INTERIOR TRANSIT ORBITS IN THE PLANAR BICIRCULAR

RESTRICTED FOUR-BODY PROBLEM: CLASSIFICATION AND

APPLICATION

A PREPRINT

Shuyue Fu School of Astronautics Beihang University Beijing, China, 100191 fushuyue@buaa.edu.cn

School of Aerospace Engineering Tsinghua University Beijing, China, 100383 wu-d@tsinghua.edu.cn

Di Wu

Shengping Gong*

School of Astronautics Beihang University Beijing, China, 100191 gongsp@buaa.edu.cn

July 8, 2024

ABSTRACT

Low-energy transfers are advantageous for lunar exploration missions due to low fuel consumption and extended launch periods. This paper is devoted to the classification of interior transit orbits and their application on low-energy transfer in the Sun-Earth/Moon planar bicircular restricted four-body problem (PBCR4BP). First, the Lagrangian coherent structures (LCSs) are introduced to generate the interior transit orbits. The number of periapses about the Moon is selected as the classification parameter and mapped into the LCSs, achieving clear classification boundaries. Then, the evolution laws of the classifications with respect to energy and solar gravity perturbation are discussed and summarized. Construction strategies for low-energy transfer are proposed based on the classifications and their evolution laws. Numerical simulation of the transfer trajectories verifies the effectiveness of the proposed strategies. The dynamical behaviors and transfer characteristics of transit orbits and their families are revealed, and a direct link between transit orbit families and low-energy transfers is finally established.

Keywords Planar bicircular restricted four-body problem · Lagrangian coherent structure · classification of interior transit orbits · low-energy transfer

1 Introduction

Lunar exploration has significantly advanced scientific knowledge by enabling deeper insights into the composition, geology, and potential for life on other planets. With the recent proposal and implementation of a series of missions (e.g., Chang'e-5, Chang'e-6, Artemis) (Qian et al., 2024a,b; Batcha et al., 2020), there has been increased requirement on designing transfer trajectories with high efficiency and low energy in the cislunar space (Oshima et al., 2019), including Earth-Moon transfer trajectories (Belbruno and Miller, 1993; Topputo, 2013), lunar free-return trajectories (Hou et al., 2013; Li et al., 2015), and cislunar escape trajectories (Zotos, 2015; Oshima, 2021). In particular, lowenergy transfers with low fuel consumption and extended launch periods (Oshima et al., 2019; Parker and Anderson, 2014) have been widely studied and applied to practical missions (e.g., *Hiten, Genesis, Danuri*) (Belbruno and Miller, 1993; Lo et al., 2001; Song et al., 2023). Low-energy transfers are usually associated with transit orbits (Yamato and Spencer, 2004; Canales et al., 2023), which are defined as trajectories passing through the neck regions in the multi-body problems (e.g., Earth-Moon circular restricted three-body problem (CR3BP) (Szebehely, 1967) and Sun-Earth/Moon bicircular restricted four-body problem (BCR4BP) (Cronin et al., 1964)). Therefore, the low-energy transfer characteristics are closely associated with the dynamical behaviors of transit orbits (Canales et al., 2023). Studies on transit orbits improve our understanding of low-energy transfer and escape mechanisms, aiding in designing these transfers using natural dynamics instead of direct optimization (Ren and Shan, 2014; Canales et al., 2023; Short et al., 2015).

Current studies on transit orbits have focused on their construction methods and applications in designing transfer trajectories. Koon et al. (2001) associated transit orbits with invariant manifolds. Their work showed that invariant manifolds of the L1/L2 periodic orbits can be used to separate transit orbits from non-transit orbits in the CR3BP. However, when there is a periodic perturbation in the system (e.g., solar gravity perturbation in the Earth-Moon CR3BP, i.e., Sun-Earth/Moon BCR4BP), the time-dependence dynamics precludes the concept of invariant manifolds, complicating the definition of transit orbits (Yamato and Spencer, 2004; Fitzgerald and Ross, 2022). To address this, almost invariant sets that separate transit and non-transit orbits (i.e., Lagrangian coherent structures (LCSs) (Qi et al., 2012; Short and Howell, 2014; Onozaki et al., 2017)) can be introduced in the non-autonomous BCR4BP. The LCSs are defined as the ridges in the finite time Lyapunov exponent (FTLE) fields (Haller, 2001), and the FTLE fields describe the mapping between the initial states and FTLE values of trajectories propagated at a given time. Initial states inside the LCSs generate transit orbits through forward-time propagation, while those outside result in non-transit orbits.

Even inside the LCSs, transit orbits exhibit different patterns and dynamical behaviors depending on the initial states (Canales et al., 2023; Short et al., 2015). Waalkens et al. (2005) pointed out that the classification of transit orbits can be achieved based on the passage time of transit orbits. However, this method could benefit from further refinement to clearly define the boundaries between different transit orbit families and to provide a more comprehensive geometric description. Meanwhile, in the BCR4BP, the configurations of the LCSs vary with energy and solar gravity perturbation (Qi et al., 2012), affecting the transit dynamical behaviors and corresponding transfer characteristics. Current

studies inadequately explore the evolution of transit orbit families inside the LCSs with respect to energy and solar gravity perturbations. Understanding and using these laws will further aid in the construction of low-energy transfers. Therefore, in this paper, based on the LCSs in the Sun-Earth/Moon planar BCR4BP (PBCR4BP), we investigate the classifications of transit orbits associated with L1 region, i.e., interior transit orbits, and analyze the evolution laws of transit orbit families and their transfer characteristics with respect to energy and solar gravity perturbation. Then, the classifications and their evolution laws are applied to constructing low-energy transfers.

Different from Waalkens et al.'s classification method (Waalkens et al., 2005) for transit orbits based on passage time, this paper introduces the number of periapses about the Moon as a classification parameter for transit orbits, revealing the geometric properties of transit orbits (Bosanac, 2020). The mapping between the number of periapses and the initial states of transit orbits is established based on the LCSs. A clear classification boundary is achieved, and the consistency of the developed classification results with those based on the passage time is verified. The evolution laws of the classifications with respect to energy and solar gravity perturbation are analyzed and applied to the two typical scenarios of low-energy transfers, i.e., bi-impulsive Earth-Moon transfer and cislunar escape. Our contribution bridges the gap in understanding the evolution of transit orbit families with respect to energy and solar gravity perturbation in the PBCR4BP and establishes a direct link between transit orbit families and low-energy transfer characteristics.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. The dynamics of the Sun-Earth/Moon PBCR4BP and LCSs are detailed in Section 2. Section 3 presents the generation method of transit orbits and the corresponding characteristic parameters. In Section 4, the classification of transit orbits based on the LCSs is presented. The evolution laws of transit orbit families with respect to energy and solar gravity perturbation are analyzed and discussed. Then, the application of the classification on the two scenarios of low-energy transfers is mentioned in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 shows the conclusions of this paper.

2 Dynamical model

The dynamical model for this study is presented in this section, including the PBCR4BP and Lagrangian coherent structure (LCS). Based on the LCSs, interior transit orbits are constructed and investigated.

2.1 Dynamics of the PBCR4BP

The Sun-Earth/Moon PBCR4BP (Cronin et al., 1964) is adopted in this paper where the Sun, Earth, Moon, and test body (spacecraft) move on the same plane. The Earth-Moon barycenter is in the circular orbit about the Sun, while the Earth and Moon are in the circular orbits about their barycenter. The test body (spacecraft) is considered as a massless particle and dominated by the gravity forces from the Sun, Earth, and Moon. The Sun-Earth/Moon PBCR4BP can be considered as a simplified model of the real Sun-Earth/Moon system. As shown in Fig. 1, the Earth-Moon rotating frame (Qi et al., 2012; Topputo, 2013; Oshima et al., 2019) is adopted, and its origin is the Earth-Moon barycenter.

The x axis is directed from the Earth to the Moon; the y axis is perpendicular to the x axis and determined by the right-hand rule.



Figure 1: Sun-Earth/Moon PBCR4BP in the Earth-Moon rotating frame.

