



ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Radio Science Investigations with the Asteroid Impact Mission

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Radio Science Investigations with the Asteroid Impact Mission / Zannoni, Marco; Tommei, Giacomo; Modenini, Dario; Tortora, Paolo; Mackenzie, Ruairaidh; Scoubeau, Mehdi; Herfort, Ulrich; Carnelli, Ian. - In: ADVANCES IN SPACE RESEARCH. - ISSN 0273-1177. - ELETTRONICO. - 62:8(2018), pp. 2273-2289. [10.1016/j.asr.2017.12.003]

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/651429> since: 2019-09-27

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2017.12.003>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

(Article begins on next page)

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Marco Zannoni, Giacomo Tommei, Dario Modenini, Paolo Tortora, Ruaraidh Mackenzie, Mehdi Scoubeau, Ulrich Herfort, Ian Carnelli

Radio science investigations with the Asteroid impact mission

In: Advances in Space Research, Volume 62, Issue 8, 2018, p. 2273-2289

The final published version is available online at:

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2017.12.003>

Rights / License:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Radio Science Investigations with the Asteroid Impact Mission

Marco Zannoni^{1*} (m.zannoni@unibo.it), Giacomo Tommei² (giacomo.tommei@unipi.it), Dario Modenini¹ (dario.modenini@unibo.it), Paolo Tortora¹ (paolo.tortora@unibo.it), Ruairaidh Mackenzie³ (ruairaidh.mackenzie@esa.int), Mehdi Scoubeau³ (mehdi.scoubeau@esa.int), Ulrich Herfort³ (ulrich.herfort@esa.int), Ian Carnelli⁴ (ian.carnelli@esa.int)

¹Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Bologna, Via Fontanelle 40, I-47121 Forlì, Italy

²Department of Mathematics, University of Pisa, Largo Bruno Pontecorvo 5, I-56127 Pisa, Italy

³ESA/ESOC, Robert-Bosch-Strasse 5, D-64293 Darmstadt, Germany

⁴ESA/HQ, 8-10 Rue Mario Nikis, F-75738 Paris, France

*Corresponding author

Abstract

The Asteroid Impact & Deflection Assessment (AIDA) mission is a joint ESA/NASA collaboration to study the binary Near-Earth Asteroid (65803) Didymos and assess the feasibility of the kinetic impactor technique to deflect an asteroid. The European contribution to AIDA is the Asteroid Impact Mission (AIM), which will characterize in detail the Didymos system, investigating the surface, subsurface, and internal properties of the asteroid.

This paper presents a possible Radio Science Experiment (RSE) to be performed with AIM focused at its precise orbit determination within the Didymos system, providing an assessment of the accuracies achievable in the estimation of the scientific parameters of interest, like the masses and the extended gravity fields of Didymos primary and secondary, their relative orbit, and their rotational states. The experiment expected performances were assessed through numerical simulations, based upon a complete and realistic dynamical model of the Didymos system and the AIM spacecraft.

Given the small mass of the Didymos system, optical navigation images proved to be crucial to obtain good accuracies for the scientific parameters of interest, even keeping AIM at relatively large distances from Didymos. At 10 km, after 8 flybys dedicated to gravity science, the masses of the primary and secondary can be estimated to about 0.2% and 1.6% (1-sigma), respectively, with the mass of the secondary being mainly given by observing the wobble of the primary around the common center of mass due to the mutual orbital motion; the orbital motion of the secondary around the primary can be estimated to about 1 m, and the pole orientation of the primary and the secondary can be estimated to about 0.1 deg and 0.4 deg, respectively (1-sigma).

Keywords: Orbit determination; Near-Earth asteroids; Binary asteroids.

1. Introduction

The study of multiple asteroid systems is a relatively young field of research, but very important because such objects enable investigations of properties and processes that are difficult to verify by other means (see Margot et al. 2015 for a brief review of asteroid systems). The existence of binary asteroids was disputed until 1993, when Galileo spacecraft, during a fly-by, discovered the satellite Dactyl of (243) Ida. A few years later, due to the increase of ground-based efforts, a satellite around (45) Eugenia was discovered.

