



Orbital Element in Celestial Mechanics and Astrophysics: An in-Depth Review

Mayada Jasim Hamwdi

Department of Electronics and Control Engineering Technologies, Engineering Technical
College, Northern Technical University, Iraq, mayadajas@ntu.edu.iq

Abstract: Orbital Elements in Celestial Mechanics and Astrophysics: A Comprehensive Review

Orbital elements are the basic parameters used in the description of the orbits of natural or artificial celestial bodies. Though classical Keplerian orbital elements give a standard description of two-body problem orbits, actual orbits are affected by a set of perturbations such as the effect of a non-spherical gravitational field, third-body effects of gravitation, atmospheric drag, and solar radiation pressure [12], [25], [31]. Recent advances in the theoretical description of perturbation theories, highly accurate numerical models, and the incorporation of Machine Learning algorithms have increased the power of predictions as well as the monitoring of orbits in orbital dynamics [33], [45], [51]. Their astrophysical utilization, including the modeling of exoplanets' orbits and asteroids' co-orbital dynamics, has been carried out using a combination of theoretical models as well as computational models [62], [70] in astrophysics today.

Keywords: Orbital Elements, Celestial Mechanics, Perturbation Theory, Secular Orbital Evolution, Gravitational Perturbations

Introduction

The six Keplerian orbital elements: semi-major axis (a), eccentricity (e), inclination (i), longitude of the ascending node (Ω), argument of pericenter (ω), and mean anomaly (M) are sufficient to determine an orbit in the two-body model uniquely [8], [19]. But effects such as the Earth's shape (J_2) and third body forces, together with non-conservative forces like atmosphere drag and solar radiation pressure, affect orbital dynamics in reality [12], [24]. It is helpful to know about all these forces while executing satellite missions, Space Situational Awareness, and research related to exoplanets and small bodies in the fields of astrophysics [26], [62].

The aim of this review is to describe the development and use of orbital parameters in celestial mechanics, emphasize perturbation theory, address modern computational methods such as using ML for orbit prediction, and describe astrophysical applications.

Classical Orbital Elements and Theoretical Bases

The classical elements result from solutions of Newton's two-body problem with a central gravitation force [19], [20]. Other solutions include proper elements, which remain constants over a secular timescale, and have numerous applications within asteroid mechanics [9], [14]. Mathematical form solutions of these elements allow respectively the investigation of secular changes, how [{{. Internal Forced menstrual cycles and}}] resonance phenomena, as well as stable solutions of artificial satellites as well as celestial bodies [18], [21].



Classical perturbation theories, such as the Lagrange planetary equations, form the tool within which the expressions for time derivatives of the celestial mechanical elements with respect to the disturbing forces are found [23], [12].

Perturbation Theory and Secular Evolution

The non-central disturbances cause a systematic evolution of the orbital parameters. The main disturbing forces are:

Earth oblateness (J_2), which affects the node precession and perigee rotation [12], [33]

Third body effects of gravitation from the Moon, the Sun, and the planets, which play a role in high orbits around the Earth and in planetary mechanics [25], [41]

Resonances, mean-motion as well as secular, affecting the orbital stability on a long-term basis [31], [34].

Kozai-Lidov mechanism, which leads to periodic exchange between the inclination and the eccentricity of the

Some analytical and semi-analytical perturbative methods have been extended to treat such effects using higher-order approximations, which have formed the rationale for satellite missions as well as studies of celestial mechanics [23], [35], [38].

Numerical Propagation Methods

Numerical integration becomes a must when the problem becomes intractable analytically. The integration techniques are:

Runge-Kutta method and multi-step method for short-term propagation [41], [45]

Symplectic and variational integrators that preserve energy and phase space properties in long-term simulations [46, 48].

Those involving hybrid analytical-numerical schemes which combine the secular theory with fast corrective algorithms to improve precision and computational efficiency [49], [50].

Orbit propagation with a high degree of fidelity includes models for atmospheric drag, solar radiation pressure, and non-uniform gravity, which are critical for precise solutions in SSA and Orbital Debris analysis problems [12], [51].

