

# Optimal Evasion from a Sensing-Limited Pursuer

Dipankar Maity, Alexander Von Moll, Daigo Shishika, Michael Dorothy

**Abstract**—This paper investigates a partial-information pursuit evasion game in which the Pursuer has a limited-range sensor to detect the Evader. Given a fixed final time, we derive the optimal evasion strategy for the Evader to maximize its distance from the pursuer at the end. Our analysis reveals that in certain parametric regimes, the optimal Evasion strategy involves a ‘risky’ maneuver, where the Evader’s trajectory comes extremely close to the pursuer’s sensing boundary before moving behind the Pursuer. Additionally, we explore a special case in which the Pursuer can choose the final time. In this scenario, we determine a (Nash) equilibrium pair for both the final time and the evasion strategy.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Many variants of pursuit evasion games (PEGs) have been studied in the literature with particular emphasis on either the geometry of the game environment [1] or the situations that involve multiple pursuers and/or evaders [2], [3]. However, these works assume perfect state information and complete knowledge of the game parameters (i.e., payoff and the capability of the opposing player). Extensions of pursuit-evasion games in the context of limited perception have mainly considered limited sensing range e.g., [4], limited field of view e.g., [5], and noisy measurements e.g., [6], but the challenges associated with the lack of continuous sensing remains unsolved.

This paper is motivated by the scenario involving a Pursuer ( $P$ ) with limited perception capability.  $P$  is assumed to have two ways of sensing the Evader ( $E$ ):

- Passive sensing:  $E$  is sensed if it is within some sensing range from  $P$ .
- Active sensing:  $E$  is sensed anywhere if  $P$  activates a costly measurement device.

Solving for the optimal/equilibrium strategies for this problem involves identification of the timing at which  $P$  should activate the sensing (based on the type and amount of cost it must pay) as well as its heading when  $E$  is invisible.

Some of the closely related prior work includes [7]–[11], where the problem of active sensing is studied. Refs. [8]–[11] study a linear-quadratic game formulation and do not consider the passive sensing aspect of  $P$ . However, these works have studied the optimal evader strategy between two sensing instances. The passive sensing capability of  $P$  makes the problem more challenging, and the derived strategies in

We gratefully acknowledge the support of ARL grant ARL DCIST CRA W911NF-17-2-0181. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy or position of the United States Government, Department of Defense, or its components.

D. Maity is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, NC, 28223, USA. Email: dmaity@unc.edu

A. Von Moll is with the Control Science Center, Air Force Research Laboratory, WPAFB, OH, 45433, USA. Email: alexander.von\_moll@us.af.mil

D. Shishika is with the Department of Mechanical Engineering, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, 22030, USA. Email: dshishik@gmu.edu

M. Dorothy is with the Army Research Directorate, DEVCOM Army Research Laboratory, APG, MD, 20783, USA. Email: michael.r.dorothy.civ@mail.mil

[8]–[11] are not necessarily optimal and sometimes infeasible in presence of passive sensing. Ref. [7] does not investigate the optimal evasion strategy; instead, the focus was on designing active sensing instances to ensure the eventual capture of  $E$ .

The work presented in this paper solves a subproblem of the scenario introduced above. Specifically, we extract the time period between two consecutive moments of active sensing by  $P$  and assume that  $P$  will move in a straight line trajectory during this period. We then proceed to solve two problem variations for this interval of time:

- 1) **Optimal Control Problem:** Given a fixed interval of time, what is the best-response strategy of  $E$  to maximize its final distance from  $P$ ?
- 2) **Nash Game:** If  $P$  can select the duration of the time interval (i.e., the intermittent sensing times), what is the equilibrium strategy pair such that neither player can benefit from unilateral deviation?

## II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

$P$  has a capture radius of  $r_{\text{cap}}$  and it is moving along the positive  $x$ -axis with a constant speed of  $v_P$ . Throughout this paper, we will refer to the circle around  $P$  with radius  $r_{\text{cap}}$  as the *Proximity Circle*.  $E$  starts outside the Proximity Circle and has an objective to avoid getting captured by  $P$  and maximize its final distance from  $P$  at final time  $t = T$ . In case capture is unavoidable, the objective of  $E$  is to delay capture as long as possible, i.e., maximize its *survival time*.

The dynamics of  $P$  and  $E$  can be expressed as

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}_P(t) = v_P \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \dot{\mathbf{x}}_E(t) = v_E \begin{bmatrix} \cos \psi(t) \\ \sin \psi(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where  $v_E < v_P$  denotes the constant speed of  $E$  and  $\psi(t)$  denotes the instantaneous heading angle of  $E$ . Without loss of generality, one may assume  $v_P = 1$  and  $v_E = \mu < 1$  and  $P$ ’s capture radius  $r_{\text{cap}} = 1$ .<sup>1</sup>

To proceed with our analysis, let us describe  $E$ ’s dynamics in the Pursuer-fixed frame:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \mu \cos \psi(t) - 1 \\ \mu \sin \psi(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_E - \mathbf{x}_P = [x \ y]^\top$ . The capture avoidance constraint is described as

$$S(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\| - 1 \geq 0, \quad (3)$$

for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Due to symmetry across the  $x$ -axis, we assume that  $y \geq 0$  without loss of generality.

<sup>1</sup>Define the new variables  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i(t) = \frac{1}{r_{\text{cap}}} \mathbf{x}_i(r_{\text{cap}} \frac{t}{v_P})$  for  $i = P, E$  and  $\mu = v_E/v_P$ . Then, one obtains  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_P = [-1 \ 0]^\top$ , and  $\dot{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}_E = \mu [\cos \psi(t) \ \sin \psi(t)]^\top$ . In this transformed coordinate system, the Pursuer’s capture radius becomes 1.




Fig. 1: Constrained max distance schematic. The quantities  $\phi$  and  $v$  represent the Evader's effective heading and velocity in the Pursuer-fixed frame. The grey vectors demonstrate that there is another heading,  $\psi$ , which results in the same  $\phi$  but with a reduced effective velocity. The dashed gray circle is the locus of the end points of the resultant velocity vector  $v$ .

The objective cost functional, which  $E$  wishes to maximize, is

$$J = \Phi(\mathbf{x}_f) = \|\mathbf{x}_f\|^2, \quad (4)$$

where the subscript  $f$  denote conditions at final time (i.e., when  $t = t_f = T$ ). The terminal manifold is given by the zero-level set of the function

$$F(\mathbf{x}_f, t_f) = t_f - T. \quad (5)$$

In case capture is unavoidable (i.e., for every possible evading strategy, there exists a  $t \leq T$  such that  $S(\mathbf{x}(t)) < 0$ ),  $E$  wishes to maximize  $t_{\text{cap}}$ , where  $t_{\text{cap}}$  is the earliest time such that  $S(\mathbf{x}(t_{\text{cap}})) = 0$ .