The dimensionless units are set as follows (Topputo, 2013; Oshima et al., 2019): the length unit (LU) is the Earth-Moon distance; the mass unit (MU) is the combined mass of the Earth and Moon; the time unit (TU) is $TU = T_{EM}/2\pi$, where T_{EM} is the period of the motion of the Earth and Moon around their barycenter. With these dimensionless units, the equations of the PBCR4BP can be written as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{y} \\ \dot{u} \\ \dot{v} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \\ 2v + \frac{\partial \Omega_4}{\partial x} \\ -2u + \frac{\partial \Omega_4}{\partial y} \end{bmatrix}$$
(1)

$$\Omega_4 = \frac{1}{2} \left[x^2 + y^2 + \mu \left(1 - \mu \right) \right] + \frac{1 - \mu}{r_1} + \frac{\mu}{r_2} + \frac{\mu_S}{r_3} - \frac{\mu_S}{\rho^2} \left(x \cos \theta_S + y \sin \theta_S \right)$$
(2)

where $\mathbf{X} = [x, y, u, v]^{\mathrm{T}}$ is the orbital state, and Ω_4 is the effective potential of the PBCR4BP, μ is the mass parameter expressed as $\mu = m_{\mathrm{M}}/(m_{\mathrm{E}} + m_{\mathrm{M}})$, and $\mu_{\mathrm{S}} = m_{\mathrm{S}}/(m_{\mathrm{E}} + m_{\mathrm{M}})$ denotes the dimensionless mass of the Sun. The parameters m_{S} , m_{E} and m_{M} denote the masses of the Sun, Earth, and Moon, respectively. The distance between the test body (spacecraft) and the Earth, the Moon, and the Sun r_1 , r_2 , and r_3 is expressed as:

$$r_1 = \sqrt{(x+\mu)^2 + y^2}$$
(3)

$$r_2 = \sqrt{\left(x + \mu - 1\right)^2 + y^2} \tag{4}$$

$$r_3 = \sqrt{\left(x - \rho \cos \theta_{\rm S}\right)^2 + \left(y - \rho \sin \theta_{\rm S}\right)^2} \tag{5}$$

where the solar gravity perturbation depends on the distance between the Sun and the Earth-Moon barycenter (ρ), and the solar phase angle $\theta_{\rm S} = \theta_{\rm S0} + \omega_{\rm S}T$. Moreover, $\theta_{\rm S0} = \omega_{\rm S}t_0$ is the solar phase angle at the initial epoch t_0 (i.e., at $t_0 = 0$, the position of the Sun is located at (ρ , 0) in the Earth-Moon Rotating Frame), $\omega_{\rm S}$ is the synodic solar phase angular velocity, and $T = t - t_0$ denotes the propagation time from the initial epoch t_0 to the given epoch t. The specific values of the aforementioned physical constants used in the simulation are summarized in Table 1 (Topputo, 2013). When the trajectories in the PBCR4BP are propagated numerically, the variable step-size, variable order (VSVO) Adams-Bashforth-Moulton algorithm (Topputo, 2013; Oshima, 2021) is adopted with absolute and relative tolerances set to 1×10^{-13} .

Symbol	Value	Units	Meaning
μ	$1.21506683 \times 10^{-2}$	-	Earth-Moon mass parameter
$\mu_{\mathbf{S}}$	3.28900541×10^{5}	-	Dimensionless mass of the Sun
ρ	3.88811143×10^{2}	-	Dimensionless Sun-Earth/Moon distance
ω_{S}	$-9.25195985 \times 10^{-1}$	_	Synodic angular velocity
$T_{\rm EM}$	2.24735067×10^{6}	S	Earth-Moon period
$R_{\rm E}$	6378.145	km	Mean Earth's radius
$R_{\rm M}$	1737.100	km	Mean Moon's radius
LU	3.84405000×10^{5}	km	Length unit
TU	3.75676968×10^5	S	Time unit

Table 1: Physical constants of the PBCR4BP

The Hamiltonian indicating the generalized energy of the test body (spacecraft) in the PBCR4BP (Qi et al., 2012) is defined as follows:

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \left(u^2 + v^2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left(x^2 + y^2 \right) - \frac{1 - \mu}{r_1} - \frac{\mu}{r_2} - \frac{\mu_{\rm S}}{r_3} + \frac{\mu_{\rm S}}{\rho^2} x \cos \theta_{\rm S} + \frac{\mu_{\rm S}}{\rho^2} y \sin \theta_{\rm S} - \frac{1}{2} \mu \left(1 - \mu \right) \tag{6}$$

A higher Hamiltonian means a higher level of energy. The Hamiltonian is time-dependent due to the solar gravity perturbation. Following the concept of Hill region (Koon et al., 2001; Gong and Liu, 2016), the instantaneous Hill region in the PBCR4BP is defined by the initial Hamiltonian H_0 and the initial solar phase angle θ_{S0} :

$$S(H_0, \theta_{S0}) = \{(x, y) | H(x, y, u, v, \theta_{S0}) \le H_0, u = v = 0\}$$
(7)

Thus, under a specific initial Hamiltonian H_0 and initial solar phase angle θ_{S0} , the reachable region can be mainly categorized into the Earth region, the Moon region, the L1 region, the L2 region, and the Earth-Moon exterior region (see Fig. 2) (Yamato and Spencer, 2004). The L1 region and L2 region denote the neck regions. Due to the different

patterns of instantaneous Hill regions under different (θ_{S0} , H_0), dynamical behaviors of the trajectories vary with (θ_{S0} , H_0).

Note that the Hill region parameterized by (θ_{S0} , H_0) is time-dependent, so the trajectories in the PBCR4BP may intersect with the instantaneous zero-velocity curves (black curves in Fig. 2) (Qi et al., 2012). Then, the transit orbits passing through the neck regions are investigated. As the almost invariant sets in the non-autonomous PBCR4BP, LCSs separating the transit orbits from the non-transit orbits (Qi et al., 2012; Short and Howell, 2014) are introduced.



Figure 2: Instantaneous Hill regions.

2.2 Lagrangian coherent structure

In the non-autonomous PBCR4BP, the LCSs are introduced to describe the phase space transport and generate transit orbits (Qi et al., 2012; Short and Howell, 2014). Beforehand, the finite time Lyapunov exponent (FTLE) and FTLE

fields are introduced to define the LCSs. To reduce the dimension of the phase space and visualize the FTLE field, the initial Poincaré section U_0 (i.e., at the initial epoch t_0) in this paper is selected as:

$$U_0 = \{(y_0, v_0) | x_0 = \text{const}, \ H_0 = \text{const}, \ \theta_{S0} = \text{const}\}$$
(8)

where the subscript '0' denotes the quantities associated with U_0 at the initial epoch $t_0 = \theta_{S0}/\omega_S$. In the following texts, the U_0 is set as $U_0 = \{(y_0, v_0) | x_0 = 0.5 \text{ LU}, H_0 = \text{const}, \theta_{S0} = \text{const}\}$. When U_0 is selected, $u_0 = \dot{x}_0$ is calculated as:

$$u_{0} = \pm \sqrt{\begin{array}{c} -2H_{0} + x_{0}^{2} + y_{0}^{2} - v_{0}^{2} + \frac{2(1-\mu)}{r_{10}} + \frac{2\mu}{r_{20}} + \frac{2\mu_{5}}{r_{30}} \\ -\frac{2\mu_{5}}{\rho^{2}} \left(x_{0}\cos\theta_{50} + y_{0}\sin\theta_{50}\right) + \mu \left(1-\mu\right)} \end{array}$$
(9)

where (y_0, v_0) are selected from the grid on U_0 and the signs of u_0 depend on the direction of the orbital propagation. The positive sign of u_0 is adopted to obtain the trajectories towards the Moon (Qi et al., 2012; Short and Howell, 2014). Therefore, the set of initial states of trajectories (M) is selected on U_0 , i.e., (y_0, v_0) under the specific (θ_{S0}, H_0). The trajectories are generated from the forward time propagation of M on U_0 and the FTLE values associated with these trajectories can be calculated as (Gawlik et al., 2009):

$$\sigma\left(\boldsymbol{X}_{0}, t_{0}, T\right) = \frac{1}{T} \ln\left(\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}\left(\left(\nabla\phi_{t_{0}}^{t_{0}+T}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_{0}\right)\right)^{\mathrm{T}} \nabla\phi_{t_{0}}^{t_{0}+T}\left(\boldsymbol{X}_{0}\right)\right)}\right)_{\boldsymbol{X}_{0} \in M}$$
(10)

where $\lambda_{\max}\left(\left(\nabla \phi_{t_0}^{t_0+T}(\mathbf{X}_0)\right)^{\mathrm{T}} \nabla \phi_{t_0}^{t_0+T}(\mathbf{X}_0)\right)$ is the maximum eigenvalue of the Cauchy-Green tensor $\left(\nabla \phi_{t_0}^{t_0+T}(\mathbf{X}_0)\right)^{\mathrm{T}} \nabla \phi_{t_0}^{t_0+T}(\mathbf{X}_0)$, and $\phi_{t_0}^{t_0+T}: M \to \mathbb{R}^4$ is the flow map of the PBCR4BP. The set of FTLE values M_2 is obtained, the mapping $\Re: M \to M_2$ is established, and the FTLE field is visualized (see grey region in Fig. 3). The LCSs are defined as the ridges in the FTLE fields (Lin et al., 2020; Haller, 2001), shown as a closed curve on the (y_0, v_0) plane (see black curve in Fig. 3). The LCS separates the transit orbits (blue trajectories reaching the Moon region in Fig. 3) from the non-transit orbits (blue trajectories bounded back to the Earth region in Fig. 3), i.e., the initial states inside the LCSs (the set of these initial states is denoted as M_3) can be propagated forwards in time to obtain transit orbits.

