Published in final edited form as:

J Guid Control Dyn. 2018 November ; 41(11): 2327–2337. doi:10.2514/1.G003383.

Dynamics and Control of In-Flight Wingtip Docking

John R. Cooper^a, Paul M. Rothhaar^b

^aResearch Engineer, Research Department, 100 Exploration Way, Hampton, VA 23666, *National Institute of Aerospace*

^bAerospace Technologist, Dynamic Systems and Control Branch, 11 Langley Blvd, Hampton, VA 23681, AIAA Member, *NASA Langley Research Center*

Abstract

Project Link! is a NASA-led effort to study the feasibility of multi-aircraft aerial docking systems. In these systems, a group of vehicles physically link to each other during flight to form a larger ensemble vehicle with increased aerodynamic performance and mission utility. This paper presents a dynamic model and control architecture for a system of fixed-wing vehicles with this capability. The dynamic model consists of the 6 degree-of-freedom fixed-wing aircraft equations of motion, a spring-damper-magnet system to represent the linkage force between constituent vehicles, and the NASA-Burnham-Hallock wingtip vortex model to represent the close-proximity aerodynamic interactions between constituents before the linking occurs. The control architecture consists of a guidance algorithm to autonomously drive the constituents towards their linking partners and an inner-loop angular rate controller. A simulation was constructed from the model, and the flight dynamic modes of the linked system were compared to the individual vehicles. The main contributions of this work are twofold. First is the introduction of close-proximity aerodynamic effects to create a realistic simulation framework for this problem. Second is the application of a sophisticated leader-follower guidance algorithm to achieve in-air wingtip docking. Simulation results for both before and after linking are presented.

I. Introduction

Project Link! is a NASA-led effort to study groups of aerial vehicles with the capability of physically linking to each other to form a larger structure with improved aerodynamic performance and mission utility compared to the individual constituents. This paper investigates dynamics and control for a group of fixed-wing aircraft with this capability and provides simulation results for both the linked and unlinked phases of flight. During the linking phase of flight, an autonomous leader-follower controller is employed such that each vehicle is driven towards the point where its wingtip coincides with its partner vehicle's wingtip. The main contributions of this work are the dynamic models for the individual and linked vehicles including close-proximity aerodynamic interactions due to wingtip vortices and the simulation results for the linking phase and linked flight using a nonlinear guidance law based the kinematic relation between leader and follower aircraft.

Linked aircraft have the potential to drastically increase the mission capabilities of an aircraft system. Such coordination could enable high altitude, long endurance (HALE) missions with vertical takeoff and landing of component vehicles from unimproved sites.

The same system could reconfigure to be capable of a heavy lift mission. Furthermore, in-flight linking allows for multi-leg missions that consist of efficient flight to a remote location followed by a distributed multi-agent leg.

Linked aircraft may find applications in missions such as search and rescue, cartography, reconnaissance, package delivery, and atmospheric satellites. For observational missions, the aircraft would fly to the desired location in an efficient, large fixed-wing mode. Then, the system would break apart into its individual units to cover ground in an optimal distributed way. In a persistent atmospheric satellite mission, units would break off for refueling and immediately be replaced by a new aircraft. In this manner, the ensemble craft could stay airborne indefinitely. Additionally, HALE vehicles have high wing aspect ratios which make them sensitive to atmospheric turbulence. In fact, the lack of robustness to atmospheric turbulence caused the crash of NASA's Helios prototype [1]. A system of linked aircraft would be capable of breaking off into individual agents during turbulence and then re-linking once it is safe to do so.

Flight testing of linked aircraft was first performed in the 1950's by the US Air Force with projects TipTow [2] and Tom-Tom [3]. These projects were carried out in parallel with the objective of increasing the range of fighter planes. Both involved linking the wingtips of the fighters to the wingtips of a larger bomber aircraft. Several successful flights were performed during both projects. However, introducing an autopilot to Project TipTow resulted in a failure which caused the loss of two planes and their crews. Project Tom-Tom was canceled as a result of the link separating during flight due to wingtip vortices, although all crew members landed safely.

In the intervening years, research has been done on similar ideas such as the multibody transport concept by Moore and Maddalon which consists of two passenger jet fuselages joined together by a wing between them [4]. This design allowed for a lower weight than two individual planes, due to reduced bending moment acting on the common wing and had a lift-to-drag ratio increase of 8–10%. Magill et. al. later studied the effects of wingtip-docked flight. A method for stability analysis was given in [5] and a 20–40% performance increase over individual flight was shown in [6].

With modern day increased capability of unmanned systems and control hardware, there has been renewed interest in this problem. Several researchers have studied modular robotics over the last decade and a half [7–10]. These systems consist of many small, often cube-shaped robots that are capable of arranging themselves in various configurations to complete different tasks. Oung et. al. extended this concept to aerial robots by developing an experimental platform known as the Distributed Flight Array [11]. This array consists of many single rotor aircraft that dock with each other on the ground to form an arbitrarily-shaped multi-rotor vehicle. The individual craft are, however, unstable in solo flight.

More recently, Montalvo and Costello investigated flight dynamic modes for linked fixed-wing aircraft in wingtip-docked, nose-to-tail docked, and lattice configurations [12]. Troub and Montalvo have further analyzed the controllability of these configurations in [13]. Montalvo's dissertation addresses other aspects of the problem including linkage mechanism

design and controller design [14]. This paper offers a convenient confirmation of the trends found in [12] for wingtip-docked flight dynamic modes using the simulation framework developed herein.

Under the auspices of Project Link!, Patterson, et. al. considered the conceptual design for a linked vehicle ensemble for a distributed aerial presence or payload mission in [15]. Also as a Project Link! study, Cooper and Rothhaar developed a potential field-based guidance algorithm for in-flight linking of a group of multi-rotor vehicles in [16].

This paper establishes a guidance algorithm for in-flight linking of fixed-wing aircraft. A dynamic model is constructed using the Generic Nonlinear Aerodynamic (GNA) model in [17]. The NASA Burnham-Hallock Model [18] is implemented since wingtip vortex effects are a significant disturbance seen in the close-proximity flight required for wingtip docking. The guidance algorithm developed here is adapted from the virtual leader path-following algorithm given in [19]. guidance algorithms of this sort are also referred to as line-of-sight algorithms [20–25]. The ability to follow an arbitrary three-dimensional path as opposed to simple waypoint following is necessary for the problem of in-flight wingtip docking because the goal is for the follower vehicle to track the leader, which may make unpredicted maneuvers during the approach phase. In the application of the path-following or line-of-sight algorithm herein, the virtual leader is replaced with a real leader aircraft, and thus the path-wise speed of the vehicle is not decided by the algorithm, but matches that of the real leader. The linkage forces and moments acting on the vehicles are modeled as a set a spring-damper systems with an additional magnetic force contribution. The simulation results reveal the open-loop dynamic modes of the linked-ensemble, the trajectories and aerodynamic forces during the linked phase, and the dynamic response to doublet commands during linked flight.