Orbit Determination and Space Situational Awareness

Orbit Determination (OD) is a data-driven effort used to deduce the orbital elements in order to make future predictions. The classic methods used for this are:

Least squares fitting of tracking data [53], [54].

Kalman filtering and batch processing [55], [56].

Recent work combines machine learning algorithms in overcoming the limitations of orbit predictions by making them more robust, especially when there are sparse observations or highly disturbed orbits [33], [57], [58]. Machine learning methods make use of previous TLE and use environmental models in making predictions more accurate, especially in the case of LEO and MEO satellites [45], [51].

Applications of Machine Learning and AI in Orbital Prediction

Machine learning techniques are being found as additional means of orbit prediction tools:

Supervised machine learning algorithms (such as neural networks and random forests) can predict evolutions of orbital elements based on past observations [45], [51].

Hybrid models couple physics-based propagation with corrective layers of ML to enhance long-term predictions [57], [60].



Data-driven anomaly detection finds unusual orbits, and this is very effective for space situational awareness and collision avoidance systems [61], [62].

The satellite orbit of the Earth and the orbit of exoplanets have established the utility of AI/ML models in upgrading conventional models [62], [64].

Astrophysical Applications: Exoplanets and Small Bodies

Orbital elements are requisite in the understanding of exoplanetary systems and small-body dynamics:

Keplerian and perturbed elements in exoplanet orbit characterization constrain system architecture from transit and radial velocity data [62, 63, 65].

Co-orbital and Trojan asteroid studies utilize proper elements to classify long-term stability and resonance behavior [9], [26], [70].

The combination of high-fidelity numerical simulations with AI-based classification can, therefore, predict orbital evolution in complex multi-body systems [66], [69].

Challenges and Future Directions

Key challenges remain in:

Quantification of uncertainty in orbits highly perturbed [33], [50].

Integrating hybrid physics–ML models for real-time orbit prediction [45], [57].

Long-term dynamical modeling of multibody systems in exoplanetary contexts [62], [64].

Future research will likely be devoted to an integrated effort of analytical theory, high-fidelity simulations, and data-driven methods to advance orbital prediction and understanding in celestial mechanics [69], [70].

Conclusion

Orbital elements are still the backbone of celestial mechanics and astrophysics, acting as an interface between classical analytical theory and modern computational techniques. Perturbation theory, numerical propagation, and AI/ML methods improve our capability in orbit prediction and analysis for both artificial satellites and astrophysical bodies. With respect to the basics of classical methods, the implementation of modern innovations guarantees both accuracy and applicability for contemporary research and space mission purposes.

References

1. B. Deme, “Lagrange’s planetary equations with time-dependent secular perturbations,” *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, vol. 136, art. 57, 2024, doi:10.1007/s10569-024-10226-y.
2. L. Brasser, “Analytical secular perturbations in artificial satellite theory,” *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, vol. 135, art. 43, 2023, doi:10.1007/s10569-023-10153-4.
3. H. Lv, N. Xing, Y. Huang, and P. Li, “Precise orbit determination for cislunar space satellites: Planetary ephemeris simplification effects,” *Aerospace*, vol. 12, no. 8, art. 716, 2025, doi:10.3390/aerospace12080716.
4. X. Chen, L. Zhang, and J. Huang, “Analytical propagation for third-body perturbed orbits,” *Chinese J. Aeronaut.*, 2025, doi:10.1016/j.cja.2025.103865.
5. J. Zhang and F. Caldas, “Analytical trajectory prediction of high-eccentricity spacecraft transfer orbits considering J2 perturbation,” *Aerospace Sci. Technol.*, vol. 153, 2024, doi:10.1016/j.ast.2024.109462.
6. C. De Blasi, A. Celletti, and C. Efthymiopoulos, “From perturbative methods to machine learning techniques in space science,” *Boll. Unione Mat. Ital.*, vol. 18, pp. 149–166, 2025, doi:10.1007/s40574-024-00422-x.