Similar to the invariant manifolds of the L1/L2 periodic orbits (Koon et al., 2001; Gong et al., 2007) in the autonomous planar circular restricted three-body problem (PCR3BP), there are interior-LCSs associated with the L1 region and exterior-LCSs associated with the L2 region (see examples of interior-LCSs and exterior-LCSs on U_0 under the specific (θ_{S0} , H_0) in Fig. 4). The LCS presented in Fig. 3 is an interior-LCS. Consequentially, interior transit orbits (i.e., trajectories passing through the L1 region) can generated from the forward time propagation of the initial states inside the interior-LCSs while exterior transit orbits (i.e., trajectories passing through the L2 region) can obtained from exterior-LCSs. In this paper, the dynamical behaviors and characteristics of interior transit orbits are focused on and analyzed based on the interior-LCSs parameterized by (θ_{S0} , H_0). In the following texts, interior transit orbits and interior-LCSs are abbreviated as transit orbits and LCSs. Even inside the LCSs, the patterns of transit orbits are different (Canales et al., 2023; Short et al., 2015), which results in the difference in their characteristics. Therefore, this paper investigates transit orbits in terms of transit orbit families to reveal the link between transit orbit patterns and their transfer characteristics.



Figure 3: The role of the LCS as a separatrix.

As mentioned above, the U_0 is set as $U_0 = \{(y_0, v_0) | x_0 = 0.5 \text{ LU}, H_0 = \text{const}, \theta_{S0} = \text{const}\}$. Therefore, the LCSs on the (y_0, v_0) plane are parameterized by (θ_{S0}, H_0) to investigate the effect of energy and solar gravity perturbation. At a specific θ_{S0} , when H_0 on U_0 is low enough, the LCS will shrink to one point (Qi et al., 2012), as shown in Fig. 5. This implies that the existence of LCSs depends on a specific range of H_0 . When θ_{S0} varies, Qi et al. (Qi et al., 2012) pointed out that the configurations of LCSs translate along the H_0 axis (see Fig. 5). In addition, we further find that the configurations of LCSs also translate in the (y_0, v_0) plane. The parameter pair (θ_{S0}, H_0) affects the configurations and distributions of the LCSs (Qi et al., 2012), and further affects the dynamical behaviors of transit orbits (i.e., the patterns of them) and transfer characteristics of their families. The minimum H_0 ($H_{0 \min}$) required for the existence of the LCSs at each θ_{S0} is presented in Table 2. Then, the evolution laws of transit orbits and their



Figure 4: Examples of interior-LCSs and exterior-LCSs in the FTLE fields. (a) Interior-LCS; (b) Exterior-LCS.

families with respect to (θ_{S0}, H_0) are discussed and analyzed. Beforehand, the generation method of transit orbits and corresponding parameters are presented in Section 3.



Figure 5: The effect of solar gravity perturbation on the LCSs.

3 Transit orbit and classification method

In this section, the generation method of transit orbits is first presented based on the LCSs. Then, based on the propagation of transit orbits, an important parameter, i.e., the number of periapses about the Moon (N) is introduced.

Table 2: $H_{0 \min}$ for LCSs at each θ_{S0}

$\theta_{\rm S0}/\deg$	45	135	225	315
$\overline{H_{0\min}/(\text{LU/TU})^2}$	-847.5150	-847.5135	-847.5150	-847.5135

This parameter can naturally classify the transit orbits into families with different characteristics. Then, parameters associated with these characteristics are presented.

3.1 Generation of transit orbits

The step sizes of (y_0, v_0) grid in the M_3 under the specific (θ_{S0}, H_0) are set as 0.0002 LU and 0.0002 $(LU/TU)^2$ to generate transit orbits. Based on selected (y_0, v_0) in M_3 , the transit orbits are propagated forward in time. The Moon is treated as a particle with m_M to ensure successive propagation of the transit orbits within the Moon region. Note that the propagation will stop when the transit orbit impacts the center of the Moon (i.e., singular collision orbits (Oshima et al., 2017)). These singular collision orbits are not the primary focus of this paper.

The orbital propagation time is set to T = 10000 TU to make the transit orbits have enough time to pass through the L1/L2 region (Zotos, 2015). Propagation stops when the transit orbits pass through the L1/L2 region (i.e. when the transit orbits reach the termination Poincaré sections $U_1 = \{X | x = 0.7 \text{ LU}, u < 0\}$ or $U_2 = \{X | x = 1.2 \text{ LU}, u > 0\}$). The actual propagation time is denoted as the passage time in the Moon region (T_{Passage}) . The trajectories reaching U_1 are defined as L1 escape trajectories, while the orbits reaching U_2 are defined as L2 escape trajectories (Ren and Shan, 2014; Zotos, 2014). According to Liouville's theorem (Arnol'd, 2013), excluding the singular collision orbits, L1 escape trajectories and L2 escape trajectories consist of transit orbits. When the propagation of transit orbits is finished, a parameter, i.e., the number of periapses about the Moon is introduced to classify the transit orbits.

3.2 Classification of transit orbits

When the propagation of transit orbits is finished, the number of periapses of each trajectory is recorded. The states of periapsis about the Moon satisfy (Bosanac, 2020):

$$q = (x_p + \mu - 1)(u_p - y_p) + y_p(v_p + x_p + \mu - 1) = 0$$
(11)

$$\dot{q} = (x_p + \mu - 1)(\ddot{x}_p - v_p) + u_p(u_p - y_p) + y_p(\ddot{y}_p + u_p) + v_p(v_p + x_p + \mu - 1) > 0$$
(12)

where the subscript 'p' denotes the quantities associated with the periapsis about the Moon. Equation (11) denotes that the position vector relative to the Moon is normal to the velocity vector in the inertial frame, and the time derivative $\dot{q} > 0$ geometrically guarantees that the position of the states $X_p = [x_p, y_p, u_p, v_p]^T$ satisfying Eq. (12) corresponds to a periapsis rather than an apoapsis. In this paper, the number of the periapses at $T_{\text{Passage}}(N)$ is used as the classification parameter. N reveals the stability of transit orbits about the Moon, such that a higher N corresponds to a longer T_{Passage} . Transit orbits with the different N belong to different families. Similarly, transit orbits with the same N but different periapsis distribution (i.e., different patterns shown in Canales et al. (2023) and Short et al. (2015), which is reflected in the discontinuous distributions in M_3) also represent different families.

When the propagation of transit orbits is finished, the value of N for each trajectory is recorded, and the mapping $\Im: M_3 \to N$ is established. Then, the classifications of transit orbits under specific (θ_{S0} , H_0) are established based on N and periapsis distribution. To quantitatively measure the difference between the periapsis distribution of transit orbits with the same N and exactly extract the initial state set of the same family, the density-based spatial clustering of applications with noise (DBSCAN) method (Bosanac, 2020; Ester et al., 1996) is adopted. Clustering is performed for the transit orbits with the same N to classify transit orbits with different periapsis distribution into different families. The compressed description vector is set as:

$$\boldsymbol{Y}_{Nj} = \begin{bmatrix} y_0, \, v_0, \, T_{\text{Passage}}, \, \boldsymbol{X}_{p1}^{\text{T}}, \, ..., \, \boldsymbol{X}_{pi}^{\text{T}}, \, ..., \, \boldsymbol{X}_{pN}^{\text{T}}, \, L \end{bmatrix}$$
(13)

where $X_{pi} = [x_{pi}, y_{pi}, u_{pi}, v_{pi}]^{T}$ (i = 1, ..., N) is the orbital state of the *i*-th peripasis of the transit orbit. The subscript 'j' denotes the compressed description vector of *j*-th trajectory of transit orbits with *N*. The quantity *L* determines whether the transit orbit is an L1 escape trajectory, an L2 escape trajectory, or some other trajectory:

$$L = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ L1 escape trajectory} \\ 2 \text{ L2 escape trajectory} \\ 0 \text{ other} \end{cases}$$
(14)

The vectors Y_{Nj} are combined to form the dataset $[S]_N$ and the clustering is performed to extract the initial state (i.e., (y_0, v_0)) set. After the clustering, the transit orbit families denoted as F11, F12, etc., detailed in Section 4, and their initial state sets are denoted as M_{F11} , M_{F12} , etc. Subsequently, the transfer characteristic parameters of typical families are analyzed to reveal the evolution laws with respect to (θ_{S0}, H_0) . These parameters include the percentages (η) (Zotos, 2015; Qi and de Ruiter, 2018), the average $T_{Passage}$ ($\langle T_{Passage} \rangle$) (Waalkens et al., 2005) and the ranges of periapsis altitudes (h_p) (Topputo, 2013; Oshima et al., 2019).