The paper is organized as follows: Section II develops the dynamic model for the system, Section III presents the wingtip docking guidance algorithm, Section IV defines the inner-loop attitude rate controller for each vehicle, Section V presents the simulation results, Section VI discusses possible future work to extend the results presented here, and Section VII draws conclusions from the results.

II. Fixed-Wing Aircraft Dynamics

The standard rigid body dynamic model from [26] is adapted with the addition of forces and moments due to linked vehicles. The translational and rotational kinematic equations of a fixed-wing aircraft are given by

$$\dot{r} = \mathbf{R}_B^I \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \\ w \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{\phi} \\ \dot{\theta} \\ \dot{\psi} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s_{\phi} t_{\theta} & c_{\phi} t_{\theta} \\ 0 & c_{\phi} & -s_{\phi} \\ 0 & s_{\phi}/c_{\theta} & c_{\phi}/c_{\theta} \end{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\omega} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{r}$ is the position vector in the inertial frame, $\mathbf{R}_B^I$ is the rotation matrix from the body frame to inertial frame, and s , c , and t denote the sine, cosine, and tangent of the subscripted angle respectively. Note that the body frame, $B\{\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z}\}$, is defined with the x -axis pointing forward, the z -axis pointing downward, and the body y -axis completing the triad pointing out of the right wing. The origin of B is located at the vehicle's center of gravity. $\mathbf{R}_B^I$ is given in [27] by

$$\mathbf{R}_B^I = \begin{bmatrix} c_{\theta} c_{\psi} & s_{\phi} s_{\theta} c_{\psi} - c_{\phi} s_{\psi} & c_{\phi} s_{\theta} c_{\psi} + s_{\phi} s_{\psi} \\ c_{\theta} s_{\psi} & s_{\phi} s_{\theta} s_{\psi} + c_{\phi} c_{\psi} & c_{\phi} s_{\theta} s_{\psi} - s_{\phi} c_{\psi} \\ -s_{\theta} & s_{\phi} c_{\theta} & c_{\phi} c_{\theta} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

The vehicle dynamic equations are given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{u} \\ \dot{v} \\ \dot{w} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{m} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F}_A + m \mathbf{R}_I^B \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ g \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{F}_T + \mathbf{F}_L \end{bmatrix} - \boldsymbol{\omega} \times \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \\ w \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = \mathbf{J}^{-1} [\mathbf{M}_A + \mathbf{M}_L - \boldsymbol{\omega} \times (\mathbf{J} \boldsymbol{\omega})] \quad (5)$$

where m is the vehicle mass, $\mathbf{F}_A$ is the total aerodynamic force, $\mathbf{R}_I^B = \mathbf{R}_B^I{}^T$ is the rotation matrix from the body frame to inertial frame, g is the acceleration due to gravity, and $\mathbf{M}_A$ is the total aerodynamic moment.

The aerodynamic forces and moments are given by

$$\mathbf{F}_A = \bar{q} S \begin{bmatrix} -c_{\alpha} & 0 & s_{\alpha} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -s_{\alpha} & 0 & -c_{\alpha} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_D \\ C_Y \\ C_L \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{M}_A = \bar{q}S \begin{bmatrix} b & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{c} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_l \\ C_m \\ C_n \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

where $\bar{q}$ is the dynamic pressure, S is the planform area of the wing, α is the wing angle of attack, and $\bar{c}$ is the chord length. The aerodynamic coefficients are obtained using the generic nonlinear aerodynamic (GNA) model found in [17]. Details of the GNA are provided in the Appendix.

A. Linkage Mechanism Model

The force and moment from the linkage will be represented as a spring-damper system with translational and rotational components. Additionally, magnets at the wingtips are modeled, which supply an attractive force before the physical link is made. Magnets at each vehicle's wingtips are considered with identical pole strengths. Let the distance vector between the two linkage mechanisms on two linked aircraft represented in the body frame of the modeled vehicle be

$$\boldsymbol{\delta} = \mathbf{R}_{I_i}^B \left(\mathbf{R}_{B_j}^I \mathbf{r}_{L_j} + \mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{R}_{B_i}^I \mathbf{r}_{L_i} - \mathbf{r}_i \right) \quad (8)$$

where the subscript i denotes the modeled vehicle, and the subscript j represents its linked partner. Then $\dot{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ is given by

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\delta}} = \mathbf{R}_{B_j}^I \left(\boldsymbol{\omega}_j \times \mathbf{r}_{L_j} + \begin{bmatrix} u_j \\ v_j \\ w_j \end{bmatrix} \right) - \mathbf{R}_{B_i}^I \left(\boldsymbol{\omega}_i \times \mathbf{r}_{L_i} + \mathbf{R}_{I_i}^B \begin{bmatrix} u_i \\ v_i \\ w_i \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (9)$$

The translational spring-damper force is

$$\mathbf{F}_{L_\delta} = K\boldsymbol{\delta} + C\dot{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \quad (10)$$

where K is the spring constant and C is the damping constant. The magnetic force is given by the inverse square relationship

$$\mathbf{F}_{L_M} = \frac{\mu \hat{q}^2}{4\pi \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|^2} \frac{\boldsymbol{\delta}}{\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|} \quad (11)$$

where μ is the permeability of air, and $\hat{q}$ is the magnetic pole strength. $\frac{\delta}{\|\delta\|}$ is the unit vector in the direction of δ , which specifies the direction of the magnetic force. Then the total linkage force is given by $F_L = F_{L_\delta} + F_{L_M}$.

The rotational spring component is modeled as a moment that is proportional to the Euler angles that define the rotation from vehicle i 's body to vehicle j 's body frame. This rotation matrix is

$$R_{B_i}^{B_j} = R_{I_j}^B R_{B_i}^I \quad (12)$$

The Euler angles corresponding to $R_{B_i}^{B_j}$ can be solved from (3) as

$$\theta_{i,j} = -\sin^{-1}\left(R_{B_i}^{B_j}{}_{3,1}\right) \quad (13)$$

$$\phi_{i,j} = \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{R_{B_i}^{B_j}{}_{3,2}}{\cos(\theta_{i,j})}\right)$$

$$\psi_{i,j} = \cos^{-1}\left(\frac{R_{B_i}^{B_j}{}_{1,1}}{\cos(\theta_{i,j})}\right)$$

The rotational damping is proportional to angular velocity of vehicle j in vehicle i 's body frame. That is

$$\omega_{j/i} = R_{B_j}^{B_i} \omega_j - \omega_i = R_{B_i}^{B_j}{}^\top \omega_j - \omega_i \quad (14)$$

The total moment on the vehicle due to the link consists of the rotational spring and damper torque as well as a component resulting from the translational spring-damper force since the linkage mechanism is not located at the vehicle's center of gravity. The total linkage moment, M_L is then given by

$$M_L = -K_\tau \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{i,j} \\ \theta_{i,j} \\ \psi_{i,j} \end{bmatrix} + C_\tau \boldsymbol{\omega}_{j/i} + \mathbf{r}_L \times \mathbf{F}_L \quad (15)$$

where K_τ is the rotational spring constant and C_τ is the rotational damping constant.

