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#### Abstract

The goal of the project is to find an optimal design of a Schmidt-Cassegrain telescope which is popular for amateur astronomers. The telescope model includes two disciplines viz. Optics and Thermal design. Firstly, the optics is designed through a ray-tracing program which takes the system components and predicts the first-order and third-order optics. The objective function of the optical design is to reduce the aberrations to provide clear image. Next, a thermal subsystem considers the deformation of the telescope mirrors, caused because of the change in clamping force (preload) as they are exposed to different thermal environments. The objective function of this subsystem is to maximize the robustness of the mirrors with change in temperature, to maintain the quality of image. The optimization is done in MATLAB and iSIGHT which are interfaced with Ansys for the structural analysis of mirror system. Finally, the subsystems are integrated using 'All-in-one' approach, with the objective function being minimization of aberrations in the optical image, caused because of thermal gradients.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Schmidt-Cassegrain Telescope (SCT) is a very popular telescope for amateur astronomers. It consists of two mirrors and a refractive medium, a Schmidt corrector. The Schmidt corrector is an aspheric refraction lens inserted to help reduce monochromatic aberrations with spherical mirrors. The profile of a Schmidt corrector dictates how the rays are refracted through the profile. However, since the corrector is a refracting element, it creates chromatic aberrations which can be measured through spot diagrams. The corrector lens is usually an addition to a telescope with a reflective surface.

Advantages of SCT are its compactness, transportability and excellent reduction of chromatic aberrations. The SCT combines the Cassegrain telescope with a Schmidt corrector for a total of three optical components. The locations of these components are free which gives a large design space for the designer. The SCT system consists of two strongly curved mirrors for our model.

In addition, the Schmidt corrector helps reduce the amount of loss of light with respect to the traditional Cassegrain telescope. This system will give us a very interesting optimization model as many different objects and disciplines rely on the same design variables of the system.

In addition to Optical design, the design for changes in thermal environment also is considered. Temperature changes cause quite a lot of corresponding changes to occur in optical surface radii, air spaces and lens thicknesses, the refractive indices of optical materials and of the surrounding air, as well as the physical dimensions of structural members. Any of these effects will tend to defocus and misalign the system.

The subsystem design break-up is made in the following way:

1) Optical design - Kwang Jae Lee
2) Thermal design - Anupam Garge

## 2. OPTICAL DESIGN

### 2.1. Problem Statement

Aberrations within the system lead to reduced optical quality. An ideal optical system would produce a point image for the astronomer's eyes if the source was a star. However, in most cases a blurred circle is obtained where it is a combination of different kinds of aberrations. There are two types of aberrations: chromatic and monochromatic. Chromatic aberrations are a function of the color of light or wavelength of the light entering in the system. While monochromatic aberrations will be the same for all types of wavelengths entering in the system.

The SCT consists of two mirrors and a refractive medium, a Schmidt corrector. The Schmidt corrector is an aspheric refraction lens inserted to help reduce monochromatic aberrations with spherical mirrors. However, since the corrector is a refracting element, it creates chromatic aberrations.

In addition, a baffle system was designed in our system to help reduce stray light entering the telescope.

### 2.2. Nomenclature

| Variable | Description | Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $D_{\text {sch }}$ | Diameter of Schmidt corrector and primary stop | mm |
| $D_{1}$ | Inner Diameter of tube and primary mirror | mm |
| $D_{3}$ | Diameter of secondary mirror | mm |
| $D_{\text {eye }}$ | Diameter of eyepiece | mm |
| $Z_{\text {sch }}$ | Length of outside edge of schmidt corrector to primary mirror | mm |
| $Z_{\text {mirrors }}$ | Location of secondary mirror | mm |
| $v$ | Vertex of Back Focus | mm |
| $\varepsilon_{1}$ | Eccentricity of primary mirror |  |
| $\varepsilon_{2}$ | Eccentricity of secondary mirror |  |
| $R_{1}$ | Radius of curvature of the vertex of primary mirror | mm |
| $R_{2}$ | Radius of curvature of the vertex of secondary mirror | mm |
| Airy | Airy disk radius | mm |
| $\frac{F}{\#}$ | $\frac{\text { focal }}{\#}$ of Schmidt-Cassegrain |  |
| $\frac{F}{\#_{\max }}$ | Maximum $\frac{\text { focal }}{\#}$ range for Schmidt-Cassegrain |  |
| $\frac{F}{\#_{\min }}$ | Minimum $\frac{\text { focal }}{\#}$ range for Schmidt-Cassegrain |  |
| 2w | Angular Field of View | degree |
| $\delta S_{I}^{*}$ | Contribution of an aspheric plate to third order aberrations |  |
| $\hat{m}_{2}$ | Integer in definition of characteristic function of SCT |  |
| numrays | Minimum Number of rays for ray-tracing |  |
| $\max _{\text {deadraysratio }}$ | Maximum ratio of dead rays/total rays |  |
| $d_{p l}$ | Thickness of Schmidt Corrector | mm |
| $k_{p l}$ | Dimensionless Profile Constant for Schmidgt Corrector |  |
| h | Baffle optimization free parameter | mm |
| $X_{1}, Z_{1}$ | Baffle Position of primary mirror |  |
| $X_{3}, Z_{3}$ | Baffle Position of secondary mirror |  |
| g | Relative power of Schmidt corrector |  |

### 2.3. Mathematical Model (I)

In this study, we will find better design based on the model introduced in Mark [2].
Figure 1 shows the base profile and design variables of the SCT.


Figure 1 Dimensioned Draiwing of Schmidt-Cassegrain Telescope

Schmidt corrector:

$$
d_{p l}=\frac{1}{512}\left(\frac{1}{n_{0}^{\prime}-1}\right) \frac{D_{s c h}}{N^{3}}\left(\rho_{p l}{ }^{4}-k_{p l} \rho_{p l}{ }^{2}\right)+\left(d_{p l}\right)_{0}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& N=\frac{-f_{1}^{\prime}}{D_{s c h}} \\
& \rho_{p l}=\frac{y}{D_{s c h} / 2} \\
& k_{p l}=\Delta Z \frac{16 f^{\prime}}{y_{m}^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

### 2.3.1. Objective Function

The main purpose of this sub problem is to minimize the aberrations. The aberrations are viewed by the astronomer as a blurred image and can be caused by a variety of reasons. A visual method to view these aberrations is through a series of spot diagrams. The circle in which the light must encompass can be measured through an Airy disk which includes $84 \%$ of the energy in the image [6].

$$
\min _{X} \sum_{\lambda=1}^{3} \sum_{\text {rays }=1}^{\text {numrays }} \Phi(X)
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Airy }=2.44 * \lambda * F / \# \\
& \Phi(x, y, z, \lambda)=\frac{2000}{1+e^{100000\left(\frac{\text { Ary }}{2}-\operatorname{spot}(x, y, z, z)\right)}}
\end{aligned}
$$

### 2.3.2. Constraints

## Physical constraints

Focal Ratio:
An important system performance parameter considered with all telescope is the focal ratio. The focal ratio is a ratio of the focal length of a mirror and the diameter of the aperture. Most telescopes are designed with a focal ratio specified, however for our model the focal ratio will be calculated from the radius of curvatures of the mirrors and the separation in-between mirrors.
$\frac{1}{f^{\prime}}=\frac{-f_{2}^{\prime}+f_{1}^{\prime}-Z_{\text {mirrors }}}{f_{1}^{\prime} f_{2}^{\prime}}$
$\frac{F}{\#}=\frac{f^{\prime}}{D_{\text {sch }}}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{F}{\# \max } \geq \frac{F}{\#} \\
& \frac{F}{\#}_{\min } \leq \frac{F}{\#}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Baffle Design:

A baffle system was designed in our system to help reduce stray light entering the telescope. The baffle system goal is to eliminate all the direct stray light entering the system without limiting the contrast and resolution of the object you are trying to view. Terebizh [5] has a optimal baffle algorithm which was used for this project.


Figure 2 Scenarios of Rays Blocked be Baffles
$\rho_{\text {baf }}\left(h_{*}\right)=\left[\left(Z_{3}-Z_{2}\right)^{2}+\left(Y_{3}-Y_{2}\right)^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}=0$
$\frac{\text { deadrays }}{\text { rays }_{\text {total }}} \leq \max _{\text {deadraysratio }}$

## Dead rays

Case \#1: $\quad-\mu \cdot Z_{\text {mirrors }}+\mu \cdot z_{0}+y_{0} \leq \frac{D_{3}}{2}$
Case \#2: $\quad Z_{3} \leq \frac{b-b_{1}}{m_{1}+\mu} \leq Z_{\text {mirrors }}$
Case \#3: $\quad Z_{3} \leq \frac{a-b_{1}}{m_{1}-k} \leq Z_{\text {mirrors }}, y=k z+a$ : reflectedray

Case \#4: $\quad 0 \leq \frac{a-b_{2}}{m_{2}-k} \leq Z_{1}$
Case \#5: $\quad-v \leq \frac{b_{3}-b_{2}}{m_{2}-m_{3}} \leq Z_{1}$
where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(z_{0}, y_{0}\right): \text { Ray Position, } \alpha: \text { angle of ray } \\
& \mu=\tan \alpha \\
& b=\mu \cdot z_{0}+y_{0} \\
& b_{1}=-m_{1} Z_{3}+Y_{3} \\
& b_{2}=\frac{D_{\text {eye }}}{2} \\
& b_{3}=-S_{s} m_{3}+y_{2} \\
& m_{1}=\frac{Y_{3}-\frac{D_{3}}{2}}{Z_{3}-Z_{\text {mirrors }}} \\
& m_{2}=\frac{Y_{1}-\frac{D_{\text {eye }}}{2}}{Z_{1}} \\
& m_{3}=\frac{Y+l}{S_{2}+v}
\end{aligned}
$$

Monochromatic Aberrations:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
-f^{\prime} \zeta+L \zeta+\delta S_{I}^{*}=0 & \text { spherical aberration } \\
-d_{1} \xi-\frac{-f^{\prime}}{2}+\frac{s_{p l}}{f^{\prime}} \delta S_{I}^{*}=0 & \text { coma } \\
\frac{f^{\prime}}{L}\left(f^{\prime}+d_{1}\right)+\frac{d_{1}^{2}}{L} \xi+\left(\frac{s_{p l}}{f^{\prime}}\right)^{2} \delta S_{I}^{*}=0 & \text { astigmatism }
\end{array}
$$

Where

$$
\hat{m}_{2}=\frac{f^{\prime}}{f_{1}^{\prime}}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \xi=\frac{\left(\hat{m}_{2}+1\right)^{3}}{4}\left[\left(\frac{\hat{m}_{2}-1}{\hat{m}_{2}+1}\right)^{2}-\varepsilon_{2}^{2}\right] \\
& \zeta=\frac{\hat{m}_{2}^{2}}{4}\left(1-\varepsilon_{1}^{2}\right) \\
& d_{1}=Z_{\text {mirrors }} \\
& L=v-Z_{\text {mirrors }} \\
& S_{p l}=-Z_{\text {sch }} f^{\prime} \\
& \delta S_{I}^{*} \leq \frac{-f_{1}^{\prime}}{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

Geometric relations:

$$
Z_{\text {sch }} \geq-Z_{\text {mirrors }}
$$

## Practical constraints

From the practical point of view, the range of design variables is restricted as: (Sign convention follows the classical optics )
$10 \mathrm{~mm} \leq Z_{\text {sch }} \leq 4000 \mathrm{~mm}$
$-4000 \mathrm{~mm} \leq Z_{\text {mirrors }} \leq 10 \mathrm{~mm}$
$-20000 \leq R_{1} \leq 0 \mathrm{~mm}$
$-20000 \leq R_{2} \leq 0 \mathrm{~mm}$
$0 \mathrm{~mm} \leq v \leq 2000 \mathrm{~mm}$

## Geometric relations

Following dimensions are determined from the result of ray tracing with 0 and given angular field of view
$D_{1} \quad$ Inner Diameter of tube and primary mirror
$D_{3} \quad$ Diameter of secondary mirror
$D_{\text {eye }} \quad$ Diameter of eyepiece

### 2.3.3. Design Variables and Parameters

## Variables:

$R_{1} \quad$ Radius of curvature of the vertex of primary mirror
$R_{2} \quad$ Radius of curvature of the vertex of secondary mirror
$\varepsilon_{1} \quad$ Eccentricity of primary mirror
$\varepsilon_{2} \quad$ Eccentricity of secondary mirror
$Z_{\text {sch }} \quad$ Length of outside edge of Schmidt corrector to primary mirror
$Z_{\text {mirrors }} \quad$ Location of secondary mirror
$\delta S_{I}^{*} \quad$ Contribution of an aspheric plate to third order aberrations
h Baffle optimization free parameter