1 Since then, many binary asteroids have been found using different observation techniques and now
2 binaries are known to exist among almost all dynamical classes of minor planets: NEAs binaries are a
3 significant fraction, about $15\pm 4\%$, of the entire population (Pravec et al., 2006).

4
5 The Asteroid Impact Mission (AIM) is a candidate ESA mission to the binary Near-Earth Asteroid (65803)
6 Didymos (Michel et al., 2016). AIM would characterize for the first time a binary asteroid system, providing
7 an understanding of its formation and evolution, and of the origin of the entire Solar System. AIM can be
8 conceived as a stand-alone mission, but it is also the ESA contribution to the proposed joint mission AIDA
9 (Asteroid Impact & Deflection Assessment), which includes also NASA's spacecraft DART (Double Asteroid
10 Redirection Test) (Cheng et al., 2015)(Cheng et al., 2016). DART would impact the secondary of Didymos to
11 test and validate the kinetic impactor as a planetary protection strategy and greatly increase the scientific
12 return of both missions through the detailed comparison of the Didymos system before and after the
13 impact. In addition to its own scientific payload, AIM is planned to carry some smaller probes (Mascot-2
14 asteroid lander, developed by DLR, and two or more CubeSat Opportunity Payloads (COPINS)).
15
16
17
18

19 A binary asteroid system is an intrinsically complex dynamical environment, characterized by a strong
20 coupling between the rotational and orbital dynamics of the two bodies. Measuring their orbital and
21 rotational dynamics could be useful to possibly characterize the main effects on the long-term behavior of
22 the binary, like the spin-orbit resonance, the Yarkovsky-O'Keefe-Radzievskii-Paddack (YORP) effect and the
23 Binary YORP (BYORP) effect.
24
25
26

27 Besides the scientific relevance, an accurate estimation of the orbit and the gravity of the secondary is very
28 important also for the AIM mission operations, to ensure a safe navigation in the proximity of the system,
29 as during the deployment of the smaller probes.
30
31

32 Moreover, in the context of the AIDA mission, the precise characterization of the Didymos system provided
33 by AIM could greatly enhance the study of the effects of the DART impact on the secondary, through
34 comparisons between the system properties before and after the impact.
35
36

37 This paper describes a possible Radio Science Experiment (RSE) in the framework of the AIM mission:
38 exploiting the radiometric measurements, acquired between the spacecraft and the Earth, and optical
39 measurements of Didymos taken by the spacecraft, it is possible to perform a precise orbit determination
40 of the probe within the Didymos system, estimating, at the same time, a number of dynamical parameters
41 of scientific interest. First, reconstructing the relative orbits of AIM, Didymos primary, and secondary, an
42 estimation of the masses of Didymos can be obtained, which can then be used together with their shapes
43 to derive the bulk densities and their average composition. Then, the degree-2 gravity coefficients of the
44 bodies provide information about their internal mass distribution, while higher degree coefficients may
45 highlight the presence of local density anomalies through a gravity-topography comparison. A realization of
46 the body-fixed frames of the bodies is obtained estimating the coordinates of a number of surface
47 topographic feature, known as landmarks. Finally, measuring the time evolution of the frames, along with
48 the gravities, provides additional information about the moments of inertia of the bodies, and their internal
49 mass distributions.
50
51
52
53
54

55 Numerical simulations were carried out during this study, with the following goals: assess the feasibility of
56 performing Radio Science investigations of the Didymos system with the AIM mission; provide a preliminary
57 evaluation of the accuracies achievable in the estimation of the scientific parameters of interest; provide
58 guidelines to maximize the scientific return of the entire mission.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the baseline AIM mission scenario used as an input
2 for the study; the procedure adopted for the numerical simulations is outlined in Section 3; Section 4,
3 Section 5, and Section 6 describe in detail the dynamical model implemented in the simulations, the
4 generation of simulated measurements, and the setup of the estimation filter, respectively. The main
5 results of the simulations are provided and discussed in Section 7. Finally, Section 8 summarizes the main
6 findings and conclusions of this work.
7

