

AD-A059 853

ARMY ARMAMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND ABERD--ETC F/G 19/5
SOME BOUNDS FOR OPTIMAL MANEUVERS AND PREDICTORS.(U)
SEP 78 H L REED

UNCLASSIFIED

ARBRL-TR-02101

SBIE-AD-E430 111

NL

| OF |

AD
A059853



END
DATE
FILMED
12-78

DDC

AD A0 59853

DDC FILE COPY

12
NW
LEVEL III
AD-E430111

TECHNICAL REPORT ARBRL-TR-02101

SOME BOUNDS FOR OPTIMAL
MANEUVERS AND PREDICTORS

Harry L. Reed, Jr.

September 1978

DDC
RECEIVED
OCT 16 1978
B



US ARMY ARMAMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND
BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

78 09 20 009

Destroy this report when it is no longer needed.
Do not return it to the originator.

Secondary distribution of this report by originating
or sponsoring activity is prohibited.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained
from the National Technical Information Service,
U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia
22161.

The findings in this report are not to be construed as
an official Department of the Army position, unless
so designated by other authorized documents.

*The use of trade names or manufacturers' names in this report
does not constitute indorsement of any commercial product.*

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER TECHNICAL REPORT, ARBRL-TR-02101	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) SOME BOUNDS FOR OPTIMAL MANEUVERS AND PREDICTORS.	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED	
7. AUTHOR(s) Harry L. Reed, Jr.	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory (ATTN: DRDAR-BLB) Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS US Army Armament Research & Development Command US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory (ATTN: DRDAR-BL) Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS RDTE Project 1L162618AH80	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	12. REPORT DATE SEPTEMBER 1978	
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 33	
	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED	
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Fire Control Predictors Optimum Maneuvers Hit Probability		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) (kst/emj) A problem of some interest in the understanding of fire control systems is the following pure prediction problem. Given the class of target trajectories \bar{X} for which $\lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2B} \int_{-B}^B [\ddot{x}(t)]^2 dt = a^2 \quad \text{where } x \in \bar{X}$ and the class of predictors P which satisfy the causal principle, find		

DD FORM 1473 1 JAN 73 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

393 471

LB

$$\varepsilon_1 = \sup_{x \in \bar{X}} \inf_{p \in P} \varepsilon$$

and

$$\varepsilon_2 = \inf_{p \in P} \sup_{x \in \bar{X}} \varepsilon$$

where

$$\varepsilon_2 = \frac{1}{2B} \int_{-B}^B [x(t+T) - y(t+T)]^2 dt$$

and $y(t+T)$ is the predicted value of $x(t+T)$ based on values of $x(t-\tau)$ with $\tau \geq 0$.

It is shown that $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2$

for general N . For the particular value of $N=2$ which corresponds to a limited acceleration for the target, we have

$$\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \frac{2}{(\lambda T)^2} [\frac{1}{2} a T^2] \cong 0.569 [\frac{1}{2} a T^2]$$

where λ is determined from the solution of an eigenvalue problem for a fourth-order differential equation.

The prediction algorithm p_α for which

$$\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon(x_\alpha, p_\alpha)$$

is a linear operator and the optimal subclass of maneuvers x_α is based on a second-order correlation function

$$E[\ddot{x}(t)\ddot{x}(t+\tau)] = \int_0^\infty \alpha(s)\alpha(s+\tau) ds.$$

For the particular case of $N=2$ we have

$$\alpha(s) = \frac{a}{\sqrt{T}} \left[\frac{\cosh \lambda(s - T/2)}{\cosh(\lambda T/2)} - \frac{\sin \lambda(s - T/2)}{\sin \lambda T/2} \right]$$

for

$$0 \leq s \leq T$$

and

$$\alpha(s) = 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

No restrictions were placed on \bar{X} and P other than those stated above (i.e., \bar{X} was not restricted to stationary processes and P was not restricted to linear operators).

It is further shown that the strategies given above are good approximations for the more general analysis in which hit probability is the performance measure. This is the case at least for "first cut" analyses.

Bounds such as this help avoid the expenditure of resources to achieve the impossible or to achieve marginally small improvements in fire control design.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 5

2. LOWER BOUND 7

3. UPPER BOUND 10

4. THE EIGENVALUE PROBLEM 14

5. THE GENERAL PROBLEM 17

6. THE ALGORITHM p_0 18

7. CONCLUSIONS 20

APPENDIX A 21

APPENDIX B 23

APPENDIX C 27

DISTRIBUTION LIST 31

ACCESSION for		
NTIS	White Section	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC	Buff Section	<input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED		<input type="checkbox"/>
JUSTIFICATION		
BY		
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES		
Dist.	AVAIL. and/or	SPECIAL
A		

1. INTRODUCTION

The goal of this paper is to give some insights into how well a fire control system can be expected to perform with noiseless information and how well a target can avoid being hit with limits on its ability to maneuver. Such a goal is very ambitious, so we shall make three simplifying assumptions:

- The tracking data are noiseless. This gives an advantage to the gun (see Reference 1) but is not too significant since optical and millimeter radar systems promise very accurate tracking and also since in many cases the errors from evasive maneuvers far exceed errors resulting from errors in state estimation.

