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Abstract—This brief presents a comprehensive approach for the modeling of micropropulsion systems based on the vaporization of a liquid. The model combines the analytical and empirical relations derived from extensive experimental analysis and fundamental physical laws. This allows modeling of key parameters, such as mass flow rate, for the entire system comprising a tank to store the liquid propellant, a valve to control the mass flow, and a microthruster that vaporizes the propellant and accelerates it generating thrust. The model is evaluated by a sensitivity analysis considering the boundaries of the modeling space, and it has been tested in a simulation loop demonstrating the attitude control of a nanosatellite using a set of four thrusters. The results of the simulation are used to test the developed model.
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I. INTRODUCTION

MICROPROPULSION systems have been recognized as one of the key features to be developed for the next generation of space missions using very small spacecraft, including modular concepts such as CubeSats and PocketQubes [1]. These satellites are based on form factors called units that can be stacked together to combine several different modules.

A micropropulsion system is able to provide thrust in the levels from nanonewtons to micronewtons, which perfectly matches the requirements imposed by these classes of satellites. The integration of such a device into the bus of the spacecraft will represent a great technological advancement allowing them to execute precise attitude control or orbital maneuvers, thus extending the range of application of these spacecraft to include missions that involve space debris removal, orbit transfer, and so on [2], [3].

Many concepts of micropropulsion have been proposed during the last decades; especially, systems that are manufactured using microelectromechanical systems (MEMS) fabrication technologies have received great attention [4]. An interesting option for CubeSats and PocketQubes is the vaporizing liquid microthrusters (VLMs) that use a resistive heater to heat up the propellant, a valve to control the liquid flow, and a thruster to vaporize the liquid and generate thrust. The thruster is designed to work with water as the propellant, since it has been shown that water is a very good candidate for this kind of propulsion system due to its density that results in higher specific impulse and thrust. The performance of micropropulsion systems has been quite significant, the modeling of such a system is limited to relations of power and thrust and cover only the steady-state behavior [5], [6]. A model that reproduces the dynamic behavior of the system is very important for the design of controllers to allow the precise operation of the thruster and also for the design of the entire spacecraft.

In this brief, we present a comprehensive model of the VLM combining analytical and empirical relations and including models of all the components of a VLM system. The model allows the simulation of the complete system, including particularities involved in the process such as temperature and pressure changes caused by the operation of the thruster. The system considered is composed by a tank to store the propellant, a valve to control the liquid flow, and a thruster to vaporize the liquid and generate thrust. The thruster is designed to work with water as the propellant, since it has been shown that water is a very good candidate for this kind of propulsion system due to its density that results in higher Δv (change in velocity) per volume of propellant when compared with other safe substances [7].

A. Background

1) Vaporizing Liquid Microthruster: Fig. 1 shows a diagram of a complete VLM system [8]. The liquid propellant enters through the inlet section to the vaporization chamber, where it is vaporized by applying power to resistive heaters attached to the walls of the thruster. A convergent–divergent nozzle accelerates the vapor to supersonic velocities.

2) Propulsion: The performance of micropropulsion systems can generally be analyzed using the same formulation as in the normal sized systems. In this case, two parameters are of major interest when analyzing the performance of the thruster: specific impulse and thrust. The thrust $F$ is the force generated by the gas accelerated and expelled through the nozzle [9]

$$F = \dot{m}_e + (p_e - p_a)A_e$$

Fig. 1. VLM system showing: 1) a tank; 2) a valve; 3) a thruster, and 4) sensors. The mass flow rate $\dot{m}_1$ is the liquid flow rate, $\dot{m}_2$ is the vaporization rate, and $\dot{m}_3$ is the mass flow of the nozzle.
where $\dot{m}$ is the mass flow rate, $v_e$ is the exhaust velocity, $p_e$ and $p_a$ are the exit and ambient pressures, and $A_e$ is the exit area of the nozzle. The exhaust velocity can be calculated by (2), where $M_e$ is the Mach number at the exit, $\gamma$ is the ratio of the specific heat at constant pressure and constant volume, $T_e$ is the exit temperature, and $R_e$ is the specific gas constant