8 9 10 **2. AIM Mission Scenario**

11 To assess the orbit determination performances, the mission scenario must specify: the relative geometry
12 between the Sun, the Earth, and the Didymos system that, given the orbits and rotational models of the
13 celestial bodies, is provided by the mission timeline; the relative geometry between the spacecraft and the
14 Didymos system during the radio science experiments, which is usually driven by the mission objectives and
15 operational constraints.
16
17

18
19 The AIM mission timeline adopted during this study is represented in Table 1: the launch is scheduled in
20 October-November 2020, while the arrival to Didymos system is in May 2022. Radio science investigations
21 will be carried out mainly before CubeSats and Lander deployment. Hence, the main dynamical properties
22 of the system shall be characterized with a sufficient accuracy during the Early Characterization Phase
23 (ECP), Detailed Characterization Phase 1 (DCP1), and Payload Deployment Phase (PDP), to ensure a safe
24 navigation in proximity of the Didymos system during these critical events. The observations after the
25 lander deployment, during the Detailed Characterization Phase 2 (DCP2), and after the Impact Phase,
26 during the Detailed Characterization Phase 3 (DCP3), will be used respectively to improve the estimation
27 accuracy and to estimate the changes in the dynamical model of the Didymos binary system due to the
28 DART impact. During the adopted mission timeline the Sun-Earth-Probe (SEP) angle is always larger than 90
29 deg, resulting in favorable conditions for spacecraft operations, in terms of achievable telemetry data rate
30 and radiometric noise levels. The results of this study are expected to be representative also for different
31 mission timelines, with small quantitative variations because several conservative assumptions were made
32 during the study, absorbing possible changes in the relative Sun-Earth-Didymos geometry.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Regarding the Didymos-AIM relative geometry, a mission concept similar to Rosetta was assumed: the AIM
40 reference orbit consists of a series of hyperbolic arcs connected by impulsive maneuvers to form pyramid-
41 like trajectories. This strategy is much more flexible and offers several operational advantages (Herfort and
42 Casas, 2015): lower sensitivity to errors in gravity potential; lower sensitivity to errors in the maneuvers;
43 more favorable illumination conditions, both for science observations and optical navigation; safe escape
44 trajectory in case of spacecraft problems.
45
46
47

48 The same strategy was adopted for the radio science investigations, which should be performed during a
49 limited number of hyperbolic arcs connected to the pyramid-like reference trajectory. Table 2 provides the
50 parameters which completely defines the Didymos-AIM relative hyperbolic trajectory, and the
51 corresponding range of values assumed during this study.
52
53
54

55 The results reported in this paper were obtained assuming 8 non-contiguous flybys dedicated to the Radio
56 Science Experiment. To make comparisons between different strategies, all the 8 flybys were designed to
57 have the same configuration (spacecraft initial conditions, arc length, noise levels, ...), except for the
58 relative position between the spacecraft and Didymos secondary at the time of flyby pericenter. Being the
59 flyby geometry fixed, this relative position is completely defined by the true anomaly of Didymos secondary
60 along its orbital motion around the primary. In order to reduce the number of simulations and better de-
61
62
63
64
65

1 correlate the gravity fields of Didymos primary and secondary, the timing of each radio science flyby was
2 chosen to have a different true anomaly of Didymos secondary at the pericenter epoch, uniformly
3 distributed between 0 and 360 deg. An example of the spacecraft trajectories during the radio science
4 flybys is represented in Figure 2. Then, a series of simulations were performed to assess the sensitivity of
5 the experiment performances to different orbital geometries. For each mission phase studied,
6 characterized by a different distance from the system, the flyby plane was chosen to minimize the
7 uncertainties in the GM of Didymos primary and secondary, which are the main scientific parameters of
8 interest. The real AIM Radio Science Experiment may employ a combination of a different number of flybys,
9 each with a different geometry, for example to gradually reduce the distance to Didymos for safety
10 reasons.
11
12
13
14

15 **3. Simulation Procedure**

16 A gravity radio science experiment represents a particular application of the orbit determination process,
17 whose aim is to estimate a set of parameters to completely define the past trajectory of the spacecraft and
18 predict its future evolution. To assess the formal accuracies of the estimated parameters before the
19 execution of the experiment, numerical simulations may be implemented, performing the same orbit
20 determination procedure for the analysis of real data, but using simulated data. Moreover, controlling the
21 dynamical model used to generate the simulated measurements, it is possible to provide a better
22 understanding of the effects of the main design parameters which affect the performances of the
23 experiment.
24
25
26
27
28

