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We have presented in this communication a new solving procedure for the dynamics of
non-rigid asteroid rotation, considering the final spin state of rotation for a small celestial
body (asteroid). The last condition means the ultimate absence of the applied external
torques (including short-term effect from torques during collisions, long-term YORP
effect, etc.).

Fundamental law of angular momentum conservation has been used for the
aforementioned solving procedure. The system of Euler equations for dynamics of non-
rigid asteroid rotation has been explored with regard to the existence of an analytic way of
presentation of the approximated solution.

Despite of various perturbations (such as collisions, YORP effect) which destabilize
the rotation of asteroid via deviating from the current spin state, the inelastic (mainly,
tidal) dissipation reduces kinetic energy of asteroid. So, evolution of the spinning asteroid
should be resulting by the rotation about maximal-inertia axis with the proper spin state
corresponding to minimal energy with a fixed angular momentum.

Basing on the aforesaid assumption (component $K_1$ is supposed to be fluctuating near
the given appropriate constant of the fixed angular momentum), we have obtained that 2-
nd component $K_2$ is the solution of appropriate Riccati ordinary differential equation of 1-
st order, whereas component $K_3$ should be determined via expression for $K_2$.
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1. **Introduction, the system of equations.**

The main motivation of the current research is the analytical exploration of the dynamics of asteroid rotation when it moves in elliptic orbit through Space. In our previous research [1], we have explored the regimes of *rigid* asteroid rotation under the additional influence of YORP-effect. Let us note that assumption of asteroid rotating as rigid body means that distances between various points inside the rigid body should be preferably constant or should be elongated negligibly.

We will consider here regime of rotation of small celestial bodies (asteroids less than $<10$ km in diameter) which differ from the rigid body in a sufficient extent. It means that distances between various points inside the asteroid can not be considered as being elongated negligibly. Meanwhile, only circa 20% of all the registered asteroids (near-Earth objects in NASA data base) are recognized as to be close to the rigid body approximation. For example, we can provide the comparison with to the actual/observed data for nonrigid asteroids, which is available in the modern research with respect to the *rubble pile asteroids* [2].

It is very important to create the adequate physical model along with the mathematical model of the aforementioned asteroid’s spinning phenomenon with the main aim of the clarifying the results of data of astrometric observations. Indeed, if regime of rotation of asteroid is suddenly changing, we could observe even physical disintegration of asteroids (or self-destruction under the influence of sudden acceleration during a fast rotation [3]).

It is also worth to note that fundamental law of angular momentum conservation should be valid even during the *non-rigid* regime of asteroid’s rotation [4]. Namely, theorem of conservation of angular momentum describes rotation of asteroid in a frame of reference fixed in the rotating body [5] ($I_i \neq 0$):

$$\frac{d \vec{K}}{dt} + [\vec{\Omega} \times \vec{K}] = \vec{M},$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $\vec{K} = \{ I_i \cdot \Omega_i \}$, whereas $\vec{\Omega} = \{ \Omega_i \}$ (here $\Omega_i$ are the components of angular velocity vector along the principal axes, $i = 1, 2, 3$), $I_i$ are the principal moments of inertia, and $\vec{M} = \vec{M}(t)$ is the total sum of applied external torques (including short-term effect from torques during collisions, long-term YORP effect [1], [6], etc.).
Let us especially emphasize that we will consider here principal moments of inertia to be variable (time-dependent, \( I_1 = I_1(t) \)), in general case; e.g., components of inertia tensor of asteroid may be changed during collisions [4]. Indeed, we should take into consideration the possible changes in its form, along with the decreasing of the mass via partial physical disintegration of asteroids during collisions or even via self-destruction due to the regime of fast rotation [1]. Despite of various perturbations (such as collisions, YORP effect) which destabilize the rotation of asteroid via deviating from the current spin state, the inelastic (mainly, tidal) dissipation [7-9] reduces kinetic energy of asteroid.