## Parameters:

$D_{\text {sch }}=$ 8inch $\quad$ Diameter of Schmidt corrector and primary stop
$\frac{F}{\#}=5 \quad$ Maximum $\frac{\text { focal }}{\#}$ range for Schmidt-Cassegrain
$\frac{F}{\#}=2.5 \quad$ Minimum $\frac{\text { focal }}{\#}$ range for Schmidt-Cassegrain
$\max _{\text {deadraysratio }}=0.35$ Maximum ratio of dead rays/total rays
$\lambda_{1}=656.27 \mathrm{~nm} \quad$ Wavelength of red light
$\lambda_{2}=546.07 \mathrm{~nm} \quad$ Wavelength of green light
$\lambda_{3}=486.13 \mathrm{~nm} \quad$ Wavelength of blue light
$n_{1}=1.51432 \quad$ Red light refractive index of BK7 glass
$n_{2}=1.51872 \quad$ Green light refractive index of BK7 glass
$n_{3}=1.52238$
Blue light refractive index of BK7 glass
$2 w=1^{\circ}$
Angular Field of View

### 2.3.4. Summary Model

$\min _{X} \sum_{\lambda=1}^{3} \sum_{\text {rays }=1}^{\text {numrays }} \Phi(X)$
where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Airy }=2.44 * \lambda * F / \# \\
& \Phi(x, y, z, \lambda)=\frac{2000}{1+e^{100000\left(\frac{\text { Airy }}{2}-\operatorname{spot}(x, y, z, \lambda)\right)}}
\end{aligned}
$$

subject to
g1: $\quad \frac{F}{\#}-\frac{F}{\#}_{\max } \leq 0$
g2: $\quad \frac{F}{\#}_{\min }-\frac{F}{\#} \leq 0$
g3: $\quad \frac{\text { deadrays }(\text { case } \# 1 \sim \# 5)}{\text { rays }_{\text {total }}}-\max _{\text {deadraysratio }} \leq 0$
g4: $\quad \delta S_{I}^{*}+\frac{f_{1}^{\prime}}{4} \leq 0$
g5: $\quad-Z_{\text {mirrors }}-Z_{\text {sch }} \leq 0$
h1: $\quad-f^{\prime} \zeta+L \zeta+\delta S_{I}^{*}=0$
h2: $\quad-d_{1} \xi-\frac{-f^{\prime}}{2}+\frac{s_{p l}}{f^{\prime}} \delta S_{I}^{*}=0$
h3: $\quad \frac{f^{\prime}}{L}\left(f^{\prime}+d_{1}\right)+\frac{d_{1}^{2}}{L} \xi+\left(\frac{s_{p l}}{f^{\prime}}\right)^{2} \delta S_{I}^{*}=0$
h4: $\quad \rho_{\text {baf }}(h)=\left[\left(Z_{3}-Z_{2}\right)^{2}+\left(Y_{3}-Y_{2}\right)^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}=0$

### 2.4. Mathematical Model (II)

After first mathematical model is defined, a lot of changes and corrections are made.
Objective function is changed to minimize RMS (root mean square) of spot size based on geometric optics, and baffle equality constraint is removed to simplify the model.

### 2.4.1. Objective function

$$
\min _{X}\left(f_{1}(X)+f_{2}(X)\right) * 10^{3}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{1}=\sqrt{\frac{1}{\text { numRays }} \sum_{i=1}^{\text {numRays }}\left(\sqrt{x_{i}^{2}+y_{i}^{2}}\right)^{2}} \quad \text { with } \mathrm{w}=0^{\circ} \\
& f_{2}=\sqrt{\frac{1}{\text { numRays }} \sum_{i=1}^{\text {numRays }}\left(\sqrt{x_{i}^{2}+y_{i}^{2}}\right)^{2}} \quad \text { with } \mathrm{w}=0.5^{\circ} \\
& (\mathrm{Xi}, \mathrm{Yi}): \text { Position of i-th spot }
\end{aligned}
$$

### 2.4.2. Design Variables and Parameters

## Variables:

$R_{1} \quad$ Radius of curvature of the vertex of primary mirror
$R_{2} \quad$ Radius of curvature of the vertex of secondary mirror
$\varepsilon_{1} \quad$ Eccentricity of primary mirror
$\varepsilon_{2} \quad$ Eccentricity of secondary mirror
$Z_{\text {mirrors }} \quad$ Location of secondary mirror
v Vertex of back focus
g Relative power of Schmidt corrector

## Parameters:

$D_{\text {sch }}=200 \mathrm{~mm} \quad$ Diameter of Schmidt corrector and primary stop
$Z_{\text {sch }}=600 \mathrm{~mm} \quad$ Length of outside edge of Schmidt corrector to primary mirror
$\frac{F}{\#}=10 \quad \frac{\text { focal }}{\#}$ for Schmidt-Cassegrain
$\lambda_{1}=656.27 \mathrm{~nm} \quad$ Wavelength of red light
$\lambda_{2}=546.07 \mathrm{~nm} \quad$ Wavelength of green light
$\lambda_{3}=486.13 \mathrm{~nm} \quad$ Wavelength of blue light
$n_{1}=1.51432 \quad$ Red light refractive index of BK7 glass
$n_{2}=1.51872 \quad$ Green light refractive index of BK7 glass
$n_{3}=1.52238 \quad$ Blue light refractive index of BK7 glass
$2 w=1^{\circ} \quad$ Angular Field of View

### 2.4.3. Summary Model

$$
\min _{X}\left(f_{1}(X)+f_{2}(X)\right) * 10^{3}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{1}=\sqrt{\frac{1}{\text { numRays }} \sum_{i=1}^{\text {numRays }}\left(\sqrt{x_{i}^{2}+y_{i}^{2}}\right)^{2}} \quad \text { with } \mathrm{w}=0^{\circ} \\
& f_{2}=\sqrt{\frac{1}{\text { numRays }} \sum_{i=1}^{\text {numRays }}\left(\sqrt{x_{i}^{2}+y_{i}^{2}}\right)^{2}} \quad \text { with } \mathrm{w}=0.5^{\circ}
\end{aligned}
$$

(Xi, Yi) : Position of spot
Airy $=1.22 * \lambda * F / \#$
$\frac{1}{f^{\prime}}=\frac{-f^{\prime}{ }_{2}+f_{1}^{\prime}-Z_{\text {mirrors }}}{f^{\prime}{ }_{1} f^{\prime}{ }_{2}}, f_{1}^{\prime}=R_{1} / 2, f^{\prime}{ }_{2}=R_{2} / 2$
subject to
g1: $\quad$ max distance of $\operatorname{spot}\left(w=0^{\circ}\right)-$ Airy $\leq 0$
g2: $\quad$ max distance of $\operatorname{spot}\left(w=0.5^{\circ}\right)-$ Airy $\leq 0$
g3: $\quad-Z_{\text {mirrors }}-Z_{\text {sch }} \leq 0$
g4: $\quad-20000 \leq R_{1} \leq 0$
g5: $\quad-20000 \leq R_{2} \leq 0$
g6: $\quad 0 \leq \varepsilon_{1}^{2} \leq 1$
g7: $\quad 0 \leq \varepsilon_{2}{ }^{2} \leq 1$
g8: $\quad 0.5 \leq g \leq 1.0$
g9: $\quad-1000 \leq Z_{\text {mirrors }} \leq-10$
g10: $\quad 20 \leq v \leq 500$
h1: $\quad \frac{F}{\#} * D_{\text {sch }}-f^{\prime}=0$

### 2.5. Ray Tracing

In the following sections, the results of ray-trace will be presented. Negative values for r , d (distance between mirrors), and n (refractive index) mean that rays go to the left. The following examples are used to show the ray-trace results. Last surfaces are the focal planes in the tables.

System 1: Newtonian. $D=150$, Primary mirror is spherical

| Surface | r | $\mathrm{e}^{2}$ | d | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | -500 | 0 | 300 | 1 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | -250 | -1 |

System 2: Cassegrain. $D=150$

| Surface | r | $\mathrm{e}^{2}$ | d | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | -1000 | 1 | 500 | 1 |
| 2 | -373.33 | 2.778 | -360 | -1 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 560 | 1 |

System 3: Spherical mirror with Schmidt corrector. $\mathrm{D}=150$ (same as 1 except corrector)

| Surface | r | $\mathrm{e}^{2}$ | d | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 (Sch) | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1.51872 |
| 2 | -500 | 0 | 295 | 1 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | -250 | -1 |

System 4: Schmidt-Cassegrain. D=150

| Surface | r | $\mathrm{e}^{2}$ | d | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1($ Sch $)$ | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1.51872 |
| 2 | -1000 | 1 | 495 | 1 |
| 3 | -373.33 | 2.778 | -360 | -1 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 560 | 1 |

### 2.5.1. Initial rays

Initial rays are constructed in concentric pattern using given minimum number of rays.
These rays are used in spot diagram.


Figure 3 Example of initial rays. ( $D=100 \mathrm{~mm}$ )

### 2.5.2. Examples of ray-trace



Figure 4 Result of ray-trace of System 1 and its spherical aberration. ( $\mathrm{w}=0^{\circ}$ )


Figure 5 Result of ray-trace of System 2. $\left(\mathrm{w}=0.45^{\circ}\right)$


Figure 7 Result of ray-trace of System 4. $\left(w=0.45^{\circ}\right)$

### 2.5.3. Spot diagram

Spot diagram is the set of points which is formed on the focal plane after passing several lenses and mirrors. Examples of spot diagram are given in Figure 8.

(a) System $1\left(w=0^{\circ}\right)$

(c) System 3 ( $\mathrm{w}=0.45^{\circ}$, defocus -1)

(b) System $2\left(w=0^{\circ}\right)$

(d) System $1\left(\mathrm{w}=0.45^{\circ}, \mathrm{R} 1=-300, \mathrm{~d}=-1500\right)$

Figure 8 Examples of spot diagrams

### 2.6. Result

### 2.6.1. iSIGHT Model



Figure 9 iSIGHT process integration


Figure 10 Parameters and initial values in iSIGHT

### 2.6.2. iSIGHT Result

## Parameter Information

| Inputs | Type | Current Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R1 | REAL | -1599.42925616822 |
| e1 | REAL | 0.0666500298321939 |
| e 2 | REAL | 1.0 |
| Zmirrors | REAL | -552.446054174238 |
| Zsch | REAL | 600.0 |
| v | REAL | 61.2673611322561 |
| g | REAL | 0.644926034485024 |
| Dsch | REAL | 200.0 |
| FNo | REAL | 10.0 |


| Outputs | Type | Current Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R2 | REAL | -824.032616560787 |
| g1 | REAL | -47.553945825762 |
| f | REAL | 288.974630307584 |
| SpotRms1 | REAL | 0.000585767967671273 |
| SpotRms2 | REAL | 0.0682401995228084 |
| Airy | REAL | 0.006662054 |
| g2 | REAL | -0.00607628603232873 |
| g3 | REAL | 0.0615781455228084 |
| Objective | REAL | 288.974630307584 |
| Feasibility | INTEGER | 3 |
| TaskProcessStatus | REAL | -1.0 |

* Current Value $=$ value when report was generated


## Optimization Techniques

| Step 1 | Sequential Quadratic Programming - NLPQL |
| :---: | :---: |
| Step 2 | Mixed Integer Optimization - MOST |


| Design Variables | Type | Lower Bound | Current Value | Upper Bound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| e 1 | REAL | 0.0 | 0.0666500298321939 | 1.0 |
| e 2 | REAL | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Zmirrors | REAL | -1000.0 | -552.446054174238 | -10.0 |
| v | REAL | 20.0 | 61.2673611322561 | 500.0 |
| g | REAL | 0.5 | 0.644926034485024 | 1.0 |
| R1 | REAL | -2000.0 | -1599.42925616822 | 0.0 |


| Output Constraints | Type | Lower Bound | Current Value | Upper Bound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| g1 | REAL |  | -47.553945825762 | 0.0 |
| g 2 | REAL |  | -0.00607628603232873 | 0.0 |
| g 3 | REAL |  | 0.0615781455228084 | 0.0 |


| Objectives | Type | Direction | Current Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f | REAL | minimize | 288.974630307584 |

## Execution Results ( After first iteration 222 )

| Task | Task1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total runs | 146 |
| Feasible runs | 0 |
| Infeasible runs | 146 |
| Failed runs | 0 |
| Database file | Task1.db |


| Best design: | currently | previously |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RunCounter | 369 | 222 |
| ObjectiveAndPenalty | 302.766498313612 | 302.824676106791 |
| Objective | 288.974630307584 | 289.036636836608 |
| Penalty | 13.791868006028 | 13.788039270183 |

## Best design parameter values

| R1 | -1599.42925616822 | previously |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| e1 | 0.0666500298321939 |  |
| e2 | 1.0 |  |
| Zmirrors | -552.446054174238 |  |
| Zsch | 600.0 |  |
| v | 61.2673611322561 |  |
| g | 0.644926034485024 |  |
| Dsch | 200.0 |  |
| FNo | 10.0 |  |
| R2 | -824.032616560787 |  |
| g1 | -47.553945825762 |  |
| f | 288.974630307584 |  |
| SpotRms1 | 0.000585767967671273 |  |
| SpotRms2 | 0.0682401995228084 |  |
| Airy | 0.006662054 |  |
| g2 | -0.00607628603232873 |  |
| 0.0615781455228084 |  |  |

### 2.6.3. Spot diagram of optimal design



Figure 11 Spot diagram

### 2.7. Discussion

First, optimization problems from the one mirror system to Cassegrain telescope were solved with MATLAB fmincon to check the availability of the mathematical model. After verifying the feasibility of the model, SCT optimization model was constructed by iSIGHT because of easy manipulation of design variables and constraints, and the preparation of system integration.