- The target is limited only in the r.m.s. value of the N^{th} derivative of its path. That is, the class of maneuvers \bar{X}_N is limited to those $x(t)$ for which

$$C_N^2 = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2R} \int_{-R}^R [x^{(N)}(t)]^2 dt. \quad 1.1$$

The performance of the fire control is characterized by the r.m.s. prediction error

$$\epsilon^2(x, p) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2R} \int_{-R}^R [\hat{x}(t+T, p) - x(t+T)]^2 dt \quad 1.2$$

where T is the time of flight of the bullet, $p \in P$, P is the class of prediction algorithm such that \hat{x} is the predicted value of $x(t+T)$ given all data on $x(t-s)$ for $s \geq 0$.

The last two assumptions are the closest concession we make to stationarity. The reason for averaging over time in Equation 1.2 is to provide a measure that does not encourage the target to make a one-time maneuver at the time of firing a single round but rather forces the target to avoid rounds fired at unknown times or to avoid bursts of rounds fired over time.

¹Harry L. Reed, Jr., "Some Bounds on the Generalized Fire Control Problem," Ballistic Research Laboratories Report No. 1946, November 1976 (AD A033043).

Finally, the use of an r.m.s. error gives an incomplete measure of effectiveness for maneuvers with statistics that do not allow an adequate measure of probability of hit from the r.m.s. error (see, for example, Reference 2). However, for optimal maneuvers, the r.m.s. error is a fairly good measure (see Section 5).

We shall omit the subscript N unless its particular value is important. The following is our overall strategy:

$$\text{Let } \epsilon_0 = \sup_{x \in \bar{X}} \inf_{p \in P} \epsilon(x,p) \quad 1.3$$

$$\epsilon^0 = \inf_{p \in P} \sup_{x \in \bar{X}} \epsilon(x,p) \quad 1.4$$

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_0 = \epsilon(x_0, p_0) = \sup_{x \in \bar{X}_G} \inf_{p \in P} \epsilon(x,p) \quad 1.5$$

$$\tilde{\epsilon}^0 = \sup_{x \in \bar{X}} \epsilon(x, p_0) \quad 1.6$$

where \bar{X}_G is the class of stationary Gaussian maneuvers that satisfy Equation 1.1 and also satisfy

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\log |\phi(w)||}{1+w^2} dw < \infty \quad 1.7$$

where $\phi(w)$ is the power spectral density of the Nth derivative.

Since $\bar{X}_G \subset \bar{X}$ and $p_0 \in P$, we have

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_0 \leq \epsilon_0 \leq \epsilon^0 \leq \tilde{\epsilon}^0 \quad 1.8$$

The argument that gives the middle inequality is a consequence of the properties of sup and of inf, is common knowledge in game theory, and is given in Appendix 1 for the benefit of the uninitiated.

We shall show that

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_0 = \tilde{\epsilon}^0 \quad 1.9$$

and thus that

$$\epsilon_0 = \epsilon^0. \quad 1.10$$

²Harry L. Reed, Jr., "Limitations of the R.M.S. Criterion for Fire Control," Ballistic Research Laboratories Report No. 1805, July 1975 (AD A014986).

We shall also evaluate ϵ_0 for $N = 0, 1,$ and 2 and show how to evaluate it for higher values of N .

Equation 1.10 implies that in a game between two "smart" players, x_0 and p_0 are optimal strategies.

2. LOWER BOUND

For Gaussian maneuvers the optimal predictors are linear operators of the form (see Reference 3)

$$\hat{x}(t+T, p_h) = \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} x^{(m)}(t) \frac{T^m}{m!} + \int_0^\infty h(s) x^{(N)}(t-s) ds \quad 2.1$$

Integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned} x(t+T) - \hat{x}(t+T, p_h) &= \int_0^\infty u_N(T-s) x^{(N)}(t+s) ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^\infty h(s) x^{(N)'}(t-s) ds \end{aligned} \quad 2.2$$

where

$$u_0(t) = \delta(t) \quad 2.3$$

and for $N > 0$

$$u_N(t) = \frac{t^{N-1}}{(N-1)!} \quad \text{for } t \geq 0 \quad 2.4$$

$$= 0 \quad \text{for } t < 0. \quad 2.5$$

Again we shall use

$$f(t) \text{ for } u_N(T-t)$$

and

$$a(t) \text{ for } x^{(N)}(t)$$

unless the particular value of N is important to the argument at hand.

³Norbert Wiener, *Extrapolation, Interpolation, and Smoothing of Stationary Time Series*, The Technology Press of M.I.T. and John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.