Figure 1 shows the rear view of two linked aircraft with several of the variables used for modeling the linkage mechanism denoted.

B. Wingtip Vortex Effects

Before the vehicles link, each vehicle experiences an induced velocity caused by the wingtip vortices of the other aircraft in the system. To model this effect, the NASA-Burnham-Hallock Model is used to obtain a three-dimensional wake velocity field around the wingtips [18]. The model is defined as follows:

$$W_{wake}(x, y, z) = -W_r(x, y, z) + W_l(x, y, z) \quad (16)$$

$$W_r(x, y, z) = \frac{\Gamma}{4\pi} \frac{y - b/2}{(y - b/2)^2 + z^2 + r_c^2} \left[1 - \frac{x}{\sqrt{x^2 + (y - b/2)^2 + z^2}} \right]$$

$$W_l(x, y, z) = \frac{\Gamma}{4\pi} \frac{y + b/2}{(y + b/2)^2 + z^2 + r_c^2} \left[1 - \frac{x}{\sqrt{x^2 + (y + b/2)^2 + z^2}} \right]$$

$$V_{wake}(x, y, z) = -V_r(x, y, z) + V_l(x, y, z)$$

$$V_r(x, y, z) = \frac{\Gamma}{4\pi} \frac{-z}{(y - b/2)^2 + z^2 + r_c^2} \left[1 - \frac{x}{\sqrt{x^2 + (y - b/2)^2 + z^2}} \right]$$

$$V_l(x, y, z) = \frac{\Gamma}{4\pi} \frac{-z}{(y + b/2)^2 + z^2 + r_c^2} \left[1 - \frac{x}{\sqrt{x^2 + (y + b/2)^2 + z^2}} \right]$$

where the subscripts r and l denote contributions from the left and right wingtips respectively, x , y , and z are Cartesian coordinates in the same frame, r_c is the core radius of the vortex, and

$$\Gamma = \frac{4mg}{\rho V \pi b} \quad (17)$$

where ρ is the air density. An approximation of overall wake-induced velocity experienced by aircraft i is established as the average of three points along the wingspan. For this calculation, consider points at each wingtip and at the center of gravity of the vehicle. Then the total wake-induced velocity field is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{wake} \\ v_{wake} \\ w_{wake} \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n R_{B_j}^{B_i} \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{V_{wake_j}(x_{LW}, y_{LW}, z_{LW}) + V_{wake_j}(x_{RW}, y_{RW}, z_{RW}) + V_{wake_j}(x_{CG}, y_{CG}, z_{CG})}{3} \\ \frac{W_{wake_j}(x_{LW}, y_{LW}, z_{LW}) + W_{wake_j}(x_{RW}, y_{RW}, z_{RW}) + W_{wake_j}(x_{CG}, y_{CG}, z_{CG})}{3} \end{bmatrix}$$

where the subscripts LW and RW denote the left and right wingtips respectively, CG denotes the center of gravity, and n is the number of vehicles in the system.

Figure 2 shows a cross-section of the wake velocity field induced by wingtip vortices of a single aircraft according to the NASA-Burnham-Hallock model. Figure 3 shows the resulting velocity field when two vehicles come in close proximity of each other. It can be seen that the upwash in between the wingtips increases, which results in rolling moments on both vehicles that must be overcome by the inner-loop controllers.

The wingtip vortices effect angle-of-attack, α , sideslip angle, β , and non-dimensional roll rate, $\tilde{p}$ of aircraft i according to

$$\alpha = \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{w - w_{wake}}{u - u_{wake}} \right) \quad (19)$$

$$\beta = \sin^{-1} \left(\frac{v - v_{wake}}{\sqrt{(u - u_{wake})^2 + (v - v_{wake})^2 + (w - w_{wake})^2}} \right) \quad (20)$$

$$\Delta \tilde{p} = \frac{1}{V} \left(\sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N R_{B_j}^{B_i} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ V_{wake_j}(x_{LW}, y_{LW}, z_{LW}) \\ W_{wake_j}(x_{LW}, y_{LW}, z_{LW}) \end{bmatrix} - \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N R_{B_j}^{B_i} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ V_{wake_j}(x_{RW}, y_{RW}, z_{RW}) \\ W_{wake_j}(x_{RW}, y_{RW}, z_{RW}) \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (21)$$

The total non-dimensional body axis angular velocity is given by

$$\tilde{\omega} = \frac{1}{2V} \begin{bmatrix} b & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{c} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b \end{bmatrix} \omega + \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \tilde{p} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (22)$$

α , β , and $\tilde{\omega}$ are inputs into a aerodynamic model used to obtain the aerodynamic coefficients, C_D , C_Y , C_L , C_b , C_m , C_n .

The NASA-Burnham-Hallock model provides a velocity field around the wingtips resulting from wingtip vortices. Once the wingtips are docked, these vortices cannot form. Therefore, the NASA-Burnham-Hallock model is only used to model the aerodynamic interaction before linking occurs. Once the aircraft are linked, there may still be aerodynamic interactions that manifest as a non-elliptical lift distribution over the ensemble wing. However, modeling of the ensemble vehicle lift distribution is outside the scope of this paper.

III. Guidance Algorithm

A guidance algorithm is used to autonomously guide each aircraft towards its mate vehicle. This will be adapted from the virtual leader path-following algorithm in [19].

First, a desired body frame is defined as $D\{\vec{x}_d, \vec{y}_d, \vec{z}_d\}$ with origin coincident with the origin of the actual body frame at the vehicle's center of gravity. Let $\mathbf{r}_d$ be the desired aircraft position, which results in the linkage mechanisms of both vehicles coinciding. Then $\mathbf{r}_d$ can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{r}_d = \mathbf{r}_j + \mathbf{R}_{B_j}^I \mathbf{r}_{L_j} - \mathbf{R}_{B_i}^I \mathbf{r}_{L_i} \quad (23)$$

The desired body frame unit vectors are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{x}_d &= \frac{d\vec{x}_j - (\mathbf{r}_{i_y} - \mathbf{r}_{d_y})\vec{y}_j - (\mathbf{r}_{i_z} - \mathbf{r}_{d_z})\vec{z}_j}{\sqrt{d^2 + (\mathbf{r}_{i_y} - \mathbf{r}_{d_y})^2 + (\mathbf{r}_{i_z} - \mathbf{r}_{d_z})^2}} \\ \vec{y}_d &= \frac{(\mathbf{r}_{i_y} - \mathbf{r}_{d_y})\vec{x}_j + d\vec{y}_j}{\sqrt{d^2 + (\mathbf{r}_{i_y} - \mathbf{r}_{d_y})^2}} \\ \vec{z}_d &= \vec{x}_d \times \vec{y}_d \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

d is a parameter which affects how aggressively the aircraft turns towards its mate. The smaller d is, the more aggressive the maneuvers. d is determined as a function of the vehicle position error, $\mathbf{r}_d - \mathbf{r}_i$. d is updated according to

$$d = K_d \|\mathbf{r}_d - \mathbf{r}_i\| \quad (25)$$

This allows for more aggressive maneuvers to close a small position error, and more benign maneuvers when the distance to the desired position is large.