29 In this work the same models are used to compute the simulated observed and computed measurements,
30 performing a so-called “covariance analysis”. The output of a covariance analysis is useful to compare
31 different solutions, obtained for example using different orbital geometries, coverage assumptions, filter
32 setups. However, the real uncertainties associated to estimated parameters are usually larger than the
33 formal values provided by the orbit determination, because the classical procedure does not consider
34 possible estimation biases due to errors in the dynamical model, linearization errors, colored measurement
35 noise, and other effects. For this reason, in the numerical simulations of the AIM Radio Science Experiment
36 a series of conservative assumptions were made to obtain more realistic estimation uncertainties, namely:
37 the adopted Doppler measurement noise is larger than the expected level by more than a factor of 2; the
38 adopted optical measurement noise is larger than the expected level by a factor of 2-20; large a priori
39 uncertainties on the solve-for parameters were used.
40
41
42
43
44

45 The numerical simulations were performed using JPL’s orbit determination program MONTE (Mission
46 Analysis, Operations, and Navigation Toolkit Environment), currently used for the operations of all NASA’s
47 space missions managed by JPL (Evans et al., 2016) and for radio science data analysis (see e.g. (Iess et al.,
48 2014) and (Tortora et al., 2016)). MONTE’s mathematical formulation is described in detail in (Moyer, 1971)
49 and (Moyer, 2000).
50
51
52
53

54 **4. Dynamical Model**

55 As a part of the orbit determination process of the AIM spacecraft, all the relevant dynamics must be
56 modeled and updated, namely: the orbit of the Didymos system within the Solar System, the relative orbit
57 between Didymos secondary and primary, and the relative orbit of the spacecraft with respect to the
58 Didymos system.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

To better understand the dynamical environment within the Didymos system and to build a realistic dynamical model, the order-of-magnitude of the main gravitational and non-gravitational accelerations acting on a spacecraft were computed for different distances from Didymos. The resulting values are collected in Table 3. As a result, the orbits of Didymos secondary and AIM were computed numerically integrating the equations of motion with respect to the system center of mass, using the following gravitational accelerations: point-mass accelerations due to the Sun, all the planets of the Solar System, the Moon, and Pluto; point-mass accelerations due to Didymos primary and secondary, along with the accelerations due to their gravity spherical harmonics.

The dynamical model also included the main non-gravitational accelerations acting on the spacecraft: the Solar Radiation Pressure (SRP), using a realistic shape model of AIM, and the Thermal Recoil Pressure (TRP). The total SRP on the spacecraft is computed as the sum of the forces acting on its components, each with different geometry, surface properties, and orientation with respect to the Sun. The components used to model the spacecraft shape, along with their properties, are summarized in Table 4. The TRP arises from an anisotropic emission of the thermal flux radiated into space to keep a thermal equilibrium condition. The TRP acting on the spacecraft is function of its shape, orientation with respect to the Sun and other celestial bodies, its surface properties, and its thermal state. For simplicity the TRP is modeled as a constant acceleration in the body-fixed frame, with a nominal zero value. As a reference, using precise analytical models of the Rosetta spacecraft, the TRP was estimated to be 5-10% of the SRP (Kato and van der Ha, 2012). One of the main source of error in the orbit determination are the modelization errors of the non-gravitational accelerations. In order to take into accounts these effects, a scale factor for the SRP and the three Cartesian components of the TRP were estimated as a part of the orbit determination process.

The following accelerations were not used in the integration, because considered to be negligible: the relativistic perturbative accelerations due to all bodies but the Sun; the acceleration on Didymos secondary due to its own spherical harmonics (indirect oblateness); the non-gravitational accelerations on Didymos secondary due to Solar Radiation Pressure, albedo and thermal emissions, because of its low area-to-mass ratio; the non-gravitational accelerations on AIM due to primary and secondary albedo and thermal emissions.

