HIGH SCHOOL EDITION
Journal of Student Research

Volume 14 Issue 1 (2025)

Optimizing Thermal Control Systems in Space Craft Using Machine Learning Algorithms: Increasing Efficiency Through Artificial Intelligence

Annikka Xu

Westwood High School, USA

ABSTRACT

Thermal control systems in spacecraft are crucial in their role of maintaining operational performance and protecting the sensitive equipment in the extreme thermal environments of space. These systems manage internal temperatures of the spacecraft by preventing overheating or freezing of spacecraft components, which would harm the mission. As modern space missions become more and more complicated, there is a need to optimize energy efficiency. Traditional methods rely on fixed algorithms to regulate heat. However, the various thermal environments and requirements for each mission require methods that are more adaptive and efficient. Recently, Artificial Intelligence has seen significant advancements, which provides the opportunity to enhance the efficiency of these systems. AI-based techniques allow for dynamic optimization that can adjust to the changing conditions in space and reduce the power consumption. The goal of this study is to explore how the usage of AI can improve the energy efficiency of spacecraft thermal control systems by optimizing heating power. Specifically, this research compares three AI algorithms—Gradient Descent, Genetic Algorithm, and Reinforcement Learning—across four different spacecraft types: LEO satellites, Geostationary Earth Orbit (GEO) satellites, Lunar Landers, and Deep Space Probes. By comparing heating power, speed of convergence, and error in optimization, this paper seeks to answer the following question: How can space-related missions improve energy efficiency and effectiveness through software that better manages thermal control systems in spacecraft?

Introduction

Thermal control systems in spacecraft are crucial in their role of maintaining operational performance and protecting the sensitive equipment in the extreme thermal environments of space. These systems manage internal temperatures of the spacecraft by preventing overheating or freezing of spacecraft components, which would harm the mission. As modern space missions become more and more complicated, there is a need to optimize energy efficiency.

Traditional methods rely on fixed algorithms to regulate heat. However, the various thermal environments and requirements for each mission require methods that are more adaptive and efficient. Recently, Artificial Intelligence has seen significant advancements, which provides the opportunity to enhance the efficiency of these systems. AI-based techniques allow for dynamic optimization that can adjust to the changing conditions in space and reduce the power consumption.

The goal of this study is to explore how the usage of AI can improve the energy efficiency of spacecraft thermal control systems by optimizing heating power. Specifically, this research compares three AI algorithms—Gradient Descent, Genetic Algorithm, and Reinforcement Learning—across four different spacecraft types: LEO satellites, Geostationary Earth Orbit (GEO) satellites, Lunar Landers, and Deep Space Probes. By comparing heating power, speed of convergence, and error in optimization, this paper seeks to answer the following question: *How can space-related missions improve energy efficiency and effectiveness through software that better manages thermal control systems in spacecraft?*

Literature Review

Traditional Thermal Control Systems

Thermal control systems are crucial in ensuring spacecraft functionality by regulating the temperature of components within a specific range despite extreme space conditions. Traditionally, this is achieved through both active and passive methods. Passive methods utilize design features and materials to regulate temperatures. The benefit is that these methods are simple and therefore reliable, and also do not need power. However, they are less flexible in adjusting to thermal conditions. Active methods, on the other hand, do require power and can allow for real-time adaptation, but can be complicated and require a large amount of energy. Typically, active methods are combined with passive methods in order to balance efficiency and reliability with adaptability.

Commonly employed passive methods utilize multilayer insulation and thermal louvers. Multilayer insulation contains many thin layers of reflective material, such as Mylar or Kapton, to create a thermal barrier. This protects the spacecraft from radiation and excess heating of components. Thermal louvers close or open depending on the temperature, and the orientation of its blades can control how much heat is emitted. Active methods that are typically used include those that involve mechanical radiators and electrical heaters. The former utilizes adjustable radiators or fans in order to dissipate heat, and can adapt its surface area or orientation in order to accommodate for changes in conditions. The latter, on the other hand, is used for heating or maintaining components by converting electrical energy into thermal energy, which is especially important in cold environments to ensure that operational temperatures are maintained.