It means that evolution of the spinning asteroid should be resulting by the rotation about maximal-inertia axis [7] with the proper spin state corresponding to minimal energy with a fixed angular momentum.

We will consider in (1) only such the aforesaid final dynamical state of asteroid rotation (which is fluctuating near the given appropriate constant of the fixed angular momentum). Asteroid is supposed to be moving along its orbit far from the close influences of additional gravitational forces from planet of mass \( m\text{ planet} \) or far from Hill sphere [1] (motion of asteroid is determined by equations of ER3BP with primaries \( m\text{ planet} \) and \( M\text{ Sun} \), \( m\text{ planet} < M\text{ Sun} \)):

\[
r_H = a_p \cdot \left( \frac{m\text{ planet}}{M\text{ Sun}} \right)^{1/3}
\]

where \( a_p \) is semimajor axis of the planet.

Let us also assume (as first approximation) that all external torques, associated with inertial forces, tides, YORP effect are neglected in (1) (i.e., \( \vec{M} \approx \vec{0} \) in (1)).

According to the results of [7], inelastic (mainly tidal) dissipation, which is reducing kinetic energy, yields evolution of spin towards rotation about maximal-inertia axis \( I_1 \) with rate of rotation \( \Omega_1 \) (for definiteness, \( I_1 > I_2 > I_3 \)); it means:

\[
\{\Omega_2, \Omega_3\} \ll \Omega_1 \Rightarrow \{\Omega_2, \Omega_3\} \rightarrow 0
\]

The last but not least, let us additionally note that the spatial ER3BP is not conservative, and no integrals of motion are known [10] (including total angular momentum, which combines the expressions in (1) and orbital angular momentum).
2. Analytical exploring of the system of equations (1).

First of all, we should note that (1) is the system of 3 nonlinear differential equations with respect to $\bar{K} = \{ I_1 \cdot \Omega_1 \}$ (with all coefficients depending on time $t$):

$$\frac{d \bar{K}}{dt} + [\bar{\Omega} \times \bar{K}] = \bar{0}, \quad \Rightarrow \quad \begin{cases} \frac{d K_1}{dt} = K_2 \cdot \left( \frac{K_3}{I_3} \right) - K_3 \cdot \left( \frac{K_2}{I_2} \right), \\ \frac{d K_2}{dt} = K_3 \cdot \left( \frac{K_1}{I_1} \right) - K_1 \cdot \left( \frac{K_3}{I_3} \right), \\ \frac{d K_3}{dt} = K_1 \cdot \left( \frac{K_2}{I_2} \right) - K_2 \cdot \left( \frac{K_1}{I_1} \right). \end{cases}$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \begin{cases} \frac{d K_1}{dt} = K_2 \cdot K_3 \cdot \left( \frac{I_2 - I_3}{I_2 \cdot I_3} \right), \\ \frac{d K_2}{dt} = K_1 \cdot K_3 \cdot \left( \frac{I_3 - I_1}{I_1 \cdot I_3} \right), \\ \frac{d K_3}{dt} = K_1 \cdot K_2 \cdot \left( \frac{I_1 - I_2}{I_1 \cdot I_2} \right). \end{cases}$$

Let us multiply 1-st equation of system (3) or (4) on $(K_1/I_1)$, the 2-nd Eq. on $(K_2/I_2)$, 3-rd on $(K_3/I_3)$; then if we sum all the resulting equations of the system above, we should obtain

$$\left( \frac{1}{I_1} \right) \frac{d (K_1^2)}{dt} + \left( \frac{1}{I_2} \right) \frac{d (K_2^2)}{dt} + \left( \frac{1}{I_3} \right) \frac{d (K_3^2)}{dt} = 0$$

(5)
3. **Solving procedure and the approximated solution for Eqns. (1).**

According to the assumption (2) above, in (1) we will consider only the final dynamical state of asteroid rotation (which is fluctuating near the given appropriate constant of the fixed angular momentum, $K_1 \equiv \text{const}$). It means that equation (5) can be transformed to the form below

$$
\frac{d(K_2^2)}{dt} + \left(\frac{I_2}{I_3}\right) \frac{d(K_3^2)}{dt} \approx 0
$$

(6)

Let us note that in case $K_1 \equiv const$, 1-st equation of system (4) should be satisfied accordingly at first approximation (if we take into account assumption (2) for the right part of 1-st equation of system (4), where $\Omega_2 = (K_2/I_2)$, $\Omega_3 = (K_3/I_3)$, $\{\Omega_2, \Omega_3\} \to 0$).