The initial conditions of Didymos secondary were computed assuming an equatorial, circular orbit with respect to the primary, with a semi-major axis of 1.18 km (Scheirich and Pravec, 2009)(Fang and Margot, 2012). The distance between Didymos primary and the system center of mass is about 11 m.

The rotational models of Didymos primary and secondary influence the gravitational accelerations acting on Didymos secondary and on the spacecraft. The pole orientation of Didymos primary and secondary with respect to the Earth Mean Orbit at J2000 (EMO2000) is described by its right ascension α and declination δ , modeled as linear functions of time:

$$\alpha = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1(t - t_0) \quad (1)$$

$$\delta = \delta_0 + \delta_1(t - t_0) \quad (2)$$

The orientation of prime meridian of Didymos primary with respect to the node is described by the angle w , modeled as a linear function of time, corresponding to a uniform rotation:

$$w = w_0 + w_1(t - t_0) \quad (3)$$

In addition to a uniform rotation, the prime meridian of Didymos secondary may experience a libration with angular velocity ω , amplitude w_a , and phase φ :

$$w = w_0 + w_1(t - t_0) + w_a \sin[\omega(t - t_0) + \varphi] \quad (4)$$

1 The Didymos primary rotational model was adopted from (Scheirich and Pravec, 2009) and (Osip et al.,
 2 2016), while the rotational model of the secondary was built assuming a synchronous rotation around the
 3 primary, with the addition of a libration at the orbital period of amplitude 1 deg, consistent with the value
 4 reported in (Richardson et al., 2016). The corresponding numerical values defining the rotational models
 5 are collected in Table 5. A drift of less than 30 deg/century in the pole orientation of the secondary was
 6 obtained; the drift is caused by the perturbations on the relative orbit of the two bodies, caused by the Sun
 7 (mainly) and the Earth.
 8

9
 10 All the coefficients of the rotational models of Didymos primary and secondary were estimated during the
 11 simulations.
 12

13
 14 The gravitational masses (GM) of Didymos primary and secondary were computed from their diameter
 15 ratio and the total mass of the system (Fang and Margot, 2012), assuming the same density. The resulting
 16 primary and secondary GM are $3.4903 \times 10^{-8} \text{ km}^3/\text{s}^2$ and $3.23 \times 10^{-10} \text{ km}^3/\text{s}^2$, respectively, with a mass ratio of
 17 about 0.01.
 18

19
 20 Didymos primary extended gravity is modeled using a spherical harmonics expansion up to degree 20,
 21 whose coefficients were obtained from the polyhedral shape. Several methods are available in literature to
 22 compute the gravity spherical harmonics expansion of a homogeneous polyhedron (Werner, 1997)(Tsoulis
 23 et al., 2009). However, for simplicity, the following procedure was used: the input polyhedron was
 24 represented as a spherical harmonic expansion of degree 20 through a least squares fit of the vertices of
 25 the polyhedron. The degree was chosen to obtain a resolution comparable to the polyhedral
 26 representation. Then, the shape coefficients of the series were converted to gravity coefficients, under the
 27 assumption of uniform density, following (Wieczorek, 1998). As reference, the resulting normalized degree-
 28 2 gravity coefficients of Didymos primary are collected in Table 6. The corresponding gravity field
 29 coefficients are represented in Figure 1.
 30

31
 32 Didymos secondary extended gravity is modeled using the degree-2 spherical harmonics expansion of a
 33 homogeneous tri-axial ellipsoid, aligned with the body-fixed axes, with semi-principal axes $a = 103 \text{ m}$, $b = 79$
 34 m , $c = 66 \text{ m}$ (Pravec et al., 2006)(Richardson et al., 2016). The degree-2 normalized gravity coefficients are
 35 provided in Table 6; the only non-zero terms were computed using the following equations (Bills et al.,
 36 2014):
 37

$$38 \bar{C}_{20} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \frac{2c^2 - (a^2 + b^2)}{10a^2} \quad (5)$$

$$39 \bar{C}_{22} = \sqrt{\frac{12}{5}} \frac{a^2 - b^2}{20a^2} \quad (6)$$

40
 41 The gravitational parameters and the degree-2 coefficients of Didymos primary and secondary were
 42 estimated as a part of the orbit determination process.
 43