Figure 11 shows the spot diagram of optimal design by iSIGHT. A black circle in Figure 11 is the airy disc which is a diameter of the first PSF minima, given by $2.44 \lambda \mathrm{~F}$ linearly and $2.44 \lambda / \mathrm{D}$ angularly (in radians) $-\lambda$ being the wavelength of light, F the ratio of focal length vs. aperture D of the optical system, and it encircles $83.8 \%$ of the total energy contained by the diffraction pattern. As can be seen, this optimal solution has the good optical performance with the incident angle 0 degree.


Figure 12 Various results of optimization

However, coma aberration of which spot diagram is the comet shape still exists. Although 10 combinations of different objective functions and constraints are used to try to remove coma aberration, there is no feasible solution to get rid of the coma. Various results are given in Figure 12, but every spot diagram has coma or spherical aberration.

Different starting points or scaling the problem might be needed to get better result. Also, surrogate model may result in better design because the objective function could have the noise, so it could have many local optima. Although these were not covered in this study, these could be done as the future work.

## 3. THERMAL DESIGN

### 3.1. Problem Statement

The telescope can be used in different temperature environments which will affect the performance of the system. Thermal expansion or compression will result in misalignments of the parts and aberrations within the system. The system is designed for room temperature; however the telescope could be brought outside during a cold night or used in very hot conditions. Thermal displacements shall be taken into account for the outside tube. This will affect the positioning of the Schmidt corrector and secondary mirror.

When temperature changes, corresponding changes occur in optical surface radii, air spaces and lens thicknesses, the refractive indices of optical materials and of the surrounding air, as well as the physical dimensions of structural members. Any of these effects will tend to defocus and misalign the system.

Temperature gradients, axial and radial, can also exist in the system. These may cause effects similar to decentrations or tilts of optics (affecting imagery) and develop line-ofsight pointing errors. But in our model, we shall neglect these temperature gradients and assume that temperature is uniform throughout the lens and that; there is no tilting of the lens. Dimensional changes of optical and mechanical parts forming assemblies usually cause changes in clamping forces (preloads); these changes affect contact stresses at opto-mechanical interfaces. Although these problems may be serious if they are not attended to, most can be eliminated or drastically reduced in magnitude by careful optomechanical design.

### 3.2. Nomenclature

| Variable | Description | Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\alpha_{M}$ | Coefficient of thermal expansion of optical materials | $1 /{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| $\alpha_{G}$ | Coefficient of thermal expansion of mount | $1 /{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| $\Delta \mathrm{T}$ | Temperature change | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{G}}$ | Optic outer diameter | mm |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | Diameter of primary mirror | mm |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | Diameter of secondary mirror | mm |
| Dsch | Diameter of Schmidt corrector | mm |
| tc | Mount wall thickness | mm |
| $\Delta \mathrm{r}$ | Radial clearance | mm |
| $\sigma_{\mathrm{R}}$ | Radial Stress | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ |
| $\sigma_{M}$ | Tangential Stress | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{R}_{1}$ | Radius of back-surface of primary mirror | mm |
| $\mathrm{R}_{2}$ | Radius of back-surface of secondary mirror | mm |
| R | Radius of front-surface of primary mirror | mm |
| r | Radius of front-surface of secondary mirror | mm |
| $\mathrm{m}_{1}$ | Mass of primary mirror | Kg |
| $\mathrm{m}_{2}$ | Mass of secondary mirror | Kg |
| P | Total axial Preload | N |
| $\Delta \mathrm{P}$ | Change in preload | N |
| $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}}$ | Assembly temperature | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| $\Delta \mathrm{a}$ | Axial gap | mm |
| $\mathrm{t}_{1}$ | Edge thickness of primary mirror | mm |
| $\mathrm{t}_{2}$ | Edge thickness of secondary mirror | mm |
| Zmirrors | Distance between primary and secondary mirrors | mm |
| Zsch | Distance between primary mirror and Schmidt corrector | mm |
| $\mathrm{Z}_{\text {tube }}$ | Length of the tube | mm |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\text {tube }}$ | Nominal diameter of tube | mm |
| $\mathrm{f}_{1}$ | Focal length of primary mirror | mm |
| $\mathrm{f}_{2}$ | Focal length of secondary mirror | mm |
| f | Focal length of telescope | mm |
| fno | Focal number of the telescope | - |
| fno_new | Focal number of telescope after deformation | - |



Figure 13 Schematic Layout

Changes in temperature cause differential expansion or contraction of circular-aperture optics (lenses, windows, filters and mirrors) with respect to mounting materials in both axial and radial directions. In the discussion of effects of changes in radial dimensions, we assume rotational symmetry of optics and pertinent portions of mount. That is, clearance between optical outer diameter and inner diameter of mount is small; that all components are at uniform temperature before and after each temperature change; that the co-efficients of thermal expansion (CTEs) of optical materials and of the mount are $\alpha_{G}$ and $\alpha_{M}$ respectively; and that the temperature changes are $\Delta T$.

The CTE of mount usually exceeds that of optic mounted in it. In usual case, a drop in temperature will cause the mount to contract radially toward the optic's rim. Any radial clearance between these components will decrease in size and, if temperature falls far enough, the inner diameter of mount will contact outer diameter of optic. Any further decrease in temperature will cause radial force to be exerted upon the rim of optic. The force compresses the optic radially and creates radial stresses. To the degree of approximation applied here, the strain and stress are symmetrical about the axis. If stress is large enough, the performance of optic will be adversely affected. Extremely large stresses will cause failure of optic and plastic deformation of the mount.

If $\alpha G>\alpha M$, increase in temperature will cause the mount to expand away from the optic, thereby increasing radial clearance or creating such a clearance. Significant increase in
radial clearance may allow the optic to shift under external forces such as shock or vibration, and then the alignment may be affected.
(1) Radial Stress in optic

The magnitude of radial stress, $\sigma_{\mathrm{R}}$ in a rim contact mounted optic for a given temperature drop $\Delta \mathrm{T}$ can be estimated as,

$$
\begin{gathered}
\sigma_{\mathrm{R}}=-\mathrm{K}_{1} \mathrm{~K}_{2} \Delta \mathrm{~T} \\
\text { where, } K_{1}=\frac{\alpha_{M}-\alpha_{G}}{\frac{1}{E_{G}}+\frac{D_{G}}{2 E_{M} t_{C}}} \\
K_{2}=1+\frac{2 \Delta r}{D_{G} \Delta T\left(\alpha_{M}-\alpha_{G}\right)}
\end{gathered}
$$

Where, $D_{G}$ is optic $O D, t_{c}$ the mount wall thickness directly outside the rim of optic, and $\Delta \mathrm{r}$ the radial clearance.

Note that $\Delta \mathrm{T}$ is negative for temperature decrease. Also $0<\mathrm{K}_{2}<1$.
If $\Delta r$ exceeds $\left[D_{G} . \Delta T\left(\alpha_{M}-\alpha_{G}\right) / 2\right]$, the optic will not be constrained by the mount ID and radial stress will not develop within the temperature range $\Delta \mathrm{T}$ as a result of rim contact.
(2) Tangential (Hoop) Stress in the mount wall

Another consequence of differential contraction of the mount relative to rim contact optic is that the stress built up within the mount in accordance with the following equation,

$$
\sigma_{M}=\sigma_{R} \cdot D_{G} /\left(2 t_{c}\right)
$$

Where, $\sigma_{M}$ is the tangential stress.
With this expression, we can determine if the mount is strong enough to withstand the force exerted upon the optic without causing plastic deformation or failure. If yield strength of mount material exceeds $\sigma_{M}$, a safety factor exists. Note that if $K_{2}$ is negative, there can be no stress in the cell wall.

## Radial Effects at increased temperature

The increase $\Delta \mathrm{GAP}_{\mathrm{R}}$, in nominal radial clearance $\mathrm{GAP}_{\mathrm{R}}$, between the optic and its mount that is due to temperature increase of $\Delta \mathrm{T}$ can be estimated by,

$$
\Delta \mathrm{GAP}_{\mathrm{R}}=\left(\alpha_{\mathrm{M}}-\alpha_{\mathrm{G}}\right)\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{G} / 2}\right) \Delta \mathrm{T}
$$

## Changes in Axial Preload caused by temperature variations

Optical and mounting materials usually have dissimilar CTEs, generally $\alpha_{M}>\alpha_{G}$. So temperature changes of $\Delta \mathrm{T}$ cause changes in total axial preload P . This change in preload is given by the equation,

$$
\Delta \mathrm{P}=\mathrm{K}_{3} \Delta \mathrm{~T}
$$

Where, $K_{3}$ is the 'temperature sensitivity factor' which is the rate of change of preload with temperature for the design.

Knowledge of $\mathrm{K}_{3}$ would be advantageous because it would allow the estimation of actual preload at any temperature by adding $\Delta \mathrm{P}$ to actual preload. In absence of friction, the preload will be same at all surfaces of all lenses clamped by single retaining ring.

If $\alpha_{M}>\alpha_{G}$, the metal in the mount expands more than the optic for given temperature increase $\Delta \mathrm{T}$. Any axial preload existing at assembly temperature $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}}$, will then decrease. If temperature rises sufficiently, preload will disappear. If the lens is not otherwise constrained axially, it will be free to move within the mount in response to externally applied forces. We define the temperature at which preload goes to zero as $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{C}}$. It is given by the equation,

$$
\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}}-\left(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{A}} / \mathrm{K}_{3}\right)
$$

The mount maintains contact with the lens until temperature rises to $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{C}}$. A further temperature increase introduces an axial gap between mount and the lens. This gap should not exceed the design tolerance for despace of this lens.

The increase in axial gap $\Delta \mathrm{GAP}_{\mathrm{A}}$ created in single element lens subassembly, a cemented doublet lens subassembly, air-spaced doublet subassembly, and general multilens subassembly as the temperature rises by $\Delta \mathrm{T}$ above $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{C}}$ can be approximated, respectively as,

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Delta \mathrm{GAP}_{\mathrm{A}}=\left(\alpha_{\mathrm{M}}-\alpha_{\mathrm{G}}\right)\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{E}}\right)\left(\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{c}}\right) \\
\Delta \mathrm{GAP}_{\mathrm{A}}=\left[\left(\alpha_{\mathrm{M}}-\alpha_{\mathrm{G} 1}\right)\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{E} 1}\right)+\left(\alpha_{\mathrm{M}}-\alpha_{\mathrm{G} 2}\right)\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{E} 2}\right)\right]\left(\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{c}}\right) \\
\Delta \mathrm{GAP}_{\mathrm{A}}=\left[\left(\alpha_{\mathrm{M}}-\alpha_{\mathrm{G} 1}\right)\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{E} 1}\right)+\left(\alpha_{\mathrm{M}}-\alpha_{\mathrm{S}}\right)\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{S}}\right)+\left(\alpha_{\mathrm{M}}-\alpha_{\mathrm{G} 2}\right)\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{E} 2}\right)\right]\left(\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{c}}\right) \\
\Delta \mathrm{GAP}_{\mathrm{A}}=\Sigma_{1}{ }^{n}\left(\alpha_{\mathrm{M}}-\alpha_{1}\right)\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)\left(\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{c}}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

In all the cases, if the preload applied at assembly is large, the calculated value for $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{C}}$ may exceed $\mathrm{T}_{\text {max }}$. In this case, $\Delta \mathrm{GAP}_{\mathrm{A}}$ will be negative, indicating that glass-to-metal contact is never lost within the range $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}} \leq \mathrm{T} \leq \mathrm{T}_{\text {MAX }}$.

