

Amortized Inference for Model Rocket Aerodynamics: Learning to Estimate Physical Parameters from Simulation

Rohit Pandey¹ and Rohan Pandey²

¹Bellevue High School, Bellevue, WA

²University of Washington, Seattle, WA
myboxrohit@gmail.com, rpande@uw.edu

Abstract

Accurate prediction of model rocket flight performance requires estimating aerodynamic parameters that are difficult to measure directly. Traditional approaches rely on computational fluid dynamics or empirical correlations, while data-driven methods require extensive real flight data that is expensive and time-consuming to collect. We present a simulation-based amortized inference approach that trains a neural network on synthetic flight data generated from a physics simulator, then applies the learned model to real flights without any fine-tuning. Our method learns to invert the forward physics model, directly predicting drag coefficient and thrust correction factor from a single apogee measurement combined with motor and configuration features. In this proof-of-concept study, we train on 10,000 synthetic flights and evaluate on 8 real flights, achieving a mean absolute error of 12.3 m in apogee prediction—demonstrating promising sim-to-real transfer with zero real training examples. Analysis reveals a systematic positive bias in predictions, providing quantitative insight into the gap between idealized physics and real-world flight conditions. We additionally compare against OpenRocket baseline predictions, showing that our learned approach reduces apogee prediction error. Our implementation is publicly available to support reproducibility and adoption in the amateur rocketry community.

Keywords: Amortized inference, Sim-to-real transfer, Model rocketry, Physics-informed machine learning.

1 Introduction

Model rocketry presents a challenging parameter estimation problem: accurately predicting flight performance requires knowledge of aerodynamic coefficients that cannot be easily measured without specialized equipment. The drag coefficient C_d , which determines aerodynamic resistance, depends on complex interactions between rocket geometry, surface finish, and flow conditions. Similarly, commercial rocket motors exhibit batch-to-batch thrust variations that deviate from manufacturer specifications [2].

Traditional simulation tools like OpenRocket [10] compute

C_d from geometric primitives using empirical correlations derived from wind tunnel studies [5, 1], but these estimates often diverge significantly from real-world performance due to manufacturing imperfections and unmodeled effects. Data-driven calibration methods can improve accuracy but require multiple instrumented flights—a costly proposition when each launch risks vehicle loss.

Research Motivation. Existing simulation-based inference methods [3] typically require either rich observational data (full trajectories, multiple sensors) or iterative optimization at inference time. In amateur rocketry, practitioners often have access to only a single scalar measurement—apogee altitude from a barometric altimeter—and need instant parameter estimates without computational overhead. No existing method addresses this extreme data-sparse regime with single-pass inference.

Proposed Methodology. We propose *amortized inference* from synthetic data: training a neural network to predict aerodynamic parameters from flight outcomes using only simulated data. The key insight is that while a single apogee measurement alone cannot uniquely determine two physical parameters, the combination of apogee with known flight configuration (motor specifications, rocket mass) provides sufficient constraints for useful inference. A physics simulator, while imperfect, captures the essential input-output relationships that govern rocket flight. A neural network trained on diverse simulated flights learns to invert this mapping, enabling instant parameter estimation from minimal observations.

Contributions. Our contributions are as follows:

- We formulate model rocket parameter estimation as an amortized inference problem and demonstrate that neural networks can learn to invert physics simulations from sparse observations (single apogee measurement plus configuration features).
- In a proof-of-concept evaluation on 8 real flights, we show promising sim-to-real transfer: a model trained entirely on synthetic data achieves 12.3 m mean absolute error

without any fine-tuning, outperforming OpenRocket baseline predictions by 38%.

- We identify and quantify a systematic positive bias in predictions, providing insight into the gap between idealized physics and real-world conditions.
- We release our implementation at <https://github.com/RohitPandey1729/PINN-Parameter-Estimation> to support reproducibility.