The percentage of transit orbit families is expressed as (take family F11 for example) (Qi and de Ruiter, 2018):

$$\eta_{\text{F11}} = \frac{m\left(M_{\text{F11}}\right)}{m\left(M_{3}\right)} = \frac{\iint_{(y_{0}, v_{0}) \in M_{\text{F11}}} dy_{0} dv_{0}}{\iint_{(y_{0}, v_{0}) \in M_{3}} dy_{0} dv_{0}}$$
(15)

where $m(\cdot)$ denotes the measurement of the sets, M_{F11} denotes the initial state set of family F11 (apparently, $M_{F11} \subseteq M_3$). The percentages of transit orbit families reveal the variation of family distribution inside the LCSs with (θ_{S0}, H_0) . The average $T_{Passage}$ ($\langle T_{Passage} \rangle$) of families is expressed as (take family F11 for example) (Waalkens et al., 2005):

$$\langle T_{\text{Passage}} \rangle_{\text{F11}} = \frac{\iint_{(y_0, v_0) \in M_{\text{F11}}} T_{\text{Passage}} dy_0 dv_0}{m(M_{\text{F11}})} = \frac{\iint_{(y_0, v_0) \in M_{\text{F11}}} T_{\text{Passage}} dy_0 dv_0}{\iint_{(y_0, v_0) \in M_{\text{F11}}} dy_0 dv_0} \tag{16}$$

where T_{Passage} denotes the passage time associated with trajectories propagated by the initial states $(y_0, v_0) \in M_{\text{F11}}$. $\langle T_{\text{Passage}} \rangle$ is related to the time of flight (TOF) of low-energy transfers constructed from transit orbits and the evaluation of lunar flyby (LF) (Gong and Li, 2015; Qi and Xu, 2015) in low-energy transfers.

The periapsis altitude of transit orbits about the Moon is calculated by (Topputo, 2013; Oshima et al., 2019):

$$h_p = \sqrt{\left(x_p + \mu - 1\right)^2 + y_p^2} - R_{\rm M} \tag{17}$$

The periapsis altitude about the Moon of transit orbits is associated with the altitude of lunar insertion orbits in the low-energy transfers. Therefore, $\langle T_{\text{Passage}} \rangle$ and the ranges of periapsis altitudes are parameters that reveal transfer characteristics.



Figure 6: Process of classification.

Above all, the process of classification is presented in Fig. 6. Then, the classifications of transit orbits and evolution laws with respect to (θ_{s0}, H_0) will be detailed.

4 Classifications of transit orbits

In this section, the classifications of transit orbits are achieved by the mapping $\Im : M_3 \to N$ based on the LCSs. First, the global map of classification with a range of H_0 at a specific θ_{S0} is presented. Then, the typical maps of classifications are selected to detail the patterns and periapsis distributions of transit orbit families. Similar analyses are subsequently performed for other θ_{S0} cases. Finally, the evolution laws of transfer characteristic parameters for transit orbit families with respect to (θ_{S0} , H_0) are discussed and summarized.

4.1 Case I: 45 deg

Our exploration begins with the case at $\theta_{S0} = 45$ deg. Subsequently, the similarities and differences between the classifications at $\theta_{S0} = 45$ deg and those at other θ_{S0} are discussed (Subsections 4.2-4.3). The existence of LCSs depends on $H_{0 \min}$, as presented in Table 2 (Qi et al., 2012). Since this paper focuses on transit orbits constructing low-energy transfers, so H_0 does not need to be very high. Therefore, we investigate a specific range of H_0 at each θ_{S0} . The selection criteria are as follows: when H_0 is lower than the minimum value (H_{01}) of the selected range, the

variation in classification is too dramatic to summarize the characteristics; when H_0 is higher than the maximum value (H_{02}) of the selected range, the classification is similar to that under H_{02} . Consequently, the range is selected from -847.5100 to -847.4945 (LU/TU)² for each investigated θ_{S0} in this paper. First, a global map of classifications with H_0 at $\theta_{S0} = 45$ deg is presented.

4.1.1 Global map of classification

Figures 7 and 8 show the global map of classifications under different H_0 at $\theta_{S0} = 45$ deg. The regions with different colors show the different *N*, along with the distribution of different transit orbit families inside the LCSs. In addition, regions highlighted in dark red are defined as high-*N* (HN) regions (i.e., the regions with N > 10). Note that the HN regions are usually associated with local scatter distribution, which likely corresponds to chaotic scattering and the theory of leaking Hamiltonian systems (Zotos, 2015). Moreover, the transit orbits related to HN regions are usually associated with the lunar collision trajectories (i.e., the states *X* satisfy $\sqrt{(x - \mu + 1)^2 + y^2} < R_M$) (Canales et al., 2023). When the transit orbits are used to construct low-energy transfers, the lunar collision trajectories should be excluded. Therefore, this paper focuses on other typical families of transit orbits.

Other families of transit orbits are generally separated by the HN regions and are collectively referred to as regular regions. In the regular regions, different N values indicate different families of transit orbits. Furthermore, the families with the same N may not be distributed continuously and can be considered as different families. The geometry and characteristics of transit orbits differ significantly between different families.

As shown in Figs. 7 and 8, when H_0 varies from -847.5095 to $-847.5090 (LU/TU)^2$, an island of HN region emerges from the family with N = 6 and gradually expands into a larger HN region (i.e., an ocean of HN region). When H_0 varies from -847.5090 to -847.5080 (LU/TU)², a family island with N = 5 (blue region) emerges from the ocean of HN region. Meanwhile, a family with N=3 (green region) begins to appear, which is associated with L2 escape trajectories, detailed in Subsections 4.1.3-4.1.6. As the values of H_0 increase (from -847.5085 to -847.5065 (LU/TU)²), the family island with N = 5 (blue region) gradually expands to a family ocean. Meanwhile, the area of the family with N = 6 (red region) shrinks gradually and disappears. At the same time, the family with N = 3 (green region) also expands gradually and occupies the central regions of the LCS. After the area of the aforementioned family with N = 5 occupies the lower left regions of the LCS and continues to expand with the increase of H_0 , new islands of HN regions are generated. These new islands eventually form families with N = 2 and N = 1, which are associated with L2 escape trajectories (see details in Subsections 4.1.3-4.1.6). Based on the global map of classifications at $\theta_{S0} = 45 \text{ deg}$, four typical classifications under four different levels of H_0 at $\theta_{S0} = 45 \text{ deg}$ are analyzed in detail. The classifications under other H_0 are similar to these four typical classifications. The four different levels of H_0 are set to -847.5100, -847.5075, -847.5025, and -847.4950 (LU/TU)² (the four H_0 values are denoted as IH I, IH II, IH III, and IH IV for the captions of subsections). Under these four levels of H_0 , initial state sets of transit orbit families are extracted, and corresponding transfer characteristics are analyzed.



N=1 N=2 N=3 N=4 N=5 N=6 N=7 N=8 N=9 HN

Figure 7: Global map of classifications.

4.1.2 Classifications under IH I

Figure 9 (a) presents the classification under $H_0 = -847.5100 (LU/TU)^2$. The classification results are consistent with those based on the T_{Passage} (Zotos, 2015; Waalkens et al., 2005), as shown in Fig. 9 (b). However, the classification results based on N exhibit clear boundaries between different families. Subsequently, based on the classification results shown in Fig. 9 (a), the initial state sets of transit orbit families in the regular regions are extracted and presented in Fig. 10, where families are marked as F11, F12, and so on. The first number denotes the N value, while the second number distinguishes different families with the same N.



