For spacecraft propulsion systems that operate beyond Earth's atmosphere, conventional turbine engines (such as those found on airplanes) are unsuitable because they rely on atmospheric oxygen to burn fuel. Instead, space missions typically use rocket engines, particularly liquid-fuel or ion propulsion engines, both of which are highly suited to the vacuum of space. Here, I'll review a few propulsion systems commonly used or considered for space missions, focusing on cost, functionality, durability, and the type of fuel or energy source that powers them.

---

## Recommended Space Propulsion Options

### 1. SpaceX Merlin 1D Rocket Engine

- **Overview**: The Merlin 1D engine, used in SpaceX's Falcon rockets, is a highly efficient liquid rocket engine. It is optimized for operation in the vacuum of space, unlike jet turbines which require atmospheric oxygen.
- **Fuel Type**: Rocket-grade kerosene (RP-1) and liquid oxygen (LOX).
- **Thrust**: Up to 914 kN (in vacuum).
- **Specific Impulse (Isp)**: Approximately 311 seconds in a vacuum, meaning it provides efficient thrust for space missions.
- **Cost**: Around $1 million per engine, though exact costs can vary based on contracts and configurations.
- **Durability**: Merlin engines have undergone rigorous testing and are designed to withstand high heat, pressure, and vibration, making them resilient to extreme space conditions.
- **Advantages**:
  - High thrust-to-weight ratio.
  - Reusable, lowering overall mission costs when launching multiple payloads.
  - Proven capability, as it's used in the Falcon 9 and Falcon Heavy, which have launched numerous missions.
- **Disadvantages**:
  - Limited suitability for deep-space missions because it requires a sizable supply of fuel, which can add to spacecraft mass.

### 2. Raptor Engine (Methane-based, SpaceX)

- **Overview**: The Raptor engine is another of SpaceX's innovations, intended for its Starship. It uses liquid methane and liquid oxygen, making it more suited to deep-space missions and potentially refuelable on Mars.
- **Fuel Type**: Methane ($CH_4$) and liquid oxygen (LOX).
- **Thrust**: Approximately 2 MN (in vacuum).

- **Specific Impulse (Isp)**: Approximately 380 seconds in a vacuum.
- **Cost**: Estimated to be $2 million per engine, though it varies based on the scale of manufacturing and mission scope.
- **Durability**: High resilience, engineered for multiple reuses even in extreme environments.
- **Advantages**:
  - Methane is more stable than RP-1 and can potentially be sourced or synthesized on Mars, making it highly suitable for long-term interplanetary missions.
  - High specific impulse and thrust, suitable for large payloads and interplanetary transit.
- **Disadvantages**:
  - Slightly more expensive per engine than Merlin engines.
  - Requires development of infrastructure for methane production in space or on Mars for long-term missions.

#### 3. Ion Thrusters (e.g., NASA's NEXT or X3 Thruster)

- **Overview**: Ion propulsion is suitable for long-duration, deep-space missions where high efficiency and low thrust are acceptable. NASA's NEXT ion thruster and the X3 thruster are notable examples.
- **Fuel Type**: Xenon gas.
- **Thrust**: Much lower than chemical rockets (typically in millinewtons to a few newtons).
- **Specific Impulse (Isp)**: Ranges from 1,500 to over 5,000 seconds, depending on the thruster and power supplied, making it extremely fuel-efficient.
- **Cost**: Can vary widely; a full ion propulsion system can cost upwards of $10 million due to high power requirements and specific fuel needs.
- **Durability**: Designed for continuous operation over long periods (years), capable of withstanding radiation, particle impacts, and other space hazards.
- **Advantages**:
  - Very high efficiency, allowing for longer missions with less fuel, as it accelerates ions over time.
  - Ideal for deep-space exploration missions (e.g., asteroid missions, Mars transit).
  - Minimal fuel requirements, reducing mass significantly.
- **Disadvantages**:
  - Low thrust makes it unsuitable for launch or quick acceleration.
  - Expensive, primarily due to power requirements and the need for high-grade xenon as a propellant.

---

## Key Considerations for Spacecraft Propulsion

1. **Cost Analysis**:
    - Chemical rocket engines (like the Merlin and Raptor) generally have lower initial costs and are reusable, which can reduce expenses for missions requiring multiple launches.
    - Ion thrusters have high efficiency but incur higher costs for initial deployment, largely due to fuel and power system requirements.
2. **Fuel Efficiency**:
    - **Liquid Rockets**: RP-1/LOX and Methane/LOX provide high thrust but have a limited operational time, making them ideal for launches and initial space maneuvers.
    - **Ion Thrusters**: Extremely fuel-efficient, allowing for extended missions with small amounts of xenon, suitable for interplanetary travel.
3. **Durability Against Extreme Conditions**:
    - Chemical rocket engines like the Raptor and Merlin 1D are built to withstand reentry and launch vibrations, extreme temperatures, and rapid pressure changes.
    - Ion thrusters are designed for long-duration missions and to withstand constant exposure to radiation and particles in deep space.
4. **Fuel Storage and Resupply**:
    - RP-1 and LOX need careful cryogenic storage, making them difficult to sustain on long-duration missions.
    - Methane has the potential for in-situ resource utilization, particularly on Mars, making the Raptor engine a strategic choice for Mars exploration.
    - Ion thrusters, while efficient, rely on xenon, a costly and limited resource that must be stored under high pressure.

---

## Recommendations

For a spacecraft with goals of interplanetary exploration, particularly with potential Martian landings or extended missions in deep space, the **Raptor Engine** is highly recommended. Its methane/LOX combination provides both high efficiency and potential for fuel sourcing on Mars. For extended deep-space missions where sustained, long-term propulsion is key, **pairing a chemical engine (like the Raptor) with an ion thruster** could offer an effective balance between high thrust (for initial maneuvers) and fuel-efficient, low-thrust propulsion for long journeys.

By implementing this combination, the mission can benefit from high thrust at the start and then conserve fuel with ion thrusters over time. If budget and mission scope allow, a **dual-propulsion**

**system** (Raptor for thrust and ion thrusters for endurance) would provide an optimal setup for a long-duration space mission.