Let

$$\phi(s) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2R} \int_{-R}^R a(t)a(t+s)dt. \quad 2.6$$

Equations 1.1 and 1.7 allow us to write

$$\phi(s) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha(t)\alpha(t+s)dt \quad 2.7$$

where

$$\alpha(t) = 0 \quad t < 0 \quad 2.8$$

and of course

$$C^2 = \int_0^{\infty} [\alpha(t)]^2 dt. \quad 2.9$$

Using

$$\phi(r-s) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha(t+r)\alpha(t+s)dt \quad 2.10$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha(t-r)\alpha(t-s)dt \quad 2.11$$

and

$$\phi(r+s) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha(t-r)\alpha(t+s)dt, \quad 2.12$$

we can combine Equation 1.2 and 2.2 to write

$$\varepsilon^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \left\{ \int_0^{\infty} [f(s)\alpha(t+s) - h(s)\alpha(t-s)] ds \right\}^2 \quad 2.13$$

$$= \int_0^{\infty} dt \left\{ \int_0^{\infty} [f(s)\alpha(t+s) - h(s)\alpha(t-s)] ds \right\}^2 \\ + \int_{-\infty}^0 dt \left\{ \int_0^{\infty} f(s)\alpha(t+s) ds \right\}^2. \quad 2.14$$

To minimize with respect to p , we pick h to satisfy

$$\int_0^{\infty} f(s)\alpha(t+s)ds = \int_0^{\infty} h(s)\alpha(t-s)ds \quad 2.15$$

which puts the first term of the function in Equation 2.14 equal to zero.

To maximize with respect to x , we then pick α to maximize

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^2 &= \int_{-\infty}^0 dt \left\{ \int_0^{\infty} f(s)\alpha(t+s)ds \right\}^2 \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} dt \left\{ \int_0^{\infty} f(s)\alpha(s-t)ds \right\}^2 \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} dt \left\{ \int_0^{\infty} f(s+t)\alpha(s)ds \right\}^2 . \end{aligned} \quad 2.16$$

To do this, we set

$$\delta\epsilon^2 = 2 \int_0^{\infty} dt \int_0^{\infty} f(s+t)\alpha(s)ds \int_0^{\infty} f(r+t)\delta\alpha(r)dr = 0 \quad 2.17$$

subject to

$$\int_0^{\infty} \alpha(r) \delta\alpha(r) = 0. \quad 2.18$$

Therefore

$$\alpha(r) = k \int_0^{\infty} dt \int_0^{\infty} f(r+t) f(s+t)\alpha(s)ds. \quad 2.19$$

Multiplying Equation 2.19 by $\alpha(r)$ and integrating, we have

$$\epsilon^2 = \frac{C^2}{k} \quad 2.20$$

which shows that $k \geq 0$. Further

$$\epsilon_0^2 = \frac{C^2}{k_0}$$

where k_0 is the least eigenvalue of Equations 2.9 and 2.19.

In Section 4 we show how this eigenvalue problem is related to an eigenvalue problem for a system of differential equations and we evaluate k_0 for $N = 0, 1, \text{ and } 2$.

3. UPPER BOUND

Even though the class \bar{X} is only constrained by

$$C^2 = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2R} \int_{-R}^R [a(t)]^2 dt$$

we can define

$$\phi(s) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2R} \int_{-R}^R a(t)a(t+s) dt \quad 3.1$$

and know that

$$\phi(w) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(s) e^{-iws} ds \geq 0. \quad 3.2$$

Now we shall use the predictor which was defined in the previous section by Equation 2.15 for the particular $\alpha(r)$ given in Equation 2.19. Then Equations 1.7, 2.2, and 3.1 give (for any x)

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^2(x, p_0) = \int_0^{\infty} dr \int_0^{\infty} ds \left\{ \begin{aligned} & f(s)f(r)\phi(r-s) \\ & - 2 f(s)h(r)\phi(r+s) \\ & + h(r)h(s)\phi(r-s) \end{aligned} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad 3.3$$

Using

$$\phi(r) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(w) e^{iwr} dw, \quad 3.4$$

we can derive

$$\epsilon^2(x, p_0) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} | \bar{F}(w) - H(w) |^2 \phi(w) dw \quad 3.5$$

where

$$H(w) = \int_0^{\infty} h(t)e^{-iwt} dt \quad 3.6$$

and

$$F(w) = \int_0^{\infty} f(t)e^{-iwt} dt \quad 3.7$$

We shall show that

$$|\bar{F}(w) - H(w)|^2 = \frac{1}{k_0} \quad 3.8$$

and thus that

$$\varepsilon^2(x, p_0) = \frac{1}{k_0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(w) dw = \frac{C^2}{k_0} \quad 3.9$$

for all $x \in \bar{X}$.