N=1 N=2 N=3 N=4 N=5 N=6 N=7 N=8 N=9 HN

Figure 8: Global map of classifications.

Figure 10 shows 14 families in the regular regions. The typical patterns of transit orbits associated with these 14 families are shown in Fig. 11. All the transit orbits associated with regular regions are L1 escape trajectories because the low H_0 makes the L2 region fail to open. It is found that transit orbits associated with families F23 and F24 are similar to those associated with F11 in terms of patterns. This similarity arises because family F11 is in a bordering position with the other two families, and the continuous dependence on initial conditions of solutions to ordinary differential equations (Nazaryan, 1992) results in similar dynamical behaviors of the transit orbits. Additionally, transit orbits associated with families F11, F21, F22, F23, F24, F31, F32, F41, F42, and F51 can be considered as short-term capture trajectories, while families F61, F71, F81, and F91 can be considered as tour trajectories (Canales et al., 2023; Short et al., 2015).



Figure 9: Consistency between two classification methods. (a) Classification results based on N; (b) Classification results based on T_{Passage} .



Figure 10: Initial state sets of transit orbit families.

Figure 12 shows the periapsis distribution about the Moon for different families. We find that the periapses of shortterm capture trajectories have a wedge-shaped distribution, while the periapses of tour trajectories exhibit a distribution encircling the Moon. Moreover, families F23 and F24 have a similar periapsis distribution (i.e., the first periapses of family F23 and the second periapses of family F24) compared with that of F11. Therefore, transit orbits associated with families F23 and F24 can be considered as distorted trajectories derived from those associated with family F11. Since H_0 is so low that the L2 region fails to open, all the transit orbits are L1 escape trajectories. When H_0 is sufficiently high, the L2 region will open and L2 escape trajectories will be generated. Subsequently, the classifications and different dynamical phenomena under higher H_0 values are presented.



Figure 11: Typical patterns of transit orbits associated with different families.

4.1.3 Classifications under IH II

Figure 13 shows 14 families in the regular regions. For L1 escape trajectories, short-term capture trajectories are generated in families F11, F21, F22, F23, F24, F31, F32, F51, and F53, while tour trajectories are generated in families F52 and F61, as shown in Figs. 14 and 15. As shown in Fig. 14, it is found that L2 escape trajectories are generated in families F33, F43, and F44. Most of the periapses of L2 escape trajectories satisfy $y_p < 0$ (see Fig. 15). It is concluded that the dynamical behaviors of transit orbits can be clearly revealed by the classifications based on N and periapsis distribution.

4.1.4 Classifications under IH III

When H_0 continues to increase, as shown in Fig. 16, there are 12 families in the regular regions. Figure 17 shows typical trajectory patterns. For L1 escape trajectories, short-term capture trajectories are generated in families F11, F23, F24, F32, F51, and F53, while tour trajectories are generated in families F46 and F52. The L2 escape trajectories are generated in families F25, F33, F43, F44, and F45. With the increase of H_0 , there is an overall decreasing trend in *N*, which is reflected in the shrinkage of families of relatively high *N*. Additionally, the percentages of L2 escape



Figure 12: Periapsis distribution of transit orbit families.

trajectories increase when H_0 increases, while percentages and N of tour trajectories decrease. Figure 18 presents the periapsis distribution of the transit orbit families.

4.1.5 Classifications under IH IV

Figure 19 shows 9 families in the regular regions. For L1 escape trajectories, short-term capture trajectories are generated in families F11, F23, F24, and F32, while tour trajectories are generated in families F34 and F47 (see Figs. 20 and 21). L2 escape trajectories are generated in families F12, F25, and F34. Linking the classification with those under the three aforementioned H_0 values, it is found that variations in H_0 are accompanied by the emergence of new families and the disappearance of existing families. In the next subsection, the evolution laws of classifications with respect to H_0 are discussed and analyzed.



Figure 13: Initial state sets of transit orbit families.



Figure 14: Typical patterns of transit orbits associated with different families.



Figure 15: Periapsis distribution of transit orbit families.

4.1.6 Evolution laws of classifications with respect to the initial Hamiltonian

Based on the aforementioned results, we find that transit orbits can be categorized into L1 and L2 escape trajectories according to the termination Poincaré sections (i.e., U_1 and U_2). Furthermore, L1 escape trajectories can be categorized into short-term capture trajectories and tour trajectories based on the patterns of transit orbits. Therefore, the investigated transit orbits can be categorized into three main types: (i) short-term capture trajectories, (ii) tour trajectories, and (iii) L2 escape trajectories. Under the investigated range of H_0 , L1 escape trajectories always exist, while the existence of L2 escape trajectories requires a higher H_0 . The typical trajectory patterns and periapsis distributions are shown in Fig. 22. Subsequently, the evolution laws of H_0 are discussed and analyzed in terms of these three types. For short-term capture trajectories, it is found that families F11, F23, F24, and F32 exist across all the investigated H_0 values. Therefore, the percentages, $\langle T_{\text{Passage}} \rangle$, and the ranges of h_p under these four H_0 values are presented to reveal



Figure 16: Initial state sets of transit orbit families.



Figure 17: Typical patterns of transit orbits associated with different families.

the effects of H_0 . As shown in Table 3, with the increase of H_0 , the percentages of families F11 and F32 exhibit an initial increase followed by a decrease, while families F23 and F24 exhibit a continuous increase. Moreover, $\langle T_{\text{Passage}} \rangle$ of all four families decreases. Figure 23 presents the variation of the ranges of h_p of these four families. It is found that, except for the second periapses of family F32, the ranges of h_p increase with the increase of H_0 . For the second periapsis of family F32, the range of h_p exhibits an initial increase followed by a decrease. Furthermore, the variation



Figure 18: Periapsis distribution of transit orbit families.



Figure 19: Initial state sets of transit orbit families.

of H_0 is accompanied by the disappearance of certain short-term capture trajectory families (e.g., families F41, F51, etc.).



Figure 20: Typical patterns of transit orbits associated with different families.

For tour trajectories and L2 escape trajectories, the variation in H_0 mainly affects the emergence of new families (i.e., new families with relatively low *N*) and the disappearance of old families (i.e., old families with relatively high *N*). Overall, the *N* values of transit orbit families decrease with the increase of H_0 .

4.2 Case II: 135 deg

To illustrate the similarities and differences in the classifications at different θ_{S0} , we explore two additional cases (i.e., $\theta_{S0} = 135 \text{ deg}$ and $\theta_{S0} = 225 \text{ deg}$) to reveal the effects of the solar gravity perturbation on transit orbits. In this subsection, our exploration continues with the case at $\theta_{S0} = 135 \text{ deg}$.

4.2.1 Global map of classification

Similar to Subsection 4.1, a global map of classifications with H_0 is presented to compare with the cases at $\theta_{S0} = 45$ deg, as shown in Figs. 24 and 25. It is found that when H_0 is relatively low (e.g. $H_0 = -847.5100 (\text{LU/TU})^2$), the difference is that at $\theta_{S0} = 135$ deg, the percentage of family F11 (pink regions) is less than that at $\theta_{S0} = 45$ deg. Additionally, when H_0 is relatively high (e.g. $H_0 = -847.4950 (\text{LU/TU})^2$), the percentage of family F12 at $\theta_{S0} = 135$ deg is less than that at $\theta_{S0} = 45$ deg. Referring to the effects of θ_{S0} on the configurations and distributions of LCSs (i.e., the configurations of the LCSs translate along the H_0 axis at different θ_{S0}) shown in Fig. 5, it can be concluded that θ_{S0} affects the energy conditions of generation and disappearance of the families by affecting the



Figure 21: Periapsis distribution of transit orbit families.



Figure 22: Three main types of transit orbits and periapsis distributions.

configurations of the LCSs under different H_0 . Subsequently, classifications under the four aforementioned H_0 values are detailed.

4.2.2 Classifications under IH I-IV

Figure 26 presents the extracted initial state sets of classifications under four aforementioned H_0 values at $\theta_{S0} = 135$ deg. It is found that the families at $\theta_{S0} = 135$ deg are similar to those at $\theta_{S0} = 45$ deg, except for family F50.



Figure 23: The ranges of h_p for four families under four H_0 values.