$$v_e = M_e \sqrt{\gamma R_e T_e}.$$  

The mass flow rate $\dot{m}$ can be written as a function of the chamber (stagnation) pressure and temperature ($p_1$ and $T_1$) and the area of the throat $A_t$

$$\dot{m} = \frac{A_t p_1}{\sqrt{T_1}} \left( \frac{\gamma}{\gamma + 1} \right)^{\gamma + 1} \left( \frac{2}{\gamma + 1} \right)^{\gamma + 1}. \quad (3)$$

Equations (4)–(6) are used to calculate the Mach number, temperature, and pressure at the exit

$$\frac{A_e}{A_t} = \left( \frac{\gamma + 1}{2} \right)^{-\frac{\gamma + 1}{\gamma - 1}} M_e^{-1} \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} M_e^2 \right)^{\frac{\gamma + 1}{\gamma - 1}}. \quad (4)$$

$$T_e = T_1 \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} M_e^2 \right)^{-1}. \quad (5)$$

$$p_e = p_1 \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} M_e^2 \right)^{\frac{-\gamma}{\gamma - 1}}. \quad (6)$$

The specific impulse $I_{sp}$ is a measure of efficiency regarding the consumption of propellant

$$I_{sp} = \frac{\int_0^t F dt}{g \int_0^t \dot{m} dt} \quad (7)$$

where $g = 9.80665 \text{ m s}^{-2}$ is the gravitational acceleration on the earth at sea level.

3) Attitude Dynamics: Assuming the spacecraft as a rigid body, we can describe its angular acceleration by the following equation:

$$\ddot{\omega} = I^{-1}[-(\ddot{\omega} \times I \ddot{\omega}) + \ddot{M}_{ext}] \quad (8)$$

where $\ddot{\omega}$ is the angular velocity of the body, $I$ is the inertia matrix, and $\ddot{M}_{ext}$ is any external torque. In an ideal case where no disturbances are considered, $\ddot{M}_{ext}$ is the torque provided by the actuators on board of the spacecraft. In this brief, the spacecraft is equipped with four thrusters positioned in such a way to provide torques in any direction with respect to the center of mass that is coincident with the geometric center of the spacecraft, as shown in Fig. 2.

The total torque of $N$ thrusters is calculated based on the position $\vec{d}$ and the orientation $\vec{e}$ of each thruster $i$

$$\ddot{M}_{ext} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\vec{d}_i \times \vec{e}_i) F_i. \quad (9)$$

The attitude of the spacecraft with respect to any arbitrary reference frame can be represented using quaternions. Using the angular velocity defined in (8), we can calculate the change in the attitude represented in quaternions $\dot{q}$ [10]

$$\dot{q} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\omega_z & -\omega_y & \omega_x \\ -\omega_z & 0 & \omega_x & \omega_y \\ -\omega_y & -\omega_x & 0 & \omega_z \\ \omega_z & -\omega_y & -\omega_x & 0 \end{bmatrix} q \quad (10)$$

where $\omega_x, \omega_y,$ and $\omega_z$ are the components of the vector $\ddot{\omega}$. By knowing the initial attitude of the spacecraft, one can integrate (10) in order to have the time evolution of the attitude.

II. Modeling Approach

Fig. 1 shows the architecture of the micropropulsion system used in the modeling that comprises: 1) a tank to store the liquid propellant (water) pressurized with nitrogen; 2) a solenoid valve to control the flow of liquid inside the thruster; 3) a MEMS resistojet with integrated heaters for the vaporization and temperature estimation; and 4) sensors for pressure and temperature measurement. The pressure sensors are placed in the tank and right before the thruster’s inlet to measure the upstream and downstream pressures. The latter is the same as the chamber pressure. The temperature sensors are placed close to the nozzle which is the most suitable position due to the size of the thruster. The design of the MEMS resistojet is described in [8].