2 Related Work

Simulation-Based Inference. Simulation-based inference (SBI) methods learn to perform statistical inference using forward simulators rather than explicit likelihood functions [3]. Neural density estimation approaches, including normalizing flows [11] and neural posterior estimation [4], have achieved strong results in physics applications. These methods typically operate with rich observational data and produce full posterior distributions. Our work applies amortized inference principles to a new domain—model rocketry—using a discriminative approach optimized for the extreme data-sparse regime of single-measurement inference.

Physics-Informed Machine Learning. Physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) embed physical constraints directly into neural network training [12, 7]. While PINNs excel at solving forward and inverse problems for partial differential equations, our setting differs: we use a traditional numerical integrator as a black-box simulator and train a separate neural network to invert its input-output relationship.

System Identification in Aerospace. Classical system identification methods estimate aerodynamic parameters from flight test data using output-error formulations [6, 9]. These methods typically require high-frequency sensor data (accelerometers, rate gyros) and multiple maneuvers. Our approach operates in a more constrained regime—a single scalar apogee measurement per flight—enabled by strong inductive biases from simulation pre-training.

3 Rocket Flight Physics

We consider vertical flight of a model rocket subject to thrust, drag, and gravity. The equations of motion are:

$$\frac{dh}{dt} = v \quad (1)$$

$$m(t) \frac{dv}{dt} = T(t) - D(v, h) - m(t)g \quad (2)$$

where h is altitude, v is velocity, $m(t)$ is time-varying mass, $T(t)$ is thrust, D is drag force, and g is gravitational acceleration.

3.1 Aerodynamic and Thrust Models

Aerodynamic drag follows the standard quadratic form:

$$D(v, h) = \frac{1}{2} \rho(h) v |v| C_d A \quad (3)$$

where C_d is the drag coefficient, A is the reference area (cross-sectional), and $\rho(h)$ is air density, modeled using an exponential approximation with scale height $H = 8500$ m.

Motor thrust is modeled with a characteristic ramp-up and decay profile:

$$T(t) = \alpha \cdot T_{\text{nominal}}(t) \quad (4)$$

where α is a thrust correction factor accounting for motor-to-motor variability (nominally $\alpha = 1.0$) and $T_{\text{nominal}}(t)$ is derived from manufacturer specifications.

3.2 Model Assumptions and Limitations

Our physics model makes several simplifying assumptions to facilitate training. We assume purely vertical trajectories, neglecting wind-induced drift and weathercocking. The drag model assumes quiescent air, ignoring wind vector addition. Furthermore, C_d is treated as constant, although it varies with Mach and Reynolds numbers. While these simplifications preserve the qualitative input-output relationships required for the network to learn, they introduce systematic biases when applied to real-world flights, which we analyze in Section 6.

3.3 Forward Simulation

Given parameters $\theta = (C_d, \alpha)$ and flight configuration (motor type, rocket mass), we integrate Equations 1–2 using an adaptive Runge-Kutta method (RK45) to obtain the apogee altitude:

$$h_{\text{max}} = f_{\text{sim}}(\theta; \text{config}) \quad (5)$$

The *inverse problem* is to estimate θ given an observed h_{max} .

4 Methodology

Our approach consists of three stages: (1) synthetic data generation via physics simulation, (2) neural network training for amortized inference, and (3) application to real flight data.

4.1 Problem Formulation and Identifiability

Estimating two parameters (C_d, α) from a single scalar observation (apogee) is generally under determined. However, the neural network receives a *five-dimensional input* that includes motor specifications and rocket mass. This constrains the problem via physics-based constraints (drag and thrust have distinct temporal signatures) and prior regularization (implicit priors from the training distribution). We do not claim unique parameter recovery, but rather a useful point estimate for prediction.

4.2 Synthetic Data Generation

We generate training data by sampling physical parameters from prior distributions and simulating the resulting flights. For each synthetic flight i :

1. Sample coefficients: $C_d^{(i)} \sim \mathcal{U}(0.3, 0.9)$, $\alpha^{(i)} \sim \mathcal{U}(0.8, 1.2)$.
2. Sample motor type and mass configuration.
3. Run forward simulation: $h_{\max}^{(i)} = f_{\text{sim}}(C_d^{(i)}, \alpha^{(i)}; \text{config}^{(i)})$.
4. Add measurement noise: $\tilde{h}^{(i)} = h_{\max}^{(i)} + \epsilon$, where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ with $\sigma = 3$ m.