The pattern and periapsis distribution of trajectories associated with family F50 are detailed in Appendix A. Since when θ_{S0} switches from 45 deg to 135 deg, the configurations of the LCSs translate along the increasing H_0 axis (see in Fig. 5), the emergence and disappearance of the same transit orbit families at $\theta_{S0} = 135$ deg require higher H_0 values than at $\theta_{S0} = 45$ deg. For example, families F23 and F24 exist under $H_0 = -847.5100$ (LU/TU)² at $\theta_{S0} = 45$ deg, but do not exist under the same H_0 at $\theta_{S0} = 135$ deg, requiring higher H_0 values, e.g., $H_0 = -847.5075$ (LU/TU)² for their existence. Table 4 presents the percentages and $\langle T_{Passage} \rangle$ of typical short-term capture trajectory families (i.e., families F11, F23, F24 and F32) at $\theta_{S0} = 135$ deg. Figure 27 shows the ranges of h_p of these aforementioned families. Note that families F23 and F24 do not exist under $H_0 = -847.5100$ (LU/TU)². It is found that the trend of parameters varying with H_0 for short-term capture trajectories at $\theta_{S0} = 135$ deg are similar to those at $\theta_{S0} = 45$ deg,

Family	$H_0/(\mathrm{LU/TU})^2$	$\eta/\%$	$\left< T_{\text{Passage}} \right> / \text{TU}$
	-847.5100	17.15	4.1065
F11	-847.5075	22.81	3.7921
1.11	-847.5025	26.65	3.4767
	-847.4950	25.48	3.2484
	-847.5100	0.50	4.6511
F23	-847.5075	1.55	4.3471
123	-847.5025	3.66	3.9871
	-847.4950	5.85	3.7631
	-847.5100	1.05	4.5209
F24	-847.5075	2.24	4.2252
1 24	-847.5025	4.07	3.8871
	-847.4950	5.99	3.7155
	-847.5100	2.17	5.7073
F37	-847.5075	4.10	5.4504
1 32	-847.5025	4.55	5.2954
	-847.4950	2.35	5.2364

Table 3: Transfer characteristics of families varying with H_0

except that the percentages of family F11 continuously increase with the increase of H_0 . In addition, $\langle T_{\text{Passage}} \rangle$ of these families are longer than those under the same H_0 at $\theta_{S0} = 45$ deg. Similarly, the effects of H_0 on the families of tour trajectories and L2 escape trajectories are reflected in the emergence and disappearance of transit orbit families. Therefore, it is concluded that the evolution laws with respect to H_0 are similar at different θ_{S0} values but differ in the energy conditions for the emergence and disappearance of transit orbit families.

4.3 Case III: 225 deg

When θ_{S0} differs by 180 deg from $\theta_{S0} = 45$ deg, the dynamical phenomenon appears to be quite similar. In Fig. 28, it is found that the classifications of transit orbits at $\theta_{S0} = 225$ deg are almost identical to those at $\theta_{S0} = 45$ deg under the same H_0 . The dynamical behaviors and transfer characteristics of transit orbit families are similar at these two θ_{S0} values. This phenomenon also exists for any two θ_{S0} values that differ by 180 deg (Ren and Shan, 2014). Considering the energy conditions required for the existence of the LCSs at each θ_{S0} shown in Table 2, it confirms the aforementioned conclusions that θ_{S0} affects the energy conditions of emergence and disappearance of transit orbit families by affecting the configurations of the LCSs under different H_0 . This finding expands on the results from Ren and Shan (Ren and Shan, 2014), and our future research will further investigate this phenomenon.



N=1 N=2 N=3 N=4 N=5 N=6 N=7 N=8 N=9 HN

Figure 24: Global map of classifications.

5 Application of classifications on low-energy transfer

In this section, the classifications and their evolution laws presented in Section 4 are applied to the constructions of two low-energy transfer scenarios, i.e., bi-impulsive Earth-Moon transfer (without and with LF (Qi and Xu, 2017; Gong and Li, 2015; Qi and Xu, 2015)) and cislunar escape. The construction strategies of these two scenarios are proposed based on the classifications and their evolution laws. Samples of transfer trajectories are presented and the link between classifications, evolution laws, and transfer characteristics is revealed.



N=1 N=2 N=3 N=4 N=5 N=6 N=7 N=8 N=9 HN

Figure 25: Global map of classifications (continued).

5.1 Bi-impulsive Earth-Moon transfer

Bi-impulsive Earth-Moon transfer is described as a process in which the test body (spacecraft) is launched to a transfer trajectory from a circular Earth parking orbit after performing an Earth injection impulse (Δv_i) and inserted into a circular lunar insertion orbit through a Moon insertion impulse (Δv_f). To maximize energy variations, the impulses should be tangential to the orbital velocity (Pernicka et al., 1994). Therefore, the states of departure point at the Earth parking orbit and insertion point at the lunar insertion orbit should satisfy (Topputo, 2013; Oshima et al., 2019):

$$\psi_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} (x_{i} + \mu)^{2} + y_{i}^{2} - (R_{\rm E} + h_{i})^{2} \\ (x_{i} + \mu) (u_{i} - y_{i}) + y_{i} (v_{i} + x_{i} + \mu) \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0}$$
(18)



Figure 26: Initial state sets of transit orbit families under four H_0 values.

$$\psi_f = \begin{bmatrix} (x_f + \mu - 1)^2 + y_f^2 - (R_M + h_f)^2 \\ (x_f + \mu - 1)(u_f - y_f) + y_f(v_f + x_f + \mu - 1) \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0}$$
(19)

where h_i denotes the altitude of the Earth parking orbit and h_f denotes the altitude of the lunar insertion orbit. The subscript '*i*' denotes quantities associated with the departure point, while '*f*' denotes quantities associated with the insertion point. In this paper, h_i is set to 36000 km and h_f is set to 100 km. Bi-impulsive Earth-Moon transfer can be categorized into two main types, i.e., transfer without LF and transfer with LF. These two types of transfer can be constructed based on the LCSs and transit orbits with different strategies.

In this paper, the segment of the trajectories towards the Moon (i.e., Segment I) is generated from the forward-time propagation of the initial states of transit orbits inside the LCSs, the segment of the trajectories departing from the Earth parking orbits (i.e., Segment II) is generated from the backward-time propagation. For transfer without LF, part of the transit orbits consists of Segment I (i.e., the propagation time of Segment I $T_1 < T_{\text{Passage}}$), with a periapsis satisfying $h_p = 100$ km for the lunar insertion orbit. For transfer with LF, transit orbits play the role of lunar flyby trajectories in Segment I, and the orbital propagation continues (i.e., $T_1 > T_{\text{Passage}}$) when the transit orbits reach U_1



Figure 27: The ranges of h_p for four families under four H_0 values.

or U_2 . Note that trajectories inserted into the surface of the Earth or Moon are excluded in the construction. Segment I and Segment II are searched from M_3 inside the LCSs to satisfy the constraints (18)-(19). When the transfers are constructed, the Earth injection impulse (Δv_i) , the Moon insertion impulse (Δv_f) , and the total impulse (Δv) are calculated by:

$$\Delta v_i = \sqrt{(u_i - y_i)^2 + (v_i + x_i + \mu)^2} - \sqrt{\frac{1 - \mu}{R_{\rm E} + h_i}}$$
(20)

$$\Delta v_f = \sqrt{\left(u_f - y_f\right)^2 + \left(v_f + x_f + \mu - 1\right)^2} - \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{R_{\rm M} + h_f}} \tag{21}$$

$$\Delta v = \Delta v_i + \Delta v_f \tag{22}$$

Family	$H_0/(\mathrm{LU/TU})^2$	$\eta/\%$	$\left< T_{\mathrm{Passage}} \right> /\mathrm{TU}$
	-847.5100	1.88	5.2976
F11	-847.5075	14.72	4.0889
111	-847.5025	25.72	3.5565
	-847.4950	27.56	3.2676
	-847.5100	_	_
F23	-847.5075	1.81	4.4827
123	-847.5025	3.85	4.0901
	-847.4950	5.70	3.8021
	-847.5100	-	_
F24	-847.5075	1.00	4.6668
1 27	-847.5025	3.15	4.1665
	-847.4950	5.47	3.7926
	-847.5100	0.88	6.4009
F32	-847.5075	2.61	5.7128
1 32	-847.5025	4.57	5.4137
	-847.4950	2.63	5.2941

Table 4: Transfer characteristics of families varying with H_0

5.1.1 Bi-impulsive Earth-Moon transfer without LF

Based on the aforementioned discussions on the ranges of h_p in Section 4, we select transit orbits with periapses satisfying $h_p = 100$ km for the lunar insertion orbit to construct the transfers (i.e., Strategy I). For example, the transit orbits associated with family F11 under $(135 \text{ deg}, -847.4950 (\text{LU/TU})^2)$ ($h_p \in [-1.7061 \times 10^3, 1.8823 \times 10^4]$ km) are selected. Figure 29 presents three samples of transfers and the initial states inside the corresponding LCS. In these three samples, transit orbits insert into lunar insertion orbit at the first periapsis, validating the effectiveness of the proposed strategy.