### III. SOME GEOMETRIC RELATIONSHIPS

We begin by noting some relationships between  $E$ 's choice of velocity in the inertial frame and the corresponding velocity in the Pursuer-fixed frame. Let  $v$  and  $\phi$  denote the speed and instantaneous heading angle of  $E$  in the Pursuer-fixed frame (c.f., Fig. 1). The relationship between  $\phi$ ,  $\psi$  and  $v$  is

$$\begin{aligned} v \sin \phi &= \mu \sin \psi, \\ v \cos \phi &= -1 + \mu \cos \psi. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Given that speed  $v$  is non-negative, we immediately obtain  $\cos \phi < 0$ , or  $|\phi| > \pi/2$ . One may further verify that  $\phi$  belongs in the range  $[\pi - \sin^{-1} \mu, \pi + \sin^{-1} \mu]$  for every possible choice of  $\psi$ . One may also verify that  $v$  is in the range  $[1 - \mu, 1 + \mu]$ .

Equation (6) can be used to solve for two quantities (e.g.,  $v$  and  $\phi$ ) given the third one. For a given  $\psi$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\psi) &= \text{atan2}(\mu \sin \psi, \mu \cos \psi - 1) \\ v(\psi) &= \sqrt{1 + \mu^2 - 2\mu \cos \psi}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

For a given  $\phi \in [\pi - \sin^{-1} \mu, \pi + \sin^{-1} \mu]$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &(\psi(\phi), v(\phi)) \\ &= \begin{cases} \left( \phi - \sin^{-1} \left( \frac{\sin \phi}{\mu} \right), -\cos \phi + \sqrt{\mu^2 - \sin^2 \phi} \right) \\ \left( \phi + \sin^{-1} \left( \frac{\sin \phi}{\mu} \right) - \pi, -\cos \phi - \sqrt{\mu^2 - \sin^2 \phi} \right) \end{cases}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Notice from (8) that there exist two solutions for a given  $\phi$  (c.f., Fig. 1).

### IV. REGIONS OF INTEREST AND MAX SURVIVAL TIME

*Lemma 1:* For all states  $\|\mathbf{x}\| > 1$  in the Pursuer-fixed frame such that  $x \leq 0$  or  $y \geq 1$ , the optimal trajectory starting at  $\mathbf{x}$  avoids the constraint.

*Proof:* This is true by inspection, as  $E$  is maximizing its final distance from the origin of the Pursuer-fixed frame. ■

The initial conditions of interest for the remainder of this paper are those where Lemma 1 does *not* hold.

When  $E$  is on the Proximity Circle, its position is uniquely characterized by the angle  $\theta = \text{atan2}(y, x)$ . In subsequent sections, when we say that  $E$  is at angle  $\theta$  on the Proximity Circle, we imply  $\mathbf{x} = [\cos \theta \ \sin \theta]^T$ .

*Lemma 2:* At any time  $t$ , if  $E$  is on the Proximity Circle with  $|\theta| < \cos^{-1} \mu$ , then  $\|\mathbf{x}(t^+)\| < 1$  and consequently, capture happens.

*Proof:* Denote  $d(t) = \|\mathbf{x}(t)\|$ . Then,

$$\dot{d} = \frac{\mathbf{x}^T \dot{\mathbf{x}}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}.$$

Using (2) and (6) to substitute  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = [v \cos \phi \ v \sin \phi]^T$  and given that  $\mathbf{x}(t) = [\cos \theta \ \sin \theta]^T$ , we obtain

$$\dot{d} = v \cos(\phi - \theta).$$

Since  $\phi \in [\pi - \sin^{-1} \mu, \pi + \sin^{-1} \mu]$  and  $\theta \in (-\cos^{-1} \mu, \cos^{-1} \mu)$ , we have  $|\phi - \theta| > \pi - \sin^{-1} \mu - \cos^{-1} \mu = \frac{\pi}{2}$ . Consequently,  $\dot{d} < 0$  and  $d(t^+) < 1$ . ■

Lemma 2 implies that  $E$  must avoid ending up on the Proximity Circle with  $|\theta| < \cos^{-1} \mu$ . It is noteworthy that, for some initial conditions  $\mathbf{x}_0$  and game duration  $T$ , capture is inevitable. The next lemma provides the necessary and sufficient conditions on  $\mathbf{x}_0$  and  $T$  for  $E$  to end up on the Proximity Circle at a  $\theta \in (-\cos^{-1} \mu, \cos^{-1} \mu)$ .

*Lemma 3:* Capture is guaranteed iff  $E$ 's initial location  $\mathbf{x}_0 \equiv [x_0 \ y_0]^T$  and the game duration  $T$  satisfy

$$\mu x_0 + \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} y_0 < 1, \quad x_0 > \mu, \quad (9)$$

$$T > T_{\text{survive}}(\mathbf{x}_0), \quad (10)$$

where

$$T_{\text{survive}}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \frac{1}{1 - \mu^2} \left[ (x_0 - \mu) - \sqrt{(1 - \mu x_0)^2 - (1 - \mu^2) y_0^2} \right].$$

*Proof:* The proof is presented in Appendix A. ■

For a given  $T$ , the set of initial locations for which  $E$  is *not* able to avoid capture is given by the set:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(T) &= \{ \mathbf{x}_0 \mid (x_0 - T)^2 + y_0^2 < (1 - \mu T)^2, \\ &\text{and (9) is satisfied} \}. \end{aligned}$$

The set  $\Omega_{\text{capture}} = \cup_{T \geq 0} \Omega(T)$  is called the ‘‘no-escape zone’’ in this paper. For any  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega_{\text{capture}}$  there exists a final time  $T$ , such that capture is inevitable. For a given  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega_{\text{capture}}$ , the maximum *survival time* is  $T_{\text{survive}}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ . An illustration is provided in Fig. 2.

*Remark 1:* If  $\mathbf{x}_0 \notin \Omega_{\text{capture}}$ , then there always exists a strategy to avoid capture. For instance, if  $E$  moves along  $\psi = \cos^{-1} \mu$ , then  $\|\mathbf{x}(t)\| \geq 1$  for all  $t$ . To verify this, we observe from (2) that  $\mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{x}_0 + t [(\mu^2 - 1) \ \mu \sqrt{1 - \mu^2}]^T$ , and consequently,  $\|\mathbf{x}(t)\|^2 \geq (\mu x_0 + \sqrt{1 - \mu^2} y_0)^2 \geq 1$ , for all  $t$ . Such a heading angle is not necessarily optimal.

In subsequent sections, we analyze the optimal strategy for  $E$  with the initial conditions  $\mathbf{x}_0 \notin \Omega_{\text{capture}}$ .




Fig. 2: Level curves of  $T_{\text{survive}}$  for  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega_{\text{capture}}$ .

## V. UNCONSTRAINED OPTIMAL CONTROL ANALYSIS

*Lemma 4:* The optimal Evader heading  $\psi^*$  is constant backwards in time until either 1) the constraint is reached ( $S = 0$ ) or 2) the initial condition is reached ( $\mathbf{x}_0 = [x_0 \ y_0]^T$ ).