Small changes in position and orientation of the lens are tolerable. However, high accelerations applied to lens assembly when clearance exists between lens and its mounting surfaces may cause damage to the lens from glass-to-metal impacts. Also, various optical errors like change of focus, astigmatism, and coma result from shifts in the position of optical surfaces. All these considerations translate into our objective function for design optimization of the thermal subsystem.

## Clamping mechanism of the mirrors

A threaded retainer mechanism is used for mounting the mirrors in the outer tube. The retainer can be moved on the threaded tube wall, which then holds the lens within opposite retaining pads. The retainer applies the required clamping force (preload) at assembly temperature. This retainer then, moves along the threads due to
expansion/contraction of mirrors and the tube during temperature changes, which causes the preload to vary.
The mechanism is shown below:


Figure 14 Lens mounting configuration for a single lens

### 3.3. Mathematical Model

### 3.3.1. Objective Function

The objective function of thermal subsystem is to maximize the robustness of the lens system. Now, the change in temperature causes equivalent expansion/contraction of the mirrors, which effectively deforms the mirrors and causes change in the focal length of the system.

So, we define our objective function as,
'To minimize the change in focal number of the system, because of the change in temperature.'

Minimize

$$
f=\left|\left(\frac{f}{n o}\right)_{\text {new }}-\left(\frac{f}{n o .}\right)\right|
$$

### 3.3.2. Design Variables

The dimensions of the two mirrors will be considered while optimizing the design.
The radius of back-surface of the mirrors and the thickness of the mirrors will be the design variables, which will affect the objective function.

## Variables:

$\mathrm{R}_{1}$-back Radius of back-surface of primary mirror
$\mathrm{R}_{2}$-back Radius of back-surface of secondary mirror
$t_{1} \quad$ Thickness of primary mirror
$\mathrm{t}_{2} \quad$ Thickness of secondary mirror

### 3.3.3. Design Parameters

Hard Parameters
A careful selection of materials for the optical mirrors and the mounting tube will be executed.
Corning Pyrex ${ }^{\circledR} 7740$ Borosilicate glass is used for the primary and secondary mirrors. Pyrex ${ }^{\circledR}$ provides unique chemical, thermal, mechanical and optical properties. The material selected for the mounting tube is a wrought aluminum alloy called Aluminum 7050-T7451.

The mechanical and thermal properties for these materials can be considered as hard parameters.

| $\alpha_{M}$ | Coefficient of thermal expansion of the mounting tube | $2.353 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{m}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\alpha_{G}$ | Coefficient of thermal expansion of the mirrors | $3.25 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{m}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| $\rho_{\mathrm{M}}$ | Density of mounting tube | $2823 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{cu} . \mathrm{m}$ |
| $\rho_{\mathrm{G}}$ | Density of mirrors | $2230 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{cu} . \mathrm{m}$ |

## Performance Parameters

Certain values are considered as parameters during formulation of the design optimization model.

| $\Delta \mathrm{T}$ | Change in temperature | $90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{T}_{\text {max }}$ | Maximum temperature | $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| $\mathrm{T}_{\text {min }}$ | Minimum temperature | $-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}}$ | Assembly temperature | $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | Diameter of primary mirror | 203 mm |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | Diameter of primary mirror | 60 mm |
| $\mathrm{R}_{1}$ | Radius of front surface of primary mirror | 810 mm |
| $\mathrm{R}_{2}$ | Radius of front surface of secondary mirror | 250 mm |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\text {sch }}$ | Diameter of Schmidt corrector | 203 mm |
| $\mathrm{Z}_{\text {mirrors }}$ | Distance between the mirrors | 255 mm |
| f | Focal length of telescope at assembly temperature | 2030 mm |

### 3.3.4. Constraints

Dimensional constraints for primary mirror
g1: $\quad-\mathrm{t} 1+\mathrm{S}+\mathrm{S} 1 \leq 0.003$
g2: $\quad-\mathrm{S} 1 \leq 0$
Dimensional constraints for primary mirror
g3: $\quad-\mathrm{S} 2+\mathrm{s} \leq 0.004$
g4: $\quad \mathrm{S} 2-\mathrm{s} \leq 0$
g5: $\quad-\mathrm{S} 2 \leq 0$
Mass constraint for primary mirror
g6: $\quad \Pi \times \rho G \times\left[t 1 \times\left(D 1^{2} / 4\right)-S 1^{2} \times(R 1\right.$ back $\left.-S 1 / 3)-S^{2}(R 1-S / 3)\right] \leq 1$
Mass constraint for secondary mirror
g7: $\quad \Pi \times \rho G \times\left[t 2 \times\left(D 2^{2} / 4\right)-S 2^{2} \times(R 2\right.$ back $\left.-S 2 / 3)-s^{2}(R 2-s / 3)\right] \leq 0.7$

## Definitions

Mirror geometry

1) $S=R_{1}-\sqrt{R_{1}-\left(D_{1} / 4\right)^{2}}$
2) $S_{1}=R_{1} b a c k-\sqrt{R_{1} b a c k-\left(D_{1} / 4\right)^{2}}$
3) $s=R_{2}-\sqrt{R_{2}-\left(D_{2} / 4\right)^{2}}$
4) $S_{2}=R_{2}$ back $-\sqrt{R_{2} \text { back }-\left(D_{2} / 4\right)^{2}}$

Focal length
5) $f_{1}=R_{1} / 2$
6) $f_{2}=R_{2} / 2$
7) $\frac{1}{f}=\frac{-f_{2}+f_{1}-Z_{\text {mirrors }}}{f_{1} \times f_{2}}$
8) $\frac{1}{f_{\text {new }}}=\frac{-f_{\text {neew }}+f_{1 \text { new }}-Z_{\text {mirrors }}}{f_{\text {Inew }} \times f_{\text {2new }}}$
9) $\left(\frac{f}{n o .}\right)=\frac{f}{D_{s c h}}$
10) $\left(\frac{f}{n o .}\right)_{\text {new }}=\frac{f_{\text {new }}}{D_{\text {sch }}}$

### 3.3.5. Summary of the model

Minimize

$$
f=\left|\left(\frac{f}{\text { no. }}\right)_{\text {new }}-\left(\frac{f}{\text { no. }}\right)\right|
$$

Subject to
g1: $\quad-\mathrm{t} 1+\mathrm{S}+\mathrm{S} 1 \leq 0.003$
g2: $\quad-\mathrm{S} 1 \leq 0$
g3: $\quad-\mathrm{S} 2+\mathrm{s} \leq 0.004$
g4: $\quad \mathrm{S} 2-\mathrm{s} \leq 0$
g5: $\quad-\mathrm{S} 2 \leq 0$
g6: $\quad \Pi \times \rho G \times\left[t 1 \times\left(D 1^{2} / 4\right)-\mathrm{S}^{2} \times(\mathrm{R} 1\right.$ back $\left.-\mathrm{S} 1 / 3)-\mathrm{S}^{2}(\mathrm{R} 1-\mathrm{S} / 3)\right] \leq 1$
g7: $\quad \Pi \times \rho \mathrm{G} \times\left[\mathrm{t} 2 \times\left(\mathrm{D} 2^{2} / 4\right)-\mathrm{S} 2^{2} \times(\mathrm{R} 2\right.$ back $\left.-\mathrm{S} 2 / 3)-\mathrm{s}^{2}(\mathrm{R} 2-\mathrm{s} / 3)\right] \leq 0.7$

### 3.4. Model Analysis

The model involves thermal analysis of the mirrors. The behavior of the lens with change in temperature will be analyzed. This means, various important design considerations like deformations, change in focal number, and stresses developed will be observed.

### 3.4.1. Determination of preload at temperature limits

As stated earlier, the change in preload due to change in temperature is given as,

$$
\Delta \mathrm{P}=\mathrm{K}_{3} \cdot \Delta \mathrm{~T}
$$

where, $K_{3}$ is the temperature sensitivity factor. $K_{3}=\frac{-\left(\alpha_{M}-\alpha_{G}\right)}{\frac{2 t_{E}}{E_{G} A_{G}}+\frac{t_{E}}{E_{M} A_{M}}}$
For mirror 1
On careful study, $\mathrm{K}_{3}$ is taken equal to $-10 \mathrm{~N} /{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$
Also, acceleration due to vibrations, in axial direction is taken to be 15 times gravity and mass to be 0.6 kg .
Then preload needed to overcome acceleration $=0.6 \times 15 \times 9.81=90 \mathrm{~N}$
The preload dissipated from $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}}$ to $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{MAX}}=(-10) \times 40=-400 \mathrm{~N}$
So total preload needed at assembly $=90+400=490 \mathrm{~N}$
And,
Preload dissipated from $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}}$ to $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{MIN}}=(-10) \times 50=-500 \mathrm{~N}$
So total preload at $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{MIN}}=490+500=990 \mathrm{~N}=$ approx. 1000 N

For mirror 2
On careful study, $\mathrm{K}_{3}$ is taken equal to $-6 \mathrm{~N} /{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$
Also, acceleration due to vibrations, in axial direction is taken to be 15 times gravity and mass to be 0.4 kg .

Then preload needed to overcome acceleration $=0.4 \times 15 \times 9.81=60 \mathrm{~N}$
The preload dissipated from $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}}$ to $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{MAX}}=(-6) \times 40=-240 \mathrm{~N}$
So total preload needed at assembly $=60+240=300 \mathrm{~N}$

And,
Preload dissipated from $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{A}}$ to $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{MIN}}=(-6) \times 50=-300 \mathrm{~N}$
So total preload at $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{MIN}}=300+300=600 \mathrm{~N}$

The next step in problem solving is structural analysis in Ansys. We have accounted for the thermal changes by calculating the preloads at temperature limits. For simplification purposes, we shall use only the maximum preload. This preload occurs at minimum temperature, as can be seen above.

### 3.4.2. FEM Analysis

FEM analysis holds a crucial role in the model optimization. Ansys is used for getting the finite element results.

Since the dimensions of the mirrors are unknown, we will use the parametric batch mode programming in Ansys. Ansys will perform its regular run and will give the deformation of the mirror, and will generate output file giving the deformations at the nodes.
The values of back-radius of the mirrors and the thickness will affect the deformation for the given preload, and our aim is to find the optimum value of these minimizers to get the minimum objective function, which is change in focal number.

Since, focal length depends on front-radius, we will get the deflections of only the nodes on front face of the mirrors. Also, we know the initial co-ordinates of these nodes, from which we can calculate the new co-ordinates after deformation. Once these co-ordinates are known, a quadratic curve is fitted to this data, from which the new focal length can be calculated.

The output from the analysis is shown below.

Mirror 1 Analysis


Figure 15 Deformed Structure


Figure 16 X and Y deformations

Mirror 2 Analysis


Figure 17 Deformed structure


Figure 18 X and Y deformations

### 3.5. Optimization Study

The Optimization study will give the optimum values of design variables, namely $\mathrm{R}_{1}$ back, $R_{2}$ back, $t_{1}$ and $t_{2}$, for which the telescope will have the minimum change in focal number, when exposed to temperature gradient.

### 3.5.1. MATLAB Analysis

The MATLAB code for optimization, fmincon, will be interfaced with Ansys using the batch mode. Ansys will then perform the iterative analysis for optimization, which will give the optimized value for the variables and minimum change in focal number, for changes in temperature.


Figure 19 Process flow

The functions and the constraints were carefully scaled as the variables were of different orders, with the radii of back-surfaces being of the order of meters, and the thicknesses of mirrors of the order of millimeters. After scaling was performed, fmincon gave a feasible optimum solution and the results are quoted below. The following results were obtained.