44 5. Measurement Models

45
 46 Each radio science arc starts at $C/A - 36 \text{ h}$ and ends at $C/A + 36 \text{ h}$, where C/A is the time of closest approach
 47 to the Didymos system center of mass. An orbital maneuver is executed just before the arc start and just
 48 after the arc end, to connect the arc, optimized for radio science investigations, to the pyramid-like
 49 reference trajectory. The flyby timeline is represented in Figure 3.
 50

1 During the arc both two-way Doppler and optical navigation observables are collected: given the typical
2 small relative velocities and accelerations near Didymos system, the classical Doppler measurements,
3 usually adopted as main observable in the interplanetary orbit determination process, provide a limited
4 information content. Hence, the spacecraft navigation must be enhanced by means of additional
5 observations, like optical measurements obtained by the onboard cameras. When aiming at a distant
6 target, the picture of a body provides its relative direction with respect to the spacecraft, in the camera
7 frame (centroid). When near, the camera may be used to identify optical features on the surface of a body
8 (landmarks), allowing to better estimate also its rotational state. Additionally, in a binary system the optical
9 measurements provide also the accurate relative positions of the two bodies, posing a strong constraint on
10 their relative orbital motion. The relative orbital motion provides information about the total mass of the
11 system but, if the mutual orbital motion is measured with respect to the common center of mass, which is
12 inertially fixed, also the mass ratio can be obtained. The inertial motion of the secondary provides
13 information mainly about the mass of the primary, and vice versa.
14
15
16
17

18 However, the optical measurements are affected by a scaling symmetry, because they do not provide direct
19 information about the relative distance with respect to a body: the same optical measurements can be
20 obtained changing the distance AIM-body and the size of the body by the same scale factor S . The scaling
21 symmetry affects also the estimation of the body mass: in the approximation of the two-body problem,
22 during the orbital motion the same series of pictures can be obtained changing the body mass by S^3 . The
23 scaling symmetry applies also to a binary system: the same optical measurements can be obtained
24 changing also the distance primary-secondary by the same scale factor. The scaling symmetry can be
25 constrained using a priori information about the estimated parameters, and different observables, like
26 Doppler and range, which provide absolute measurements of velocity and distances with respect to the
27 Earth.
28
29
30
31
32

33 The nominal Doppler coverage assumed in the simulations consists of three 8 h tracking passes centered
34 around the start maneuver and the end maneuver, to aid the spacecraft navigation, and around the
35 pericenter, to improve the sensitivity to the gravity fields (Figure 3). The arc starts just after the start
36 maneuver, and ends just before the end maneuver, so that only 4h of data during the first and last tracking
37 passes were used in the estimation, for a total coverage of 16 h. During scheduled tracking passes two-way
38 Doppler measurements between AIM and an Earth ground stations are simulated, with a count time of 60
39 s, and then degraded adding a white Gaussian noise. During the filtering procedure, Doppler data are
40 weighted using directly the input noise level. The noise level expected on Doppler observables was
41 computed using simplified models of the main noise sources (Iess et al., 2014). Then, for simplicity, a
42 constant noise level of 0.051 mm/s at 60 s integration time was adopted as a nominal value, corresponding
43 to the maximum expected noise during the AIM mission, multiplied by a conservative factor of 2. As a
44 comparison, the two-way X/X Doppler measurements of the Dawn spacecraft were characterized by a noise
45 of about 0.02 mm/s at 60 s integration time (Konopliv et al., 2014), while the X/X Doppler measurements of
46 the Rosetta spacecraft were characterized by a noise of about 0.090 mm/s, scaled to 60 s integration time
47 (Godard et al., 2015).
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Between tracking periods, when the spacecraft does not have to point the fixed HGA to the Earth, optical
55 observables are acquired, with a nominal sampling time of 2 h (Figure 3). At each sampling epoch one
56 picture of Didymos primary and one picture of Didymos secondary are taken. For operational constraints of
57 the AIM spacecraft, a picture of Didymos can be acquired only if the angle Sun-Didymos-AIM, also called
58 Sun phase angle, is less than 60 deg. The optical observables used in the orbit determination are the line
59 and pixel location of all the surface landmarks visible in the image. If the body size on the picture is smaller
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 than 100 pixels, the centroid is used as observable instead of the landmarks. The same characteristics of
2 the navigation camera of Rosetta were used to generate the simulated optical observables (Pardo de
3 Santayana and Lauer, 2015). The line and pixel coordinates of the landmarks (or centroids) are degraded
4 adding a white Gaussian noise with a constant standard deviation of 2 pixel. This value is about two times
5 the accuracy in the optical measurements of Rosetta (Godard et al., 2015) and 20 times the corresponding
6 accuracy of Dawn (Konopliv et al., 2014). A total of 528 landmarks were generated on the surface of
7 Didymos primary and secondary, uniformly spaced in latitude and longitude by 15 degrees. As reference,
8 for Rosetta orbit determination the number of landmarks was between 50 (during high altitude orbits) and
9 1000 (low altitude orbits) (Pardo de Santayana and Lauer, 2015). A picture provides an angular
10 measurement of a body relative to the spacecraft, in the frame of reference of the camera. The relative
11 direction is translated in the inertial frame knowing the spacecraft attitude and the body-fixed camera
12 orientation. However, an error in the inertial pointing of the camera propagates directly to the relative
13 position of the spacecraft with respect to the body. For this reason, a pointing correction is estimated for
14 each picture, as in (Konopliv et al., 2014). The pointing error is modeled as three rotations, with a priori 1-
15 sigma uncertainty of 10 mdeg. This is the same value used in the orbit determination analysis of Rosetta
16 (Godard et al., 2015), but it is more than a factor 2 larger than the values used for Dawn (Konopliv et al.,
17 2014). Conservative values of pixel noise and pointing errors were adopted to approximately account for
18 errors in the optical measurements difficult to model, like landmark misdetection or offsets between the
19 body centroid and its center of mass.