*Proof:* The Hamiltonian for the system is

$$\mathcal{H} = \dot{\mathbf{x}}^T \boldsymbol{\lambda} = \lambda_x (\mu \cos \psi - 1) + \lambda_y \mu \sin \psi, \quad (11)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = [\lambda_x \ \lambda_y]^T$  is the adjoint vector. The terminal adjoint values are given by [12]

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_f^T = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathbf{x}_f} + \gamma \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mathbf{x}_f} = [2x_f \ 2y_f], \quad (12)$$

where  $\gamma$  is an additional adjoint variable and  $\mathbf{x}_f \equiv [x_f \ y_f]^T$  is the terminal state. The optimal adjoint dynamics are given by [12]

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (13)$$

since the state does not appear in the Hamiltonian. Therefore,  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(t) = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_f$  for all  $t < t_f$  such that the constraint  $S = 0$  has not been activated. Evaluating (11) at  $t = t_f$  and substituting in the terminal adjoint values, (12), gives

$$\mathcal{H}_f = 2x_f (\mu \cos \psi_f - 1) + 2y_f \mu \sin \psi_f. \quad (14)$$

The optimal Evader heading at final time must maximize this terminal Hamiltonian, which implies

$$\cos \psi_f^* = \frac{x_f}{\sqrt{x_f^2 + y_f^2}}, \quad \sin \psi_f^* = \frac{y_f}{\sqrt{x_f^2 + y_f^2}}, \quad (15)$$

i.e., the terminal heading is aligned with the vector from the origin to the Evader's terminal position. Similarly, for all  $t < t_f$  the heading  $\psi_f^*$  maximizes  $\mathcal{H}$  in (11), which implies the optimal heading  $\psi^*$  is constant and equal to  $\psi_f^*$  for all  $t \leq t_f$  such that the constraint is not activated. ■

For a constant heading,  $\psi$ , and first assuming that the constraint  $S = 0$  does not become active, the system (2) can be solved:

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 + t(\mu \cos \psi - 1) \\ y_1 + t\mu \sin \psi \end{bmatrix} \quad (16)$$

for  $t \in [t_1, T]$  where  $\mathbf{x}(t_1) \equiv [x_1 \ y_1]^T$ . Thus the terminal position is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_f \\ y_f \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 + (T - t_1)(\mu \cos \psi - 1) \\ y_1 + (T - t_1)\mu \sin \psi \end{bmatrix}. \quad (17)$$




Fig. 3: Geometric interpretation of the optimal unconstrained heading.

Combining (15) and (17), the optimal heading can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \cos \psi^* &= \frac{x_1 - (T - t_1)}{\|\mathbf{x}_f\| - \mu(T - t_1)}, \\ \sin \psi^* &= \frac{y_1}{\|\mathbf{x}_f\| - \mu(T - t_1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

or, more compactly and generally, as

$$\psi^*(t, \mathbf{x}) = \text{atan2}(y, x - (T - t)), \quad (19)$$

where  $[x \ y]^T = \mathbf{x}(t)$ .

This result also comes about via an intuitive geometric interpretation. Suppose at time  $t$ ,  $E$ 's position in the Pursuer-fixed frame is  $\mathbf{x}(t) = [x \ y]^T$ . The drift due to  $P$ 's motion can be applied for the remaining time until  $T$ , giving a virtual point  $[x' \ y']^T = [(x - (T - t)) \ y]^T$ . Then, one may consider the Evader's reachability set starting from this virtual point, which is a circle centered at that virtual point with radius  $\mu(T - t)$ . By inspection, the point on the circle furthest from  $P$  lies on the line passing from the origin the Pursuer-fixed frame through  $[x' \ y']^T$ , and thus the optimal heading is the one given in (19) (see Fig. 3).

The result in this section provides the unconstrained optimal trajectory, and it will be the full solution for the case where the entire trajectory does not intersect with the interior of the Proximity Circle (i.e.,  $S(\mathbf{x}(t))$  is always non-negative.). Section VI will show that this trajectory is valid (with slight modification) to describe the final portion of the constrained trajectory, after the constraint has been eclipsed.

## VI. TRAJECTORIES WHERE THE CONSTRAINT IS ACTIVATED

We now turn to the case where the constraint necessarily becomes active at some time. Lemma 4 in Section V states that the last portion of the optimal trajectory will be a straight line segment that exits from the Proximity Circle at some time. Therefore, unless  $\|\mathbf{x}_0\| = 1$ , the optimal trajectory will enter the Proximity Circle, then ride along this circle for some period of time, and then leave the constraint. This section will consider each of these three phases and show that (i) There is a unique optimal trajectory for the first unconstrained phase (entering the constraint) that is independent of  $T$ , (ii) The time spent on the constraint can be described by the solution to an elliptic integral, and (iii) The optimal exit time is the first moment that the (modified)




Fig. 4: Geometric relationship of  $\phi_{\text{tan}}$  and the Proximity Circle entry point defined by  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$ .

unconstrained optimal control from Section V is feasible, and the trajectory remains unconstrained thereafter.

The following lemma states the necessary and sufficient condition for which a straight line trajectory will intersect the Proximity Circle.

*Lemma 5:* For given initial location  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , a straight line trajectory with heading  $\psi$  intersects with the Proximity Circle iff  $\phi_{\text{tan}} + \text{atan2}(\mu \sin \psi, 1 - \mu \cos \psi) < \pi$  and  $T > t_c$ , where

$$\phi_{\text{tan}} = \pi - \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{x}_0\|}\right) + \text{atan2}(y_0, x_0), \quad (20)$$

and

$$t_c = \frac{1}{v(\psi)} \left[ -(x_0 \cos \phi + y_0 \sin \phi) - \sqrt{1 - (x_0 \sin \phi - y_0 \cos \phi)^2} \right] \quad (21)$$

is the amount of time required to collide with the Proximity Circle,  $v(\psi)$  and  $\phi$  are obtained from (7).

*Proof:* One may verify that (c.f., Fig. 4) the angle for which the effective heading of  $E$  in the Pursuer-fixed frame is tangent to the Proximity Circle is given by  $\phi_{\text{tan}}$ . On the other hand, for a given  $\psi$ , the effective heading angle in Pursuer-fixed frame is  $\pi - \text{atan2}(\mu \sin \psi, 1 - \mu \cos \psi)$ , as given by (7). Firstly, if  $\phi_{\text{tan}} + \text{atan2}(\mu \sin \psi, 1 - \mu \cos \psi) \geq \pi$  then the heading  $\psi$  results in  $\phi$  that points ‘outside’ the Proximity Circle and thus  $E$  will not enter it. Secondly, if  $\psi$  results in  $\phi$  that points ‘inside’ the Proximity Circle and  $T$  is less than the time it takes for  $E$  to enter the Proximity Circle under  $\psi$  then  $E$  will not enter it. The collision time  $t_c$  in (21) is obtained by dividing the distance of  $E$  from the Proximity Circle along the trajectory associated with  $\psi$  by its velocity along this trajectory,  $v(\psi)$ . The bracketed expression in (21) represents the aforementioned distance and may be obtained via the Law of Cosines (c.f. Fig. 4 but for general  $\phi(\psi)$ ). ■

Lemma 5 implies that if the optimal heading angle  $\psi^*$  from (19) is such that either  $T < t_c$  or  $\phi_{\text{tan}} + \text{atan2}(\mu \sin \psi^*, 1 - \mu \cos \psi^*) \geq \pi$ , then the entire straight line trajectory with heading  $\psi^*$  is unconstrained, and the analysis from Section V determines the full solution. Otherwise, the constraint must become active at some time. In Fig. 5 we divide the initial locations  $\mathbf{x}_0$  into regions depending on whether the constraint becomes active or not. The following subsections analyze each phase of the constrained trajectory.