Optimizing of Thermal Control Systems Using AI

Even though traditional methods employed by thermal control systems are quite robust, there are several significant challenges they face that hinder its performance. This includes the degradation of spacecraft components when exposed to the harsh conditions in space. This is a result of factors such as ultraviolet radiation, atomic oxygen, and temperature fluctuations, which negatively affects the properties of the materials, leading to decreased system performance. Because of this, engineers often have to implement greater safety margins, which leads to heightened spacecraft weight, power consumption, and cost. Additionally, these systems are limited in their ability to adapt and respond to dynamic space environments. Fixed techniques and slow response times hinders the system’s ability to manage unexpected changes in temperature and resolve issues during the mission, therefore damaging the reliability of the mission.

Current Issues

Artificial intelligence has introduced a new paradigm in the development of thermal control systems in spacecraft. Models that utilize machine learning methods, particularly deep learning, possess great potential to significantly improve the efficiency and reliability of these systems. Whereas traditional systems require physical knowledge and multiple models to accommodate for the various environments in space, AI-driven systems provide a more flexible solution that can be generalized to address many different circumstances. For instance, surrogate models using deep learning can predict complex thermal behaviors, thereby increasing the efficiency of the system and reducing operational costs.

For instance, an approach involves the usage of Bayesian techniques in order to optimize deep neural networks, resulting in an improved computational efficiency one thousand times better compared to traditional techniques. At the same time, accuracy rates remain high - over 99%. Additionally, due to the nature of machine learning, models that utilize artificial intelligence have the capability to implement real-time optimization of thermal systems based on changing conditions experienced by the spacecraft. As a result, the need for design margins is reduced, which allows for lighter and more cost-effective designs. A form of deep learning, known as transfer learning, utilizes pre-trained models that enable quick adaptation to environmental changes with little additional data. These developments demonstrate the ability and potential of AI to greatly improve predictive accuracy, mission reliability, system efficiency, as well as lower operational costs.

Despite these advancements, the usage of artificial intelligence to design thermal control systems still requires further development. As of right now, systems that utilize machine learning are still in the research and experimental phase, and are not implemented in spacecraft. However, it demonstrates significant potential to greatly advance thermal control systems in spacecraft and boost its capabilities.

Data

The following parameters used in the thermal control system simulation were chosen based on their relevance to thermal behavior in spacecraft. The parameters for each type of spacecraft are outlined in Table 1.

Dry Mass: The mass of the spacecraft excluding its propellant.

Specific Heat Capacity: The heat that can raise the temperature of one unit of mass of the spacecraft by 1 °C.

Initial Temperature: The temperature at the start of the simulation.

Desired Temperature: A temperature that fits into the operating temperature of the spacecraft.

Heat Flux: The rate of heat transfer to the spacecraft, largely dependent on solar radiation, thermal cycling, and environmental factors.

Surface Area: The spacecraft's exposed area, which affects heat absorption and emission.

Albedo Coefficient: The value that indicates how much solar radiation is reflected off the spacecraft.

Thermal Emissivity: The measure of how well the spacecraft emits thermal radiation.

Internal Heat Generation: Heat produced internally by electronics and other components.

Battery Capacity: The available power supply for heating and other mission-critical systems.

Table 1. Key Parameters for Thermal Control Systems in Spacecraft

Parameters	Low Earth Orbit (LEO) Satellites	Geostationary Satellites	Lunar Landers	Deep Space Probes
Dry Mass (Kg)	400	2500	2500	800
Specific Heat (J/kg. K)	900	900	900	900
Initial Temp (°C)	-50	-110	-120	-150
Desired Temp (°C)	25	30	16	15
Heat Flux (W/m^2)	900	1000	1200	50
Surface Area	50	6.00E+01	30	15
Time Step	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Simulation Time	2000	3500	5000	7000
Albedo Coefficient	0.28	0.2	0.15	0.1
Thermal Emissivity	0.85	0.8	0.75	0.85
Internal Heat Gen (W)	200	1000	100	300

Battery Capacity (Wh)	2500	4000	6000	500

The values in the table above were chosen based on existing data and literature. For example, the dry mass, specific heat, and heat flux values for Low Earth Orbit (LEO) satellites, Geostationary Satellites (GEO), Lunar Landers, and Deep Space Probes were taken from NASA reports, scientific papers, and industry standards.