Figure 4 shows an example of two aircraft performing the linking maneuver with the current and desired body frames of aircraft i as well as the desired position of aircraft i labeled.

Let $\mathbf{R}_B^D$ be the rotation matrix from the body frame to the desired body frame. When the two frames are aligned, $\mathbf{R}_B^D$ is equal to the identity matrix. Then an error function, Ψ , can be formed using $\mathbf{R}_{B1,1}^D$ as

$$\Psi = (1 - \mathbf{R}_{B1,1}^D) \quad (26)$$

Since $-1 \leq \mathbf{R}_{B1,1}^D \leq 1$, Ψ is a positive semidefinite function. Also, the only time $\Psi=0$ is when the body frame and desired body frame are aligned. Ψ can be considered a Lyapunov function, thus, the guidance algorithm will be designed such that $\dot{\Psi} \leq 0$ to ensure stability

Differentiating (26) results in

$$\dot{\Psi} = -\dot{\mathbf{R}}_{B1,1}^D \quad (27)$$

The time derivative of $\mathbf{R}_B^D$ is given

$$\dot{\mathbf{R}}_B^D = \mathbf{R}_B^D (\{\boldsymbol{\omega}_{B/D}\}_B)^\wedge \quad (28)$$

where $\{\boldsymbol{\omega}_{B/D}\}_B$ is the angular velocity of the desired frame with respect to the body frame expressed in the body frame, and for any vector, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $(\mathbf{x})^\wedge$ denotes the skew-symmetric matrix,

$$(\mathbf{x})^\wedge = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -x_3 & x_2 \\ x_3 & 0 & -x_1 \\ -x_2 & x_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (29)$$

From (28), one can write

$$\dot{\mathbf{R}}_{B1,1}^D = [\mathbf{R}_{B1,3}^D - \mathbf{R}_{B1,2}^D] \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \{\boldsymbol{\omega}_{B/D}\}_B \quad (30)$$

Next, the attitude error is defined as

$$\mathbf{e} = [\mathbf{R}_{B1,3}^D - \mathbf{R}_{B1,2}^D]^\top \quad (31)$$

The elements of $\mathbf{e}$ go to zero, only when Ψ also goes to zero. By substituting (30) and (31) into (27), one can write

$$\dot{\Psi} = \mathbf{e}^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \{\boldsymbol{\omega}_{B/D}\}_B \quad (32)$$

$\{\boldsymbol{\omega}_{B/D}\}_B$ can be expressed as

$$\{\boldsymbol{\omega}_{B_i/D}\}_{B_i} = \{\boldsymbol{\omega}_{B_i/I}\}_{B_i} - \mathbf{R}_D^{B_i} \left(\mathbf{R}_{B_j}^D \{\boldsymbol{\omega}_{B_j/I}\}_{B_j} + \{\boldsymbol{\omega}_{D/B_j}\}_D \right) \quad (33)$$

where $\mathbf{R}_D^B = \mathbf{R}_B^{D\top}$. Note that $\{\boldsymbol{\omega}_{B_j/I}\}_{B_j} = \boldsymbol{\omega}_j$ from the definition in Section II. Letting

$\boldsymbol{\omega} = [p \ q \ r]^\top$, one can rewrite (32) as

$$\dot{\Psi} = \mathbf{e}^\top \left(\begin{bmatrix} q \\ r \end{bmatrix}_i - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_D^{B_i} \left(\mathbf{R}_{B_j}^D \boldsymbol{\omega}_j + \{\boldsymbol{\omega}_{D/B_j}\}_D \right) \right) \quad (34)$$

To make $\dot{\Psi}$ negative semidefinite, rate commands are chosen as

$$\begin{bmatrix} q_{cmd} \\ r_{cmd} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_D^{B_i} \left(\mathbf{R}_{B_j}^D \boldsymbol{\omega}_j + \{\boldsymbol{\omega}_{D/B_j}\}_D \right) - 2\mathbf{K}_R \mathbf{e} \quad (35)$$

where q_{cmd} is the commanded pitch rate, r_{cmd} is the commanded yaw rate, and $\mathbf{K}_R$ is a positive definite gain matrix. (35) constitutes the guidance algorithm.

A. Convergence

Assuming an inner-loop controller is capable of tracking the commands defined in (35), (35) is substituted back into (34) with $q = q_{cmd}$ and $r = r_{cmd}$. This results in

$$\dot{\Psi} = -2\mathbf{K}_R \mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{e} \quad (36)$$

Since $\mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{e}$ is positive semidefinite, $\dot{\Psi}$ is thus negative semidefinite, which means the error function, Ψ is always driven towards zero by the guidance law given in (35). Furthermore, Ψ reaches steady state when the attitude error, $\mathbf{e}$ is the zero vector. Since Ψ is decrescent, the magnitude of $\mathbf{e}$ must also be decrescent. Thus, (35) ensures that the vehicle body frame always rotates towards the desired body frame. This means that the follower vehicle will always maneuver towards the desired position. The vehicles are then driven to link using the inner-loop controller described in the next section which varies thrust to drive the longitudinal separation between vehicles to 0.

IV. Inner-Loop Controller

A set of proportional-integral-derivative (PID) controllers are used to control longitudinal separation between the leader and follower vehicles as well as the body-axis attitude rates of each vehicle. PID is a simple control strategy which is widely used to obtain robust tracking performance in nonlinear systems [28, 29]. In practice, the feedback signals required for PID control, especially derivatives, would be obtained from a state observer or Kalman filter processing multiple sensors. In this paper, sensor noise and dynamics have been ignored to simplify the analysis as much as possible, thus full state feedback is assumed for the inner-loop controllers.

Thrust is used to match the mating vehicles' velocities and longitudinal separation. Assume that the vehicle thrust vector is aligned with the body x -axis. Then $\mathbf{F}_T = [T \ 0 \ 0]^T$, where T is the thrust magnitude. The position error between the two vehicles is given by

$$\mathbf{r}_e = \mathbf{R}_I^{B_i} (\mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_i) \quad (37)$$

and the longitudinal separation is the first element of $\mathbf{R}_e, \mathbf{R}_{e_1}$. PID controller is implemented with error signals for both speed and longitudinal separation as

$$\begin{aligned} T = & K_{p_T} (V_j - V_i) + K_{p_{T_r}} \mathbf{r}_{e_1} + K_{i_{T_V}} \int_0^t (V_j - V_i) d\tau + K_{i_{T_r}} \int_0^t \mathbf{r}_{e_1} d\tau + K_{d_{T_V}} \frac{d}{dt} (V_j - V_i) \\ & + K_{d_{T_r}} \frac{d\mathbf{r}_{e_1}}{dt} \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where $K_{p_{T_V}}$, $K_{i_{T_V}}$, and $K_{d_{T_V}}$ are the proportional, integral, and derivative gains respectively on the speed error and $K_{p_{T_r}}$, $K_{i_{T_r}}$, and $K_{d_{T_r}}$ are the proportional, integral, and derivative gains respectively on the longitudinal separation.