## Numerical Results:

Warning: Large-scale (trust region) method does not currently solve this type of problem, using medium-scale (line search) instead.
$>$ In fmincon at 303
In mainfile at 29
\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%
Diagnostic Information
Number of variables: 4

Functions
Objective:
Gradient:
myfun
Hessian:
finite-differencing
Nonlinear constraints:
finite-differencing (or Quasi-Newton)
Nonlinear constraints: nonlcon
Gradient of nonlinear constraints: finite-differencing

## Constraints

Number of nonlinear inequality constraints: 7
Number of nonlinear equality constraints: 0

Number of linear inequality constraints: 0
Number of linear equality constraints: 0
Number of lower bound constraints: 4
Number of upper bound constraints: 4

[^0]```
y=
    1.0e+003 *
    2.800
```

$\mathrm{f}=$
1.0152

|  |  | Max | Line search | Directional | First order |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Iter | F-count | $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{x})$ | constraint | steplength | derivative | optimality Procedure |
| 4 | 45 | 1.0152 | -0.1125 | 1 | -0.166 | 25 Hessian modified |

As seen, the objective is minimized and all the constraints are satisfied. The minimum change in the focal number of the system comes out to be 1.0152 , which is practically a good value.

### 3.5.2. iSIGHT Analysis

The model was also tested and run in iSIGHT to see whether the same optimum solution is obtained. The iSIGHT results are shown below.

## Parameter Information

| Inputs | Type | Current Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R1Back | REAL | 2799.99999999988 |
| R1 | REAL | 810.0 |
| t 1 | REAL | 7.99999994722238 |
| R2Back | REAL | 1999.99799999976 |
| R2 | REAL | 250.0 |
| t2 | REAL | 7.00421985643328 |
| rho | REAL | $2.23 \mathrm{e}-006$ |
| D1 | REAL | 203.0 |
| D2 | REAL | 60.0 |
| pi | REAL | 3.141592 |
| Dsch | REAL | 203.0 |
| Zmirrors | REAL | 255.0 |


| Auxiliaries | Type | Current Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S | REAL | 1.59141673285035 |
| s | REAL | 0.450405730644405 |
| S1 | REAL | 0.459959654086106 |
| S2 | REAL | 0.0563070997220621 |


| Outputs | Type | Current Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| g 1 | REAL | -0.441112165449894 |
| g 2 | REAL | -0.656236593761532 |
| g 3 | REAL | -2.94862356028593 |
| g 4 | REAL | -3.60584511664595 |
| g 5 | REAL | -0.394154883354048 |
| g 6 | REAL | -0.459959654086106 |
| g 7 | REAL | -0.0562508472903573 |
| f | REAL | 1.0142764223645 |
| Objective | REAL | $\mathbf{1 . 0 1 4 2 7 6 4 2 2 3 6 4 5}$ |
| Feasibility | INTEGER | 9 |
| TaskProcessStatus | REAL | -1.0 |

* Current Value = value when report was generated


## Task Setup

## ---Optimize: PriorityRankedPlan

## Optimization Techniques:

| Step 1 | Sequential Quadratic Programming - NLPQL |
| :---: | :---: |
| Step 2 | Mixed Integer Optimization - MOST |


| Design Variables | Type | Lower Bound | Current Value | Upper Bound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R1Back | REAL | 1000.0 | 2799.9999999988 | 3200.0 |
| t 1 | REAL | 3.0 | 7.99999994722238 | 10.0 |
| R2Back | REAL | 600.0 | 1999.99799999976 | 2000.0 |
| t 2 | REAL | 3.0 | 7.00421985643328 | 8.0 |


| Output Constraints | Type | Lower Bound | Current Value | Upper Bound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| g 1 | REAL |  | -0.441112165449894 | 0.0 |
| g 2 | REAL |  | -0.656236593761532 | 0.0 |
| g 3 | REAL |  | -2.94862356028593 | 0.0 |
| g 4 | REAL |  | -3.60584511664595 | 0.0 |
| g 5 | REAL |  | -0.394154883354048 | 0.0 |
| g 6 | REAL |  | -0.459959654086106 | 0.0 |
| g 7 | REAL |  | -0.0562508472903573 | 0.0 |


| Objectives | Type | Direction | Current Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{f}$ | REAL | minimize | 1.0142764223645 |

## Execution Results

| Task | Task1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total runs | 100 |
| Feasible runs | 95 |
| Infeasible runs | 5 |
| Failed runs | 0 |
| Database file | Task1.db |

## Optimization Plan: PriorityRankedPlan

Executed between RunCounter 723 and 822 (100 runs)

## Techniques used:

| Step1 | Sequential Quadratic Programming - NLPQL |
| :---: | :---: |
| Step2 | Mixed Integer Optimization - MOST |


| Best design: | currently | previously |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RunCounter | 776 | 722 |
| ObjectiveAndPenalty | 1.0142764223645 | 1.01709992437423 |
| Objective | 1.0142764223645 | 1.01709992437423 |
| Penalty | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Best design ObjectiveAndPenalty value improved by 0.00282350201 ( $0.28 \%$ ) after executing this Optimization Plan

Best design parameter values:

| R1Back | $\mathbf{2 7 9 9 . 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 8 8}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| R1 | 810.0 |
| t1 | $\mathbf{7 . 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 4 7 2 2 3 8}$ |
| R2Back | $\mathbf{1 9 9 9 . 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 6}$ |
| R2 | 250.0 |
| t2 | $\mathbf{7 . 0 0 4 2 1 9 8 5 6 4 3 3 2 8}$ |
| rho | $2.23 \mathrm{e}-006$ |
| D1 | 203.0 |
| D2 | 60.0 |
| pi | 3.141592 |
| Dsch | 203.0 |
| Zmirrors | 2555.0 |
| g1 | -0.441112165449894 |
| g2 | -0.656236593761532 |


| g 3 | -2.94862356028593 |
| :---: | :---: |
| g 4 | -3.60584511664595 |
| g 5 | -0.394154883354048 |
| g 6 | -0.459959654086106 |
| g 7 | -0.0562508472903573 |
| $\mathbf{f}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 1 4 2 7 6 4 2 2 3 6 4 5}$ |

## History Plots (improvements only)



The above figure shows the progress of objective function against the number of runs. The figure is a plot of $8^{\text {th }}$ run at which the minimum result was obtained with very small change than the previous.

### 3.5.3. Discussion

(1) When compared with the results generated by fmincon, it is seen that the values of minimizers obtained in iSIGHT match well.
(2) The value of radius of back-surface of secondary mirror hits the upper bound, which implies that the function is oppositely monotonic with respect to this variable.
(3) The thermal analysis has been done by considering only the extreme temperature at which the preload is maximum. A better curve for the function variation can be obtained if all the temperatures over the temperature range and the respective preloads are considered.
(4) The algorithm has good global convergence, as the values obtained for optimal variables are same even if the initial point is changed.
(5) A parametric study will prove helpful to understand the sensitivity of the objective function with respect to various parameters.
(6) Some other techniques for optimization other than Sequential Quadratic Programming (SQP) and Mixed Integer Optimization (MOST) may be used if they can give a better design.

## 4. SYSTEM INTEGRATION

### 4.1. Interaction between subsystems

Both the subsystems have an objective function which ultimately gives a better image quality.

The optical subsystem aims at minimizing the aberrations in the telescope, so that maximum number of light rays hit the eyepiece and a clear image is obtained. The thermal subsystem considers the effects of temperature changes on performance of lens system. It aims at maximizing the robustness of the telescope with respect to temperature.

Thus, both the systems will give geometry of the structure after analysis. So a trade-off will have to be done between the geometries obtained from the two optimization processes for aberrations and robustness. This trade-off will have to be done, keeping in mind, the final objective of 'high quality image' of the telescope, as it is mainly used by amateur astronomers. We shall be following the 'All-in-one' approach for the system Integration and Optimization using iSIGHT.

### 4.2. Mathematical model

### 4.2.1. Design Variables

| $R_{2}$ | Radius of curvature of the vertex of secondary mirror |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\varepsilon_{1}$ | Eccentricity of primary mirror |
| $\varepsilon_{2}$ | Eccentricity of secondary mirror |
| $Z_{\text {mirrors }}$ | Location of secondary mirror |
| $v$ | Vertex of back focus |
| g | Relative power of Schmidt corrector |
| R 1 -back | Radius of back-surface of primary mirror |
| R 2 -back | Radius of back-surface of secondary mirror |
| t 1 | Thickness of primary mirror |
| t 2 | Thickness of secondary mirror |

### 4.2.2. Summary Model

$$
\min _{X}\left(f_{1}(X)+f_{2}(X)\right) * 10^{3}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{1}=\sqrt{\frac{1}{\text { numRays }} \sum_{i=1}^{\text {numRays }}\left(\sqrt{x_{i}^{2}+y_{i}^{2}}\right)^{2}} \quad \text { with } \mathrm{w}=0^{\circ} \\
& f_{2}=\sqrt{\frac{1}{\text { numRays }} \sum_{i=1}^{\text {numRays }}\left(\sqrt{x_{i}^{2}+y_{i}^{2}}\right)^{2}} \quad \text { with } \mathrm{w}=0.5^{\circ}
\end{aligned}
$$

(Xi, Yi) : Position of i-th spot

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Airy }=1.22 * \lambda * F / \# \\
& \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}=\frac{-f^{\prime}{ }_{2}+f_{1}^{\prime}-Z_{\text {mirrors }}}{f^{\prime} f^{\prime} '_{2}}, f_{1}^{\prime}=R_{1} / 2, f_{2}^{\prime}=R_{2} / 2
\end{aligned}
$$

subject to
g1: maximum distance of $\operatorname{spot}\left(w=0^{\circ}\right)$ - Airy $\leq 0$
g2: $\quad$ maximum distance of $\operatorname{spot}\left(w=0.5^{\circ}\right)-$ Airy $\leq 0$
g3: $\quad-Z_{\text {mirrors }}-Z_{\text {sch }} \leq 0$
g4: $\quad-\mathrm{t} 1+\mathrm{S}+\mathrm{S} 1 \leq 0.003$
g5: $\quad-\mathrm{S} 1 \leq 0$
g6: $\quad-\mathrm{S} 2+\mathrm{s} \leq 0.004$
g7: $\quad \mathrm{S} 2-\mathrm{s} \leq 0$
g8: $\quad-\mathrm{S} 2 \leq 0$
g9: $\quad \Pi \times \rho \mathrm{G} \times\left[\mathrm{t} 1 \times\left(\mathrm{D} 1^{2} / 4\right)-\mathrm{S}^{2} \times(\mathrm{R} 1\right.$ back $\left.-\mathrm{S} 1 / 3)-\mathrm{S}^{2}(\mathrm{R} 1-\mathrm{S} / 3)\right] \leq 1$
$\mathrm{g} 10: \quad \Pi \times \rho \mathrm{G} \times\left[\mathrm{t} 2 \times\left(\mathrm{D} 2^{2} / 4\right)-\mathrm{S} 2^{2} \times(\mathrm{R} 2\right.$ back $\left.-\mathrm{S} 2 / 3)-\mathrm{s}^{2}(\mathrm{R} 2-\mathrm{s} / 3)\right] \leq 0.7$
g11: $\quad f=\left|\left(\frac{f}{\text { no. }}\right)_{\text {new }}-\left(\frac{f}{\text { no. }}\right)\right|<1.5$
g12: $\quad-20000 \leq R_{2} \leq 0$
g13: $\quad 0 \leq \varepsilon_{1}^{2} \leq 1$
g14: $\quad 0 \leq \varepsilon_{2}{ }^{2} \leq 1$
g15: $\quad 0.5 \leq g \leq 1.0$
g16: $\quad-1000 \leq Z_{\text {mirrors }} \leq-10$
g17: $\quad 20 \leq v \leq 500$
g18: $\quad 1000 \leq$ R1back $\leq 3200$
g19: $\quad 600 \leq R 2$ back $\leq 2000$
g20: $\quad 3 \leq t_{1} \leq 10$
g21: $\quad 3 \leq t_{2} \leq 8$
h1: $\quad \frac{F}{\#} * D_{\text {sch }}-f^{\prime}=0$

### 4.3. Result

### 4.3.1. iSIGHT Model



Figure 20 iSIGHT process integration


Figure 21 Parameters and initial values in iSIGHT

### 4.3.2. iSIGHT Result

## Parameter Information

| Inputs | Type | Current Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R1 | REAL | -1000.0 |
| e 1 | REAL | 0.241268158665424 |
| e 2 | REAL | 0.813188920132218 |
| Zmirrors | REAL | -364.24710736342 |
| Zsch | REAL | 600.0 |
| v | REAL | 162.87204520286 |
| g | REAL | 0.54313763628044 |
| Dsch | REAL | 200.0 |
| FNo | REAL | 10.0 |
| R1Back | REAL | 2800.00015952392 |
| t1 | REAL | 7.06575666672614 |
| R2Back | REAL | 1800.18001534471 |
| t2 | REAL | 6.00667234586645 |
| rho | REAL | $2.23 \mathrm{e}-006$ |
| D1 | REAL | 203.0 |
| D2 | REAL | 60.0 |
| pi | REAL | 3.141592 |


| Auxiliaries | Type | Current Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S | REAL | 1.28861150981163 |
| S | REAL | 0.310672531191358 |
| S1 | REAL | 0.459959627876742 |
| S2 | REAL | 0.0624948348738599 |


| Outputs | Type | Current Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R2 | REAL | -362.007713697547 |
| g 1 | REAL | -235.75289263658 |
| f | REAL | 12.2698322075955 |
| SpotRms1 | REAL | 0.00214761407079987 |
| SpotRms2 | REAL | 0.00214761407079987 |
| Airy | REAL | 0.006662054 |
| g2 | REAL | -0.00451443992920013 |
| g3 | REAL | -0.00451443992920013 |
| g11 | REAL | -0.50580708618426 |
| g12 | REAL | -0.662421204465261 |
| g13 | REAL | -2.31718552903777 |
| g14 | REAL | -3.7515944720937 |
| g15 | REAL | -0.2484055279063 |
| g16 | REAL | -0.459959627876742 |
| g17 | REAL | -0.0624948348738599 |
| Fthermal | REAL | 0.984277856815019 |
| Objective | REAL | $\mathbf{1 2 . 2 6 9 8 3 2 2 0 7 5 9 5 5 ~}$ |
| Feasibility | INTEGER | 9 |
| TaskProcessStatus | REAL | -1.0 |

[^1]Optimization Techniques

| Step 1 | Sequential Quadratic Programming - NLPQL |
| :---: | :---: |
| Step 2 | Mixed Integer Optimization - MOST |


| Design Variables | Type | Lower Bound | Current Value | Upper Bound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| e 1 | REAL | 0.0 | 0.241268158665424 | 1.0 |
| e 2 | REAL | 0.0 | 0.813188920132218 | 1.0 |
| Zmirrors | REAL | -1000.0 | -364.24710736342 | -10.0 |
| v | REAL | 20.0 | 162.87204520286 | 500.0 |
| g | REAL | 0.5 | 0.54313763628044 | 1.0 |
| R1Back | REAL | 1000.0 | 2800.00015952392 | 3200.0 |
| t 1 | REAL | 3.0 | 7.06575666672614 | 10.0 |
| R2Back | REAL | 600.0 | 1800.18001534471 | 2000.0 |
| t 2 | REAL | 3.0 | 6.00667234586645 | 8.0 |


| Output <br> Constraints | Type | Lower Bound | Current Value | Upper Bound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| g 1 | REAL |  | -235.75289263658 | 0.0 |
| g 2 | REAL |  | -0.00451443992920013 | 0.0 |
| g 3 | REAL |  | -0.00451443992920013 | 0.0 |
| g11 | REAL |  | -0.50580708618426 | 0.0 |
| g12 | REAL |  | -0.662421204465261 | 0.0 |
| g13 | REAL |  | -2.31718552903777 | 0.0 |
| g14 | REAL |  | -3.7515944720937 | 0.0 |
| g15 | REAL |  | -0.2484055279063 | 0.0 |
| g16 | REAL |  | -0.459959627876742 | 0.0 |
| g17 | REAL |  | -0.0624948348738599 | 0.0 |
| Fthermal | REAL |  | 0.984277856815019 | 1.5 |


| Objectives | Type | Direction | Current Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f | REAL | minimize | 12.2698322075955 |

## Execution Results

| Task | Task1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total runs | 236 |
| Feasible runs | 0 |
| Infeasible runs | 236 |
| Failed runs | 0 |
| Database file | Task1.db |

## Best design parameter values

| R1 | -1000.0 |
| :---: | :---: |
| e1 | 0.241268158665424 |
| e2 | 0.813188920132218 |
| Zmirrors | -364.24710736342 |
| Zsch | 600.0 |
| v | 162.87204520286 |
| g | 0.54313763628044 |
| Dsch | 200.0 |
| FNo | 10.0 |
| R1Back | 2800.00015952392 |
| t1 | 7.06575666672614 |
| R2Back | 1800.18001534471 |
| t2 | 6.00667234586645 |
| rho | $2.23 \mathrm{e}-006$ |
| D1 | 203.0 |
| D2 | 60.0 |
| pi | 3.141592 |
| R2 | -362.007713697547 |
| g1 | -235.75289263658 |
| f | 12.2698322075955 |
| SpotRms1 | 0.00214761407079987 |
| SpotRms2 | 0.00214761407079987 |
| Airy | 0.006662054 |
| g2 | -0.00451443992920013 |
| g3 | -0.00451443992920013 |
| g11 | -0.50580708618426 |
| g12 | -0.662421204465261 |
| g13 | -2.31718552903777 |
| g14 | -3.7515944720937 |
| g15 | -0.2484055279063 |
| g16 | -0.459999627876742 |
| g17 | 0.984948348738599815019 |
| Fthermal |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |



Figure 22 Spot diagram of optimal design

### 4.4. Discussion

(1) An 'All-in-one' approach has been used for integrating the two subsystems and developing an optimal design. An additional study regarding the method of approach (eg: Analytical Target Cascading) for subsystems integration will prove helpful in getting more accurate and better design.
(2) One of the design variables, R1 (the radius of front-surface of primary mirror) is considered as a parameter during integration, for the purpose of simplification of model.
(3) 6 different combinations of objective function, constraints and parameter values of optical design are tried to get an optimal design. This has immensely helped in getting the best result.
(4) It is observed that there are no coma aberrations seen and the best result is obtained when the angle $\mathrm{w}=0^{\circ}$.
(5) One of the improvements in the design method is that proper scaling can be done in future. This will greatly help in minimizing the spherical aberrations, which still are visible in the present design.
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## 7. APPENDICES

### 7.1. Subsystem I : Optical design MATLAB code

### 7.1.1. MakeInputRay.m