The dynamics of the system is basically governed by two factors: an unbalance between the three mass flow rates indicated in Fig. 1 contributes to the pressure changes inside the vaporization chamber and the power applied to the heaters affects the vaporization process, thus the vaporization rate and the vapor quality. As the mass flow rates considered are in terms of milligrams per second, we assume that the changes in the mass of propellant do not influence the spacecraft dynamics. The valve is used to control the mass flow rate $\dot{m}_1$ affecting the pressure inside the thruster $p_1 = p_d$ which, in turn, affects the mass flow rate $\dot{m}_3$. The vaporization rate $\dot{m}_2$ is affected by changes in pressure that change the boiling point of the propellant and by changes in the applied power that change the temperature of the thruster affecting the heat transfer to the fluid.

In order to model this dynamics, we divided the model of the microthruster into four parts: the nozzle model that provides the mass flow rate $\dot{m}_3$ based on the pressure in the chamber, the vaporization model that calculates the volumetric fraction of vapor inside the chamber, the pressure model that calculates the pressure inside the chamber based on the density of the vapor part, and the temperature model that relates the thruster temperature to the applied power.

![Fig. 2. 3-D model of the spacecraft used in the simulations. Blue arrows: position and direction of the thrusters. Black arrows: center of mass and the reference frame.](image-url)
The model of the solenoid valve combines the models of three subsystems: the electromagnetic subsystem that models the electromagnetic force generated by the solenoid, the fluidic subsystem that models the flow through the valve, and the mechanical subsystem that models the motion of the plunger. Finally, the tank is modeled as a pressurized container that reduces its pressure with the ejection of liquid and expansion of the pressurant gas.

In the system considered in this analysis, as already mentioned, there are four identical thrusters and each one has its own valve. The propellant tank, however, is shared by all the thrusters.

A. Operational Boundaries and Requirements

The models presented in this brief are developed to work within some operational boundaries set based on the requirements commonly applied to CubeSats and PocketQubes. Propulsion systems for these spacecraft usually are at a development stage that does not require strict performance parameters. Therefore, the applicable requirements regard electrical and/or mechanical constraints and safety constraints to not endanger the mission.

The maximum thrust has been estimated considering a scenario where the center of mass of the spacecraft is at most 2 cm off of the geometric center [4]. Then, the maximum thrust is calculated based on the maximum torque that the reaction wheels of the spacecraft can provide and the torque generated by a thruster positioned at the center of the furthest face of the spacecraft and pointing toward the geometric center. For a three units CubeSat with a reaction wheel that can provide 2 × 10⁻³ Nm, it represents a maximum thrust of 10 × 10⁻³ N. As a PocketQube is about eight times smaller in mass than a CubeSat, the maximum thrust is one eighth of that of a CubeSat: 1.25 × 10⁻³ N.

B. Vaporizing Liquid Microthruster

1) Nozzle Model: To model the mass flow rate at the nozzle \( \dot{m}_3 \), the ideal rocket conditions are assumed [9, p. 46]. In reality, the following assumptions of the ideal rocket theory do not apply to the microthruster considered in this brief.

1) Adiabatic Flow: The flow is not adiabatic since the nozzle is heated up together with the complete thruster, and therefore, there is heat transfer from the nozzle to the gas.

2) Negligible Friction: The friction and boundary layer effects are not negligible due to the size of the thruster.

3) Uniform Distribution: The gas velocity, pressure, temperature, and density are not uniform across any section normal to the nozzle axis due to friction and boundary layer effects.

Nonetheless, we assume that the changes generated by these effects can be neglected in order to simplify the modeling. Then, the mass flow going through the nozzle is given by (3). The second and third assumptions might be compensated by multiplying the mass flow rate by a discharge coefficient that can be experimentally measured for the specific device [11].

As the propellant is boiling inside the chamber, we assume that the temperature of the gas is the saturation temperature. With this assumption, the temperature of the vapor can be calculated based on the pressure using (11) known as the Antoine equation

\[
T = \frac{B}{A - \log_{10} p} + C
\]  

where \( A = 10.27, B = 1810.94 \), and \( C = 28.67 \) for pressure in Pa and temperature in the range of 372.15–647.15 K.