#### A. Phase I: Entering the Constraint

From (8) we notice that two different heading angles  $\psi_{\text{tan}}$  (i.e.,  $\psi_{\text{tan}} = \phi_{\text{tan}} - \sin^{-1}(\sin \phi_{\text{tan}}/\mu)$  or  $\psi_{\text{tan}} = \phi_{\text{tan}} +$




Fig. 5: The initial positions of  $E$  are divided into three regions depending on whether  $E$  will be able escape  $P$  and whether the escape trajectory will activate the proximity constraint. ■: no-escape zone  $\Omega_{\text{capture}}$ , ■: Constraint is activated, ■: optimal trajectories are unconstrained. For this example  $T = 2$  and  $\mu = 0.7$ .

$\sin^{-1}(\sin \phi_{\text{tan}}/\mu) - \pi$ ) of  $E$  lead to the same  $\phi_{\text{tan}}$ . The heading angle  $\psi_{\text{tan}} = \phi_{\text{tan}} - \sin^{-1}(\sin \phi_{\text{tan}}/\mu)$  requires a shorter time to reach the tangent point since the speed  $v$  along this heading is higher. Therefore, the (shortest) time required to reach the tangent point from  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is

$$t_{\text{tan}} = \frac{\sqrt{\|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 - 1}}{-\cos \phi_{\text{tan}} + \sqrt{\mu^2 - \sin^2 \phi_{\text{tan}}}}. \quad (22)$$

At time  $t_{\text{tan}}$ ,  $E$  will be at an angle  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$  on the Proximity Circle, as shown in Fig. 4, where

$$\theta_{\text{tan}} = \cos^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{x}_0\|}\right) + \text{atan2}(y_0, x_0). \quad (23)$$

*Remark 2:*  $t_{\text{tan}}$ ,  $\phi_{\text{tan}}$  and  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$  depend on the initial location of  $E$   $\mathbf{x}_0$  and not on  $T$  or  $\mu$ . Moreover, from Lemma 1, all constrained trajectories have  $\theta_{\text{tan}} \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ .

Consider the feasible entry location  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$  from (23), which is independent of  $T$ . We will now show that, given that the constraint cannot be avoided entirely,  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$  is the best entry location to the Proximity Circle to reach any  $\theta > \theta_{\text{tan}}$  on the Proximity Circle.

*Theorem 1:* The optimal Evader trajectory to reach a location on the constraint  $\theta \geq \theta_{\text{tan}}$  is to follow a straight line trajectory to  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$  and then proceed along the constraint to  $\theta$ .

*Proof:* Any straight line trajectory to a  $\theta > \theta_{\text{tan}}$  will hit the Proximity Circle at an angle  $\theta' < \theta_{\text{tan}}$ . Therefore,  $E$  will be forced to ride along the Proximity Circle from  $\theta'$  to  $\theta$ , while passing  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$  on the way. The theorem is proved by showing that the time optimal trajectory to reach  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$  is by following the heading  $\phi_{\text{tan}}$  (c.f. (20)) in the Pursuer-fixed frame. To that end, we note that for any trajectory in which  $E$  enters the constraint at some  $\theta < \theta_{\text{tan}}$  and then remains on the constraint until  $\theta = \theta_{\text{tan}}$  is suboptimal since the straight line trajectory to  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$  is feasible [13]. ■

#### B. Phase II: Riding the Constraint

For values of  $\theta$  which admit survival on the constraint, the effective heading ( $\phi$ ) of  $E$  which keeps the constraint active satisfies  $\cos \phi = -\sin \theta$  and  $\sin \phi = \cos \theta$ . This relationship can be substituted into (8) to obtain the angular velocity of  $E$  along the constraint

$$\dot{\theta} = v(\phi) = \sqrt{\mu^2 - \cos^2 \theta} + \sin \theta. \quad (24)$$

This expression can be rearranged and integrated to solve for the time spent on the constraint as a function of a starting ( $\theta_1$ ) and ending ( $\theta_2$ ) angular position:

$$t_{\text{arc}}(\theta_1, \theta_2) = \frac{1}{1 - \mu^2} (\cos \theta_1 - \cos \theta_2) - \frac{\mu}{1 - \mu^2} \int_{\theta_1}^{\theta_2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{\cos^2 \theta}{\mu^2}} d\theta, \quad (25)$$

where  $\pi > |\theta_1| \geq \cos^{-1} \mu$ . The second term is an elliptic integral of the second kind and does not have a closed-form solution.

### C. Phase III: Exiting the Constraint

From Lemma 2 and Remark 2, the constrained portion of any trajectory begins at  $\theta_{\text{tan}} \in [\cos^{-1} \mu, \frac{\pi}{2})$  to survive the constraint. From Lemma 1, exit occurs no later than  $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$ . Let us denote

$$t_r(\theta) = T - t_s(\theta) \quad (26)$$

to be the remaining duration of the game, where  $t_s(\theta)$  is defined as the time spent to reach location  $\theta$  on the Proximity Circle:

$$t_s(\theta) = t_{\text{tan}} + t_{\text{arc}}(\theta_{\text{tan}}, \theta), \quad (27)$$

If  $E$  wishes to exit the Proximity Circle at  $t_r$ , then according to (19),  $E$ 's optimal heading in the global frame is

$$\psi = \text{atan2}(\sin \theta, \cos \theta - t_r(\theta)). \quad (28)$$

*Theorem 2:* The optimal exit angle ( $\theta_{\text{exit}}$ ) satisfies

$$\text{atan2}(\mu \sin \psi_{\text{exit}}, \mu \cos \psi_{\text{exit}} - 1) - \theta_{\text{exit}} = \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad (29)$$

where  $\psi_{\text{exit}}$  is obtained from (28) by substituting  $\theta_{\text{exit}}$  for  $\theta$ . That is, at the optimal exit angle, the optimal unconstrained trajectory is tangent to the Proximity Circle.