```
function [RayIn nRays] = MakeInputRay(dDia, nMinRays, bYOnly,
nCircleInput)
```

```
% Initialize
```

% Initialize
nRays = 1; % Intializes ray counters
nRays = 1; % Intializes ray counters
RayIn(1,1) = 0; % X-Coordinate
RayIn(1,1) = 0; % X-Coordinate
RayIn(1,2) = 0; % Y-Coordinate
RayIn(1,2) = 0; % Y-Coordinate
RayIn(1,3) = 0; % Z-Coordinate at outside of Schmidt Corrector
RayIn(1,3) = 0; % Z-Coordinate at outside of Schmidt Corrector
% Calc Minimum circles
nMinCircles = 0; % Intializes number of circles around center
i = 1; % Intializes ray counter
while i < nMinRays
nMinCircles = nMinCircles + 1;
i = i + 6*nMinCircles;
end
% Number of circles
dRefGap = 2;
nCircles = ( dDia/2 - mod(dDia/2, dRefGap) ) / dRefGap + 1; %
Intializes number of circles around center
if( mod(dDia/2, dRefGap) == 0 )
nCircles = nCircles - 1;
end
if( nCircles <= nMinCircles )
nCircles = nMinCircles;
end
if( nCircleInput ~= 0 )
nCircles = nCircleInput;
end
% dH in R-direction
dH = (dDia/2) / nCircles;
if( bYOnly==1 )
for i = 1:nCircles
nRays = nRays + 1;
RayIn(nRays, 1) = 0;
RayIn(nRays, 2) = dH*i;

```
```

            RayIn(nRays, 3) = 0;
            nRays = nRays + 1;
            RayIn(nRays, 1) = 0;
            RayIn(nRays, 2) = -dH*i;
            RayIn(nRays, 3) = 0;
    end
    else
for i = 1:nCircles
dTheta = 2. * pi / (6*i);
for j=1:6*i
dAng = dTheta*(j-1) + pi/2;
nRays = nRays + 1;
RayIn(nRays, 1) = (dH*i) * cos( dAng ); % Using the
angles in-between: calcualtes the x-coordinate
RayIn(nRays, 2) = (dH*i) * sin( dAng ); % Using the
angles in-between: calcualtes the y-coordinate
RayIn(nRays, 3) = 0; % Assigns a z-
coordinate
end
end
end

```

\subsection*{7.1.2. RayTraceSch.m}
function [ptXX ptYY ptZZ] = RayTraceSch(Dsch, g, x0, y0, z0, Xi0, Eta0, Zeta0, Sk, r, e, d, n)
```

% Init.
Crefl = 0;
ptX(1) = x0;
ptY(1) = y0;
ptZ(1) = z0;
Xi(1) = Xi0;
Eta(1) = Eta0;
Zeta(1) = Zeta0;
p(1) = ptX(1)*Zeta(1);
q(1) = ptY(1)*Zeta(1);

```
\% Schmidt Corrector is the second surface in our model
nSchIdx = 2;
NN \(=1.51872 ; \%\) G Refractive Indexes for BK7 Glass
k \(=1.5\);
UC \(\quad=1 /(N N-1)\) * \(\left(-1 / r(n S c h I d x+1)^{\wedge} 3\right)\);
UB \(\quad=1 /(N N-1) * k\) * Dsch^2 / ( \(\left.8^{*} r(n S c h I d x+1) \wedge 3\right)\);
UC \(\quad=U C\) * \(g\);
\(U B=U B\) * \(g\);
for \(k=1: S k-1\)
    if( \(k\) ~= nSchIdx )
        if( r(k) == 0 ) \% Plane
            B = 0;
        else
        \(B=1 / r(k) ;\)
        end
    \(A \quad=B *\left(p(k)^{\wedge} 2+q(k)^{\wedge} 2\right)\);
    C \(\quad=\operatorname{Zeta}(k)^{\wedge} 2\);
    DD \(\quad=-C+B^{*}(p(k) * X i(k)+q(k) * E t a(k))\);
    Qt \(\quad=\operatorname{sqrt}\left(D^{\wedge} 2-A^{*} B^{*}\left(n(k)^{\wedge} 2-e(k) * C^{\wedge} 2\right)\right)\);
    \(p t Z(k)=A /(-D D+Q t) ;\)
    tt \(=1+B\) * ptZ(k) * e(k);
    RR \(=t t^{\wedge} 2-B^{*} p t Z(k){ }^{*}(t t-1)\);
    if \((n(k) / n(k+1)<0)\)
            Qtp \(=-Q t\);
            Psi \(=-2 * Q t /\left(R^{*} C\right)\);
            Crefl = Crefl+1;
        else
            Qtp \(\left.=\operatorname{sqrt(Qt\wedge 2}+R R * C *\left(n(k+1)^{\wedge} 2-n(k)^{\wedge} 2\right)\right) ;\)
            Psi \(=(Q t p-Q t) /\left(R R^{*} C\right)\);
        end
```

    Alpha \(=\) Psi * ( \(\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{k})+\mathrm{ptZ}(\mathrm{k}) * X i(k))\);
    Beta \(=\) Psi * ( \(q(k)+p t Z(k) * E t a(k))\);
    Xi(k+1) \(=X i(k)-(B\) * Alpha );
    Eta(k+1) = Eta(k) - ( B * Beta );
    Zeta(k+1) \(=\operatorname{sqrt}\left(n(k+1)^{\wedge} 2-X i(k+1)^{\wedge} 2-E t a(k+1)^{\wedge} 2\right) ;\)
    if ( mod(Crefl,2)==1 )
    Zeta \((k+1)=-Z e t a(k+1)\);
    end
    ```
    \% P2 = \(\mathrm{P}^{\prime}+\mathrm{d}^{*} \mathrm{~S}^{\prime}(\mathrm{p} 36)\)
    \(p(k+1)=p(k)+\left(t t^{*} A l p h a\right)+(d(k+1)\) * Xi(k+1) );
    \(q(k+1)=q(k)+(t t * B e t a)+(d(k+1)\) * Eta(k+1) );
else \% Schmidt-Corrector
    \(P P=p(k)^{\wedge} 2+q(k)^{\wedge} 2 ;\)
    PS \(=p(k) * X i(k)+q(k) * E t a(k) ;\)
    SS \(=X i(k)^{\wedge} 2+E t a(k)^{\wedge} 2 ;\)
    \(u=\left(p t X(k)^{\wedge} 2+p t Y(k)^{\wedge} 2\right) / 2 ;\)
    \(v=P S / Z e t a(k)^{\wedge} 2 ;\)
    w = ( SS / Zeta(k)^2 ) / 2;
    A = [w v u];
    \(B=\operatorname{conv}(A, A)\);
    COEF = UC * \(B+U B *[0 \quad 0 \mathrm{w} v \mathrm{u}]+\left[\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0\end{array}\right] ;\)
    \(p t Z(k)=m i n(\operatorname{roots}(C O E F)) ;\)
    \(\mathrm{Fz}=1\);
    \(\mathrm{Fu}=-\mathrm{UB}-2\) * UC * \(u\);
    \(\mathrm{t}=\mathrm{ptZ}(\mathrm{k})-\mathrm{Fz} / F u\);
    \(\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{n}(\mathrm{k})^{\wedge} 2\) - SS ;
    \(R=P P+2 * P S^{*} p t Z(k)+S S^{*}(p t Z(k))^{\wedge} 2+(F z / F u)^{\wedge} 2^{*} C ;\)
    \(\mathrm{Q}=-\mathrm{PS}-\mathrm{ptZ}(\mathrm{k}){ }^{*} \mathrm{SS}+(\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{ptZ}(\mathrm{k}))^{*} \mathrm{C}\);
    \(\left.\mathrm{Qp}=\operatorname{sqrt}\left(\left(\mathrm{n}(\mathrm{k}+1)^{\wedge} 2-\mathrm{n}(\mathrm{k})^{\wedge} 2\right)\right)^{*} \mathrm{R}+\mathrm{Q}^{\wedge} 2\right)\);
    if( Fz/Fu > 0 )
        Qp = - Qp;
    end
    Psi \(=(Q p-Q) / R\);
    Alpha \(=P s i *(p(k)+p t Z(k) * X i(k))\);
    Beta \(=\) Psi * ( \(q(k)+p t Z(k) * E t a(k))\);
    Xi(k+1) \(=X i(k)-A l p h a ;\)
    Eta \((k+1)=E t a(k)-B e t a ;\)
    Zeta(k+1) = sqrt( \(\left.n(k+1)^{\wedge} 2-X i(k+1)^{\wedge} 2-E t a(k+1)^{\wedge} 2\right) ;\)
    \(p(k+1)=p(k)+(t * A l p h a)+(d(k+1) * X i(k+1)) ;\)
    \(q(k+1)=q(k)+(t * B e t a)+(d(k+1) * E t a(k+1)) ;\)
end
```

ptX(k+1) = p(k+1) / Zeta(k+1);
ptY(k+1) = q(k+1) / Zeta(k+1);
ptZ(k+1) = 0.;

```
```