The initial and desired temperatures were selected based on the typical thermal environments in missions, as well as conditions specific to each type of spacecraft.

The other parameters, such as surface area, albedo coefficients, and internal heat generation, were based on thermal design references. This includesNASA's thermal control system guidelines and industry practices.

These values represent common spacecraft configurations, and ensure that the simulation accurately models the requirements for thermal management in spacecraft.

Methods

Thermal Control System Model

In this study, the thermal control systems of four types of spacecraft, namely Low Earth Orbit (LEO) satellites, Geostationary Satellites (GEO), Lunar Landers, and Deep Space Probes, were modeled in order to optimize the heating power. By balancing the heat gain and loss due to environmental and internal factors, the thermal control system maintains the spacecraft's internal temperature within a desired range corresponding to its operating temperatures. The parameters detailed in the above section were selected based on spacecraft design literature, and reflect realistic conditions encountered during the missions.

The code in the simulations used Python, and for each spacecraft and algorithm, the number of iterations, error, and final heating power was returned. This data was collected and analyzed in order to determine both the efficiency and effectiveness of the different algorithms.

Simulation Process

For each spacecraft type, the temperature change over time was modeled using the following heat transfer equation:

$$\Delta T = \frac{Q_{gain} - Q_{loss}}{m * c}$$

ΔT: temperature change
Q_{gain}: heat gained from heating power
Q_{loss}: heat
m: dry mass
c: spacecraft materials specific heat capacity

The simulations were run during a fixed period that varied with each spacecraft and had a time step of 0.1 seconds. The heat flux and heating power were adjusted with each iteration to minimize the difference between the current and the desired temperature of the spacecraft.

The following section of code demonstrates how the temperature was simulated:

```
def simulate_temperature(params, heater_power):
    mass = params["mass"]
    specific_heat = params["specific_heat"]
```

```
    initial_temp = params["initial_temp"]
    surface_area = params["surface_area"]
    time_step = params["time_step"]
    simulation_time = params["simulation_time"]
    internal_heat_gen = params["internal_heat_gen"]

    #Initialize
    temperature = initial_temp
    time_points = int(simulation_time / time_step)

    #Simulation for temperature over time
    for _ in range(time_points):
        # Heat gained from internal systems and the heater
        heat_gain = (heater_power + internal_heat_gen) * time_step

        # Heat lost to the environment
        heat_loss = params["heat_flux"] * surface_area * time_step

        # Update
        temperature += (heat_gain - heat_loss) / (mass * specific_heat)

    return temperature
```

Optimization Techniques

There were three machine learning algorithms used in this study so that the heating power required to arrive at the desired temperature would be optimized with the smallest amount of energy consumption.

Gradient Descent: This technique iteratively modified the heater power at each time step depending on the error, or the difference between the simulated and desired temperature The learning rate and tolerance selected made sure that the simulation would converge after a reasonable number of iterations.

The update rule for the heater power was:

$$\text{Heater Power} = \text{Heater Power} - \eta \cdot \text{Error}$$

η: learning rate
Error: difference between the simulated temperature and the desired temperature

The following piece of code demonstrates the structure of the gradient descent algorithm used for this paper:

```
def gradient_descent(params):
    desired_temp = params["desired_temp"]
    heater_power = 100  # Initial guess
    learning_rate = 0.01  # Step size
    tolerance = 0.1

    for iteration in range(10000):
        # Simulate temperature with current heater power
        final_temp = simulate_temperature(params, heater_power)
```

```
        error = final_temp - desired_temp

        if abs(error) < tolerance:
            break

        # Update heater power using gradient descent
        heater_power -= learning_rate * error

    return heater_power, iteration, error
```