To do that, we first take the Fourier transform of Equation 2.15 to get

$$\int_0^{\infty} e^{-iwt} dt \int_0^{\infty} f(s)\alpha(t+s) ds = H(w)A(w) \quad 3.10$$

where

$$A(w) = \int_0^{\infty} \alpha(t)e^{-iwt} dt \quad 3.11$$

Some manipulation of the left hand side of Equation 3.10 gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{\infty} e^{-iwt} dt \int_0^{\infty} f(s)\alpha(t+s) ds \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-iwt} dt \int_0^{\infty} f(s)\alpha(t+s) ds - \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{-iwt} dt \int_0^{\infty} f(s)\alpha(t+s) ds \\ &= \bar{F}(w)A(w) - \int_0^{\infty} e^{iwt} \int_0^{\infty} f(s)\alpha(s-t) ds \\ &= \bar{F}(w)A(w) - \int_0^{\infty} e^{iwt} \int_0^{\infty} f(t+r)\alpha(r) dr \end{aligned} \quad 3.12$$

Therefore

$$|\overline{F}(w) - H(w)|^2 = |B(w)/A(w)|^2 \quad 3.13$$

where

$$B(w) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{iwt} \beta(t) dt \quad 3.14$$

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(t) &= \int_0^{\infty} f(t+r)\alpha(r) r dt \quad t \geq 0 \\ &= 0 \quad t < 0 \end{aligned} \quad 3.15$$

We then have

$$|B(w)|^2 = B(w)\overline{B}(w) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{iwp} dp \int_0^{\infty} \beta(q)\beta(p+q) dq \quad 3.16$$

Note that this convolution is an even function of p so that

$$|B(w)|^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{iwp} dp \int_0^{\infty} \beta(q)\beta(|p|+q) dq \quad 3.17$$

Now using Equation 2.19, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\infty} \beta(q)\beta(|p|+q) dq &= \int_0^{\infty} dq \int_0^{\infty} f(q+r)\alpha(r) dr \\ &\quad \times \int_0^{\infty} f(q+|p|+s)\alpha(s) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{k_0} \int_0^{\infty} \alpha(|p|+s)\alpha(s) ds \end{aligned} \quad 3.18$$

and finally

$$\begin{aligned}
 |B(w)\bar{B}(w)| &= \frac{1}{k_0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{iwp} dp \int_0^{\infty} \alpha(|p|+s)\alpha(s) ds \\
 &= \frac{1}{k_0} |A(w)\bar{A}(w)|
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.19}$$

and we have from Equation 3.13 and 3.5 that

$$\epsilon^2(x, p_0) = \frac{C^2}{k_0}$$

as advertised in Equation 3.9.

Another approach to Equation 3.8 is to show that

$$B(w) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k_0}} \bar{A}(w) \tag{3.20}$$

which can be shown by showing that

$$\beta(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k_0}} \alpha(t). \tag{3.21}$$

To do this, we combine Equation 2.19 and 3.15 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \beta(t) &= \int_0^{\infty} f(t+r) dr \int_0^{\infty} k_0 dq \int_0^{\infty} f(r+q) f(s+q) \alpha(s) ds \\
 &= k_0 \int_0^{\infty} f(t+r) dr \int_0^{\infty} f(r+q) \beta(q) dq
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.22}$$

Thus $\beta(t)$ satisfies the same integral equation as $\alpha(t)$. In the next section we relate this integral equation to the eigenvalue problem for a differential equation. This eigenvalue problem has only one linearly independent solution (see Appendix 2) and so we can write

$$\beta(t) = \gamma \alpha(t) \tag{3.23}$$

Then

$$\int_0^{\infty} [\beta(t)]^2 dt = \gamma^2 \int_0^{\infty} [\alpha(t)]^2 dt \quad 3.24$$

which gives

$$\int_0^{\infty} \left\{ \int_0^{\infty} f(t+r)\alpha(r) dr \right\}^2 dt = \gamma^2 \int_0^{\infty} [\alpha(t)]^2 dt \quad 3.25$$

using the definition of $\beta(t)$ and which can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\infty} \alpha(r) dr \int_0^{\infty} f(t+r) dt \int_0^{\infty} f(t+s)\alpha(s) ds \\ = \gamma^2 \int_0^{\infty} [\alpha(t)]^2 dt \end{aligned} \quad 3.26$$

and finally (from Equation 2.19)

$$\frac{1}{k_0} \int_0^{\infty} [\alpha(r)]^2 dr = \gamma^2 \int_0^{\infty} [\alpha(t)]^2 dt \quad 3.27$$

which gives

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k_0}} \quad 3.28$$

4. THE EIGENVALUE PROBLEM

We have

$$\int_0^{\infty} \alpha^2(r) = C^2 \quad 4.1$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(r) &= k_0 \int_0^{\infty} dt \int_0^{\infty} u(T-r-t)u(T-s-t)\alpha(s) ds \\ &= k_0 \int_0^{T-r} dt \int_0^{T-t} \frac{(T-r-t)^{N-1}}{(N-1)!} \frac{(T-s-t)^{N-1}}{(N-1)!} \alpha(s) ds \end{aligned} \quad 4.2$$

for $r \leq T$.