20 Full Doppler coverage (without optical measurements) and full optical coverage (without Doppler) were
21 also analyzed, for comparison purposes only: in fact, both optical and radiometric measurements are
22 usually essential for a safe spacecraft navigation around small bodies, because their combination allows a
23 more reliable and robust orbit determination and to estimate additional mission-critical parameters, like
24 the orbital maneuvers and the heliocentric trajectory of the Didymos system. To better understand the
25 information content carried by the optical measurements, cases with pictures of only one body (either the
26 primary or the secondary) were also analyzed.

37 6. Filter Setup

38 The multi-arc approach will be adopted for the radio science investigations of the AIM mission: the data
39 obtained during non-contiguous orbital segments, called “arcs”, are combined and jointly analyzed in a
40 weighted least-squares filter to produce a single solution of a set of solve-for parameters. As a
41 consequence, the scientific results will be obtained at the end of the mission, by post-processing of all
42 available arcs, as opposed to the output of the operational orbit determination, which must be as much as
43 possible in “real time”, to safely navigate the spacecraft. The solution is formed by the estimated values of
44 the parameters and the corresponding covariance matrix, which provides the formal estimation
45 uncertainties. The multi-arc strategy is commonly used in the data analysis of radio science experiment
46 (less et al., 2012)(less et al., 2014)(Modenini and Tortora, 2014)(Tortora et al., 2016).

47 The solve-for parameters can be classified into two groups: global parameters, which do not vary with time
48 and affect the measurements of all the arcs (e.g. the gravity fields), and local parameters, which affect only
49 the measurements of a single arc (e.g. the arc initial conditions of the spacecraft). However, parameters
50 which in principle are global may be treated as local, to absorb modelization errors. For example, in this
51 work the SRP scale factor is estimated as a local parameter, to take into account possible variations of the
52 reflectivity properties of the spacecraft surfaces during the mission. Note that this approach is
53 conservative, as the parameters uncertainties would increase because of the correlations. Moreover, also
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 the orbit of the secondary was estimated locally on each arc: in the adopted mission scenario, the radio
2 science flybys may be separated by long periods of time, much larger than the mutual orbital period. In this
3 situation, a “small” error in the initial conditions, in the order of the estimation uncertainty, may
4 accumulate over time, leading to a significantly different orbital position at the end of the mission. The
5 filter setup adopted in the study is summarized in Table 7, where it is specified if each parameter, or group
6 of parameters, is treated as local or global, and the corresponding a priori 1-sigma uncertainty.
7
8
9