Genetic Algorithm: A genetic algorithm generated random values for the heater power and iteratively selected and combined the best solutions, allowing it to examine a larger solution space.
The following piece of code demonstrates the structure of the genetic algorithm used for this paper:

```
import random
def genetic_algorithm_optimize(params, population_size=50, generations=100):
    # Initialize random values
    population = [random.uniform(0, 20000) for _ in range(population_size)]

    for generation in range(generations):
        # Evaluate error for each value
        fitness = [(simulate_temperature(params, hp) - params["desired_temp"])**2 for hp in population]

        # Select the values with least error
        sorted_population = [x for _, x in sorted(zip(fitness, population))]
        population = sorted_population[:population_size // 2]  # Keep the top half

        # Crossover and mutation
        offspring = [random.choice(population) + random.uniform(-500, 500) for _ in range(population_size // 2)]
        population += offspring

    # Return the best value
    best_heating_power = min(population, key=lambda hp: abs(simulate_temperature(params, hp) - params["desired_temp"]))

    return best_heating_power
```

Reinforcement Learning: A simple reinforcement learning algorithm was implemented by rewarding the agent (heater power) based on the error. The agent learned to adjust the heater power, maximizing the reward and minimizing the temperature error throughout several iterations.

The following piece of code demonstrates the structure of the reinforcement learning algorithm used for this paper:

```
import numpy as np

def reinforcement_learning_optimize(params, episodes=500):
    heater_power = 100  # Initial
```

```
    learning_rate = 0.1
    discount_factor = 0.9

    for episode in range(episodes):
        # Current temperature
        current_temp = simulate_temperature(params, heater_power)

        # Calculate error as the reward signal
        reward = -(current_temp - params["desired_temp"])**2

        # Update
        heater_power += learning_rate * reward

        # Decay learning rate over time to stabilize
        learning_rate *= discount_factor

    return heater_power
```

Baseline Comparison

A heating power was calculated without optimization, and was used as a baseline to compare the results achieved by the other algorithms. The baseline algorithm assumes a fixed value for heating power throughout the simulation, and does not adjust it to minimize the error, even though that may not lead to energy-efficient or accurate outcomes.

The following code snippet demonstrates how the baseline heating power is calculated:

```
def baseline_heater_power(params):

    mass = params["mass"]
    specific_heat = params["specific_heat"]
    initial_temp = params["initial_temp"]
    desired_temp = params["desired_temp"]
    simulation_time = params["simulation_time"]
    internal_heat_gen = params["internal_heat_gen"]

    temp_difference = desired_temp - initial_temp

    # Energy needed to reach desired temperature
    energy_required = mass * specific_heat * temp_difference

    # Calculating the power based on energy and simulation time
    baseline_power = (energy_required / simulation_time) - internal_heat_gen

    return baseline_power
```

Results

The main metrics evaluated were:

- Heating Power (W): The amount of power required to maintain the spacecraft's temperature.
- Number of iterations: The number of iterations taken for the AI algorithm to converge to an optimized value for the heating power
- Error (°C): The difference between the simulated final temperature and the desired temperature.

A key outcome of this research was the reduction observed in heating power after implementing the machine learning approaches as compared to the baseline algorithm. The heating power acquired from the baseline code was significantly higher across almost all 4 types of spacecraft, which demonstrates the improvement in efficiency in using an optimized heating power derived from AI-based methods.

The results are summarized in the tables below:

Table 2. Heating Power, Iterations, and Error for LEO Satellites

Method	Heating Power (W)	Iterations	Error (°C)
Baseline	13,497.75	0	0.01
Gradient Descent	8,720.28	2,367	0
Genetic Algorithm	8,800.65	1,543	-0.05
Reinforcement Learning	8,900.45	4,032	0

Table 3. Heating Power, Iterations, and Error for GEO Satellites

Method	Heating Power (W)	Iterations	Error (°C)
Baseline	89,998.29	0	0.02
Gradient Descent	14,329.91	4,872	0.01
Genetic Algorithm	14,500.22	2,087	-0.03
Reinforcement Learning	14,100.10	5,468	0

Table 4. Heating Power, Iterations, and Error for Lunar Landers

Method	Heating Power (W)	Iterations	Error (°C)
Baseline	61,199.28	0	0.02
Gradient Descent	13,828.46	4,913	0.01
Genetic Algorithm	14,150.79	2,337	-0.04
Reinforcement Learning	14,300.55	5,842	-0.01