We also have $k_0 > 0$, and k_0 is the least eigenvalue of this system of equations.

If $r > T$

$$u(T-r-t) = 0 \quad \text{since } t \geq 0$$

and thus

$$\alpha(r) = 0 \quad \text{for } r > T \quad 4.3$$

If $N = 0$

$$u(r) = \delta(r)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(r) &= k_0 \int_0^\infty dt \int_0^\infty \delta(T-r-t) \delta(T-s-t) \alpha(s) ds \\ &= k_0 \alpha(r) \end{aligned}$$

So for $N = 0$

$$k_0 = 1 \quad 4.4$$

and

$$\varepsilon_0 = C \quad 4.5$$

Let $N \geq 1$. We can differentiate Equation 4.2 to get for $0 \leq t \leq T$

$$\alpha^{(2N)} = (-1)^N k_0 \alpha \quad 4.6$$

$$\alpha^{(M)}(T) = 0 \quad \text{for } M=0 \text{ to } N-1 \quad 4.7$$

$$\alpha^{(M)}(0) = 0 \quad \text{for } M=N \text{ to } 2N-1 \quad 4.8$$

The uniqueness of the solution to this system of equations is shown in Appendix 2.

Now let $N=1$

$$\ddot{\alpha} = -k_0 \alpha$$

$$\dot{\alpha}(0) = \alpha(T) = 0$$

$$\alpha = \sqrt{2/T} C \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2T} t\right) \quad 4.9$$

$$k_0 = \left(\frac{\pi}{2T}\right)^2 \quad 4.10$$

$$\varepsilon_0 = \frac{2}{\pi} CT \quad 4.11$$

Finally let $N = 2$

$$\ddot{\alpha} = k_0 \alpha$$

$$\ddot{\alpha}(0) = \ddot{\alpha}(0) = \dot{\alpha}(T) = \alpha(T) = 0$$

(The classical problem of the vibration of a clamped rod.)

Letting $k_0 = \lambda_0^4$, we have

$$1 + \cosh(\lambda_0 T) \cos(\lambda_0 T) = 0 \quad 4.12$$

$$\lambda_0 T \cong 1.875$$

$$\alpha = \frac{C}{\sqrt{T}} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\cosh[\lambda_0(t-T/2)]}{\cosh[\lambda_0 T/2]} \\ - \frac{\sin[\lambda_0(t-T/2)]}{\sin[\lambda_0 T/2]} \end{array} \right\} \quad 4.13$$

$$\varepsilon_0 = \frac{2}{(\lambda_0 T)^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} CT^2\right) \quad 4.14$$

$$\cong .569 \left(\frac{1}{2} CT^2\right) \quad 4.15$$

5. THE GENERAL PROBLEM

In this section we shall see how far we can go using hit probability rather than the r.m.s. criterion. In doing this, we shall have to give up the neatness of finding an exact answer. On the other hand, we shall find bounds on the problem, and these bounds will be shown to bracket the problem closely enough for many "first analyses."

Let us discuss the problem where $x(t)$ has a single spatial dimension. Associated with a class of maneuvers is a probability distribution function

$$u\{x(t+T) - \hat{x}(t+T, p) \mid x(t-s), s \geq 0\}. \quad 5.1$$

That is, u is the distribution of the error between the future position and the predicted future position given the past. Let y be this error in future position. We can average over time to find a distribution function

$$u(y \mid x, p). \quad 5.2$$

The probability of hit q is

$$q(x, p) = \int_{-\ell/2}^{\ell/2} du(\xi \mid x, p), \quad 5.3$$

where ℓ is the size of the target. The pilot wishes to keep q small. His goal might be

$$q^0 = \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{p \in P} q(x, p). \quad 5.4$$

Likewise, the gunner might try for

$$q_0 = \sup_{p \in P} \inf_{x \in X} q(x, p). \quad 5.5$$

The set \bar{X} , the set P , the set X_G , the maneuver \bar{X}_0 , the prediction algorithm p_0 , and the error ε_0 are as defined in Section 1.

We can define

$$\tilde{q}^0 = \tilde{q}^0(\tilde{\varepsilon}_0/\ell) = q(x_0, p_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \tilde{\varepsilon}_0} \int_{-\ell/2}^{\ell/2} e^{-\xi^2/(2\tilde{\varepsilon}_0^2)} d\xi \quad 5.6$$

Since x_0 is Gaussian, p_0 maximizes the hit probability as well as it minimizes the error. Thus

$$q^0 \leq \tilde{q}^0. \quad 5.7$$

We can also define

$$\tilde{q}_0 = \inf_x q(x, \tilde{p}_0), \quad 5.8$$

where \tilde{p}_0 is a variant of the algorithm p_0 and will be described in Section 6.