As for the 2-nd equation of system (4), we obtain (here below $K_1 \equiv \text{const}$):

$$
K_3 = \frac{1}{K_1} \left(\frac{I_1 \cdot I_3}{I_3 - I_1}\right) \frac{dK_2}{dt}
$$

(7)

Now, as for the 3-rd equation of system (4), let us substitute expression for $K_3$ from the 2-nd Eqn. of (4) the expression for derivative in the left part; it yields as below

$$
\left(\frac{I_1 \cdot I_3}{I_3 - I_1}\right) \frac{d^2K_2}{dt^2} + \left(\frac{I_1 \cdot I_3}{I_3 - I_1}\right) \frac{dK_2}{dt} - \left(K_1^2 \cdot \left(\frac{I_1 - I_2}{I_1 \cdot I_2}\right)\right) \cdot K_2 = 0
$$

(8)

where equation (8) for the dynamics of component $K_2 = I_2 \cdot \Omega_2$ could be transformed by change of variables $y = (K_2'/K_2)$ to the *Riccati* ODE of 1-st order [1].
Discussion

We have explored here the dynamics of non-rigid asteroid rotation, considering the final spin state of rotation for a small celestial body (asteroid). Non-rigid character of asteroid rotation means that principal moments of inertia are variable (time-dependent, $I_i = I_i(t)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$).

Fundamental law of angular momentum $\vec{K} = \{ I_i \cdot \Omega_i \}$ conservation (which should be valid even during the non-rigid regime of asteroid’s rotation) has been used at obtaining the analytical algorithm for solving. The proper approximate solution has been obtained which is presented below:

- component $K_1 = I_1(t) \cdot \Omega_1(t)$ is supposed to be fluctuating near the given appropriate constant of the fixed angular momentum, $K_1 \equiv \text{const}$;

- component $K_2 = I_2(t) \cdot \Omega_2(t)$ is the solution of the appropriate Riccati ODE (8):

$$\left( \frac{I_1 \cdot I_3}{I_3 - I_1} \right) \frac{d^2 K_2}{dt^2} + \frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{I_1 \cdot I_3}{I_3 - I_1} \right) \frac{d K_2}{dt} - \left( K_1^2 \cdot \frac{I_1 - I_3}{I_1 \cdot I_2} \right) K_2 = 0 ,$$

- component $K_3 = I_3(t) \cdot \Omega_3(t)$ is determined in (7) via expression for $K_2$:

$$K_3 = \frac{1}{K_1} \left( \frac{I_1 \cdot I_3}{I_3 - I_1} \right) \frac{d K_2}{dt}$$

We should additionally note that for reason of a special character of the solutions of Riccati-type ODEs, there exists a possibility for sudden jumping of magnitude of the solution at some meaning of time-parameter $t$ [11-15].

Mathematical procedure of presenting the components of angular velocity via Euler angles [16] (and Wisdom angles [17]) has been demonstrated at the Appendix in [1].
Conclusion

We have presented in this communication a new solving procedure for the dynamics of non-rigid asteroid rotation, considering the final spin state of rotation for a small celestial body (asteroid). The last condition means the ultimate absence of the applied external torques (including short-term effect from torques during collisions, long-term YORP effect, etc.).

Fundamental law of angular momentum conservation has been used for the aforementioned solving procedure. The system of Euler equations for dynamics of non-rigid asteroid rotation has been explored with regard to the existence of an analytic way of presentation of the approximated solution.