5.1.2 Bi-impulsive Earth-Moon transfer with LF

For transfer with LF, transit orbits consist of lunar flyby trajectories in Segment I. For this consideration, the trajectory patterns of families F11 and F12 are suitable due to their relatively short $\langle T_{\text{Passage}} \rangle$ (i.e., Strategy II). Transit orbits associated with family F11 under $(135 \text{ deg}, -847.4950 \text{ (LU/TU})^2)$ are selected as an example. Figure 30 presents three samples of transfers. Trajectories encounter the Moon twice during the transfers. In each sample, the first encounter with the Moon is an LF based on the transit orbit associated with family F11, while the second encounter is an insertion to the lunar insertion orbit.

Table 5 presents the impulses and time of flight (TOF) of the aforementioned samples compared with the results obtained from the patched-conic method based on the patched restricted two-body problem (R2BP) (i.e., Solution I) (Bat-



Figure 28: Initial state sets of transit orbit families under four H_0 values.

tin, 1999) and theoretical minimum impulse estimation (i.e., Solution II) (Sweetser, 1991) based on the Earth-Moon PCR3BP. It is concluded that while the TOFs of transfers with LF are longer than those without LF, the samples with LF have the advantage of requiring relatively lower impulses. Comparing these six samples with the patched-conic results, a significant reduction in impulses is achieved. Our results are closer to the theoretical minimum estimation, indicating that the construction strategies based on the classifications for low-energy transfers are effective.

5.2 Cislunar escape

Cislunar escape trajectories are those departing from a circular Earth parking orbit and entering the Earth-Moon exterior region. Similar to the bi-impulsive Earth-Moon transfer scenario, the trajectories departing from the Earth parking orbits (Segment II) and the trajectories escaping from cislunar space (Segment I, $T_1 > T_{\text{Passage}}$) form cislunar escape trajectories. The test body (spacecraft) requires a tangential Earth injection impulse (Δv_i) to depart. The altitude of circular Earth parking orbit h_i is also set to 36000 km. Therefore, the states of departure point at the Earth parking orbit should satisfy Eq. (18), while Δv_i can be calculated by Eq. (20). The numerical criteria for escape



Figure 29: Samples of bi-impulsive Earth-Moon transfers without LF. (a) Sample I; (b) Sample II; (c) Sample III.

is established such that when the states X satisfy $\sqrt{x^2 + y^2} > 10$ LU, the trajectories are considered as escape trajectories (Zotos, 2015).



Figure 30: Samples of bi-impulsive Earth-Moon transfers with LF. (a) Sample I; (b) Sample II; (c) Sample III.

As mentioned in Sections 3 and 4, L2 escape trajectories pass through the L2 region and enter the Earth-Moon exterior region. Therefore, L2 escape trajectories are applied to constructing cislunar escape trajectories (i.e., Strategy III). For example, transit orbits associated with family F25 under $(135 \text{ deg}, -847.4950 \text{ (LU/TU)}^2)$ are selected. Figure

Solutions	$\Delta v_i/(\text{km/s})$	$\Delta v_f/(\text{km/s})$	$\Delta v/(\text{km/s})$	TOF/day
Sample I ¹	0.9937	0.6357	1.6294	92
Sample II ¹	0.9949	0.6357	1.6306	109
Sample III ¹	0.9944	0.6357	1.6301	101
Sample I ²	0.9946	0.6294	1.6240	218
Sample II ²	0.9943	0.6296	1.6239	196
Sample III ²	0.9936	0.6336	1.6272	185
Solution I	1.0511	0.7094	1.7605	6
Solution II	0.9548	0.6250	1.5798	_

Table 5: Comparison of Transfer characteristics

31 presents three samples (note that parts of escape trajectories are shown for clarity). It is found that transit orbits connect the trajectories in the Earth region (i.e., Segment II) with the trajectories in the Earth-Moon exterior region.

A comparison between the Δv_i of these three samples, escape trajectories based on the R2BP (i.e., Solution I) (Curtis, 2020), and theoretical minimum impulse estimation (i.e., Solution II) based on the Earth-Moon PCR3BP is shown in Table 6. The calculation methods of Δv_i of Solution I and Solution II are detailed in Appendix B. It is found that three samples advantage in low Δv_i compared with Solution I. The low-energy escape is achieved by using natural multi-body dynamics, and our proposed strategy links the two based on the classifications of transit orbits.

Table 6: Comparison of transfer characteristics

Solutions	Sample I	Sample II	Sample III	Solution I	Solution II
$\Delta v_i/({\rm km/s})$	0.9914	0.9882	0.9944	1.2687	0.9569

6 Conclusion

This paper focuses on the classification of interior transit orbits in the Sun-Earth/Moon planar bicircular restricted four-body problem (PBCR4BP). Lagrangian coherent structures (LCSs) are introduced to generate the transit orbits and to visualize the classification. The number of periapses about the Moon is selected as the classification parameter. Utilizing the number of periapses, a clear classification boundary has been achieved, and the classification maps have been presented. The evolution laws of the classifications with respect to the initial Hamiltonian H_0 and the initial solar phase angle θ_{S0} have been discussed and analyzed. It is concluded that H_0 affects the transfer characteristic parameters and the emergence and disappearance of transit orbit families, while θ_{S0} affects the energy conditions of the emergence and disappearance of the families by affecting the configurations of the LCSs under different H_0 . Based on the classifications and their evolution laws, three construction strategies of low-energy transfers (i.e., biimpulsive Earth-Moon transfer and cislunar escape) are proposed. Numerical simulations, evolution laws, and transfer characteristics is finally established.



Figure 31: Samples of cislunar escape trajectories. (a) Sample I; (b) Sample II; (c) Sample III.

Acknowledgements

The first author acknowledges the financial support from the Outstanding Research Project of Shen Yuan Honors College, BUAA (Grant No. 230122205). The second author acknowledges the financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12302058). The third author acknowledges the financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12302058).

Appendix A Details about family F50

The typical pattern of transit orbits associated with family F50 and the periapsis distribution are presented in Fig. 32. It is found that transit orbits associated with family F50 are short-term capture trajectories.



Figure 32: Samples of bi-impulsive Earth-Moon transfers with LF. (a) Typical trajectory pattern; (b) Periapsis distribution.

Appendix B Calculation methods of Δv_i of escape trajectories

For Solution I shown in Table 6, the parabola is the escape trajectory with the minimum energy (Curtis, 2020). The velocity at the perigee (i.e., the departure point) is calculated by:

$$v_1 = \sqrt{\frac{2(1-\mu)}{R_{\rm E} + h_i}}$$
 (23)

Then, Δv_i is calculated by:

$$\Delta v_i = v_1 - \sqrt{\frac{1-\mu}{R_{\rm E} + h_i}} = (\sqrt{2} - 1)\sqrt{\frac{1-\mu}{R_{\rm E} + h_i}} \tag{24}$$

For Solution II, the theoretical minimum impulse is estimated by the difference of Jacobi energy (C) between the Earth parking orbit and the L2 point in the Earth-Moon circular restricted three-body problem. When the Jacobi energy of the trajectory is the Jacobi energy of L2 C_{L2} , the trajectory is capable of escape. The Jacobi energy is expressed as (Koon et al., 2001; Pernicka et al., 1994):

$$C = -\left(u^2 + v^2\right) + \left(x^2 + y^2\right) + \frac{2(1-\mu)}{r_1} + \frac{2\mu}{r_2} + \mu\left(1-\mu\right)$$
(25)

Then, the theoretical minimum impulse is estimated by:

$$\Delta v_i = \sqrt{\delta C + \frac{1-\mu}{R_{\rm E} + h_i}} - \sqrt{\frac{1-\mu}{R_{\rm E} + h_i}} \tag{26}$$

where δC denotes the difference of C between the Earth parking orbit and L2 ($C_{L2} = 3.184158 (LU/TU)^2$ in the Earth-Moon CR3BP).