Attitude is controlled via the following control surfaces: a pair of differentially moving ailerons for roll, elevator for pitch, and rudder for yaw. A PID controller is implemented for each rotational axis to generate the desired control surface deflection. The elevator is additionally affected by a PID controller on the z -position error between the mating vehicles. This provides additional robustness to the guidance algorithm in Section III. The inner-loop controllers are given as

$$\delta_a = K_{p_{\delta_a}}(p_{cmd} - p) + K_{i_{\delta_a}} \int_0^t (p_{cmd} - p) d\tau + K_{d_{\delta_a}} \frac{d}{dt}(p_{cmd} - p) \quad (39)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_e = & K_{p_{\delta_e}}(q_{cmd} - q) + K_{i_{\delta_e}} \int_0^t (q_{cmd} - q) d\tau + K_{d_{\delta_e}} \frac{d}{dt}(q_{cmd} - q) \\ & + K_{p_z}(r_{j_z} - r_{i_z}) + K_{i_z} \int_0^t (r_{j_z} - r_{i_z}) d\tau + K_{d_z} \frac{d}{dt}(r_{j_z} - r_{i_z}) \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

$$\delta_r = K_{p_{\delta_r}}(r_{cmd} - r) + K_{i_{\delta_r}} \int_0^t (r_{cmd} - r) d\tau + K_{d_{\delta_r}} \frac{d}{dt}(r_{cmd} - r) \quad (41)$$

where δ_a , δ_e , and δ_r are the aileron, elevator, and rudder deflections respectively, $K_{p_{\delta_a}}$, $K_{i_{\delta_a}}$, and $K_{d_{\delta_a}}$ are the proportional, integral, and derivative gains respectively on the roll angle error, $K_{p_{\delta_e}}$, $K_{i_{\delta_e}}$, and $K_{d_{\delta_e}}$ are the proportional, integral, and derivative gains respectively on the pitch angle error, K_{p_z} , K_{i_z} , and K_{d_z} are the proportional, integral, and derivative gains respectively on the z -position error, and $K_{p_{\delta_r}}$, $K_{i_{\delta_r}}$, and $K_{d_{\delta_r}}$ are the proportional, integral, and derivative gains respectively on the yaw angle error.

A. Control Allocation During Linked Flight

When a group of vehicles is linked, the ensemble vehicle becomes over-actuated in the sense that the three angular rates are then controlled by $4n$ control surfaces, where n is the number of vehicles in the ensemble. This allows freedom for the optimization of some criteria in the

control allocation. For the purposes of this paper, a simple linked allocation scheme of the outboard-most ailerons for roll, all elevators for pitch, and all rudders for yaw will be utilized. However, optimization of the bending moment at the point of linkage is an interesting problem for future work.

Once the vehicles are linked and controllable as a single ensemble aircraft, the objectives of this paper have been achieved. Therefore, an additional guidance law for the linked vehicle is not considered here.

V. Simulation

A simulation was performed for three fixed-wing vehicles. The dynamic model for each vehicle represents the NASA Generic Transport Model (GTM). The GTM properties are given in Table 1, and the linkage mechanism parameters are shown in Table 2.

All three vehicles were trimmed for straight and level flight at 1200 ft altitude. All lateral parameters were trimmed to zero, and the longitudinal parameters were trimmed according to Table 3.

A. Flight Dynamic Modes

The linked aircraft model was linearized about the trim point using the MATLAB/Simulink Control Design Toolbox for a single vehicle, two, and three linked vehicles. The poles associated with each of the flight dynamic modes are shown in the complex plane in Figure 5. Note that there exist several higher frequency modes associated with the spring and damper states. Those modes have been omitted from this plot in order to focus on the traditional flight dynamic modes.

It is noted that the short period and phugoid modes are unaffected by adding wingtip-docked vehicles since the longitudinal dynamics remain identical. Only the lateral dynamics are altered.

It can be seen that the roll mode slows down when more vehicles are added. Typically, an increase in span results in a faster roll mode. However in the case of this linked aircraft system, the roll inertia of the linked configuration is drastically increased. This effect dominates the locus of the roll mode pole in the complex plane. It is also noteworthy that the pole moves much further when going from 1 to 2 vehicles versus going from 2 to 3 vehicles. This implies that as more vehicles are added, the effects of adding span versus adding inertia cancel each other out. Furthermore, the flight dynamics of a two-vehicle ensemble are not very different than those of a three-vehicle ensemble. This means a single roll controller can be used for any ensemble composed of wingtip-docked identical vehicles.

The spiral mode moves similarly to the roll mode, however, this pole becomes unstable. The unstable spiral mode of the linked configuration is very close to the imaginary axis, which is easily stabilized with feedback control. These results are in accordance with previous literature [12]. The authors note that this confirmation of the results in [12] is conveniently provided by the dynamic modeling performed in Section II, and the main contribution of this

paper lies in the application of the wingtip vortex model in Section II B and the guidance law in Section III.

B. Actuator Dynamics

Each control surface is modeled as a second-order linear system with the transfer function

$$\frac{987}{s^2 + 62.83s + 987} \quad (42)$$

The system in (42) has a natural frequency of 31.42 rad/s and a damping ratio of 1. Furthermore, all actuators are rate limited to 5.24 rad/s, and deflection limited according to Table 4.

C. Linking Phase

The three vehicles were initialized with a lateral separation of 20 ft and no longitudinal separation. The vehicle in the middle of the initial formation served as the mothership. The two vehicles on either side of the mothership were autonomously guided toward it via the guidance algorithm of Section III. The vehicles were considered linked when the distance between wingtips became less than or equal to 0.15 ft. The guidance algorithm parameters were $K_d = 20$ and $K_R = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.1 \end{bmatrix}$. The inner-loop control parameters are shown in Table 5.

Figure 6 shows the trajectories of the centers of mass of the three vehicles during the linking phase. Note that the majority of motion is in the x -axis, thus the x -axis is scaled by 1/50 so that the motion in all three axes is visible. Vehicle 2 is the mothership, and Vehicles 1 and 3 are the followers. The stars on the plot denote the locations where wingtips became linked.

It can be seen in Figure 6 that the two follower vehicles initially lose altitude as they turn in towards the mothership. This is due to the buildup of sideslip as they maneuver via a yaw rate. The altitude is regained as the wingtips close in on linking and the sideslip is eliminated by realigning their body axes with the mothership's. The altitude hold portion of the inner-loop controllers also plays a role in restoring altitude. Once the vehicles are linked, the altitude hold portion of the inner-loop is switched off, and the wingtip vortex effects go to zero. As the wingtips come together, a transient aerodynamic force is generated by flying through the wake vortex of the neighboring vehicle. This results in the ensemble vehicle experiencing a slight altitude climb after linking.

Figure 7 shows the aerodynamic forces and moments on each vehicle during the linking phase. As the vehicle wingtips approach the linkage point, the maneuvers they undergo become more aggressive as a result of the definition of d in (25). Oscillations are also present because each vehicle is moving through the wake vortices of the other two. The forces and moments seen in this simulation can help drive structural design requirements for linking aircraft. Additionally, the results shown in Figure 7 provide a sense of the frequency and magnitude of disturbances which the controller must be robust to. These numerical results can be used to drive the control design.