Despite of various perturbations (such as collisions, YORP effect) which destabilize the rotation of asteroid via deviating from the current spin state, the inelastic (mainly, tidal) dissipation reduces kinetic energy of asteroid. So, evolution of the spinning asteroid should be resulting by the rotation about maximal-inertia axis with the proper spin state corresponding to minimal energy with a fixed angular momentum.

Basing on the aforesaid assumption (component $K_1$ is supposed to be fluctuating near the given appropriate constant of the fixed angular momentum), we have obtained that 2-nd component $K_2$ is the solution of the appropriate Riccati ordinary differential equation of 1-st order, whereas component $K_3$ should be determined via expression for $K_2$.

There is additional condition for obtaining such approximated solution ($I_1 > I_2 \geq I_3$):

$$\{\Omega_2, \Omega_3\} \ll \Omega_1,$$

where $\Omega_i$ are the components of angular velocity vector along the principal axes ($i = 1,2,3$), $I_i$ are the principal moments of inertia.

The last but not least, we can obtain one additional class of approximated solutions of system (1) with non-zero external applied torques $\vec{M}(t) \neq 0$; mathematical procedure of obtaining such the additional solution has been moved to an Appendix, with only the resulting formulae left in the main text (here below $K_1 \equiv \text{const}$):
where equations (10)-(11) for the dynamics of components of angular momentum $K_2, K_3$ ($K_2 = I_2 \Omega_2, K_3 = I_3 \Omega_3$) are the Abel ODEs of 1-st order of the 2-nd kind [13].

Also, the remarkable articles [18-20] should be cited, which concern the problem under consideration.

**Appendix (additional class of approximated solutions of system (1)).**

Let us obtain the additional class of approximated solutions of system (1). We consider the final dynamical state of asteroid rotation (which is fluctuating near the given appropriate constant of the fixed angular momentum, $K_1 \equiv \text{const}$) for which we assume $\dot{M}(t) \neq 0$.

Then 1-st equation of system (1) should be satisfied accordingly (at first approximation) under the appropriate condition below:

\[
K_2 \cdot \frac{dK_2}{dt} = M_2 \cdot K_2 + \left\{ M_1 \cdot K_1 \left( \frac{I_2}{I_3 - I_2} \right) \cdot \left( \frac{I_3 - I_1}{I_1} \right) \right\}, \quad \text{(10)}
\]

\[
K_3 \cdot \frac{dK_3}{dt} = M_3 \cdot K_3 + \left\{ K_1 \cdot M_1 \left( \frac{I_3}{I_3 - I_2} \right) \cdot \left( \frac{I_1 - I_2}{I_1} \right) \right\}, \quad \text{(11)}
\]

Meanwhile, there is no need to take into account assumption (2) for the right part of 1-st equation of system (1) in this case.

As for the 2-nd and 3-rd equations of system (1), we obtain (here below $K_1 \equiv \text{const}$):
where equations (10)-(11) for the dynamics of components of angular momentum $K_2, K_3 \ (K_2 = I_2 \cdot \Omega_2, K_3 = I_3 \cdot \Omega_3)$ are the Abel ODEs of 1-st order of the 2-nd kind [13]. These Eqns. can be transformed by the appropriate change of variables $K_3 = 1/u$ to the Abel ODEs of the 1-st kind (of Riccati type).

Accordingly, for the aforesaid reason of a special character of the solutions of Riccati-type ODEs (see Discussion), there exists a possibility for sudden jumping of magnitude of the solution at definite meaning of time-parameter $t$ [11-15].

In the physical sense, such jumping of Riccati-type solutions of Eqn. (8) can be associated with the effect of sudden acceleration/deceleration of angular velocity’s component $\Omega_2$ at definite moment of time $t_0$ (or with the alternative effect of crucial changes in the principal moment of inertia $I_2 (t)$ of asteroid during the process of rotation).
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