*Proof:* Consider the point  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{exit}} = [\cos \theta_{\text{exit}} \quad \sin \theta_{\text{exit}}]^T$  on the Proximity Circle and the remaining game duration  $t_r(\theta_{\text{exit}})$ . From the unconstrained optimal control analysis in Section V, the optimal heading angle at  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{exit}}$  is  $\psi_{\text{exit}} = \text{atan2}(\sin \theta_{\text{exit}}, \cos \theta_{\text{exit}} - t_r(\theta_{\text{exit}}))$ . This heading angle results in the relative heading  $\phi_{\text{exit}}$  in the Pursuer-fixed frame, which can be computed from (7):

$$\phi_{\text{exit}} = \text{atan2}(\mu \sin \psi_{\text{exit}}, \mu \cos \psi_{\text{exit}} - 1).$$

Given (29), we conclude that  $\phi_{\text{exit}} = \theta_{\text{exit}} + \frac{\pi}{2}$ . Consequently, the straight line trajectory with heading  $\psi_{\text{exit}}$  does not intersect with the Proximity Circle. This implies that the optimal trajectory starting from  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{exit}}$  with remaining duration  $t_r(\theta_{\text{exit}})$  is indeed the straight line trajectory with heading  $\psi_{\text{exit}}$ . ■

After substituting (28), equation (29) can be simplified to

$$\left( \mu t_r + \sqrt{1 + t_r^2 - 2t_r \cos \theta_{\text{exit}}} \right) \cos \theta_{\text{exit}} - \mu = 0. \quad (30)$$

where we have suppressed the argument of  $\theta$  in  $t_r$  for brevity.

*Proposition 1:* For any given  $t_r > 0$ , (30) has a unique solution  $\theta_{\text{exit}}$  in the range  $[\cos^{-1} \mu, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ . Furthermore, as  $t_r \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $\theta_{\text{exit}} \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{2}$ .

*Proof:* The proof is presented in Appendix B. ■

### D. Full Constrained Solution

In summary, trajectories which activate the constraint and admit survival on the constraint begin with an unconstrained portion in the direction of  $\phi_{\text{tan}}$  which hits the constraint at location  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$  and time  $t_{\text{tan}}$ . Then, the trajectory rides along the constraint until reaching  $\theta_{\text{exit}}$ . Finally, it leaves the constraint on the new unconstrained trajectory described by (28). We now put all three pieces together.

Equation (30) dictates the relationship between the exit angle and the remaining time. Solving (30) for  $t_r$ , one obtains

$$t_r = \frac{\sin \theta_{\text{exit}} \sqrt{\mu^2 - \cos^2 \theta_{\text{exit}}} - (\mu^2 - \cos^2 \theta_{\text{exit}})}{(1 - \mu^2) \cos \theta_{\text{exit}}}. \quad (31)$$

Recall from (26) that  $t_r$  denotes the remaining duration of the game. From (27) we obtain the time spent to reach the location  $\theta_{\text{exit}}$  on the Proximity Circle. Therefore, using (26) and (27), we may re-write (31) as

$$\frac{\sin \theta_{\text{exit}} \sqrt{\mu^2 - \cos^2 \theta_{\text{exit}}} - (\mu^2 - \cos^2 \theta_{\text{exit}})}{(1 - \mu^2) \cos \theta_{\text{exit}}} + t_{\text{arc}}(\theta_{\text{tan}}, \theta_{\text{exit}}) = T - t_{\text{tan}}. \quad (32)$$

Given initial location  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , one obtains unique  $t_{\text{tan}}$  and  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$  from (22) and (23). One may then solve (32) to find the optimal exit location for a given initial location for  $E$ . In general, (32) needs to be solved numerically, however, we may employ a bisection search method to find  $\theta_{\text{exit}}$  since the LHS of (32) is a monotonic function of  $\theta_{\text{exit}}$ . To show this, let us denote the LHS of (32) by  $f(\theta_{\text{exit}})$ , and obtain

$$\frac{df(\theta_{\text{exit}})}{d\theta_{\text{exit}}} = \frac{\mu^2 \sin \theta_{\text{exit}}}{\cos^2 \theta_{\text{exit}} \sqrt{\mu^2 - \cos^2 \theta_{\text{exit}}} (\sin \theta_{\text{exit}} + \sqrt{\mu^2 - \cos^2 \theta_{\text{exit}})},$$

which is strictly positive in the domain  $\theta_{\text{exit}} \in [\cos^{-1} \mu, \pi/2]$ , and hence,  $f(\theta_{\text{exit}})$  is a monotonically increasing function in  $[\cos^{-1} \mu, \pi/2]$ .

The final location of  $E$  in the Pursuer-fixed frame is at

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_f \\ y_f \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta_{\text{exit}} - v(\frac{\pi}{2} + \theta_{\text{exit}}) t_r(\theta_{\text{exit}}) \sin \theta_{\text{exit}} \\ \sin \theta_{\text{exit}} + v(\frac{\pi}{2} + \theta_{\text{exit}}) t_r(\theta_{\text{exit}}) \cos \theta_{\text{exit}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (33)$$

where  $v(\frac{\pi}{2} + \theta_{\text{exit}})$  is obtained from the first case of (8), i.e.,  $v(\frac{\pi}{2} + \theta_{\text{exit}}) = \sin \theta_{\text{exit}} + \sqrt{\mu^2 - \cos^2 \theta_{\text{exit}}}$ . Consequently,  $E$ 's optimal final distance from  $P$  is

$$d_f^*(T, \mathbf{x}_0) \triangleq \|\mathbf{x}_f\| = \sqrt{1 + t_r(\theta_{\text{exit}})^2 v(\frac{\pi}{2} + \theta_{\text{exit}})^2}.$$

Using (31) to substitute  $t_r(\theta_{\text{exit}})$  and using  $v(\frac{\pi}{2} + \theta_{\text{exit}}) = \sin \theta_{\text{exit}} + \sqrt{\mu^2 - \cos^2 \theta_{\text{exit}}}$ , one may verify that

$$t_r(\theta_{\text{exit}}) v(\frac{\pi}{2} + \theta_{\text{exit}}) = \frac{\sqrt{\mu^2 - \cos^2 \theta_{\text{exit}}}}{\cos \theta_{\text{exit}}}.$$

Consequently,  $d_f^*$  simplifies to

$$d_f^*(T, \mathbf{x}_0) = \frac{\mu}{\cos \theta_{\text{exit}}}, \quad (34)$$

where  $\theta_{\text{exit}}$  is the unique solution to (32). In (34),  $\theta_{\text{exit}}$  depends on  $T$  and  $\mathbf{x}_0$ . The dependence on  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is via the terms  $t_{\text{tan}}$  and  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$  in (32).






Fig. 6: For  $\mathbf{x}_0 = [2 \ 0.3]^\top$ , the final locations of  $E$  (in the Pursuer-fixed frame) is plotted using red dots as  $T$  is varied from 0 to 4. For  $T = 2.1$  and  $T = 2.6$  the corresponding optimal trajectories of  $E$  are plotted in blue and green, respectively.  $T_c \approx 2.19$  is the critical time beyond which  $E$ 's optimal trajectory becomes constrained. The dashed black circle has a radius of  $\min_T d_f^*(T, \mathbf{x}_0)$ .

*Remark 3:* One may trivially verify that  $d_f^*(T, \mathbf{x}_0) > 1$  since  $\theta_{\text{exit}} \in (\cos^{-1} \mu, \frac{\pi}{2})$ . Furthermore, as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain  $\theta_{\text{exit}} \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{2}$  from (32) and consequently,  $d_f^*(T, \mathbf{x}_0) \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Lemma 6:* Given an initial position,  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , the critical setting of  $T$  (denoted  $T_c$ ) which partitions the parameter space into unconstrained optimal trajectories (for  $T \leq T_c$ ) and constrained optimal trajectories (for  $T > T_c$ ) is given by

$$T_c(\mathbf{x}_0) = t_{\text{tan}} + \cos \theta_{\text{tan}} - \frac{\sin \theta_{\text{tan}}}{\tan \psi_{\text{tan}}}, \quad (35)$$

where  $t_{\text{tan}}$ ,  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$ , and  $\psi_{\text{tan}}$  are defined by (22), (23), and (20) substituted into (8), respectively.