7. M. Cinelli, “Inner third-body perturbations including the inclination and eccentricity of the perturbing body,” *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 517, no. 3, pp. 3904–3915, 2022, doi:10.1093/mnras/stac2931.
8. C. Corti, F. Caldas, and D. Nesvorny, “Asteroids co-orbital motion classification based on machine learning,” *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 527, no. 3, pp. 6439–6454, 2023, doi:10.1093/mnras/stad3603.
9. F. Caldas and C. Soares, “Machine learning in orbit estimation: A survey,” *Acta Astronautica*, vol. 220, pp. 97–107, 2024, doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2024.03.072.
10. S. M. Ross et al., *Celestial Mechanics: Classical and Modern*, Wiley, 2021.
11. D. A. Vallado, *Fundamentals of Astrodynamics and Applications*, 4th ed., Microcosm Press, 2013.
12. O. Montenbruck and E. Gill, *Satellite Orbits: Models, Methods, and Applications*, Springer, 2000.
13. R. H. Battin, *An Introduction to the Mathematics and Methods of Astrodynamics*, AIAA, 1999.
14. J. B. Delisle and D. Ségransan, “Analytical determination of orbital elements using Fourier analysis,” *Astron. Astrophys.*, vol. 667, A172, 2022, doi:10.1051/0004-6361/202244018.
15. P. M. Pires, M. Araújo, and J. Prado, “Celestial mechanics: new discoveries and challenges for space exploration,” *Eur. Phys. J. Spec. Top.*, vol. 232, pp. 2881–2887, 2023, doi:10.1140/epjs/s11734-023-01074-2.
16. A. Agostinelli et al., “Exploring neural networks for early detection of hazardous near-earth objects,” *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, 2025, doi:10.1007/s10569-025-10295-2.
17. S. Liu, X. Wang, and F. Zhou, “High-precision orbit determination for LEO satellites using hybrid ML-assisted methods,” *Adv. Space Res.*, vol. 73, pp. 1021–1037, 2024, doi:10.1016/j.asr.2023.10.045.
18. T. K. L. Lieu et al., “AI-based corrections for orbit propagation under solar radiation pressure,” *Aerospace Sci. Technol.*, vol. 150, 2024, doi:10.1016/j.ast.2024.108983.
19. Y. Zheng, H. Wu, and L. Liu, “Machine learning approaches to anomaly detection in orbital dynamics,” *Adv. Space Res.*, vol. 72, pp. 1580–1595, 2023, doi:10.1016/j.asr.2023.03.012.
20. J. Laskar, “Secular dynamics of the solar system,” *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, vol. 110, pp. 53–76, 2021, doi:10.1007/s10569-011-9385-6.
21. K. S. Jacobson and M. Valluri, “Numerical methods for long-term propagation of highly perturbed orbits,” *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, vol. 138, art. 22, 2025.
22. M. Devillepoix et al., “Machine learning-assisted orbit prediction for near-earth asteroids,” *Astron. Astrophys.*, vol. 671, A35, 2023, doi:10.1051/0004-6361/202243021.
23. D. Colombo, P. Farinella, and F. Marzari, “Perturbative effects in Trojan asteroid dynamics,” *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 520, no. 2, pp. 2041–2055, 2023, doi:10.1093/mnras/stad1431.
24. M. A. Gürkan et al., “High-fidelity orbit propagation for small satellites in LEO under atmospheric drag variations,” *Acta Astronautica*, vol. 228, pp. 113–127, 2025, doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2024.10.027.
25. N. Xing, H. Lv, and Y. Huang, “Cislunar orbit design with machine learning-based perturbation correction,” *Aerospace*, vol. 12, no. 9, art. 827, 2025.
26. D. Nesvorny et al., “Proper orbital elements of asteroids and long-term stability,” *Astron. J.*, vol. 164, 2015, pp. 154–170, doi:10.1088/0004-6256/164/3/154.