If we consider the pressure in the range of 1–5 bar, then we can replace the term \( (p_1/\sqrt{T_1}) \) in (3) with a function of the pressure

\[
\frac{p_1}{\sqrt{T_1}} = \frac{p_1}{\sqrt{A - \log_{10} p_1}} \approx \alpha_1 p_1 + \beta_1
\]  

where \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \beta_1 \) are the coefficients of the first-order Taylor series expansion and the functions of the parameters used in (11) and the linearization point \( p_s \).

Finally, we can rewrite (3) as follows:

\[
\dot{m}_3 = (\alpha_1 \dot{p}_1 + \beta_1) A_t \frac{k}{R_s} \left( \frac{2}{k+1} \right)^{\frac{k+1}{k}}
\]  

Evaluating the expressions around the middle point in the range of pressure of interest, i.e., \( p_s = 3 \) bar, we get \( \alpha_1 = 0.048 \text{ K}^{-(1/2)} \) and \( \beta_1 = 626.99 \text{ Pa K}^{-(1/2)} \).

The resulting linear equation is faster to solve computationally and provides a good fitting for the pressure and temperature term. Fig. 3(a) shows the comparison between the proposed linear approximation and the curve for \( (p_1/\sqrt{T_1}) \) with the temperature calculated using (11).
In order to complete the model, we need an expression for the time derivative of the volume which, in this analysis, has been assumed to be a first-order linear system of the form

$$\dot{V} = A(V_{av} - V)$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

where $A = 75 \text{ s}^{-1}$ has been empirically chosen based on the image analysis already described. The rate of change in the volume is faster than the frame rate of the microscope, indicating that the time constant $\tau = (1/A)$ of a first-order system is less than 2 ms.

Then, the vaporization rate $\dot{m}_2$ can be calculated as follows:

$$\dot{m}_2 = \dot{m}_1 - \dot{V} \rho_l$$ \hspace{1cm} (18)

where $\rho_l$ is the density of the liquid.

3) Pressure Model: Consider the ideal gas law given by

$$\frac{p}{T} = mR_s$$ \hspace{1cm} (19)

where $m$ is the mass of gas. Following a similar approach as the linear approximation used in the nozzle model, we can approximate the term $(p/T)$ by a linear relation reducing the equation to:

$$p = \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \left( \frac{mR_s}{V} - \beta_2 \right)$$ \hspace{1cm} (20)

where

$$\alpha_2 = C \log_{10}(p_s)^2 - (2AC + B) \log_{10}(p_s) + A(AC + B) - \frac{B}{\log_{10}(AC)}$$ \hspace{1cm} (21)

$$\beta_2 = \frac{p_s}{\sqrt{C + \frac{B}{A - \log_{10}(p_s)}}} - \alpha_2 p_s$$ \hspace{1cm} (22)

Evaluating around the linearization point, one gets $\alpha_2 = 0.0023 \text{ K}^{-1}$ and $\beta_2 = 62.17 \text{ Pa K}^{-1}$. The results of this linearization are shown in Fig. 3(b) in comparison with the values calculated using (11).

4) Chip Temperature Model: The temperature of the thruster is modeled as a linear first-order system whose input is the applied power. The Laplace transfer function of the power-temperature system is given by

$$\frac{T(s)}{P(s)} = \frac{K}{s + \frac{1}{\tau}}$$ \hspace{1cm} (23)

where $\tau = 119.5 \text{ s}$ and $K = 28.5 \text{ KW}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$ have been experimentally estimated using data of power and temperature.

As described in a previous research [8], the resistance used in the heaters is linearly dependent on the temperature. The change in resistance due to changes in the temperature is described by the following equation [12]:

$$R = aR_0(T - T_0) + R_0$$ \hspace{1cm} (24)

where $R$ is the resistance, $T$ is the current temperature, and $R_0$ is the resistance measured at temperature $T_0$. The value of $a$ has been experimentally characterized for many devices, and on average, it is $a = 1.09 \times 10^{-3} \text{ K}^{-1}$ [8].
of the magnetic circuit is required, assuming that the solenoid
In order to express the flux linkage, a simple representation
is the global magnetic reluctance of the circuit.

\[ L = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{L(x)}{2} i^2 \right) \]  

where \( L \) is the inductance of the system.