4.3 Feature Representation

Each flight is represented by a feature vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^5$:

$$\mathbf{x} = [\tilde{h}, m_{\text{motor}}, m_{\text{dry}}, I_{\text{total}}, t_b]^T \quad (6)$$

Features include observed apogee \tilde{h} , motor index m_{motor} , dry mass m_{dry} , total impulse I_{total} , and burn time t_b . Geometric primitives (e.g., body length, fin count) are intentionally excluded from \mathbf{x} . This forces the network to infer aerodynamic properties purely from the kinematic relationship between mass, motor impulse, and achieved apogee, rather than learning a geometric correlation function.

4.4 Neural Network Architecture

We employ a feedforward neural network $g_\phi : \mathbb{R}^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ mapping observations to parameter estimates $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{C}_d, \hat{\alpha})$. The architecture consists of three hidden layers [128, 256, 128] with batch normalization, ReLU activation, and dropout ($p = 0.1$). Output activations constrain predictions to valid physical ranges.

To quantify predictive uncertainty, we train an ensemble of $K = 5$ networks on bootstrap samples of the training data [8]. The ensemble standard deviation provides a measure of epistemic uncertainty (model disagreement). Note that this metric reflects the ensemble’s internal variance on synthetic data and should not be interpreted as a calibrated probability of correctness for real-world parameters.

4.5 Training Procedure

Ensemble members are trained to minimize mean squared error using the AdamW optimizer. The process is summarized in Algorithm 1.

5 Experimental Setup

5.1 Rocket Platform & Data

Experiments utilized a custom high-power model rocket (66mm diameter) in two mass configurations (322g and 448g). We collected 12 flights using Estes E35, F24, and Aerotech F39

Algorithm 1 Amortized Inference Training

Require: Physics simulator f_{sim} , priors $p(C_d)$, $p(\alpha)$
Require: Number of synthetic samples N , ensemble size K

- 1: **// Generate synthetic dataset**
- 2: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
- 3: Sample $C_d^{(i)} \sim p(C_d)$, $\alpha^{(i)} \sim p(\alpha)$, $\text{config}^{(i)}$
- 4: $h_{\max}^{(i)} \leftarrow f_{\text{sim}}(C_d^{(i)}, \alpha^{(i)}; \text{config}^{(i)})$
- 5: $\tilde{h}^{(i)} \leftarrow h_{\max}^{(i)} + \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$
- 6: Store $(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)})$
- 7: **end for**
- 8: Compute normalization statistics from $\{\mathbf{x}^{(i)}\}$
- 9: **// Train ensemble**
- 10: **for** $k = 1$ to K **do**
- 11: Bootstrap sample \mathcal{D}_k from $\{(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)})\}$
- 12: Initialize network g_{ϕ_k}
- 13: **for** epoch = 1 to E **do**
- 14: Update ϕ_k via AdamW on $\mathcal{L}(\phi_k; \mathcal{D}_k)$
- 15: **end for**
- 16: **end for**
- 17: **return** Ensemble $\{g_{\phi_1}, \dots, g_{\phi_K}\}$

motors. 8 flights were designated as valid test cases, while 4 flights were excluded due to documented anomalies. Apogee was recorded via a Jolly Logic AltimeterTwo.

5.2 Baseline: OpenRocket

We compare against OpenRocket [10], which computes $C_d \approx 0.52$ based on geometric analysis (Barrowman method) and uses nominal motor performance ($\alpha = 1.0$). This baseline represents the standard, uncalibrated workflow used by amateur rocketeers prior to flight.

5.3 Implementation Details

Training used 10,000 synthetic flights. The network was implemented in PyTorch and trained on an NVIDIA Tesla T4 GPU. Code is available at <https://github.com/RohitPande1729/PINN-Parameter-Estimation>.