    % actual intersection : A*
    ptXX(k) = ptX(k) + ptZ(k) * Xi(k) / Zeta(k);
    ptYY(k) = ptY(k) + ptZ(k) * Eta(k) / Zeta(k);
    ptZZ(k) = ptZ(k) + sum(d(1:k));
    end
% at focal plane
ptXX(Sk) = ptX(Sk);
ptYY(Sk) = ptY(Sk);
ptZZ(Sk) = ptZ(Sk) + sum(d);

```

\subsection*{7.1.3. RayTraceBaffle.m}
```

function [s1,y1,s2,y2,l] = ray_trace_baffle(R1, epsilon1, R2, epsilon2,
delta, v, xo, yo, alpha1)
% make values be positive
R1 = abs(R1);
R2 = abs(R2);
delta = abs(delta);
v = abs(v);
alpha1 = alpha1*pi()/180;
% Equation \#'s in reference to "Optimal Baffle Design"
mu = tan(alpha1);
b = xo*mu + yo; % Eq. 4
Calculates Initial Ray location
P1 = epsilon1-1-mu^2; % Eq. 8
Coefficient of primary mirror profile
P2 = 2*(R1+mu*b); % Eq. 8
Coefficient of primary mirror profile
P3 = -(b^2); % Eq. 8
Coefficient of primary mirror profile
s1 = -(2*P3)/(P2+sign(P2)*sqrt(P2^2-4*P1*P3)); % Eq. 9
Quadratic formula of mirror profile
y1 = b - mu*s1; % Eq. 10 Height
of the ray at the primary mirror
theta1 = atan(y1/(R1+(epsilon1-1)*s1)); % Eq. 12 Slope
of ray after hitting primary mirror
beta = 2*theta1-alpha1 % Eq. 13 Angle
of Ray after hitting primary mirror
k = tan(beta); % Eq. 15
Coeficients of ray refected off primary mirror
a = y1 - k*(delta-s1); % Eq. 15
Coefficients of ray refected off primary mirror
q1 = epsilon2 -1 - k^2; % Eq. 17
Coefficients of surface of secondary mirror
q2 = 2*(R2+k*a); % Eq. 17
Coefficients of surface of secondary mirror
q3 = -a^2; % Eq. 17
Coefficients of surface of secondary mirror
s2 = -2*q3/(q2+sign(q2)*(sqrt(q2^2-4*q1*q3))); % Eq. 19
Sagitta of the ray at the secondary mirror
y2 = a - k*s2; % Eq. 20 Height
of the ray at the secondary
theta2 = atan(y2/(R2+(epsilon2-1)*s2)); % Eq. 21 Angle
between optical axis and normal surface to secondary mirror
u = beta - 2*theta2; % Eq. 22 Angle
of ray of after the secondary mirror
l = y2 - ((delta+v+s2)*tan(u)); % Eq. 23 the
height of the image at the eyepiece

```

\subsection*{7.1.4. TestRay.m}
```

clear;
nSystemNo = 0; % System \# used in the project report
switch(nSystemNo)
case 1
Sk = 2;
Diam = 150;
w = 10;
r = [-500 0];
e = [0 0];
d = [300 -250];
n = [1 -1];
bSch = 0; % Just conic section
case 2
Sk = 3;
Diam = 150;
w = 0.45;
r = [-1000 -373.33 0];
e = [1 2.778 0];
d = [500 -360 560];
n = [llll
bSch = 0; % Just conic section
case 3
Sk = 4;
Diam = 150;
w = 0;
r = [0 0 - -500 0];
e = [$$
\begin{array}{llll}{0}&{0}&{0}&{0}\end{array}
$$];
d = [00 5 295 -250];
n = [lllll
g = 1;
bSch = 1; % With Schmidt corrector
case 4
Sk = 5;
Diam = 150;
w = 0.45;
r = [0 0 -1000 -373.33 0];
e = [l0}0
d = [0 [ 5 495 -360 560];
n = [1 1.51872 1 -1 1];
g = 1;
bSch = 1; % With Schmidt corrector
otherwise
Sk = 2;
Diam = 150;
w = 0.5;
r = [-3000 0];
e = [1 0];
d = [0 - 1500];
n = [1 -1];
bSch = 0; % Just conic section
end
nTestMode = 3; % 1: Ray Trace Only 2 : SpotOnly 3 : Both
TestRaySub;

```

\subsection*{7.1.5. TestRaySub.m}
```

Xi0 = 0;
Eta0 = sin(w*pi/180);
Zeta0 = cos(w*pi/180);

```
\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%
\%\%\%\%\% Ray Trace
\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%
if( nTestMode==1 || nTestMode==3 )
figure(1);
\% Make InputRay : D, MinRay, bYOnly, nInputCircle(0:Auto)
[RayIn nRays] = MakeInputRay (Diam, 200, 1, 10);
for \(i=1: n R a y s\)
        Ray(i,1) \(=\) RayIn(i,1) + d(1) * Xi0 / Zeta0;
        Ray(i,2) \(=\) RayIn(i,2) + d(1) * Eta0 / Zeta0;
        Ray(i,3) = d(1);
        if( bSch==1 )
                            [ptX ptY ptZ] = RayTraceSch(Diam, g, Ray(i,1), Ray(i,2),
Ray(i,3), Xi0, Eta0, Zeta0, Sk, r, e, d, n);
        else
            [ptX ptY ptZ] = RayTraceConic(Ray(i,1), Ray(i,2), Ray(i,3),
Xi0, Eta0, Zeta0, Sk, r, e, d, n);
        end
        ptX = [ RayIn(i,1) ptX ];
        ptY \(=[\operatorname{RayIn}(i, 2)\) ptY ];
        ptZ \(=\) [ RayIn(i,3) ptZ ];
        \%plot3(ptX, ptY, ptZ, 'Marker','.','Color','r');
        plot3(ptZ, ptY, -ptX, 'Marker','.','Color','r');
        if( i==1 )
            axis equal;
            axis([-50 max( [max(d) ptZ(Sk+1)] )+50 -Diam Diam -
(Diam+20)/2 (Diam+20)/2]);
            grid on;
                        view(0,90);
            hold;
        end
    end
end
\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%
\%\%\%\%\% Spot Diagram
\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%
if( nTestMode==2 || nTestMode==3 )
    figure(2);
    \% Make InputRay : D, MinRay, bYOnly, nInputCircle(0:Auto)
    [RayIn nRays] = MakeInputRay(Diam, 200, 0, 0);
```

for i=1:nRays
Ray(i,1) = RayIn(i,1) + d(1) * Xi0 / Zeta0;
Ray(i,2) = RayIn(i,2) + d(1) * Eta0 / Zeta0;
Ray(i,3) = d(1);
if( i== 1 )
if( bSch==1 )
[ptX0 ptY0 ptZ0] = RayTraceSch(Diam, g, Ray(i,1),
Ray(i,2), Ray(i,3), Xi0, Eta0, Zeta0, Sk, r, e, d, n);
else
[ptX0 ptY0 ptZ0] = RayTraceConic(Ray(i,1), Ray(i,2),
Ray(i,3), Xi0, Eta0, Zeta0, Sk, r, e, d, n);
end
end
if( bSch==1 )
[ptX ptY ptZ] = RayTraceSch(Diam, g ,Ray(i,1), Ray(i,2),
Ray(i,3), Xi0, Eta0, Zeta0, Sk, r, e, d, n);
else
[ptX ptY ptZ] = RayTraceConic(Ray(i,1), Ray(i,2), Ray(i,3),
Xi0, Eta0, Zeta0, Sk, r, e, d, n);
end
plot(ptX(Sk)-ptX0(Sk) , ptY(Sk)-ptY0(Sk), 'LineStyle', 'none',
'Marker','.','Color','bl');
% plot(ptX(Sk), ptY(Sk), 'LineStyle', 'none',
'Marker','.','Color','g');
if( i==1 )
axis equal;
grid on;
hold;
end
end
end

```

\subsection*{7.2. Subsystem II: Thermal Design Code}

\subsection*{7.2.1. mainfile.m}
```

% D1 = 203;
% D2 = 60;
% R1 = 810;
% R2 = 250;
% Z_m = 255;
% f1 = R1/2;
% f2 = R2/2;
% f = 2030;
% D_sch = 203;
% rho = 2230e-9;
%x_i = [R1 t1 R2 t2];
% Initial value
x_0 = [18 7 10 5];
% Inequality constraints
A=[];
b=[];
% Equality Constraints
Aeq=[];
beq=[];
% Upper and Lower bounds for x_i's
lb=[[$$
\begin{array}{llll}{8}&{4}&{6}&{2}\end{array}
$$];
ub=[[$$
\begin{array}{lllll}{32}&{10}&{15}&{8}\end{array}
$$];
%
options =
optimset('Display','iter','Diagnostics','on','DiffMinChange',0.1,'DiffM
axChange',0.2,'MaxIter',30);
%nonlcon=[];
[xopt,fval,exitflag,output]=
fmincon('myfun',x_0,A,b,Aeq,beq,lb,ub,'nonlcon',options);

```

\subsection*{7.2.2. myfun.m}
```

function [f] = myfun(x)
% Define objective function
R1back = x(1)*100;
t1 = x(2);
R2back = x(3)*100;
t2 = x(4);
y=[R1 t1 R2 t2]
% ANSYS analysis
[f1_new f2_new] = PASS(y);
R1 = 810;

```
```

R2 = 250;
D_sch = 203;
Z_m = 255;
f1 = R1/2;
f2 = R2/2;
fno = (((f1*f2)/(-f2+f1-Z_m))/D_sch);
fno_new = (((f1_new*f2_new)/(-f2_new+f1_new-Z_m))/D_sch);
% Objective function
f = abs(fno_new - fno)
end

```

\subsection*{7.2.3. nonlcon.m}
```