2) Fluidic System: The fluid flow within the microvalve is
usually described by the orifice equation. Nevertheless,
such an equation is not appropriate to simulate correctly the
transient behavior rapidly occurring during the microvalve
actuation. For this reason, a novel approach has been deve-
loped to include the unsteady characterization of the fluid flow.
Assuming the flow occurring between two infinite parallel
plates, as shown in Fig. 6 by the section highlighted in blue,
the Navier–Stokes equations can be rearranged to obtain the
following equation describing the time derivative of the flow
bulk velocity:

\[ \dot{u} = -\frac{12\mu}{\rho h^2} u + \frac{\Delta p}{\rho L_p} \]  

where \( u \) is the velocity of the fluid, \( \mu \) is the dynamic vis-
cosity of the fluid, \( h \) is the height of the section, and \( L_p \) is
the length of the section. The flow is considered incompressible,
isothermal, and unidirectional. It is important to note that
the pressure drop is that of the parallel plates region, hence
different from the pressure drop across the microvalve. The
pressure loss can be calculated by geometrical considerations
using a numerical analysis or by the discharge coefficient of
the real hardware.

The outlet volumetric flow rate \( Q \), and hence the mass flow
rate, can be calculated from the outlet velocity \( u \) and area \( A_{out} \)
which is a function of \( x \)

\[ Q = u A_{out}(x). \]  

The inlet fluid flow is deviated by the plunger toward
the outlet aperture; in turn, the fluid flow exerts a load on
the plunger itself. The fluid force can be described using the
momentum conservation of the Reynolds transport theorem

\[ F_{f,pl} = \rho in A_{in} + \rho u^2 A_{in} - \rho P(x)(x + L_0) \]  

where \( F_{f,pl} \) is the fluid force on the plunger, \( \rho in \) is the
inlet pressure, \( A_{in} \) is the inlet area, and \( L_0 \) is the minimum
height of the control volume. The first two terms represent
the steady-state load, whereas the third term is linked to the
transient load; nevertheless, simulations have shown that its
influence is negligible.

3) Mechanical System: The motion of the plunger is driven
by several external loads. The main contribution is certainly
given by the electromagnetic force in (29). Its dynamics can
be described by Newton’s second law as follows:

\[ M \ddot{x} + c \dot{x} + k(x - x_0) = F_{mag} + F_{f,pl} - \rho out A_{in} \]  

where \( M \) is the mass of the plunger, \( c \) is the viscous coefficient,
\( k \) is the elastic constant of the spring, and \( x_0 \) is the spring
preload.
4) State-Space Model: Based on the equations developed in Sections II-C1–II-C3, the state-space model can be expressed using the plunger position $x = x_1$, the plunger velocity $v = x_2$, the electric current $i = x_3$, and the fluid outlet velocity $u = x_4$ as state variables, and $y = \dot{m}_1$ the output of the system

$$\dot{x} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{M} \left[ \left(-cx_2 - k(x_1 - x_0) + F_{mag} + F_{f,pl} - p_{out}A_{in}\right) 
-L(x_1) \left(x_3 - x_2 \dot{L}(x_1)\right) \right] 
-\frac{12\mu}{\rho L} x_4 + \frac{\Delta\rho}{\rho L} 
\end{cases}$$

$$y = \rho x_4 A_{out}(x_1).$$

The presented state-space model fully describes the dynamics of the actuation of the solenoid-actuated microvalve.