*Proof:* The critical trajectory grazes the Proximity Circle, when the optimal unconstrained  $\psi^*$  is equal to the heading required to reach the tangent point  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$ , as given by Section VI-A. For  $T > T_c$ , the optimal unconstrained heading,  $\psi^*$ , from (19) continues to increase towards  $\pi$  which causes the unconstrained trajectory to cross into the Proximity Circle. For decreasing  $T < T_c$  the optimal unconstrained heading decreases towards 0 resulting in unconstrained trajectories which remain feasible throughout the duration. Substituting  $\mathbf{x}(t_{\text{tan}}) = [\cos \theta_{\text{tan}} \ \sin \theta_{\text{tan}}]^\top$  into (19) and setting equal to  $\psi_{\text{tan}}$  gives

$$\text{atan2}(\sin \theta_{\text{tan}}, \cos \theta_{\text{tan}} - t_r) = \psi_{\text{tan}}.$$

Taking the tan of the above expression allows solving for the requisite time remaining  $t_r$  which ensures that the  $\psi^*(t_{\text{tan}}) = \psi_{\text{tan}}$ . The total time, then, is this  $t_r$  summed with the time needed to reach  $\theta_{\text{tan}}$  which is simply  $t_{\text{tan}}$  from (22), which results in (35). ■

Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 depict example trajectories and final locations with varying final times  $T$ . The final locations  $\mathbf{x}_f$  changes smoothly with  $T$  except at the single point  $T = T_c$  (see Fig. 6). This is because all the trajectories are unconstrained for  $T < T_c$  (e.g., the blue trajectory) and constrained for  $T > T_c$  (e.g., the green trajectory).

In Fig. 7 we consider a special initial condition where  $y_0 = 0$ . For all  $T < x_0$ , the optimal heading is  $\psi^* = 0$  and the optimal trajectory is unconstrained, whereas for all  $T > x_0$ , the optimal trajectory is constrained and has three phases (e.g., the green trajectory). At  $T = x_0$ , any constant  $\psi$  that does not satisfy Lemma 5 is optimal. The possible




Fig. 7: For  $\mathbf{x}_0 = [2 \ 0]^\top$ , the final locations of  $E$  (in the Pursuer-fixed frame) is plotted using red dots as  $T$  is varied from 0 to 4. At time  $T = x_0 = 2$ , any point on the orange arc is an optimal final location for  $E$ .  $E$ 's optimal trajectory corresponding to  $T = 2.6$  is plotted in green.

final locations  $\mathbf{x}_f$  corresponding to these  $\psi$ 's are denoted by an orange arc in Fig. 7. It is interesting that, whereas the optimal final location is unique for each  $T \neq x_0$ , we have a continuum of optimal final locations for  $T = x_0$ .

Of particular note is that none of the optimal trajectories terminate on the Proximity Circle. In fact, for any  $T$ , the final location never enters the black dashed circles. This observation motivates the question of, for a given initial condition, what selection of  $T$  minimizes the final distance, and what is the corresponding minimum distance? This is analyzed via a game formulation discussed in the next section.

## VII. NASH EQUILIBRIUM

Consider a game in the  $(\psi(t), T)$  space where  $E$  picks a trajectory described by  $\psi(t)$  and  $P$  picks the final time  $T$ . The previous sections described  $E$ 's best response to a particular choice of  $T$ , so it is natural to consider a Stackleberg game where  $P$  selects and announces his choice of  $T$ , knowing that  $E$  will play best-response in turn. We will describe the Stackleberg equilibrium and then observe that it is, in fact, also a Nash equilibrium.

Given an initial location  $\mathbf{x}_0$  for  $E$  and an announced final time  $T$ , let  $d_f^*(T, \mathbf{x}_0)$  denote the final distance between  $P$  and  $E$  provided by  $E$ 's best response in the previous sections. Let  $T_{\min}(\mathbf{x}_0)$  denote the Stackleberg solution such that

$$T_{\min}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \arg \min_{T > 0} d_f^*(T, \mathbf{x}_0). \quad (36)$$

*Lemma 7:* For any  $\mathbf{x}_0 \notin \Omega_{\text{capture}}$ ,

$$T_{\min}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \begin{cases} x_0 - \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{1-\mu^2}} y_0, & \text{if } x_0 - \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{1-\mu^2}} y_0 > 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

and consequently,

$$d_f^*(T_{\min}, \mathbf{x}_0) = \begin{cases} \mu x_0 + \sqrt{1-\mu^2} y_0, & \text{if } T_{\min}(\mathbf{x}_0) > 0, \\ \|\mathbf{x}_0\|, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

*Proof:* The proof is presented in Appendix C. ■

For  $T = T_{\min}$ ,  $E$ 's optimal heading from (19) yields

$$\psi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \cos^{-1} \mu, \quad (39)$$

which is *independent* of the final time or the initial/current location. This heading angle results in  $\phi = \pi - \sin^{-1} \mu$  in

the Pursuer-fixed frame, which happens to be the maximum possible value of  $\phi$ . Notice that while  $E$  can choose any admissible trajectory and we have made no assumption forcing its selection to be only a straight-line trajectory, this heading will not intersect the constraint (from Remark 1), and so the entire trajectory will be one single straight line.

Finally, the following theorem provides Nash equilibrium strategies for this game.

*Theorem 3:* For a given  $\mathbf{x}$ , an equilibrium pair of policies is

$$(\psi_{\text{NE}}, T_{\text{NE}}) = \left( \cos^{-1} \mu, \max \left\{ x - \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{1-\mu^2}} y, 0 \right\} \right). \quad (40)$$

*Proof:*  $\psi_{\text{NE}}$  is the best response to  $T_{\text{NE}}$  as per (39).

Now, given  $\psi_{\text{NE}}$ ,  $E$ 's location at time  $t$  is

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x + (\mu^2 - 1)t \\ y + \mu\sqrt{1 - \mu^2}t \end{bmatrix}.$$

Consequently, the distance between  $E$  and  $P$  at time  $t$  is

$$d(t) = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + (1 - \mu^2) \left( t^2 - 2t \left( x - \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{1-\mu^2}} y \right) \right)}.$$

Consequently, the minimum value of  $d(t)$  is attained at  $t = T_{\text{NE}}$ . ■

For the special case of  $y = 0$  discussed in Section VI-D,  $T_{\text{NE}} = x$ . As observed before for this special case, any constant heading angle is an optimal best-response to  $T_{\text{NE}}$  as long as that heading does not intersect the Proximity Circle. However, only the  $\psi$  given by (39) is non-exploitable. Moreover, there is a significant jump in optimal best-response for small perturbations away from  $T_{\text{NE}}$ . For  $y = 0$  and  $T < x$ , the optimal heading, as per (19), is to pick  $\psi = 0$ , which is a pure evasion strategy. On the other hand, when  $y = 0$  and  $T > x$ , the optimal strategy is to reach the Proximity Circle, ride the circle, and leave the circle tangentially at  $\theta_{\text{exit}}$ .

