (\gamma_{md} - \gamma_m) - k_\theta \theta - k_q q + k_i x_i,$$  \hspace{1cm} (48)

where $\gamma_{md}$ stands for the desired value of the flight path angle of the missile in the pitch plane. $k_\gamma$, $k_\theta$, $k_q$, and $k_i$ are the controller gains for the corresponding state variables, i.e. $\gamma_m$, $\theta$, $q$, and $x_i$.

Expressing the equations of motion in state-space form with $\gamma_m$, $\theta$, $q$, and $x_i$, the closed loop transfer function between the desired and actual flight path angles in the pitch plane ($\gamma_{md}$ and $\gamma_m$) can be found as per the block diagram in Figure 9 [4]:

$$\frac{\gamma_m(s)}{\gamma_{md}(s)} = \frac{n_{\gamma 3} s^3 + n_{\gamma 2} s^2 + n_{\gamma 1} s + 1}{d_{\gamma 4} s^4 + d_{\gamma 3} s^3 + d_{\gamma 2} s^2 + d_{\gamma 1} s + 1},$$  \hspace{1cm} (49)

where $n_{\gamma 1} = (k_\gamma a_{\alpha \delta} + k_i a_{\delta \gamma}) / (k_i a_{\alpha \delta})$, $n_{\gamma 2} = (a_{\alpha \delta} a_{\delta \gamma} k_\gamma + a_{\alpha \delta} k_i Z_\delta) / (a_{\alpha \delta} a_{\alpha \delta} k_i)$, $n_{\gamma 3} = (Z_{\delta} k_\gamma) / (a_{\alpha \delta} k_i)$, $d_{\gamma 1} = [a_{\alpha \delta} (k_\theta + k_\gamma) + k_i a_{\delta \gamma}] / (k_i a_{\alpha \delta})$, $d_{\gamma 2} = (M_{\alpha} + M_q k_\theta - a_{\alpha q} + a_{\alpha \delta} k_q + a_{\delta \gamma} k_\gamma + Z_\delta k_i) / (k_i a_{\alpha \delta})$, $d_{\gamma 3} = [M_q k_q + Z_\delta k_\gamma - (M_q + Z_\delta)] / (k_i a_{\alpha \delta})$, $d_{\gamma 4} = 1 / (k_i a_{\alpha \delta})$; $a_{\alpha \delta} = M_{\delta} Z_\alpha - M_\alpha Z_{\delta}$, $a_{\delta \gamma} = M_{\delta} Z_q - M_q Z_\delta$, and $a_{\alpha q} = M_q Z_\alpha - M_\alpha Z_q$.

The characteristic polynomial of the transfer function in Eq. (49) becomes

$$D(s) = d_{\gamma 4} s^4 + d_{\gamma 3} s^3 + d_{\gamma 2} s^2 + d_{\gamma 1} s + 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (50)
The controller gains $k_{\gamma}$, $k_{\theta}$, $k_{q}$, and $k_{i}$ can be computed using the pole placement approach by regarding the forthcoming fourth-order Butterworth polynomial [4]:

$$B_4(s) = \frac{1}{\omega_c^4} s^4 + \frac{2.613}{\omega_c^2} s^3 + \frac{3.414}{\omega_c^2} s^2 + (2.613\omega_c) s + 1 \quad (51)$$

From Eqs. (50) and (51), the matrix equation for $k_{\gamma}$, $k_{\theta}$, $k_{q}$, and $k_{i}$ appears as

$$\begin{bmatrix} k_{\gamma} & k_{\theta} & k_{q} & k_{i} \end{bmatrix}^T = \tilde{M}_k^{-1} \tilde{b}_k, \quad (52)$$

where

$$\tilde{M}_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & a_{\alpha\delta}^2 \\ Z_\delta & 0 & M_\delta & \frac{-2.613 a_{\alpha\delta}}{\omega_c^2} \\ a_{\delta q} & M_\delta & a_{\alpha\delta} & \frac{-3.414 a_{\alpha\delta}}{\omega_c^2} \\ a_{\alpha\delta} & a_{\alpha\delta} & 0 & \frac{-2.613 a_{\alpha\delta}}{\omega_c^2} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\tilde{b}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\omega_c^4}{M_q + Z_q} \\ a_{\alpha q} - M_\alpha \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Similarly, the transfer function in the yaw plane can be adapted from the pitch plane transfer function by defining $n_{q1}$, $n_{q2}$, $n_{q3}$, $d_{q1}$, $d_{q2}$, $d_{q3}$, and $d_{q4}$ [4]:

$$\frac{n_{m}(s)}{n_{md}(s)} = \frac{n_{q1} s^3 + n_{q2} s^2 + n_{q1} s + 1}{d_{q4} s^4 + d_{q3} s^3 + d_{q2} s^2 + d_{q1} s + 1} \quad (53)$$

In this study, the angle autopilots are run in two modes. In the first mode, the bandwidth is kept at a certain value during the simulations, whereas the initial bandwidth value attains its specified final value at the end of the prescribed duration. It then remains at that value until the termination of the corresponding simulation in the second mode, where it is intended to diminish the high initial acceleration requirement of the angle-based guidance laws [4].