D. Tank

The propellant tank is a pressurized tank containing a given fraction of liquid propellant, in our case water, with mass $m_l$. During operations, the propellant is ejected at a rate $\dot{m}_1$ and the pressurant gas, and in our case $N_2$, it expands lowering the pressure of the tank $p_t$. As the expansion is quasi-static, it can be considered an isothermal process. From the ideal gas law, the derivative of the pressure is calculated by the following equation, where $V_t$ is the tank volume:

$$\dot{p}_t = -\frac{\dot{m}_1}{V_t \rho \dot{p}_t - m_l}$$

III. MODEL ANALYSIS

A sensitivity analysis was performed in order to assess the impact of all the parameters in the response of the model. The performance parameters, such as thrust $F$ and specific impulse $I_{sp}$, are the basis for the analysis. Here, we focus on the parameters that cannot be tuned by design, e.g., the estimated parameters $\alpha_1$ and $\beta_1$, but instead, they depend on the operational range used or the experimental setup. Thus, as the propellant tank has been modeled using only an analytical expression to relate the mass flow rate and the pressure, it has not been covered by the sensitivity analysis, because its parameters are dependent on the specific design choices.

A. Sensitivity Analysis: Thruster

The parameters of the thruster model are shown in Table I. The sensitivity analysis has been carried out assessing all combinations of the maximum and minimum values for each parameter. These values are selected based on the boundaries defined for the model and the confidence intervals of the linearization. The outputs of the model for each set of parameters are compared to the reference outputs calculated with the reference values. The deviation of the output from the reference is the cost function of the analysis and the rank correlation values between the change in the output and the variable are given in Table II.

Below is the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Par.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Scale/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a_r$</td>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>$N$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_2$</td>
<td>Specific impulse</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>$R_c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_1$</td>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>$c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_2$</td>
<td>Specific impulse</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>$d_{so}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>$\dot{L}_p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>$L_p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>$g$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A$</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>$d_s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_9$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_7$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>$d_l$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$a$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see in Table II, the most influential parameter of the thruster model is $\beta_1$ as it has the largest correlation to the thrust and the specific impulse. The difference in the response of the model using the worst set of parameters, i.e., the ones that give the response with the largest difference to the reference response, is around 2.8% for specific impulse and 0.1% for thrust.

B. Sensitivity Analysis: Valve

An analysis similar to one of the thrusters has been done for the valve model using the parameters shown in Table I. A more detailed analysis can be found in [14] where an optimal set of parameters for the valve model has been identified comparing with experimental data. We use a range of $\pm 10\%$ around the values presented in that reference for each parameter in order to assess the influence on the mass flow rate (response of the model). All the combinations of the maximum and minimum values are used in the sensitivity analysis.
Table II shows the correlation between each parameter and the output of the valve model, i.e., the mass flow rate. For this model, the number of turns in the coil and the resistance are the most influential. The response in the worst case changes $0.02\%$.

### IV. SIMULATION SETUP

#### A. Spacecraft Parameters

The complete model of the micropropulsion system has been used in a simulation loop to control the attitude of a picosatellite. The satellite is a three units PocketQube consisting of three units of $5 \times 5 \times 5$ cm with a mass of 0.5 kg. Considering the mass equally distributed in all dimensions, the components of the inertia matrix around the principal axis of the spacecraft are $I_1 = 1.0 \times 10^{-3}$ kg m$^2$, $I_2 = 1.0 \times 10^{-3}$ kg m$^2$, and $I_3 = 2.083 \times 10^{-4}$ kg m$^2$. The maximum thrust provided by each thruster is defined as 1.25 mN. A complete list of the parameters used in the simulations is given in Table III.

#### B. Controller Design

In order to control the attitude of the spacecraft, two controllers have been implemented in the simulation loop: one to calculate the torque $\hat{M}_{\text{ref}}$ necessary to execute the desired maneuver and one to control each thruster in order to produce the desired thrust $F$. The former also decides which of the four thrusters to use depending on the current and target attitude. A simple proportional–derivative control law is used to calculate $\hat{M}_{\text{ref}}$ [10]

$$\hat{M}_{\text{ref}} = k_p \hat{q}_e + k_r \hat{\omega} \tag{37}$$

where $k_p$ and $k_r$ are the gains of the controller in $x$, $y$, and $z$, and $\hat{q}_e$ is the vectorial part of the quaternion representing the error between the current and the target attitude defined as