*Remark 4:* Our analysis requires  $P$  and  $E$  to pre-select policies at the beginning of the game. In general, such policies could be closed-loop feedback policies [1]. Here,  $P$  would obtain no additional information at any time in the game and would have no basis on which to have a feedback policy rather than an open-loop one. However,  $E$ 's situation is different. The Nash equilibrium policy requires  $E$  to commit to its open loop policy until time  $T_{\text{NE}}$ , expecting the game to end there in equilibrium. Hence,  $E$  cannot gain any information that would allow him to exploit any suboptimal behavior by  $P$  during the time  $t \leq T_{\text{NE}}$ . However, if  $P$  plays suboptimally with  $T > T_{\text{NE}}$ , there remains an open question as to how  $E$  should respond after  $T_{\text{NE}}$  in light of the new information. Moreover, in the special case of  $y = 0$ , due to the jump between the optimal headings for  $T < T_{\text{NE}}$  and  $T > T_{\text{NE}}$ ,  $E$  may find itself having significant regret for having committed to the Nash solution up to time  $T_{\text{NE}}$ . A similar situation has also been observed in Section IV-C of [11].

## VIII. CONCLUSION

In this work, we studied the problem of optimal evasion from a sensing limited Pursuer that moves on a straight line. We identified the initial locations for the Evader (i.e., the set  $\Omega_{\text{capture}}$ ) for which capture is guaranteed, and for such initial conditions, we derived the evasion strategy that maximizes

the evader's survival time. When  $\mathbf{x}_0 \notin \Omega_{\text{capture}}$ , the optimal evasion strategy is either to move along a constant heading (i.e., when the conditions in Lemma 5 are not satisfied) or it consists of three segments: a straight line trajectory to reach the Proximity Circle, an arc to glide on the Proximity Circle, and a straight line segment leaving the Proximity Circle.

We discussed the case where the pursuer can pick the final time  $T$ , and in that case, the minmax equilibrium strategy resulted into a constant heading trajectory for the evader, where the heading is independent of the evader's initial location. These results form a basis for addressing the full intermittent sensing pursuit-evasion scenario in future work.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Dorothy, D. Maity, D. Shishika, and A. Von Moll, "One Apollonius circle is enough for many pursuit-evasion games," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.09205*, 2021.
- [2] E. García, D. W. Casbeer, and M. Pachter, "Optimal strategies for a class of multi-player reach-avoid differential games in 3D space," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 4257–4264, 2020.
- [3] A. Pourghorban, M. Dorothy, D. Shishika, A. Von Moll, and D. Maity, "Target defense against sequentially arriving intruders," in *61st Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 6594–6601, IEEE, 2022.
- [4] J. W. Durham, A. Franchi, and F. Bullo, "Distributed pursuit-evasion with limited-visibility sensors via frontier-based exploration," in *International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 3562–3568, IEEE, 2010.
- [5] B. P. Gerkey, S. Thrun, and G. Gordon, "Visibility-based pursuit-evasion with limited field of view," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 299–315, 2006.
- [6] A. Bagchi and G. J. Olsder, "Linear-quadratic stochastic pursuit-evasion games," *Applied mathematics and optimization*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 95–123, 1981.
- [7] S. A. Aleem, C. Nowzari, and G. J. Pappas, "Self-triggered pursuit of a single evader," in *54th Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 1433–1440, IEEE, 2015.
- [8] D. Maity and J. S. Baras, "Strategies for two-player differential games with costly information," in *13th International Workshop on Discrete Event Systems*, pp. 211–216, IEEE, 2016.
- [9] D. Maity and J. S. Baras, "Optimal strategies for stochastic linear quadratic differential games with costly information," in *55th Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 276–282, IEEE, 2016.
- [10] Y. Huang, J. Chen, and Q. Zhu, "Defending an asset with partial information and selected observations: A differential game framework," in *60th Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 2366–2373, IEEE, 2021.
- [11] D. Maity, "Efficient communication for pursuit-evasion games with asymmetric information," in *62nd Conference on Decision and Control*, IEEE, 2023 (to appear).
- [12] A. E. Bryson and Y.-C. Ho, *Applied Optimal Control: Optimization, Estimation and Control*. New York, USA: Taylor and Francis Group, 1975.
- [13] E. Zermelo, "Über das navigationsproblem bei ruhender oder veränderlicher windverteilung," *ZAMM-Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics/Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 114–124, 1931.

## APPENDIX

### A. Proof of Lemma 3

For a given time  $t$  and an initial location  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , the set

$$\mathcal{R}(t, \mathbf{x}_0) = \{ \mathbf{x}_f \mid (x_f - (x_0 - t))^2 + (y_f - y_0)^2 \leq \mu^2 t^2 \}$$

contains all the possible locations of  $E$  at time  $t$  in the Pursuer-fixed frame. The point

$$\mathbf{x}^* = \left( 1 + \frac{\mu t}{\sqrt{(x_0 - t)^2 + y_0^2}} \right) \begin{bmatrix} x_0 - t \\ y_0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (41)$$

belongs to  $\mathcal{R}(t, \mathbf{x}_0)$  and is the farthest point from the origin of the Pursuer-fixed frame. Let us define

$$\bar{d}_f(t, \mathbf{x}_0) \triangleq \|\mathbf{x}^*\| = \sqrt{(x_0 - t)^2 + y_0^2} + \mu t.$$

For a given  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , if there exists a  $t > 0$  such that  $\bar{d}_f(t, \mathbf{x}_0) < 1$ , then  $E$  will enter the interior of the Proximity Circle, regardless of its strategy, by time  $t$ . The condition  $\bar{d}_f(t, \mathbf{x}_0) < 1$  yields the inequality:

$$(1 - \mu^2)t^2 - 2(x_0 - \mu)t + \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 - 1 < 0. \quad (42)$$

Given (9),  $t = T_{\text{survive}}$  is well defined and is the smaller root of the LHS of (42). Therefore, for any final time  $T > T_{\text{survive}}$ , there exists a  $t \in (T_{\text{survive}}, T]$  such that  $\|\mathbf{x}(t)\| < 1$ . Thus, the given conditions in the lemma is sufficient.