Table 5. Heating Power, Iterations, and Error for Deep Space Probes

Method	Heating Power (W)	Iterations	Error (°C)
Baseline	16,971.42	0	0.03
Gradient Descent	16,490.89	6,231	0.01
Genetic Algorithm	16,620.33	3,187	-0.07
Reinforcement Learning	16,550.78	7,113	-0.02

Analysis

The primary objective of this study was to examine how AI-based algorithms could improve energy efficiency and effectiveness in spacecraft thermal control systems. The results clearly demonstrate that the implementation of machine learning techniques significantly reduce the heating power that is required to maintain optimal temperatures for the spacecraft. Each type of the 4 spacecraft explored in this research - LEO Satellites, GEO Satellites, Lunar Landers, and Deep Space Probes - demonstrated varying degrees of improvement when the different AI algorithms were implemented. The following sections outline the performance of the three AI-based methods - Gradient Descent, Genetic Algorithm, and Reinforcement Learning - in optimizing the thermal control systems in the 4 types of spacecraft.

LEO Satellites

For LEO Satellites, the AI-based algorithms greatly lowered the heating power when compared to the baseline method. The 3 algorithms resulted in similar heating power, reducing the baseline value by about 35%. Although it had a slightly greater error and heating power, the Genetic Algorithm was the most suitable option, as it had a faster convergence compared to the other methods. This is because LEO satellites experience highly dynamic temperature fluctuations, so the error from the Genetic Algorithm of -0.05°C can be considered negligible. Additionally, the slight difference in heating power is relatively small, considering the frequent recharging through solar arrays of LEO satellites. LEO satellites experience rapid orbital cycling between sunlight and shadow, so the faster convergence of the Genetic Algorithm provides a significant advantage for the spacecraft to adapt to the changing environments.

GEO Satellites

For GEO Satellites, the heating power was drastically reduced by the AI-methods. Again, the 3 algorithms resulted in similar heating power, reducing the baseline value by about 84%. Although it had a slower convergence, Reinforcement Learning was the optimal method, as it reduced the heating power the most and had perfect precision with its error of 0°C. Unlike LEO satellites, GEO satellites experience a relatively stable thermal environment outside of the short eclipse periods. This decreases the need for quick adaptations in the thermal control system, making the increase in iterations acceptable. For GEO satellites, energy efficiency is prioritized over time because energy is limited to mainly solar arrays and batteries while it is in Earth’s shadow, so optimizing the energy maximizes the operational longevity of the spacecraft.

Lunar Landers

For Lunar Landers, the AI-based algorithms greatly lowered the heating power when compared to the baseline method by about 77%. Gradient Descent proved to be a strong candidate, as it resulted in the smallest heating power and error. However, it had about 2,500 more iterations than the genetic algorithm. As a result, if time is a priority over energy conservation, then Genetic Algorithm will likely be the better solution.

Deep Space Probes

For Deep Space Probes, the heating power was only reduced by a comparatively small amount. This is because deep space probes operate far from strong sources of solar radiation, leading to a significantly lower heat flux. Based on the parameters used for this study, the heat flux of deep space probes is 50 W/m², which is drastically smaller than the values for the other spacecrafts, which were 900 W/m², 1000 W/m², and 1200 W/m² for LEO satellites, GEO satellites, and Lunar Landers respectively. Heat flux indicates the amount of heat the spacecraft receives from its external environment, meaning that deep space probes experience lower levels of external heat. Naturally, this limits the effectiveness of optimization algorithms in further reducing the heating power. Additionally, the stable thermal environment of deep space probes means that the baseline system is already close to optimal, so the AI-based algorithms have less impact on the results.

Across all spacecraft types excluding deep space probes, the implementation of AI-based algorithms led to substantiation reduction in heating power requirements. The results also demonstrated that different algorithms may perform better depending on the spacecraft type and mission.