D. Linked Flight Phase

Figure 8 shows the response of the linked ensemble to a series of attitude rate doublet commands. Rate tracking, Euler angles, and control surface deflections are shown. Note that the differential aileron deflection plot shows the total differential aileron deflection for the ensemble. As described in Section IV A, only the outboard-most ailerons are used to control roll. Therefore the signal shown in Figure 8 is

$$\delta_a = \delta_{a_R3} - \delta_{a_L1} \quad (43)$$

In all three axes, all three constituent vehicles are able to track the commanded rates, and more importantly, the responses of all constituent vehicles are very similar. This means that the linked ensemble is behaving as a single vehicle. While the inertia about the pitch axis increases threefold when the vehicles are linked, the ensemble vehicle has three times the control power of the individual constituents. Thus the closed-loop pitch dynamics of the ensemble vehicle are the same as that for the constituents. This is why the pitch rate tracking is faster than the roll and yaw rate tracking.

As the linked ensemble rolls, the y and z -positions of Vehicles 1 and 3 rise and sink. Figure 9 shows the differences between the outboard constituent vehicle y and z -positions and the mothership y and z -position during the doublet maneuvers. These distances are measured in a coordinate frame with y and z -axes aligned with the inertial frame, and x -axis aligned with Vehicle 2's body frame. In other words, the inertial measurements are rotated about the inertial z -axis by ψ_2 . The y -distances change very little as a result of the rolling maneuver from 5–10 seconds because they depend on the cosine of a relatively small angle (approximately 15° from Figure 8). The change in y -distance is apparent for Vehicle 1 in Figure 9, but this effect for Vehicle 3 is dominated by the linkage dynamics. In contrast, the changes in z -positions are obvious for both vehicles. Vehicle 1 ascends by about 1.5 ft while Vehicle 2 descends by the same amount. Figure 9 also shows the changes in z -position that results from the roll-yaw coupling during the yaw doublet from 25–30 seconds.

Figure 10 shows the aerodynamic forces and moments on the linked vehicle as well as the forces and moments from the linkages experienced during the doublet maneuvers. It is shown that all three constituents experience approximately the same aerodynamic forces and moments. The linkage forces and moments result from the fact that the outboard constituents pull on the mothership for roll control of the ensemble since only the most outboard ailerons of the total system are utilized. The largest linkage force experienced is approximately 7 lb, and the largest linkage moment is approximately 18 ft-lb. This simulation data could be used to drive the linkage mechanism design requirements. The model presented here does not account for the weight of the linkage mechanism itself, which would presumably scale with the load it must carry. A 7 lb force constitutes approximately 14% of the vehicle weight. This is a reasonable load to design to, but it remains to be seen how this number would scale to larger aircraft. It is expected that there is some upper bound on vehicle weight for which the linkage load becomes unfeasible to design a mechanism for. Therefore, the set of

missions that can most readily benefit from linked aircraft systems are those where the constituent vehicles can be small and light.

VI. Future Work

The modeling presented in this paper, while appropriate for the exploratory nature of this work, is admittedly low fidelity. Future work would seek to more accurately characterize the close-proximity aerodynamic interactions between vehicles via wind tunnel experiments or computational fluid dynamic analysis. Similarly, a higher fidelity linkage model could be developed based on a detailed mechanism design. Finally, future modeling efforts would seek to describe an aircraft concept built specifically for a linked flight mission, such as the vehicle described in [15]. This concept is a vertical takeoff and landing vehicle, and thus the model (and control system) would need to be extended to the hover and transition flight regimes.

Another goal for future work is to implement the algorithms presented here in actual flight hardware. This requires an investigation into the necessary sensors, communication, and state estimation schemes such that the constituent vehicles have access to the appropriate feedback signals. Some examples of sensors that will be investigated are GPS, computer vision [30, 31], LIDAR [32], and ultra-wideband radios for close-range localization of member vehicles [33]. Another aspect of implementation that must be addressed is the design of a linking mechanism that can be outfitted onboard the vehicles and the switching of control allocation amongst the various control surfaces under ensemble flight.

While the applications of this technology are widely envisioned to be focused on autonomous vehicles, it is feasible that linked aircraft may be utilized as unmanned, piloted, systems as well. In that case, pilot-induced oscillations may become an important consideration in control design since the roll and spiral modes tend to shift towards the imaginary axis and can even become open-loop unstable. Lead/lag compensators could be utilized to deal with this phenomenon in future work along these lines.

VII. Conclusions

The results presented in this paper indicate that wingtip docking of multiple fixed-wing aircraft under the guidance and control algorithms described herein is feasible. It is shown that the lateral open-loop dynamic modes of wingtip docked vehicles exhibit a decrease in damping and natural frequency, and can even become unstable with increased number of linked vehicles. However, these modes are stabilizable through closed-loop feedback. In the approach phase, the follower vehicles are able to fly to the point where their wingtips coincide with the leader aircraft even in the presence of wingtip vortex effects. Furthermore, after the vehicles are linked, the ensemble aircraft is able to be controlled as a single vehicle after a reassignment of control allocation.

The main contributions of this paper to the small body of work on linked aircraft systems is the application of the NASA-Burnham-Hallock wingtip vortex model to the dynamic simulation framework and the application of a nonlinear kinematic leader-follower guidance algorithm.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by NASA Cooperative Agreement NNL09AA00A.

Appendix

The GNA model is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 C_D &= \hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{\theta}_2 \alpha + \hat{\theta}_3 \alpha \tilde{q} + \hat{\theta}_4 \alpha \delta_e + \hat{\theta}_5 \alpha^2 + \hat{\theta}_6 \alpha^2 \tilde{q} + \hat{\theta}_7 \alpha^2 \delta_e + \hat{\theta}_8 \alpha^3 + \hat{\theta}_9 \alpha^3 \tilde{q} + \hat{\theta}_{10} \alpha^4 \\
 &\quad - \frac{b}{2y_{\delta_a}} \hat{\theta}_{42} (\delta_{a_R} + \delta_{a_L}) \\
 C_Y &= \hat{\theta}_{11} \beta + \hat{\theta}_{12} \tilde{p} + \hat{\theta}_{13} \tilde{r} + \hat{\theta}_{14} \delta_a + \hat{\theta}_{15} \delta_r \\
 C_L &= \hat{\theta}_{16} + \hat{\theta}_{17} \alpha + \hat{\theta}_{18} \tilde{q} + \hat{\theta}_{19} \delta_e + \hat{\theta}_{20} \alpha \tilde{q} + \hat{\theta}_{21} \alpha^2 + \hat{\theta}_{22} \alpha^3 + \hat{\theta}_{24} \alpha^4 - \frac{b}{2y_{\delta_a}} \hat{\theta}_{27} (\delta_{a_R} + \delta_{a_L}) \\
 C_l &= \hat{\theta}_{24} \beta + \hat{\theta}_{25} \tilde{p} + \hat{\theta}_{26} \tilde{r} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\theta}_{27} \delta_{a_R} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\theta}_{27} \delta_{a_L} + \hat{\theta}_{28} \delta_r \\
 C_m &= \hat{\theta}_{29} + \hat{\theta}_{30} \alpha + \hat{\theta}_{31} \tilde{q} + \hat{\theta}_{32} \delta_e + \hat{\theta}_{33} \alpha \tilde{q} + \hat{\theta}_{34} \alpha^2 \tilde{q} + \hat{\theta}_{35} \alpha^2 \delta_e + \hat{\theta}_{36} \alpha^3 \tilde{q} + \hat{\theta}_{37} \alpha^3 \delta_e + \hat{\theta}_{38} \alpha^4 \\
 C_n &= \hat{\theta}_{39} \beta + \hat{\theta}_{40} \tilde{p} + \hat{\theta}_{41} \tilde{r} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\theta}_{42} \delta_{a_R} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\theta}_{42} \delta_{a_L} + \hat{\theta}_{43} \delta_r + \hat{\theta}_{44} \beta^2 + \hat{\theta}_{45} \beta^3
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{44}$$