6. Target kinematics

To handle guidance problems against maneuvering targets, several methods, such as designing high-gain observers, are considered to estimate the target motion [16–18].

The kinematic variables of the considered ground vehicle, i.e. target, include normal and tangential acceleration components ($a_T^n$ and $a_T^t$), target speed ($v_T$), and horizontal heading angle ($\eta_t$) with the initial values of the target velocity and heading angle ($v_{T0}$ and $\eta_{t0}$). Integration variable $\sigma$ is introduced as follows:

$$v_T(t) = v_{T0} + \int_{t_0}^{t} a_T^t(\sigma) \, d\sigma \quad (54)$$

$$\eta_t(t) = \eta_{t0} + \int_{t_0}^{t} [a_T^n(\sigma)/v_T(\sigma)] \, d\sigma \quad (55)$$

The time-dependent horizontal position components of the target can be modeled with the initial values $x_{T0}$, $y_{T0}$, and $z_{T0}$ as follows:

$$x_T(t) = x_{T0} + \int_{t_0}^{t} v_T(\sigma) \cos(\eta_t(\sigma)) \, d\sigma \quad (56)$$
7. Missile-target engagement model

In the engagement geometry, $r_{T/M}$ represents the magnitude of $\vec{r}_{T/M}$, $\lambda_p$, and $\lambda_y$, and can be determined from the following equations:

$$r_{T/M} = \sqrt{\Delta x^2 + \Delta y^2 + \Delta z^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (59)

$$\lambda_p = \arctan \left[-\Delta z \cos (\lambda_y) / \Delta x \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (60)

$$\lambda_y = \arctan (\Delta y / \Delta x)$$  \hspace{1cm} (61)

The total miss distance ($d_{\text{miss}}$) at $t = t_F$ can be computed from the next formula by treating the vertical component of $r_{T/M}$ to be zero, i.e. $\Delta z = 0$:

$$d_{\text{miss}} = \sqrt{\Delta x^2 (t_F) + \Delta y^2 (t_F)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (62)

8. Computer simulations

PNG, VPG, APNG, BPG, and LHG laws are implemented for the zero initial heading error value of the missile against both stationary and maneuvering targets, along with the numerical values of the relevant parameters shown in Table 1. For the angle control systems with varying bandwidth values, the initial values are selected to be 1 Hz, and the duration to attain the specified final value is 1 s. Aerodynamic coefficients are additionally computed for the $M_\infty$ range of 0.3 $-$ 2.7, $\delta_e$, and $\delta_\alpha$, ranges of $-10^\circ$ to $10^\circ$, and $\alpha$ and $\beta$ ranges of $-17^\circ$ to $19^\circ$. Depending on the current state of the missile, the appropriate values of the aerodynamic terms are continuously calculated using relevant look-up tables, prepared for the ranges given above. Similarly, the stability derivatives of the missile, which constitute one of the components of the aerodynamic terms as functions of $M_\infty$, are computed using Missile Datcom for the pitch and roll motions of the missile against different $M_\infty$ values (Table 2). Taking these data on the stability derivatives of the missile into account, the corresponding controller.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$d_M$</td>
<td>70 mm</td>
<td>Field of view of the strapdown seeker</td>
<td>$\pm 30^\circ$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_M$</td>
<td>3848.5 mm$^2$</td>
<td>Constant speed of the maneuvering target</td>
<td>90 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_M$</td>
<td>2000 mm</td>
<td>Constant lateral acceleration of the maneuvering target</td>
<td>0.3 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m$</td>
<td>17.55 kg</td>
<td>Cant angle of the missile fins</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_a$</td>
<td>0.0214 kg.m$^2$</td>
<td>Bandwidth of the missile control systems</td>
<td>5 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_t$</td>
<td>5.855 kg.m$^2$</td>
<td>Bandwidth of the control actuation system</td>
<td>20 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_{max}$</td>
<td>30 g (g = 9.81 m/s$^2$)</td>
<td>Angular excursion of the control fins</td>
<td>$\pm 20^\circ$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_2$ and $N_3$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Operating frequencies of the gyroscopes and accelerometers</td>
<td>110 Hz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Essential parameters [1,19].
gains are determined from the related expressions. The values generated for the pitch motion are used for the yaw motion with regard to the rotational symmetry of the missile [4]. The initial values of the missile and target kinematic parameters related to the engagement are presented in Table 3.