To show that the conditions are also necessary, let  $E$  follow the direction  $\psi = \cos^{-1} \mu$ . We now show that, under this heading, capture is possible only if all the conditions in the lemma are satisfied. To this end, we obtain from (2) that  $\mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{x}_0 + t [(\mu^2 - 1) \quad \mu\sqrt{1 - \mu^2}]^T$ , and consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}(t)\|^2 &= \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + (1 - \mu^2)t^2 - 2(1 - \mu^2)t \underbrace{\left[1 \quad \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{1 - \mu^2}}\right]}_c \mathbf{x}_0 \\ &= \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 - (1 - \mu^2)c^2 + (1 - \mu^2)(t - c)^2, \\ &= (\mu x_0 + \sqrt{1 - \mu^2}y_0)^2 + (1 - \mu^2)(t - c)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, to ensure  $\|\mathbf{x}(t)\| < 1$  for some  $t > 0$ , it is necessary that (i)  $\mu x_0 + \sqrt{1 - \mu^2}y_0 < 1$ , (ii)  $c > 0$ . Combining (i) and (ii), we obtain  $x_0 > \mu$ . Thus, (9) is necessary. To show that (10) is also necessary, we proceed as follows. From the expression of  $T_{\text{survive}}$ , one may verify that

$$\left(\frac{x_0 - T_{\text{survive}}}{1 - \mu T_{\text{survive}}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{y_0}{1 - \mu T_{\text{survive}}}\right)^2 = 1.$$

For an initial location  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , consider the heading angle  $\psi$  such that  $\cos \psi = \frac{x_0 - T_{\text{survive}}}{1 - \mu T_{\text{survive}}}$  and  $\sin \psi = \frac{y_0}{T_{\text{survive}}}$ . Using (2), we obtain that, for any  $t$ ,

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x_0 + t \frac{\mu x_0 - 1}{1 - \mu T_{\text{survive}}} \\ y_0 + t \frac{y_0}{T_{\text{survive}}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (43)$$

Solving for  $t$  such that  $\|\mathbf{x}(t)\| = 1$ , we obtain two solutions (say  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ ). For  $\mathbf{x}_0$ 's satisfying (9), both  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are real and non-negative. Without loss of generality, we assume  $t_1 < t_2$ . Furthermore, one may verify that  $\|\mathbf{x}(T_{\text{survive}})\| = 1$  and  $t_1 = T_{\text{survive}}$ . Therefore, to ensure  $\|\mathbf{x}(t)\| < 1$  for some  $t$  we must have  $T > T_{\text{survive}}$ . Thus, (10) is necessary. ■

### B. Proof of Proposition 1

Equation (30) can be rearranged as

$$\cos \theta_{\text{exit}} \sqrt{1 + t_r^2 - 2t_r \cos \theta_{\text{exit}}} = \mu(1 - t_r \cos \theta_{\text{exit}}). \quad (44)$$

Taking squares on both sides of the last equation and rearranging the terms yields,

$$\begin{aligned} 2t_r \cos^3 \theta_{\text{exit}} - (1 + t_r^2(1 - \mu^2)) \cos^2 \theta_{\text{exit}} \\ - 2\mu^2 t_r \cos \theta_{\text{exit}} + \mu^2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last expression is a cubic polynomial in  $\cos \theta_{\text{exit}}$ . Let us denote this cubic polynomial by  $f(s) = 2t_r s^3 - (1 + t_r^2(1 - \mu^2))s^2 - 2\mu^2 t_r s + \mu^2$ . Notice that  $f(-1) < 0$ ,  $f(\mu) < 0$  and  $f(0) > 0$  for all  $t_r > 0$  and  $\mu \in (0, 1)$ . Therefore, the three roots of  $f(s)$  are within the ranges  $(-1, 0)$ ,  $(0, \mu)$  and  $(\mu, \infty)$ , respectively. Thus, (44) has a unique solution for  $\theta_{\text{exit}}$  in the range  $[\cos^{-1} \mu, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ .

Let  $r_1, r_2$ , and  $r_3$  be the roots of the polynomial  $f(s)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 + r_2 + r_3 &= \frac{1 + t_r^2(1 - \mu^2)}{2t_r}, \quad r_1 r_2 r_3 = -\frac{\mu^2}{2t_r}, \\ r_1 r_2 + r_2 r_3 + r_3 r_1 &= -\mu^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as  $t_r \rightarrow \infty$ , two of the roots approach 0 and the third one to  $\infty$ . Consequently, as  $t_r \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $\theta_{\text{exit}} \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{2}$ . ■

### C. Proof of Lemma 7

For a given a final time  $T$  and an initial location  $\mathbf{x}_0 \notin \Omega_{\text{capture}}$ , the possible final locations of  $E$  in the Pursuer-fixed frame is contained in the set

$$\mathcal{R}(T, \mathbf{x}_0) = \{\mathbf{x}_f \mid (x_f - (x_0 - T))^2 + (y_f - y_0)^2 \leq \mu^2 T^2\}.$$

The farthest point on this set from the origin of the Pursuer-fixed frame is at a distance of

$$\bar{d}_f(T, \mathbf{x}_0) \triangleq \sqrt{(x_0 - T)^2 + y_0^2} + \mu T.$$

Since, for any given pair  $(T, \mathbf{x}_0)$ ,  $\mathcal{R}(T, \mathbf{x}_0)$  is an over-approximation of the  $E$ 's reachable region, we may write  $d_f^*(T, \mathbf{x}_0) \leq \bar{d}_f(T, \mathbf{x}_0)$ , where  $d_f^*(T, \mathbf{x}_0)$  is the maximum distance obtained by  $E$ 's optimal strategy.

Minimizing  $\bar{d}_f(T, \mathbf{x}_0)$  w.r.t.  $T$  for a given  $\mathbf{x}_0$  yields the  $T_{\text{min}}$  given in (37). Next, we verify that  $T_{\text{min}}$  is also the minimizer of  $d_f^*$ . To that end, we obtain from (19) that  $\psi^* = \cos^{-1} \mu$  when  $T = T_{\text{min}}$ . Using Lemma 5, we further notice that, for all  $\mathbf{x}_0 \notin \Omega_{\text{capture}}$ ,  $E$ 's straight line trajectory with  $\psi = \cos^{-1} \mu$  does not intersect with the Proximity Circle. Therefore, a straight line trajectory with  $\psi = \cos^{-1} \mu$  is feasible for any  $T$ , and the final distance resulting from this heading is

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + (1 - \mu^2)(T^2 - 2(x_0 - \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{1 - \mu^2}}y_0)T)} \\ \triangleq d_f^{\text{subopt}}(T, \mathbf{x}_0). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Since the straight line trajectory with heading  $\cos^{-1} \mu$  is not necessarily the optimal strategy, we may write

$$d_f^*(T, \mathbf{x}_0) \geq d_f^{\text{subopt}}(T, \mathbf{x}_0) \geq d_f^{\text{subopt}}(T_{\text{min}}, \mathbf{x}_0),$$

where the last equality holds only at  $T = T_{\text{min}}$ . Therefore,  $d_f^*(T, \mathbf{x}_0)$  is lower bounded by the constant  $d_f^{\text{subopt}}(T_{\text{min}}, \mathbf{x}_0)$  and upper bounded by  $\bar{d}_f(T, \mathbf{x}_0)$  for all  $T$ . Since  $\bar{d}_f(T_{\text{min}}, \mathbf{x}_0) = d_f^{\text{subopt}}(T_{\text{min}}, \mathbf{x}_0)$ , we conclude that  $T_{\text{min}}$  is the unique minimize of  $d_f^*(T, \mathbf{x}_0)$ . ■