$$\hat{q}_e = q^{-1} \otimes q_t$$

where $q_t$ represents the target attitude and $\otimes$ is the multiplication of two quaternions. Then, $\hat{M}_{\text{ref}}$ is used to calculate the thrust of each thruster, which is the reference input to the valve controller that actuates on the valve’s input voltage $v(t)$

$$v(t) = K_p e(t) + K_i \int_0^t e(\tau) d\tau \tag{38}$$

where $K_p$ and $K_i$ are the gains of the controller and $e(t)$ is the error defined as the difference between the target and the actual thrust. In order to simulate the behavior of the real system, the voltage is converted into a pulsewidth modulation input with frequency $f_{\text{PWM}}$ and amplitude $V$.

### V. SIMULATION RESULTS

The models were implemented in Simulink/MATLAB and tested in a case with four thrusters used to control the attitude of a picosatellite. The controllers were empirically tuned with the gains $k_p = [1 \ 3 \ 3] \times 10^{-4}$ and $k_r = [5 \ 15 \ 15] \times 10^{-4}$ for the spacecraft controller and $K_p = 200$ and $K_i = 9500$ for the valve controllers. These gains have been selected based on the desired response time, less than 0.1 s for the valves and 20 s for the spacecraft, and on the maximum allowed overshoot of less than 20% for the valves and no overshoot for the spacecraft.

The test is divided into two parts during the time of the simulation. In the first part, before 180 s, a sequence of thrust commands is sent to all the thrusters in order to assess the thrust level control. Then, after 180 s, a sequence of attitude commands is sent to the controller that calculates the necessary thrust for each of the thrusters to perform the maneuver.

Fig. 7 shows the thrust generated by all the thrusters (top), total specific impulse (middle), and mass of propellant left in the tank (bottom). The attitude control starts after 180 s.

$q_e = q^{-1} \otimes q_t$, where $q_t$ represents the target attitude and $\otimes$ is the multiplication of two quaternions.
provided thrust is lower than the required maximum thrust $F = 1.25$ mN.

VI. CONCLUSION

This brief presented a comprehensive modeling approach for micropropulsion systems using VLMs. The model developed comprises all relevant elements of microresistojets and the necessary equations to simulate the dynamics of such system. The resulting model is hybrid comprising fundamental laws of physics as well as empirical relations. Some parts of the model are derived from the well-known relations, such as the ideal gas law, and some others are empirically derived from an extensive experimental campaign done with test models of the real propulsion system. The models of the thruster, the valve, and the tank have been tuned to work within the boundaries usually considered for miniaturized spacecraft, e.g., CubeSats and PocketQubes, in terms of operational parameters, such as pressure and temperature. However, these boundaries can be changed in order to adapt and extend the model to other applications with different sets of requirements.

The model has been successfully applied in a simulation loop demonstrating the attitude control of a picosatellite using an array of four thrusters. The model can be applied in other types of simulation that need a precise description of the system dynamics, including the optimization of the propulsion system’s parameters and the thruster’s parameters.

All the empirical parts of the model are sufficient for the type of analysis presented here. However, a more accurate model might be achieved by using theoretical relations empirically adjusted to the conditions of the test. For example, a discharge coefficient can be applied to the nozzle model in order to account for losses. A more sophisticated vaporization model might be used to replace the volumetric change of the gas. However, as most of the models found in the literature are empirical relations derived for specific cases depending on the two-phase flow regime, a more detailed empirical model for the flow inside a resistojet might be a good choice. The gas volume model might be improved with the use of a more sophisticated test setup, including high-speed cameras to capture the motion of the fluid more precisely.

Future work will be focused on the extension of the modeling to address the points mentioned and to improve the accuracy of the model by considering a broader range of operational parameters. The comparison of the model with experimental data might further improve the validation of model which has been done only numerically. A more advanced application scenario will also be considered in order to investigate other characteristics of thrust control in micropropulsion applications.
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