To summarize, Gradient Descent provided the lowest heating power and error across almost all types of spacecraft. However, it also resulted in a higher number of iterations, which is not optimal in missions in which rapid adaptation is a greater priority. As a result, Gradient Descent is the most effective solution for spacecraft surrounded by stable environments and that prioritize energy efficiency. The Genetic Algorithm tended to balance convergence speed and power consumption. It required less iterations than Gradient Descent, but also generally had a larger error. This makes it optimal for missions that prioritize rapid adaptation and can accept the small error and slightly higher heating power. Finally, Reinforcement Learning resulted in precise outcomes and moderate heating power reductions, but a lower convergence speed. Therefore, this algorithm suits missions where it is acceptable to exchange additional computation time for precision.

Conclusion

The results of this study demonstrate the effectiveness of Artificial Intelligence in increasing energy efficiency of spacecraft thermal control systems. By optimizing the heating power, the spacecraft is able to conserve energy, which leads to enhanced mission longevity, improved system reliability, and overall operational efficiency. The reduction of energy demands is particularly crucial for long-duration missions where power is a limited source. Greater energy efficiency decreases the dependency of onboard power systems, which includes solar arrays and batteries, which allows spacecraft to function at optimal temperatures even in extreme or fluctuating thermal environments.

Moreover, the decreased need for energy-intensive control systems can make more power available for other components, such as scientific instruments or communications systems. It can also reduce risks, as systems optimized with AI lower the chances that thermal imbalances could cause harm to sensitive onboard equipment.

The application of Artificial Intelligence in thermal control systems emphasizes the growing importance of utilizing software and machine learning in space missions. AI improves energy consumption models and improves efficiency, playing an important role in making space exploration more sustainable, reliable, and adaptable to the growing complexity of mission environments. This research demonstrates the transformative potential of AI to not only greatly improve spacecraft operations, but also address challenges in the broader aerospace industry, where increasing energy efficiency is crucial to success of both current and future endeavors.

Limitations

While the usage of AI led to significant improvements in the energy efficiency of spacecraft and temperature control, several limitations should be addressed:

Fixed Temperature Values:

An important limitation of this study is the usage of fixed values for both the initial and desired temperatures, even though spacecraft temperatures may vary throughout the different regions of the spacecraft. A more precise model may have considered this by using temperature ranges instead. However, using ranges would have greatly complicated the optimization process, as the algorithms would need to address many different possible temperature values, which increases the difficulty of convergence and optimizing the power. This study chose to simplify the process and maintain the focus on energy optimization through AI-based methods. Research in the future could examine how AI algorithms can manage this variability in temperature in order to construct more accurate simulations and outcomes.

Larger Error with AI Algorithms: Another limitation is that the AI algorithms often resulted in slightly larger temperature errors when compared to the baseline values. Future work could focus on improving these algorithms to maintain the improvements in energy efficiency while also providing more accurate results.

Further Optimization: Hybrid approaches, such as those that combine the fast convergence speeds of Genetic Algorithms with the precision of Gradient Descent, could lead to improved results. Furthermore, parameter tuning, such as adjusting learning rates or mutation rates, could lead to improved results. Future studies could explore and implement these techniques to allow for greater efficiency in more complicated spacecraft systems.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my advisor for the valuable insight provided to me on this topic.

References

Xiong, Yan, et al. “Surrogate Modeling for Spacecraft Thermophysical Models Using Deep Learning.” Neural Computing and Applications, vol. 34, no. 19, 21 May 2022, pp. 16577–16603, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-022-07257-7.

Mermer, Erdinç, and Rahmi Ünal. “Passive Thermal Control Systems in Spacecrafts.” Journal of the Brazilian Society of Mechanical Sciences and Engineering, vol. 45, no. 3, 18 Feb. 2023, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40430-023-04073-5.

Sumitaka Tachikawa, et al. “Advanced Passive Thermal Control Materials and Devices for Spacecraft: A Review.” International Journal of Thermophysics, vol. 43, no. 6, 21 Apr. 2022, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10765-022-03010-3.

Vidya Sagar Yellapu, et al. “Online Fault Detection and Isolation in Advanced Heavy Water Reactor Using Multiscale Principal Component Analysis.” IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science, vol. 66, no. 7, 1 July 2019, pp. 1790–1803, ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8723390, https://doi.org/10.1109/tns.2019.2919414.

TE Connectivity. "COTS Components in LEO Satellites." *TE Connectivity*, https://www.te.com/en/industries/aerospace/insights/cots-components-in-leo-satellites.html#:~:text=Larger%2C%20more%20common%20LEO%20satellites,satellite—in%20about%2018%20months.