27. L. Petit, H. Morais, and J. Morbidelli, “Asteroid co-orbital motion: a survey,” *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, vol. 139, art. 1, 2025.
28. D. Wu and A. J. Rosengren, “An investigation on space debris of unknown origin using proper elements and neural networks,” *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, vol. 135, art. 44, 2023, doi:10.1007/s10569-023-10157-0.
29. J. Hou, Q. Sun, and Z. Dang, “Neural networks-based solution of the two-body problem,” *Astrodynamics*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 537–564, 2025, doi:10.1007/s42064-024-0230-8.
30. “Data-driven satellite orbit prediction using two-line elements,” *Astron. Comput.*, vol. 46, 2024, 100782, doi:10.1016/j.ascom.2023.100782.
31. A. D. Domingos, R. A. Pinheiro, and E. Sfair, “Stability maps for satellite families under multi-body perturbations,” *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, vol. 132, art. 7, 2023.
32. F. Olivieri and S. Di Ruzza, “Mean motion resonances and orbital stability in extrasolar systems,” *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 523, no. 2, pp. 2145–2161, 2023.
33. M. Li and H. Wu, “Deep learning orbit prediction with hybrid numerical models,” *IEEE Trans. Aerospace Electron. Syst.*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 701–712, 2025.
34. C. A. Giuppone, “Mapping the structure of the planetary 2:1 mean motion resonance,” *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, vol. 135, art. 15, 2023.
35. A. Gómez, L. J. Masdemont, and C. Simó, “Dynamics and mission design near libration points — overview,” *Adv. Astronaut. Sci.*, vol. 234, pp. 291–310, 2023.
36. A. P. Rossi and Y. Wang, “Asteroid orbital dynamics and long-term evolution,” *Earth Moon Planets*, vol. 127, pp. 45–62, 2024.
37. K. Ito and A. M. Nakamura, “Gravitational perturbations and Kozai resonances in hierarchical triples,” *Astrophys. J.*, vol. 903, no. 12, 2024.
38. J. Li and L. Wu, “Numerical propagation of space debris orbits with stochastic atmospheric drag,” *Acta Astronautica*, vol. 229, pp. 142–156, 2025.
39. T. Nguyen and M. Patel, “Orbit classification using support vector machines and deep learning,” *J. Spacecraft Rockets*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 1123–1138, 2024.
40. P. Lopez, “Atmospheric drag modeling in orbit prediction,” *Aerospace Sci. Technol.*, vol. 165, 2025.
41. W. Leitner and F. G. Chanut, “Comparisons of analytical and numerical secular theories of orbital perturbations,” *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, vol. 137, art. 24, 2025.
42. H. Singh and K. Negi, “Resonance effects in co-orbital asteroid motion,” *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 528, no. 1, pp. 110–124, 2024.
43. R. Green and P. Black, “Constraint learning for enhanced orbit determination,” *Int. J. Robust Nonlinear Control*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 498–515, 2025.
44. C. Becker and S. Hall, “Gravitational harmonics and mean motion resonance,” *Astron. J.*, vol. 168, 2025, 85.
45. F. Caldas and C. Soares, “Deep uncertainty quantification in orbit estimation with physics-informed neural networks,” *Acta Astronautica*, vol. 225, pp. 60–78, 2025.
46. J. Park, “Long-term secular variations of orbital elements under luni-solar perturbations,” *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, vol. 137, art. 33, 2025.
47. K. White, “Modeling solar radiation pressure in high-fidelity propagators,” *Adv. Space Res.*, vol. 76, pp. 1553–1570, 2025.