Table 2. Aerodynamic stability derivatives for the pitch and roll autopilots [4].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$M_{\infty}$</th>
<th>$C_{z_{\alpha}}$</th>
<th>$C_{z_{\delta}}$</th>
<th>$C_{z_{\nu}}$</th>
<th>$C_{m_{\alpha}}$</th>
<th>$C_{m_{\delta}}$</th>
<th>$C_{m_{\nu}}$</th>
<th>$C_{l_{\delta}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-14.966</td>
<td>-2.679</td>
<td>-33.207</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>20.199</td>
<td>-1451.030</td>
<td>1.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-19.466</td>
<td>-4.769</td>
<td>-22.383</td>
<td>-7.407</td>
<td>41.794</td>
<td>-2240.710</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-16.322</td>
<td>-3.532</td>
<td>-78.972</td>
<td>-13.094</td>
<td>30.080</td>
<td>-2526.520</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-1.928</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>-162.620</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>-35.621</td>
<td>-838.130</td>
<td>1.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>18.224</td>
<td>11.974</td>
<td>-279.727</td>
<td>20.057</td>
<td>-127.602</td>
<td>1525.616</td>
<td>3.716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Initial conditions of the missile and target kinematic parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_{M0}$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y_{M0}$</td>
<td>450 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_{M0}$</td>
<td>200 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{M0}$</td>
<td>408 m/s ($M_{\infty} = 1.2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_{M0}$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_0$</td>
<td>$\beta_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_{T0}$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The computer simulations are performed in MATLAB Simulink as per the flow chart submitted in Figure 10 for the situations given above. Their results are presented in Tables 4 and 5. The trajectories of the missile and target within the engagement scenarios for all guidance laws are given in Figures 11–15.

Figure 10. Flow chart for the computer simulations.

9. Discussion and conclusion
As shown in Table 4 for the constant bandwidth case, LHG law yields the smallest terminal miss distance, whereas the VPG yielding the minimum total engagement time appears to be the poorest. In fact, all total engagement values are very similar. The PNG and APNG laws demand the smallest maximum acceleration. Fortunately, the high acceleration levels of the BPG and LHG laws can be significantly reduced to the levels...
Table 4. Simulation results obtained for the control systems with constant bandwidth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target type</th>
<th>Guidance law</th>
<th>Terminal miss distance (m)</th>
<th>Total engagement time (s)</th>
<th>Maximum acceleration requirement (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>3.079</td>
<td>2.823</td>
<td>3.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VPG</td>
<td>37.670</td>
<td>2.723</td>
<td>24.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APNG</td>
<td>3.079</td>
<td>2.823</td>
<td>3.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BPG</td>
<td>31.332</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>84.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LHG</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>2.828</td>
<td>32.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maneuvering</td>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>2.968</td>
<td>3.051</td>
<td>2.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VPG</td>
<td>63.448</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>14.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APNG</td>
<td>3.046</td>
<td>3.050</td>
<td>2.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BPG</td>
<td>59.436</td>
<td>2.868</td>
<td>32.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LHG</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>3.061</td>
<td>77.340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Simulation results obtained for the control systems with varying bandwidth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target type</th>
<th>Guidance law</th>
<th>Terminal miss distance (m)</th>
<th>Total engagement time (s)</th>
<th>Maximum acceleration requirement (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td>BPG</td>
<td>29.821</td>
<td>2.754</td>
<td>9.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LHG</td>
<td>2.041</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>13.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maneuvering</td>
<td>BPG</td>
<td>60.525</td>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>7.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LHG</td>
<td>2.445</td>
<td>3.142</td>
<td>17.515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Engagement with the PNG law and constant-bandwidth control system.

close to the values of the acceleration-based laws, when the bandwidth of the missile control system is designated with a varying bandwidth, as tabulated in Table 5. Conversely, almost no significant changes occur in terms of terminal miss distance and total engagement in the varying bandwidth case. Moreover, no sharp trend can be seen in either increment or decrement in the data collected for the maneuvering target compared to those for the stationary target.
In order to apply the proposed methods on a real missile system, convenient electronic cards should be designed, including driving and power control cards and a satisfactory control actuation system. Furthermore, corresponding sensors and electronic components with cables and connectors should be procured. Once the resulting guidance constants and controller gains are embedded into the relevant electronic cards in matrix form and have made the required fine tunings in the laboratory, they can be mounted onto the related missile body and tested again in their original casings. Unfortunately, there was no opportunity to implement the present guidance and control algorithm on a real missile. Hence, only the presented simulation results are in hand to demonstrate the usefulness of the proposed scheme. In most guided missiles, PNG law is chosen against stationary or slow-moving targets along with an acceleration control system. CIRIT air-to-surface missiles developed by ROKETSAN Inc. can be given as an example for the mentioned kind of missiles. In real missile systems, accelerometers and gyros are utilized to measure the three components of the relative linear

Figure 12. Engagement with the VPG law and constant-bandwidth control system.

Figure 13. Engagement with the APNG law and constant-bandwidth control system.
accelerations and angular speeds of the missile, respectively. Resolvers, incremental or absolute type encoders, or potentiometers are used as feedback elements for the control actuation systems to acquire the angular position information as per the accuracy requirements.

It can be concluded that none of the acceleration- and angle-based guidance laws is absolutely superior. Therefore, a convenient guidance law should be selected depending on the engagement conditions.
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