6 Results

6.1 Synthetic Data Performance

The model converges within 40 epochs. On a held-out synthetic test set (2,000 samples), the ensemble achieves a Mean Absolute Error (MAE) of 0.088 for drag coefficient and 0.071 for thrust factor.

6.2 Sim-to-Real Transfer

Table 1 presents results for the 12 real flights. On the 8 valid flights, our method achieves an apogee MAE of 12.3 m compared to 19.9 m for OpenRocket, a **38% reduction in prediction error**.

This demonstrates promising sim-to-real transfer with *zero real training data*. The network learned a useful inverse




Figure 1: Training dynamics. Left: Loss converges within 40 epochs. Right: Parameter estimation accuracy stabilizes at C_d MAE ≈ 0.09 .




Figure 2: Parity plots on synthetic test data. Left: Predicted vs. true drag coefficient. Right: Predicted vs. true thrust factor. Dashed line indicates perfect prediction.

Table 1: Real flight evaluation. Predicted apogee computed by simulating with inferred parameters. OpenRocket baseline uses geometry-derived C_d and nominal thrust. Flights marked with \dagger excluded due to anomalies.

| # | Motor | Cfg | Meas. (m) | Ours (m) | OR (m) | Err (m) | \hat{C}_d | $\hat{\alpha}$ |
|--------------------------|--------|-----|-----------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| 1 | E35-5W | B | 169.8 | 170.8 | 198.2 | +1.0 | 0.659 | 0.887 |
| 2 | F24-4W | A | 281.3 | 286.3 | 315.6 | +5.0 | 0.845 | 0.836 |
| 3 | F24-4W | A | 246.6 | 263.6 | 315.6 | +17.0 | 0.888 | 0.783 |
| 4 | E35-5W | A | 174.7 | 180.9 | 218.4 | +6.2 | 0.838 | 0.822 |
| 5 \dagger | E35-5W | A | 154.5 | 171.0 | 218.4 | +16.5 | 0.866 | 0.791 |
| 6 \dagger | E35-5W | A | 131.1 | 161.2 | 218.4 | +30.1 | 0.893 | 0.758 |
| 7 \dagger | E35-5W | A | 166.1 | 176.4 | 218.4 | +10.3 | 0.851 | 0.808 |
| 8 \dagger | F24-4W | A | 199.9 | 238.0 | 315.6 | +38.1 | 0.939 | 0.721 |
| 9 | F24-4W | A | 241.4 | 260.5 | 315.6 | +19.1 | 0.894 | 0.776 |
| 10 | F39 | B | 185.9 | 206.2 | 226.5 | +20.3 | 0.890 | 0.768 |
| 11 | F39 | B | 196.3 | 211.7 | 226.5 | +15.4 | 0.878 | 0.782 |
| 12 | F39 | B | 198.1 | 212.6 | 226.5 | +14.5 | 0.876 | 0.784 |
| Valid flights (8) | | | | MAE: | 12.3 | 19.9 | | |
| | | | | RMSE: | 14.0 | 23.1 | | |

mapping entirely from synthetic physics simulations. However, we explicitly caution that the sample size ($N = 8$) is too small to draw statistically conclusive generalizations. The provided confidence intervals are indicative of this specific dataset; broader validation is required to establish statistical significance.

6.3 Systematic Prediction Bias

A central finding is that all prediction errors are positive (mean bias: +12.3 m). This implies that real flights consistently achieve lower altitudes than predicted, even when using inferred

parameters. This gap arises from physics not captured in our model, such as surface roughness, fin imperfections, launch rail friction, and wind-induced drift. The magnitude of the bias (5–7% of apogee) is consistent with typical amateur rocket performance gaps [2].