% Define the nonlinear constraint function
function [g,h] = nonlcon(x)
R1back = x(1)*100;
t1 = x(2);
R2back = x(3)*100;
t2 = x(4);
rho = 2230e-9;
pi = 3.14159;
D1 = 203;
D2 = 60;
R1 = 810;
R2 = 250;
S = R1-(R1^2-(D1/4)^2)^0.5;
s = R2-(R2^2-(D2/4)^2)^0.5;
S1 = R1back-(R1back^2-(D1/4)^2)^0.5;
S2 = R2back-(R2back^2-(D2/4)^2)^0.5;
% Ineqality constraints
g(1) = (pi*rho*(t1*(D1^2/4)-S1^2*(R1-S1/3)-S^2*(R-S/3)))-1;
g(2) = (pi*rho*(t2*(D2^2/4)-S2^2*(R2-S2/3)-s^2*(r-s/3)))-0.7;
g(3) = -(t1-S-S1-3);
g(4) = -S2+s-4;
g(5) = S2-S;
g(6) = -S1;
g(7) = -S2;
h = [];

```

\subsection*{7.2.4. ReadOutput.m}
```

function FinalPnt = ReadOutput(File1Name,File2Name)

```
```

fid = fopen(File1Name,'r');
count = 0;
while ~feof(fid)
line = fgetl(fid);
[Pnt nReadCnt] = sscanf('line', '%d %f %f');
if( nReadCnt ~= 0 )
count = count + 1;
X(count) = Pnt(2);
Y(count) = Pnt(3);
end
end
OrgPntCoord = [X' Y'];
fclose(fid);
fid = fopen(File2Name,'r');
count = 0;
while ~feof(fid)
line = fgetl(fid);
[Pnt nReadCnt] = sscanf('line', '%d %f');
if( nReadCnt ~= 0 )
count = count + 1;
DX(count) = Pnt(2);
end
end
DxDy = [DX(1:count/2)' DX(count/2+1:count)'];
fclose(fid);
% Final nodal position
FinalPnt = OrgPntCoord + DxDy;

```

\subsection*{7.2.5. PASS.m (The m-file which interfaces with Ansys)}
```

function [f1_new f2_new] = PASS(x_inPASS)
%
% INPUT:
% x_inPASS(1) = R1back
% x_inPASS(2) = t1
% x_inPASS(3) = R2back
% x_inPASS(4) = t3
%
% OUTPUT:
% f1_new, f2_new
% See also testPASS
warning off
x_inPASS;
R1back = x_inPASS(1); % R1back

```
```

t1 = x_inPASS(2); % t1
R2back = x_inPASS(3); % R2back
t2 = x_inPASS(4); % t1

```
PASSfilename1 = 'input_mirror1.log';
\% Generate input file (mirror1) for pass
writefile = \{
    '/batch';
    '/filename,input_mirror1';
    '';
    '!Enter the preprocessor';
    '/prep7';
    ' ';
    '!Load inputs';
    'PRESLOAD = 1000';
    ' ';
    '!Specify element type';
    '!Plane stress element';
    'ET,1,PLANE42';
    '!Axis-symmetric element';
    '!ET,1,PLANE42,0,0,1';
    ' '
    '! Specify material properties ';
    'uimp,1,EX, PRXY,DENS,62.75e9,.2,2230 ! Youngs modulus,
Poissons ratio and Density of Pyrex glass, from MatWeb';
        ' ' '
        '! Mirror variables';
        ['R1back = ' num2str(R1back)];
        ['t1 = ' num2str(t1)];
        ' ' ;
        '! Define the mirror fixed points, diameter (D1), front radius (R)';
        '! and several (WIDTH), and (HEIGHT)';
        ' ' ;
        'PI = 3.14159265359';
        'D1 = 203';
        'R = 810';
        'SCALE = 0.001';
        'S = R-SQRT((R*R-(D1/4)*(D1/4)))';
        'S1 = R1-SQRT(R1*R1-(D1/4)*(D1/4))';
        ' ';
        'WIDTH1 = S';
        'WIDTH2 = t1-S1';
        'WIDTH3 = t1';
        'WIDTH4 = 0';
        'WIDTH5 = S-R1';
        'WIDTH6 = t1-S1+R1back';
        ' ';
        'HEIGHT1 = 0';
        'HEIGHT2 = (D1/2)';
        ' ' ;
        '! Define the keypoints for the mirror';
        ' k, 1,WIDTH1*SCALE, HEIGHT1*SCALE';
        ' \(\mathrm{k}, 2\), WIDTH2*SCALE, HEIGHT1*SCALE ';
```

'k,3,WIDTH3*SCALE,HEIGHT2*SCALE';
'k,4,WIDTH4*SCALE,HEIGHT2*SCALE';
'k,5,WIDTH5*SCALE,HEIGHT1*SCALE';
'k,6,WIDTH6*SCALE,HEIGHT1*SCALE';
'';
'! Define the lines for the mirror surface';
'l,1,2 !1';
'l,3,4 !2';
'';
'! Define the arcs of the mirror surface';
'larc,1,4,5,R1 !3';
'larc,2,3,6,R1back !4';
'';
'';
'!Divide lines for the mounting rings';
'ldiv,3,0.95, , ,';
'ldiv,4,0.95,,, '';
'';
'! Define half the cross-sectional area of mirror';
'a,1,2,8,3,4,7';
'';
'! Segment the lines';
'lsel,none';
'lsel,s,,,1';
'lsel,a,,,2';
'lesize,all,,,7,1';
';
'! Segment the lines';
'lsel,none';
'lsel,s,,,3';
'lsel,a,,,4';
'lesize,all,, 50,1';
'';
'! Segment the lines';
'lsel,none';
'lsel,s,, 5';
'lsel,a,,,6';
'lesize,all,,,3,1';
'';
'! Mesh the area';
'amesh,all';
'';
'';
'! Done with the preprocessor';
'finish';
'';
''';
'! Enter the solver';
'/solu';
'antype,static';
'';
'! Select ICCG solver';
'eqslv,iccg,,3';
'';
'! Apply boundary conditions ';
'DL,1, ,Symm';
'DL,5,,UX,0';

```
```

    '';
    '! Apply pressure load';
    'SFL,6,PRES,PRESLOAD';
    '';
    '';
    '! Solve the model';
    'allsel';
    'solve';
    'finish';
    '';
    '';
    '! Go to the preprocessor';
    '/post1';
    '';
    'allsel';
    '';
    '! Get the displacement values';
    'nsort,u,x';
    '*GET,delta_xmax,sort,,max';
    'nsort,u,y';
    '*GET,delta_ymax,sort,,max';
    '';
    '! Get the stress values';
    'nsort,S,EQV';
    '*GET,stress_max,sort,,max';
    '';
    '';
    '! Display the deformed structure';
    '!PLDISP,1';
    '/output,output1.txt';
    '*VWRITE,delta_xmax,delta_ymax,stress_max';
    '%-16.8G %-16.8G %-16.8G';
    '/output';
    '';
    'nsel,s,node, ,1';
    'nsel,a,node, ,72, 120,';
    'nsel,a,node, ,69';
    ';
    '/output,outputStructInit1.txt';
    'nlist,,,coord,node';
    '/output';
    '';
    '/output,outputStructDef1.txt';
    'PRNSOL,U,X';
    'prnsol,u,y';
    '/output';
    '';
    'save';
    'finish'};
    % fid = fopen(filename)
fid = fopen(PASSfilename1,'r');
if fid ~= -1
%input file already exists
delete(PASSfilename1);
end
fid = fopen(PASSfilename1,'w');
%write new input file

```
```

fprintf(fid,'%s',writefile{1});
for i = 2:length(writefile)
fprintf(fid,'\n %s', writefile{i});
end
fclose(fid);
% Input file (mirror1) complete
PASSfilename2 = 'input_mirror2.log';
% Generate input file (mirror2) for pass
writefile = {
'/batch';
'/filename,input_mirror2';
'';
'!Enter the preprocessor';
'/prep7';
'';
'!Load inputs';
'PRESLOAD = 600';
'';
'!Specify element type';
'!Plane stress element';
'ET,1,PLANE42';
'!Axis-symmetric element';
'!ET,1,PLANE42,0,0,1';
'';
'! Specify material properties ';
'uimp,1,EX,PRXY,DENS,62.75e9,.2,2230 ! Youngs modulus,
Poissons ratio and Density of Pyrex glass, from MatWeb';
'';
'! Mirror variables';
['R2back = ' num2str(R2back)];
['t2 = ' num2str(t2)];
'';
'! Define the mirror fixed points,diameter (D1), front radius (R)';
'! and several (WIDTH), and (HEIGHT)';
'';
'PI = 3.14159265359';
'D2 = 60';
'r = 250';
'SCALE = 0.001';
'S2 = R2back-SQRT(R2back^2-(D2/4)*(D2/4))';
's = R2-SQRT((R2^2-(D2/4)*(D2/4)))';
'';
'WIDTH1 = S2';
'WIDTH2 = t2+s';
'WIDTH3 = t2';
'WIDTH4 = 0';
'WIDTH5 = S2-R2back';
'WIDTH6 = t2+s-R2';
'';
'HEIGHT1 = 0';
'HEIGHT2 = (D2/2)';
'';
'! Define the keypoints for the mirror';

```
```

'k,1,WIDTH1*SCALE,HEIGHT1*SCALE';
'k, 2,WIDTH2*SCALE,HEIGHT1*SCALE';
'k,3,WIDTH3*SCALE,HEIGHT2*SCALE';
'k,4,WIDTH4*SCALE,HEIGHT2*SCALE';
'k,5,WIDTH5*SCALE,HEIGHT1*SCALE';
'k,6,WIDTH6*SCALE,HEIGHT1*SCALE';
'';
'! Define the lines for the mirror surface';
'l,1,2 !1';
'l,3,4 !2';
'';
'! Define the arcs of the mirror surface';
'larc,1,4,5,R2back !3';
'larc,2,3,6,R2 !4';
'';
'';
'!Divide lines for the mounting rings';
'ldiv,3,0.95, , , ';
'ldiv,4,0.95,, , '';
'';
'! Define half the cross-sectional area of mirror';
'a,1,2,8,3,4,7';
'';
'! Segment the lines';
'lsel,none';
'lsel,s,,,1';
'lsel,a,,,2';
'lesize,all,, 5,1';
'';
'! Segment the lines';
'lsel,none';
'lsel,s,, 3';
'lsel,a,,,4';
'lesize,all,, ,40,1';
'';
'! Segment the lines';
'lsel,none';
'lsel,s,, 5';
'lsel,a,,,6';
'lesize,all,, 3,1';
'';
'! Mesh the area';
'amesh,all';
'';
''';
'! Done with the preprocessor';
'finish';
'';
'';
'! Enter the solver';
'/solu';
'antype,static';
'';
'! Select ICCG solver';
'eqslv,iccg,,3';
'';
'! Apply boundary conditions ';

```
'DL, 1, , UY, 0';
'DL,5, , UX, 0';
' ';
'! Apply pressure load';
'SFL, 6, PRES, PRESLOAD';
' ' ;
' '
'! Solve the model';
'allsel';
'solve';
'finish';
' '
' '
'! Go to the preprocessor';
'/post1';
'';
'allsel';
' ';
'! Get the displacement values';
'nsort, u, x';
'*GET, delta_xmax, sort, , max';
'nsort, u, y';
'*GET, delta_ymax, sort, , max';
' '
'! Get the stress values';
'nsort, S, EQV';
'*GET, stress_max, sort, ,max';
' ';
'! Display the deformed structure';
'!PLDISP,1';
'/output, output2.txt';
'*VWRITE, delta_xmax, delta_ymax,stress_max';
'\%-16.8G \%-16.8G \%-16.8G';
'/output';
' ' ;
'nsel,s,node, ,2';
'nsel, a, node, ,8, 46,';
' ';
'/output, outputStructInit2.txt';
'nlist, , coord, node';
'/output';
' ' ;
'/output,outputStructDef2.txt';
'PRNSOL, U, X';
'prnsol, u,y';
'/output';
' ';
'save';
'finish'\};
fid = fopen(PASSfilename2, 'r');
```

if fid ~= -1

```
\%input file already exists delete(PASSfilename2);
end
fid \(=\) fopen(PASSfilename2, 'w');
\%write new input file
```

fprintf(fid,'%s',writefile{1});
for i = 2:length(writefile)
fprintf(fid,'\n %s', writefile{i});
end
fclose(fid);
% Input file (mirror2) complete
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
% run PASS
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
command_line = ['h:\matlab\ansysMod1.bat'];
[status,result] = system(command_line);
pause on;
pause(10)
command_line = ['h:\matlab\ansysMod2.bat'];
[status,result] = system(command_line);
pause(10)
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
FinalPnt1 = ReadOutput('outputStructInit1.txt',
'outputStructDef1.txt');
FinalPnt2 = ReadOutput('outputStructInit2.txt',
'outputStructDef2.txt');
p1 = polyfit(FinalPnt1(:,1),FinalPnt1(:,2),2);
a_f1=p1(1);
b_f1=p1(2);
c_f1=p1(3);
% Calculate and save function value
f1_new = 1/4*a_f1;
p2 = polyfit(FinalPnt2(:,1),FinalPnt2(:,2),2);
a_f2=p2(1);
b_f2=p2(2);
c_f2=p2(3);
% Calculate and save function value
f2_new = 1/4*a_f2;

```

\subsection*{7.2.6. ansysMod1.bat}
```

cd /d H:\Matlab

```
S: \CAEN \(\backslash A N S Y S 10 \backslash S E T E N V . C M D\)
S: \CAEN \(\backslash A n s y s 10 \backslash v 100 \backslash A N S Y S \backslash b i n \backslash i n t e l \backslash a n s y s 100 . e x e-p\) ansysrf -b -i
input_mirror1.log -o outputfrom1.txt
exit

\subsection*{7.2.7. ansysMod2.bat}
```

cd /d H:\Matlab
S:\CAEN\ANSYS10\SETENV.CMD
S:\CAEN\Ansys10\v100\ANSYS\bin\intel\ansys100.exe -p ansysrf -b -i
input_mirror2.log -o outputfrom2.txt
exit

```
```


[^0]:    Algorithm selected
    medium-scale
    \%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%\%
    End diagnostic information

[^1]:    * Current Value = value when report was generated