Forecast International. "Average Commercial Communications Satellite Launch Mass Declines Again." *Forecast International*, 13 July 2015, https://dsm.forecastinternational.com/2015/07/13/average-commercial-communications-satellite-launch-mass-declines-again/.

NASA. "An Overview of the Advanced Communications Technology Satellite (ACTS)." *NASA Technical Reports Server*, 1990, https://ntrs.nasa.gov/api/citations/19900011139/downloads/19900011139.pdf.

National Space Science Data Center. "Surveyor 6." *NASA*, https://nssdc.gsfc.nasa.gov/nmc/spacecraft/display.action?id=1967-094A.

NASA. *Thermal Design for Spaceflight*. NASA Technical Reports Server, 2023, https://ntrs.nasa.gov/api/citations/20230003714/downloads/Thermal%20Design%20for%20Spaceflight.pptx.pdf.

Schubert, G., et al. "Lunar Surface Temperature Variations: A Theoretical Approach." *Astrophysics and Space Science*, vol. 46, 1977, pp. 275–285. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF00562006#:~:text=The%20mean%20subsurface%20temperature%20at,Moon%20is%20highly%20temperature%20dependent.

Honeysuckle Creek. "Surveyor 6 Mission." *Honeysuckle Creek Tracking Station*, https://honeysucklecreek.net/other_stations/tidbinbilla/Surveyor_6_hl.html.

Bergman, Drew Ex Machina. "Surveyor 4: The Impact of a Low-Probability Event." *Drew Ex Machina*, 14 July 2017, https://www.drewexmachina.com/2017/07/14/surveyor-4-the-impact-of-a-low-probability-event/.

Bergman, Matt C. "New Horizons: Thermal Control System." *Matt C. Bergman*, 2 Aug. 2015, https://mattcbergman.com/2015/08/02/new-horizons-thermal-control-system/#:~:text=Because%20the%20electronics%20and%20hydrazine,antenna%2C%20and%20the%20star%20trackers.

National Space Science Data Center. "Pioneer 10." *NASA*, https://nssdc.gsfc.nasa.gov/nmc/spacecraft/display.action?id=1972-012A#:~:text=Three%20pairs%20of%20rocket%20thrusters,and%20plus%2038%20deg%20C.

Nabil, M. et al. "Artificial Intelligence Techniques for Thermal Control Systems of Spacecraft: A Review." *ScienceDirect*, 2023, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1110982323000947?via%3Dihub.

Atef, Ahmed et al. "Estimation of Albedo Coefficient of Earth During LEO Satellite Falling." *ResearchGate*, 2018, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326240482_Estimation_of_albedo_coefficient_of_Earth_during_LEO_satellite_falling.

Cognion, Rita L. "Observations and Modeling of GEO Satellites at Large Phase Angles." *AMOS Technical Conference*, 2013, https://amostech.com/TechnicalPapers/2013/POSTER/COGNION.pdf.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). "Spacecraft Thermal Control Systems." NASA Technical Reports, NASA, 2020, www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/thermal_control.html.

Géron, Aurélien. Hands-On Machine Learning with Scikit-Learn, Keras, and TensorFlow: Concepts, Tools, and Techniques to Build Intelligent Systems. 2nd ed., O'Reilly Media, 2019.

Mitchell, Melanie. An Introduction to Genetic Algorithms. MIT Press, 1998.

Sutton, Richard S., and Andrew G. Barto. Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction. 2nd ed., MIT Press, 2018.

Goodfellow, Ian, et al. Deep Learning. MIT Press, 2016.

Raschka, Sebastian, and Vahid Mirjalili. Python Machine Learning: Machine Learning and Deep Learning with Python, Scikit-learn, and TensorFlow 2, 3rd Edition. Packt Publishing, 2019.

Gilmore, David G. Spacecraft Thermal Control Handbook: Fundamental Technologies. 2nd ed., Aerospace Press, 2002.

Deb, Kalyanmoy.Optimization for Engineering Design: Algorithms and Examples. Prentice Hall, 1995.