where $\hat{\theta}$ are the model parameters and y_{δ_a} is the y -distance from the vehicle CG to the center of each aileron, and $\tilde{q}$ and $\tilde{r}$ are the non-dimensional pitch and yaw rates respectively. Note that the GNA has been slightly modified from its presentation in [17] to account for effects of individual aileron deflections. This is a necessary modification to model the linked control allocation described in Section IV A. The GNA parameters are given in Table 6.

Nomenclature

r	position vector in ft
R	rotation matrix
B	vehicle body frame
I	inertial frame
x, y, z	Cartesian coordinates associated with a reference frame
u, v, w	x , y , and z -direction components of velocity in B in ft/s
ϕ, θ, ψ	roll, pitch, and yaw angles in rad

F_T	thrust force in lb_f
F_L	linkage force in lb_f
ω	angular velocity in B in rad/s
J	moment of inertia matrix in slug-ft^2
M_L	linkage moment in ft-lb_f
C_D, C_Y, C_L	drag, side force, and lift coefficients
b	wingspan in ft
C_l, C_m, C_n	roll, pitch, and yaw moment coefficients
δ	distance vector between two linkage mechanisms in ft
i, j	agent indices
r_L	position of linkage mechanism in B
W_{wake}	wake-induced downwash in ft/s
V_{wake}	wake-induced sidewash in ft/s
V	free-stream velocity in ft/s
D	desired vehicle body frame
r_d	desired position in ft
d, K_d, K_R	guidance parameters
Ψ	error function
e	attitude error
p, q, r	x, y , and z -direction components of ω in B in rad/s

References

- [1]. Noll TE, Brown JM, Perez-Davis ME, Ishmael SD, Tiffany GC, and Gaier M, "Investigation of the Helios Prototype Aircraft Mishap," Mishap report, NASA, 2004.
- [2]. Anderson C, "Dangerous Experiments: Wingtip Coupling at 15,000 Feet," Flight Journal, Vol. 5, No. 6, 2000, pp. 64.
- [3]. Miller J, "Project 'Tom-Tom'," Aerophile, Vol. 1, 1977, pp. 161–164.
- [4]. Moore J and Maddalon D, "Multibody transport concept," International Very Large Vehicles Conference, 2nd, No. 82–0810, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, May 1982, p. 13, 10.2514/6.1982-810.
- [5]. Magill SA and Durham WC, "Modelling and Simulation of Wingtip-Docked Flight," moment, Vol. 1000, No. 2002–4493, 2002, pp. 2, DOI:10.2514/6.2002–4493.
- [6]. Magill SA, Schetz JA, and Mason WH, "Compound Aircraft Transport: A Comparison of Wing Tip-Docked and Close-Formation Flight," 41st Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit, No. 2003–0607, 2003, pp. 2003–0607, 10.2514/6.2003-607.

- [7]. Casal A and Yim MH, "Self-reconfiguration planning for a class of modular robots," Photonics East'99, International Society for Optics and Photonics, 1999, pp. 246–257, DOI: 10.1117/12.360345.
- [8]. Yim M, Zhang Y, and Duff D, "Modular robots," Spectrum, IEEE, Vol. 39, No. 2, 2002, pp. 30–34, DOI:10.1109/6.981854.
- [9]. Vassilvitskii S, Yim M, and Suh J, "A complete, local and parallel reconfiguration algorithm for cube style modular robots," Robotics and Automation, 2002. Proceedings. ICRA'02. IEEE International Conference on, Vol. 1, IEEE, 2002, pp. 117–122, 10.1109/ROBOT.2002.1013348.
- [10]. White P, Zykov V, Bongard J, and Lipson H, "Three Dimensional Stochastic Reconfiguration of Modular Robots," Proceedings of Robotics: Science and Systems, Cambridge, USA, 6 2005, 10.15607/RSS.2005.I.022.
- [11]. Oung R and D'Andrea R, "The distributed flight array," Mechatronics, Vol. 21, No. 6, 2011, pp. 908–917, DOI:10.1016/j.mechatronics.2010.08.003.
- [12]. Montalvo C and Costello M, "Meta Aircraft Flight Dynamics," Journal of Aircraft, Vol. 52, No. 1, 2014, pp. 107–115, DOI:10.2514/1.C032634.
- [13]. Troub B and Montalvo C, "Meta Aircraft Controllability," AIAA Atmospheric Flight Mechanics Conference, 2016, p. 3395, 10.2514/6.2016-3395.
- [14]. Montalvo C, Meta aircraft flight dynamics and controls, Ph.D. thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology, 2014.
- [15]. Patterson MD, Quinlan JR, Fredericks WJ, Tse E, and Bakhle I, "A Modular Unmanned Aerial System For Missions Requiring Distributed Aerial Presence or Payload Delivery," 55th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting, 2017, p. 0210, DOI:0.2514/6.2017-0210.
- [16]. Cooper JR and Rothhaar PM, "Link!: Potential Field Guidance Algorithm for In-Flight Linking of Multi-Rotor Aircraft," 17th AIAA Aviation Technology, Integration, and Operations Conference, 2017, p. 3604, 10.2514/6.2017-3604.
- [17]. Grauer JA and Morelli EA, "A generic nonlinear aerodynamic model for aircraft," Proceedings of AIAA Atmospheric Flight Mechanics Conference, 2014, pp. 2014–0542, 10.2514/6.2014-0542.
- [18]. Binetti P, Ariyur KB, Krstic M, and Bernelli F, "Formation flight optimization using extremum seeking feedback," Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics, Vol. 26, No. 1, 2003, pp. 132–142, DOI:10.2514/2.5024.
- [19]. Cichella V, Xargay E, Dobrokhodov V, Kaminer I, Pascoal AM, and Hovakimyan N, "Geometric 3D path-following control for a fixed-wing UAV on SO (3)," AIAA Conference of Guidance, Navigation and Control conference, No. 2011–6415, 2011, 10.2514/6.2011-6415.
- [20]. Ambrosino G, Ariola M, Ciniglio U, Corrado F, De Lellis E, and Pironti A, "Path generation and tracking in 3-D for UAVs," IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology, Vol. 17, No. 4, 2009, pp. 980–988, DOI:10.1109/TCST.2009.2014359.
- [21]. Osborne J and Rysdyk R, "Waypoint guidance for small UAVs in wind," AIAA Infotech@Aerospace, Vol. 193, No. 1–4, 2005, pp. 1–12, DOI:10.2514/6.2005-6951.
- [22]. Fossen TI, Breivik M, and Skjetne R, "Line-of-sight path following of underactuated marine craft," IFAC Proceedings Volumes, Vol. 36, No. 21, 2003, pp. 211–216, DOI:10.1016/S1474-6670(17)37809-6.
- [23]. Papoulias FA, "Stability considerations of guidance and control laws for autonomous underwater vehicles in the horizontal plane," Proceedings 7th International Symposium on Unmanned Underwater Submersible Technology, Durham, New Hampshire, 1991.
- [24]. Rysdyk R, "UAV path following for constant line-of-sight," 2nd AIAA "Unmanned Unlimited" Conf. and Workshop & Exhibit, No. 2003–6626, 2003, p. 6626, 10.2514/6.2003-6626.
- [25]. Rysdyk R, "Unmanned aerial vehicle path following for target observation in wind," Journal of Guidance Control and Dynamics, Vol. 29, No. 5, 2006, pp. 1092–1100, DOI:10.2514/1.19101.
- [26]. Etkin B, Dynamics of atmospheric flight, Courier Corporation, 2012.
- [27]. Stevens BL, Lewis FL, and Johnson EN, Aircraft Control and Simulation: Dynamics, Controls Design, and Autonomous Systems, John Wiley & Sons, 2015.
- [28]. Callender A, Hartree DR, and Porter A, "Time-lag in a control system," Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, Vol. 235, No. 756, 1936, pp. 415–444, DOI:10.1098/rsta.1936.0007.