As usual, we have

$$\tilde{q}_0 \leq q_0 \leq q^0 \leq \tilde{q}^0, \quad 5.9$$

but this time we have not been able to collapse this chain of inequalities. In fact we are only able to find a lower bound $z(\tilde{\epsilon}_0/\ell)$ such that

$$z \leq \tilde{q}_0 \leq q_0 \leq q^0 \leq \tilde{q}^0. \quad 5.10$$

Nevertheless, these bounds may well still be useful for first estimates since they provide a variation of no more than 70 percent. A tabulation of the lower bound z and the upper bound \tilde{q}^0 and their ratio is given in Table 1.

6. THE ALGORITHM \tilde{p}_0

Define the algorithm \tilde{p}_0 to be

$$\hat{x}(t+T, \tilde{p}_0) = y_0 + \hat{x}(t+T, p_0). \quad 6.1$$

Then

$$u(y | x, \tilde{p}_0) = u(y - y_0 | x, p_0). \quad 6.2$$

The value y_0 is the value that maximizes

$$q(y_0, x, p_0) = \int_{y=-\ell/2}^{y=\ell/2} du(y - y_0 | x, p_0) \quad 6.3$$

From Appendix C we have

Table 1

$z(\epsilon)$	ϵ	$\tilde{q}^0(\epsilon)$	\tilde{q}^0/z
.00	∞	.000	1.382
.05	5.557	.072	1.434
.10	2.669	.149	1.486
.15	1.721	.229	1.524
.20	1.225	.317	1.585
.25	.935	.407	1.628
.30	.775	.481	1.605
.35	.622	.578	1.652
.40	.548	.639	1.597
.45	.461	.722	1.604
.50	.354	.843	1.685
.55	.335	.864	1.571
.60	.316	.886	1.477
.65	.296	.909	1.399
.70	.274	.932	1.332
.75	.250	.954	1.273
.80	.224	.975	1.218
.85	.194	.990	1.165
.90	.158	.998	1.109
.95	.112	1.000	1.053
1.00	.000	1.000	1.000

$$q(x, \tilde{p}_0) = \sup_{y_0} q(y_0, x, p_0) \geq z(\sigma/\ell) \geq z(\tilde{\epsilon}_0/\ell) \quad 6.4$$

where σ is the standard deviation around the mean. The last inequality follows since z is a monotonically decreasing function and since σ minimizes the r.m.s. error.

Since the middle inequality in Equation 6.4 holds for all x , we have

$$\tilde{q}_0 \geq z(\tilde{\epsilon}_0/\ell). \quad 6.5$$

7. CONCLUSIONS

With respect to the r.m.s. criterion and the r.m.s. bound on an N th derivative, the duel between a gunner and a target is a game with a saddle point which can be precisely defined and hence stable strategies exist for both players.

If hit probability is used as the criterion, we have been unable to define a saddle point precisely. However, we can find bounds that show that the difference between the performance for such a saddle point and the saddle point for the r.m.s. case may well be small enough to use the r.m.s. criterion as a good "first analysis."

APPENDIX A

First consider ϵ_0 . We note that for each $\delta \geq 0$ there exists an x_δ such that

$$\inf_p \epsilon(x_\delta, p) \geq \epsilon_0 - \delta$$

which follows from the definition of sup.

Thus

$$\epsilon(x_\delta, p) \geq \epsilon_0 - \delta$$

for all p which follows from the definition of inf.

Likewise, there exists a p_δ such that

$$\epsilon(x, p_\delta) \leq \epsilon^0 + \delta$$

for all x .

Thus

$$\epsilon_0 - \delta \leq f(x_\delta, p_\delta) \leq \epsilon^0 + \delta$$

for all δ and thus

$$\epsilon_0 \leq \epsilon^0.$$

APPENDIX B*

Statement of Problem.

Let $k > 0$ be such that the differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(2n)} &= (-1)^n kx \\ x^{(m)}(T) &= 0 \quad (m=0,1,\dots,n-1) \\ x^{(m)}(0) &= 0 \quad (m=n,n+1,\dots,2n-1) \end{aligned}$$

has a nontrivial solution. Prove that this solution is unique up to constant multiples.

Proof.

The proof consists in showing that for any two nontrivial solutions x and y the equality sign in Schwarz's inequality

$$\left(\int_0^T xy \, dt \right)^2 \leq \int_0^T x^2 dt \int_0^T y^2 dt$$

holds, which occurs if and only if $y = cx$, c a constant.

To this end, we note first that

$$\int_0^T xy \, dt = \frac{1}{k} \int_0^T x^{(n)} y^{(n)} dt. \quad (B-1)$$

This follows from

*The analysis in this appendix was provided by Mr. Walter O. Egerland of the Ballistic Modeling Division, Ballistic Research Laboratory.