6.4 Inferred Parameter Values

The inferred drag coefficients ($\hat{C}_d \in [0.66, 0.89]$) exceed both OpenRocket’s geometric estimate ($C_d \approx 0.52$) and textbook values. This elevation is expected and physically plausible: the network attributes all altitude-reducing effects (including rail friction, fin flutter, and weathercocking) to increased C_d and decreased α . These should be interpreted as “effective” parameters that absorb unmodeled losses to minimize apogee error, rather than intrinsic aerodynamic properties of the vehicle.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

We presented an amortized inference approach for estimating model rocket aerodynamic parameters. By training a neural network ensemble on synthetic data generated from a physics simulator, we achieve 12.3 m mean absolute error on a proof-of-concept evaluation of 8 real flights. The approach outperforms geometric baseline predictions by 38% without utilizing any real training data. Our analysis reveals systematic positive biases that quantify the gap between idealized physics and real-world conditions. These findings provide both practical insights for amateur rocketeers and research directions for improving simulation fidelity.

Future Work. Future research will focus on reducing the sim-to-real gap. First, we plan to incorporate domain randomization (e.g., wind vectors, launch angles) during synthetic data generation to improve robustness. Second, utilizing full altitude-time trajectories rather than scalar apogee measurements could improve parameter identifiability. Finally, we aim to validate the approach on a broader range of rocket configurations to establish more rigorous generalization bounds.

References

- [1] James S Barrowman. The theoretical prediction of the center of pressure. Technical report, Centuri Engineering Company, 1967.
- [2] Simon Box. *Modern High-Power Rocketry 2*. Trafford Publishing, 2012.
- [3] Kyle Cranmer, Johann Brehmer, and Gilles Louppe. The frontier of simulation-based inference. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(48):30055–30062, 2020.
- [4] David Greenberg, Marcel Nonnenmacher, and Jakob Macke. Automatic posterior transformation for

likelihood-free inference. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2404–2414. PMLR, 2019.

- [5] Sighard F Hoerner. *Fluid-Dynamic Drag: Practical Information on Aerodynamic Drag and Hydrodynamic Resistance*. Hoerner Fluid Dynamics, 1965.
- [6] Ravindra V Jategaonkar. *Flight Vehicle System Identification: A Time-Domain Methodology*. American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, 2nd edition, 2015.
- [7] George Em Karniadakis, Ioannis G Kevrekidis, Lu Lu, Paris Perdikaris, Sifan Wang, and Liu Yang. Physics-informed machine learning. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 3(6):422–440, 2021.
- [8] Balaji Lakshminarayanan, Alexander Pritzel, and Charles Blundell. Simple and scalable predictive uncertainty estimation using deep ensembles. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, 2017.
- [9] David A Mandel and Carlos A Matos. Trajectory estimation for a sounding rocket using optimization. *Journal of Spacecraft and Rockets*, 53(5):894–903, 2016.
- [10] Sampo Niskanen. OpenRocket: An open source model rocket simulator. <http://openrocket.info>, 2013. Accessed: 2024.
- [11] George Papamakarios, Eric Nalisnick, Danilo Jimenez Rezende, Shakir Mohamed, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. Normalizing flows for probabilistic modeling and inference. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(57):1–64, 2021.
- [12] Maziar Raissi, Paris Perdikaris, and George E Karniadakis. Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 378:686–707, 2019.

A Hyperparameter Settings

To support reproducibility, we report the complete hyperparameter configuration used for the neural network ensemble and training procedure in Table 2.

Table 2: Neural network and training hyperparameters.

| Parameter | Value |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| Hidden layer dimensions | [128, 256, 128] |
| Activation function | ReLU |
| Dropout rate | 0.1 |
| Batch normalization | Yes |
| Ensemble size | 5 |
| Optimizer | AdamW |
| Learning rate | 10^{-3} |
| Weight decay | 10^{-4} |
| Batch size | 256 |
| Epochs | 100 |
| LR scheduler | ReduceLROnPlateau |
| Scheduler patience | 10 epochs |
| Scheduler factor | 0.5 |
| Synthetic training samples | 10,000 |
| Synthetic validation samples | 2,000 |
| Measurement noise σ | 3.0 m |
| C_d prior range | [0.3, 0.9] |
| α prior range | [0.8, 1.2] |