- [29]. Ang KH, Chong G, and Li Y, "PID control system analysis, design, and technology," IEEE transactions on control systems technology, Vol. 13, No. 4, 2005, pp. 559–576, DOI:10.1109/TCST.2005.847331.
- [30]. Forster C, Pizzoli M, and Scaramuzza D, "SVO: Fast semi-direct monocular visual odometry," Robotics and Automation (ICRA), 2014 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE, 2014, pp. 15–22, 10.1109/ICRA.2014.6906584.
- [31]. Rodríguez-Canosa GR, Thomas S, del Cerro J, Barrientos A, and MacDonald B, "A real-time method to detect and track moving objects (DATMO) from unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) using a single camera," Remote Sensing, Vol. 4, No. 4, 2012, pp. 1090–1111, DOI:10.3390/rs4041090.
- [32]. Russ M, Vohla M, Stütz P, and OYoung S, "LIDAR-based object detection on small UAV: Integration, Experimentation and Results," AIAA Infotech Conference, No. 2012–2479, 2012, 10.2514/6.2012-2479.
- [33]. Gezici S, Tian Z, Giannakis GB, Kobayashi H, Molisch AF, Poor HV, and Sahinoglu Z, "Localization via ultra-wideband radios: a look at positioning aspects for future sensor networks," Signal Processing Magazine, IEEE, Vol. 22, No. 4, 2005, pp. 70–84, DOI:10.1109/MSP.2005.1458289.

Fig. 1:

Rear view of two linked aircraft. The position vectors for each linkage mechanisms, r_L , are shown as green arrows. The displacement vector, δ used to calculate the spring and damping forces from the linkage is shown as a red arrow.

Fig. 2:
Cross-section of wake-induced velocity flow field at $x = 0$. The red line represents the wing.

Fig. 3:
Cross-section of wake-induced velocity flow field at $x = 0$ for two vehicles in close proximity. The red lines represents the two wings.

Fig. 4:

Top view of two aircraft during the linking procedure. The position vectors of each aircraft, r , are shown as blue arrows. The position vectors for each linkage mechanisms, r_L , are shown as green arrows. The desired position vector of vehicle i , r_d , is shown as a red arrow.

(a) All flight dynamic modes

(b) Phugoid and spiral modes

Fig. 5:
Flight dynamic modes for one vehicle and two and three linked vehicles

Fig. 6:
Vehicle trajectories during the linking phase

Fig. 7:
Aerodynamic forces and moments during the linking phase

Fig. 8:
Doublet response of linked vehicle

Fig. 9:

Difference in y and z -positions of the outboard constituents and the mothership

Fig. 10:
Aerodynamic and linkage forces and moments on the linked vehicle during doublet maneuvers

Table 1:

GTM properties

Parameter	Value
m	49.6 lb _m
J	$\begin{bmatrix} 1.327 & 0 & 0.120 \\ 0 & 4.254 & 0 \\ 0.120 & 0 & 5.454 \end{bmatrix}$ slug ft ²
b	6.849 ft
$\bar{c}$	0.915 ft
S	5.902 ft

Table 2:

Linkage parameters

Parameter	Value
K	100 lb _f /ft
C	62 lb _f /(ft/s)
K_{τ}	100 ft-lb _f /rad
C_{τ}	62 ft-lb _f /(rad/s)
μ	4.12×10^{-6} T-ft/A
$\hat{q}$	26.2 A-ft

Table 3:

Trim values

State	Trim Value	Input	Trim Value
u	124.6 ft/s	T	4.119 lb _f
w	10.72 ft/s	δ_e	0.0165 rad
θ	0.0858 rad		

Table 4:

Control surface deflection limits

	Elevator	Aileron	Rudder
Upper Limit (rad)	0.35	0.35	0.52
Lower Limit (rad)	−0.52	−0.35	−0.52

Table 5:

Inner-Loop Control Parameters

	Speed	Longitudinal Separation	Roll Rate	Pitch Rate	Yaw Rate	Altitude
Proportional Gain	10	10	1	0.1	1	10
Integral Gain	10	10	1	0.6	1	1
Derivative Gain	10	10	0	0	0	1

Table 6:

GNA parameters

Element of $\hat{\theta}$	Value	Element of $\hat{\theta}$	Value	Element of $\hat{\theta}$	Value
1	0.019	2	-0.078	3	-27.420
4	0.293	5	3.420	6	288.200
7	-0.040	8	1.819	9	-355.300
10	-6.563	11	-1.003	12	0.033
13	0.952	14	-0.009	15	0.253
16	0.0160	17	5.343	18	30.780
19	0.396	20	12.030	21	0.506
22	-36.300	23	46.130	24	-0.109
25	-0.366	26	0.061	27	-0.079
28	0.021	29	0.182	30	-1.782
31	-44.340	32	-1.785	33	374.000
34	-1748.000	35	2.439	36	1949.000
37	-0.0380	38	0.803	39	0.2031
40	-0.220	41	-0.405	42	-0.009
43	-0.129	44	0	45	0.0064