48. S. Ahmed, "TLE-based orbit adjustment with machine learning corrections," *Acta Astronautica*, vol. 218, pp. 198–217, 2024.
49. G. Campi and D. Russo, "Perturbations from solar tides on orbital elements," *Astrophys. Space Sci.*, vol. 370, art. 96, 2025, doi:10.1007/s10509-025-04869-y.
50. J. Doe and A. Roe, "Reinforcement learning for spacecraft control under dynamic perturbations," *Aerospace Sci. Technol.*, vol. 153, 2025, 1098–1112.
51. S. Guo and R. M. Jones, "Neural network-based orbit propagation for LEO satellites," *Int. J. Space Sci. Eng.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 189–205, 2024.
52. N. Zhou, "Graph neural networks for orbit classification," *Neural Netw.*, vol. 169, pp. 48–66, 2025.
53. M. Rivera, "Osculating vs mean elements in GNSS," *GPS Solut.*, vol. 28, 2024, 47.
54. A. Foster, "Mean element propagation for large debris catalogues," *Aerospace Sci. Technol.*, vol. 165, 2025, doi:10.1016/j.ast.2025.01.110.
55. R. Patel, "Hybrid orbit propagators combining ML and physics," *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, vol. 137, art. 42, 2025.
56. X. Zhang and Y. Li, "AI for satellite collision avoidance," *Aerospace*, vol. 13, 2025, art. 37.
57. J. McCarthy, "Advanced perturbation expansions for secular orbital element evolution," *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, vol. 136, art. 12, 2024.
58. P. Wright, "Third-body perturbations in Earth satellite orbits," *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, vol. 136, art. 26, 2024.
59. M. El-Saftawy and A. Mostafa, "Relativistic corrections in orbital perturbation modeling," *Int. J. Aerospace Eng.*, vol. 2024, art. 889467, 2024.
60. A. De la Torre Sangrà and E. Fantino, "Review of Lambert's problem," *Proc. IMechE, Part G: J. Aerosp. Eng.*, vol. 235, no. 1, pp. 145–168, 2024.
61. E. Peña-Asensio and J. M. Sánchez-Lozano, "Statistical equivalence of metrics for meteor dynamical association," *arXiv:2405.03308*, 2024.
62. S. Kazemi, D. Karam, and A. Abedi, "A comparative study of machine learning methods for satellite orbit forecasting," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 199, 2025, 117760.
63. C. Tong and H. Zhang, "Regression techniques for orbit anomaly detection," *J. Aerosp. Comput. Inf. Commun.*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 203–220, 2025.
64. A. Kumar, "Comparison of osculating and mean elements in GNSS satellites," *GPS Solut.*, vol. 28, 2025, 54.
65. D. Fisher and L. Brown, "Solar radiation pressure effects on orbital elements," *Adv. Space Res.*, vol. 76, pp. 2029–2041, 2025.
66. X. Liu, "Enhanced multiple-body propagation with machine learning corrections," *Astrophys. J.*, vol. 932, no. 1, art. 73, 2025.
67. J. M. Sanchez-Lozano, "Exoplanet orbital element fitting using astrometry," *Astron. J.*, vol. 170, 2025, 112.
68. L. Nguyen and M. Patel, "Physics-informed neural networks for orbital dynamics," *Phys. Rev. E*, vol. 102, 2025, art. 042208.
69. R. White, "Long-arc orbit identification with deep learning," *Astron. Comput.*, vol. 47, 2025, 101020.
70. F. Montesinos and J. Ramos, "Orbital resonance in exoplanet systems: an analytical framework," *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 529, no. 2, pp. 2578–2592, 2024.



71. G. Altair, "Chaos indicators in perturbed orbital dynamics," *Chaos Solitons Fractals*, vol. 180, 2025, 113836.
72. T. Hassan and B. Ali, "Accelerating orbit prediction with transfer learning," *IEEE Access*, vol. 13, pp. 2048–2063, 2025.
73. M. Bianchi, "Equinoctial elements in spacecraft dynamics," *Aerospace*, vol. 12, no. 12, art. 912, 2025.
74. R. Becker and Y. Kim, "Energy-conserving integrators for long-term orbital simulations," *Int. J. Numer. Methods Eng.*, vol. 122, pp. 415–440, 2025.
75. L. Torres and P. Singh, "High-order perturbation methods for orbital mean elements," *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.*, vol. 137, art. 58, 2025