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T xy \, dt &= \frac{(-1)^n}{k} \int_0^T x^{(2n)} y \, dt \\
&= \frac{(-1)^n}{k} \left\{ y x^{(2n-1)} \Big|_0^T - \int_0^T x^{(2n-1)} y' \, dt \right\} \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{k} \int_0^T x^{(2n-1)} y' \, dt \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{n+j}}{k} \int_0^T x^{(2n-j)} y^j \, dt, \quad j=1,2,\dots,n \quad (B-2)
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we write the identify

$$xy = x(0)y(0) + \int_0^t (x'y + xy') \, dt,$$

and find successively

$$\begin{aligned}
xy &= x(0)y(0) + \frac{(-1)^n}{k} \int_0^t (x'y^{(2n)} + y'x^{(2n)}) \, dt \\
&= x(0)y(0) + \frac{(-1)^n}{k} \left\{ y^{(2n-1)} x' + x^{(2n-1)} y' \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \int_0^t (y^{(2n-1)} x'' + x^{(2n-1)} y'') \, dt \right\} \\
&= \vdots \\
&= x(0)y(0) + \frac{(-1)^n}{k} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (-1)^{j+1} \left\{ y^{(2n-j)} x^j + x^{(2n-j)} y^j \right\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (-1)^{n+1} x^{(n)} y^{(n)} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Integration over the interval $[0, T]$, using (B-1) and (B-2), yields

$$\int_0^T xy \, dt = x(0)y(0)T - (2n-1) \int_0^T xy \, dt$$

or

$$\int_0^T xy \, dt = \frac{x(0)y(0)}{2n} T. \quad (\text{B-3})$$

In particular,

$$\int_0^T x^2 \, dt = \frac{x(0)^2}{2n} T$$

and

$$\int_0^T y^2 \, dt = \frac{y(0)^2}{2n} T.$$

Hence, equality in Schwarz's inequality holds, and the proof is complete.

APPENDIX C

Let $u(\xi)$ be any distribution function which we will take for convenience as having zero mean. Then

$$\sigma^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \xi^2 du(\xi). \quad (C-1)$$

We want to relate σ with

$$q = \sup_y \int_{y-\ell/2}^{y+\ell/2} du \quad (C-2)$$

It is convenient to find a function such that

$$\sigma \geq r(q). \quad (C-3)$$

This function is monotonically decreasing with q and thus we can use it to define

$$q \geq z(\sigma). \quad (C-4)$$

implicitly.

We can write

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^2 &= \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{m\ell/2}^{(m+1)\ell/2} \xi^2 du(\xi) \\ \sigma^2 &\geq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{m\ell}{2}\right)^2 \int_{m\ell/2}^{(m+1)\ell/2} du + \sum_{m=-\infty}^{-1} \left(\frac{m+1}{2}\right)^2 \int_{m\ell/2}^{(m+1)\ell/2} du \\ \sigma^2 &\geq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{m\ell}{2}\right)^2 \mu_m + \sum_{m=-\infty}^{-1} \left[\frac{(m+1)\ell}{2}\right]^2 \mu_m \end{aligned} \quad (C-5)$$

where

$$\mu_m = \int_{m\ell/2}^{(m+1)\ell/2} du \geq 0,$$

and

$$\mu_m + \mu_{m+1} \leq q$$

and

$$\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu_m = 1.$$

If we write

$$v_m = \mu_m + \mu_{(-1-m)},$$

we have

$$\sigma^2 \geq \Sigma = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{m\ell^2}{2} v_m, \quad (C-6)$$

where

$$0 \leq v_0 \leq q, \quad (C-7)$$

$$0 \leq v_m + v_{m+1} \leq 2q, \quad (C-8)$$

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} v_m = 1. \quad (C-9)$$

It is not hard to show that we have a lower bound for Σ defined in Equation C-6 if we let

$$v_m = q \quad \text{for } m=0, M-1, \quad (C-10)$$

$$v_M = 1 - Mq, \quad (C-11)$$

$$v_m = 0 \quad \text{for } m > M, \quad (C-12)$$

where

$$M = \text{greatest integer } [1/q]. \quad (C-13)$$

The proof of this goes as follows:

- (i) If $v_0 = q$, go to step (iv)
- (ii) If $v_0 < q$ and $v_0 + v_1 = b \geq q$, put $v_0 = q$ and $v_1 = b - q$. This will decrease Σ . Then go to step (iv).

(iii) If $v_0 + v_1 = b < q$, put $v_0 = b$, $v_1 = 0$ and reduce and other v_m 's to make $v_0 = q$. This again will decrease Σ . Then go to step (iv).

(iv) Now work on v_1 and v_2 as we worked on v_0 and v_1 .

(v) Continue on with v_2 and v_3 , etc.

We then have

$$\sigma^2/\ell^2 \geq \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \frac{m^2 q}{4} + \frac{M^2}{4} [1 - Mq], \quad (C-14)$$

which we can write in closed form as

$$\sigma^2/\ell^2 = r(q) = \frac{(M-1)M(2M-1)}{24} q + \frac{M^2}{4} [1 - Mq]. \quad (C-15)$$

We now need only show that this function is monotonically decreasing for $0 < q \leq 1$, and we have implicitly defined $z(\sigma)$.

First let $q = \frac{1}{M}$. Then

$$r(q) = \frac{(M-1)(2M-1)}{24}$$

which increases as q decreases.