References

- Yuqi Qian, Long Xiao, Jiawei Zhao, James W Head, Qi He, Huiru Xu, Feizhou Wang, Xiaoping Zhang, Xianquan Ping, Wen Zeng, X Wang, J Michalski, J Liu, B Ye, M Wang, L Sun, Y Pang, J Wang, and S Zhao. First magnetic and spectroscopic constraints on attenuated space weathering at the chang'e-5 landing site. *Icarus*, 410:115892, 2024a.
- Yuqi Qian, James Head, Joseph Michalski, Xing Wang, Carolyn H van der Bogert, Harald Hiesinger, Lingzhi Sun,
 Wei Yang, Long Xiao, Xianhua Li, and G Zhao. Long-lasting farside volcanism in the apollo basin: Chang'e-6 landing site. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 637:118737, 2024b.
- Amelia L Batcha, Jacob Williams, Timothy F Dawn, Jeffrey P Gutkowski, Maxon V Widner, Sarah L Smallwood, Brian J Killeen, Elizabeth C Williams, and Robert E Harpold. Artemis i trajectory design and optimization, 2020. Paper presented at 2020 AAS/AIAA Astrodynamics Specialist Conference, American Astronautical Society/American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, AAS 20-649.
- Kenta Oshima, Francesco Topputo, and Tomohiro Yanao. Low-energy transfers to the moon with long transfer time. *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, 131:1–19, 2019.
- Edward A Belbruno and James K Miller. Sun-perturbed earth-to-moon transfers with ballistic capture. *J. Guid. Control Dyn.*, 16(4):770–775, 1993.
- Francesco Topputo. On optimal two-impulse earth-moon transfers in a four-body model. *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, 117:279–313, 2013.
- Xiyun Hou, Yu-hui Zhao, and Lin Liu. Free return trajectories in lunar missions. *Chin. Astron. Astrophys.*, 37(2): 183–194, 2013.
- Jingyang Li, Shengping Gong, Hexi Baoyin, and Fanghua Jiang. Lunar orbit insertion targeting from the two-segment lunar free-return trajectories. *Adv. Space Res.*, 55(4):1051–1060, 2015.
- Euaggelos E Zotos. Classifying orbits in the restricted three-body problem. Nonlinear Dyn., 82:1233–1250, 2015.
- Kenta Oshima. Capture and escape analyses on planar retrograde periodic orbit around the earth. *Adv. Space Res.*, 68 (9):3891–3902, 2021.
- Jeffrey S Parker and Rodney L Anderson. *Low-energy lunar trajectory design*, volume 12. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, 2014.
- Martin W Lo, Bobby G Williams, Williard E Bollman, Dongsuk Han, Yungsun Hahn, Julia L Bell, Edward A Hirst, Robert A Corwin, Philip E Hong, Kathleen C Howell, et al. Genesis mission design. *J. Astronaut. Sci.*, 49:169–184, 2001.
- Young-Joo Song, Jun Bang, Jonghee Bae, and SeungBum Hong. Lunar orbit acquisition of the korea pathfinder lunar orbiter: design reference vs actual flight results. *Acta Astronaut.*, 213:336–343, 2023.

- Hideaki Yamato and David B Spencer. Transit-orbit search for planar restricted three-body problems with perturbations. J. Guid. Control Dyn., 27(6):1035–1045, 2004.
- David Canales, Kathleen C Howell, Elena Fantino, and Annika J Gilliam. Transfers between moons with escape and capture patterns via lyapunov exponent maps. *J. Guid. Control Dyn.*, 46(11):2133–2149, 2023.
- Victory Szebehely. *Theory of orbit: The restricted problem of three Bodies*. Academic Press, New York and London, 1967.
- Jane Cronin, Paul B Richards, and Lawrence H Russell. Some periodic solutions of a four-body problem. *Icarus*, 3 (5-6):423–428, 1964.
- Yuan Ren and Jinjun Shan. Low-energy lunar transfers using spatial transit orbits. Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul., 19(3):554–569, 2014.
- Cody R Short, Daniel Blazevski, Kathleen C Howell, and George Haller. Stretching in phase space and applications in general nonautonomous multi-body problems. *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy*, 122:213–238, 2015.
- Wang Sang Koon, Martin W Lo, Jerrold E Marsden, and Shane D Ross. Low energy transfer to the moon. *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, 81(1-2):63–73, 2001.
- Joshua Fitzgerald and Shane D Ross. Geometry of transit orbits in the periodically-perturbed restricted three-body problem. *Adv. Space Res.*, 70(1):144–156, 2022.
- Rui Qi, Shijie Xu, Yao Zhang, and Yue Wang. Earth-to-moon low energy transfer using time-dependent invariant manifolds, 2012. Paper presented at 2012 AIAA/AAS Astrodynamics Specialist Conference, American Astronautical Society/American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, 4431.
- Cody R Short and Kathleen C Howell. Lagrangian coherent structures in various map representations for application to multi-body gravitational regimes. *Acta Astronaut.*, 94(2):592–607, 2014.
- Kaori Onozaki, Hiroaki Yoshimura, and Shane D Ross. Tube dynamics and low energy earth–moon transfers in the 4-body system. *Adv. Space Res.*, 60(10):2117–2132, 2017.
- George Haller. Distinguished material surfaces and coherent structures in three-dimensional fluid flows. *Physica D*, 149(4):248–277, 2001.
- Holger Waalkens, Andrew Burbanks, and Stephen Wiggins. Escape from planetary neighbourhoods. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 361(3):763–775, 2005.
- Natasha Bosanac. Data-mining approach to poincaré maps in multi-body trajectory design. *J. Guid. Control Dyn.*, 43 (6):1190–1200, 2020.
- Shengping Gong and Chao Liu. Hill stability of the satellites in coplanar four-body problem. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 462(1):547–553, 2016.

- Evan S Gawlik, Jerrold E Marsden, Philip C Du Toit, and Stefano Campagnola. Lagrangian coherent structures in the planar elliptic restricted three-body problem. *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, 103:227–249, 2009.
- Mingpei Lin, Yaru Zheng, and Ming Xu. Application of lagrangian coherent structures to coulomb formation on elliptic orbit. *Nonlinear Dyn.*, 102:2649–2668, 2020.
- Shengping Gong, Junfeng Li, Hexi Baoyin, and Yun-feng Gao. Lunar landing trajectory design based on invariant manifold. Appl. Math. Mech.-Engl. Ed., 28(2):201–207, 2007.
- Kenta Oshima, Francesco Topputo, Stefano Campagnola, and Tomohiro Yanao. Analysis of medium-energy transfers to the moon. *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, 127:285–300, 2017.
- Euaggelos E Zotos. Escapes in hamiltonian systems with multiple exit channels: part i. *Nonlinear Dyn.*, 78:1389–1420, 2014.
- Vladimir Igorevich Arnol'd. *Mathematical methods of classical mechanics*, volume 60. Springer Science & Business Media, New York, 2013.
- Martin Ester, Hans-Peter Kriegel, Jörg Sander, Xiaowei Xu, et al. A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise. In *kdd*, volume 96, pages 226–231, 1996.
- Yi Qi and Anton de Ruiter. Short-term capture of the earth-moon system. *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 476(4): 5464–5478, 2018.
- Shengping Gong and Junfeng Li. Asteroid capture using lunar flyby. Adv. Space Res., 56(5):848-858, 2015.
- Yi Qi and Shijie Xu. Mechanical analysis of lunar gravity assist in the earth-moon system. *Astrophys. Space Sci.*, 360: 1–15, 2015.
- AL Nazaryan. Continuous dependence on initial conditions of solutions of differential equations in banach spaces. *Math. Notes*, 51(5):479–482, 1992.
- Yi Qi and Shijie Xu. Optimal earth-moon transfers using lunar gravity assist in the restricted four-body problem. *Acta Astronaut.*, 134:106–120, 2017.
- Hank Pernicka, D Scarberry, S Marsh, and T Sweetser. A search for low delta-v earth-to-moon trajectories, 1994. Paper presented at the Astrodynamics Conference, AIAA, 3772.
- Richard H Battin. An introduction to the mathematics and methods of astrodynamics. Aiaa, Reston, 1999.
- Theodore Sweetser. An estimate of the global minimum dv needed for earth-moon transfer, 1991. Paper presented at the Spaceflight mechanics 1991, 111–120.
- Howard D Curtis. Orbital mechanics for engineering students: Revised Reprint. Butterworth-Heinemann, Waltham, 2020.