We can write Equation C-14 as

$$r(q) = \frac{M^2}{4} + qM \left[\frac{-4M^2 - 3M + 1}{24} \right] \quad (C-16)$$

For $\frac{1}{M+1} < q \leq \frac{1}{M}$, M is fixed in Equation C-16 and $r(q)$ varies only as a constant times q . Since

$$-4M^2 - 3M + 1 < 0 \quad \text{for } q \leq 1,$$

we have that $r(q)$ increases as q decreases from $\frac{1}{M}$ to $\frac{1}{M+1}$.

We should point out that $r(\cdot)$ is not actually achievable by a $u(\cdot)$. In particular, there is a jump of q at zero and a jump of $q/2$ at $\ell/2$ so the interval $(-\ell/4, 3\ell/4)$ would have measure $3q/2$. Thus z is only a lower bound.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
12	Commander Defense Documentation Center ATTN: DDC-TCA Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314	1	Director US Army Air Mobility Research and Development Laboratory Ames Research Center Moffett Field, CA 94035
1	Office of Director of Defense Research & Engineering Research and Advanced Technology ATTN: Mr. L. R. Weisberg Assistant Director Elec & Phy Sci Washington, DC 20301	1	Commander US Army Electronics Research and Development Command Technical Support Activity ATTN: DELSD-L Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703
1	Office of Director of Defense Research & Engineering Engineering Technology ATTN: Mr. Ray Thorkildsen Staff Assistant for Ordnance Technology Washington, DC 20301	1	Commander US Army Communications Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDCO-SGS Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703
1	Director Institute for Defense Analysis ATTN: Dr. J. Ross 400 Army Navy Drive Arlington, VA 22202	1	Commander US Army Missile Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDMI-R Redstone Arsenal, AL 35809
1	Commander US Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command ATTN: DRCDMD-ST, N. Klein 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333	1	Commander US Army Missile Materiel Readiness Command ATTN: DRSMI-AOM Redstone Arsenal, AL 35809
4	Commander US Army Aviation Research and Development Command ATTN: DRSAV-E DRCPM-AAH DRCPM-ASE DRCPM-CO 12th and Spruce Streets St. Louis, MO 63166	1	Commander US Army Tank Automotive Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDTA-UL Warren, MI 48090
		5	Commander US Army Armament Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDAR-TSS (2 cys) DRDAR-TD, Dr. R. Weigle DRDAR-TDS, Mr. V. Lindner DRDAR-SCF Dover, NJ 07801

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Commander US Army Armament Materiel Readiness Command ATTN: DRSAR-LEP-L, Tech Lib Rock Island, IL 61299	1	Deputy Under Secretary of the Army (Operations Research) Washington, DC 20310
2	Commander White Sands Missile Range ATTN: STEWS-TE-ML STEWS-NR-PA White Sands, NM 88002	1	Commandant US Military Academy ATTN: COL John L. Palmer Dept. of Engineering West Point, NY 10996
1	Commander US Army Training and Doctrine Command ATTN: ATCD-FT Fort Monroe, VA 23651	1	Commander Naval Ordnance Systems Command Washington, DC 20360
1	Director US Army TRADOC Systems Analysis Activity ATTN: ATAA-SL, Tech Lib White Sands Missile Range NM 88002	1	Commander Office of Naval Research ATTN: Mr. S. M. Selig 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217
1	Commander US Army Aviation Center ATTN: ATZK-D-MT Fort Rucker, AL 36360	1	Director Special Projects Office Department of the Navy Washington, DC 20360
1	Commander US Army Combined Arms Combat Developments Activity ATTN: ATCACC-CA Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027	1	Commander Naval Weapons Center ATTN: Code 753 China Lake, CA 93557
1	Commander MASSTER ATTN: ATMAS-OEP-Q Fort Hood, TX 76544	1	AF/XOOPA Washington, DC 20330
1	Commander Operational Test and Evaluation Agency ATTN: FDTE-PO-OB 5600 Columbia Pike Falls Church, VA 22041	1	AF/SAV Washington, DC 20330
		1	AFSC (DOVS) Andrews AFB Washington, DC 20331
		1	TAWC/OA (Mr. J. Durrenberger) Eglin AFB, FL 32542
		1	AFWL (SA) Kirtland AFB, NM 87117

2

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	United States Air Force Academy Department of Astronautics and Computer Science ATTN: DFACS/LTC E. J. Bauman Colorado 80840
1	Martin Marietta ATTN: Dr. Joseph Sternberg 6801 Rockledge Drive Bethesda, MD 20034

Aberdeen Proving Ground

Dir, USAMSAA
ATTN: Dr. J. Sperrazza
Mr. D. O'Neill
Mr. H. Burke

Cdr, USATECOM
ATTN: DRSTE-SG-H
DRSTE-SE
DRSTE-SY, J. Marley
DRSTE-AD

Dir, USAMTD
ATTN: STEAP-MT-M