10 7. Results

11 At first, a series of simulations were performed to assess the RSE performances achievable during the three
12 phases of the AIM mission before the deployment of the CubeSats and the Lander, each characterized by a
13 different distance from the Didymos system:
14
15

- 16 • Early Characterization Phase (ECP): the pericenter radius is 35 km, so this case provides a reference
17 solution for long distances operations. Being outside the sphere of influence of Didymos for the
18 entire duration of each arc, the Doppler observables are expected to provide very low information
19 content about the gravity fields of the bodies.
20
- 21 • Detailed Characterization Phase 1 (DCP1): the pericenter radius is 10 km, so being near the
22 boundary of the sphere of influence of Didymos the Doppler observables are expected to provide
23 some information content about the gravity fields of the bodies.
24
- 25 • Payload Deployment Phase (PDP): the pericenter radius is 2 km, so this case provides a reference
26 solution for very short distances operations. Being inside the sphere of influence of Didymos the
27 Doppler observables are expected to provide a large information content about the gravity fields of
28 the bodies.
29
30
31
32

33 A summary of the formal 1-sigma uncertainties achievable in the estimation of the main parameters of
34 interest during these phases is provided in Table 8. Both Doppler and optical measurements are processed,
35 assuming the nominal coverage described in Section 5. For each phase, the orbital geometry is chosen as a
36 best compromise to minimize the uncertainty in the GM of Didymos primary and secondary. Table 9
37 provides the 1-sigma uncertainties for a subset of the estimated parameters for the same cases, but
38 processing pictures of only one body, either the primary or the secondary.
39
40

41 Then, a number of simulations were performed to assess the information content provided by Doppler and
42 optical navigation images. Figure 4 and Figure 5 show the 1-sigma uncertainty in the GM of Didymos
43 primary and secondary, respectively, as a function of the pericenter radius of AIM and for different
44 measurement strategies. For each pericenter radius and measurement strategy, the orbital geometry is
45 chosen to optimize the estimation of the GM of each body. However, the optimal geometry for Didymos
46 primary and secondary may be different, so that it is not possible to minimize the uncertainty in the GM of
47 both bodies: for this reason the values displayed in Figure 4 and Figure 5 are, in general, smaller than the
48 ones reported in Table 8, which were obtained for a specific orbital plane. The following measurement
49 strategies were compared:
50
51

- 52 • Doppler: only Doppler measurements are processed, acquired at the beginning and end of the arc,
53 and around the pericenter, as described in Section 5.
54
- 55 • Doppler (full): only Doppler measurements are processed, assuming a continuous coverage during
56 the entire arc.
57
- 58 • Optical: only optical measurements are processed, acquired during the entire arc duration. No
59 Doppler measurements are collected, so the number of pictures is larger than Doppler+Optical
60 strategy.
61
62
63
64
65

- Optical (phase): only optical measurements are processed, acquired during the entire arc duration, but only if the Sun phase angle is smaller than 60 deg. No Doppler measurements are collected, so the number of pictures is, in general, larger than Doppler+Optical (phase) strategy.
- Doppler+Optical: both Doppler and optical measurements are processed, assuming the base coverage described in Section 5.
- Doppler+Optical (phase): both Doppler and optical measurements are processed, assuming the base coverage described in Section 5. The optical measurements are acquired only if the Sun phase angle is smaller than 60 deg. This represents the nominal measurement strategy assumed in this study.

From the results provided in Table 8, Table 9, Figure 4, and Figure 5, a number of general considerations can be made.

The Didymos primary-AIM relative position can be estimated at a level of 1% or better (1-sigma). The position uncertainty is in general dominated by the radial component, because it is directly affected by the scaling symmetry of the optical measurements. In fact, a picture of a single body provides a direct information on the body-camera relative distance only knowing the size of the body. If a picture of two bodies is taken, the relative camera-bodies range can be directly reconstructed also from the relative distance between the two bodies. If the two bodies are imaged through two different pictures, there is an additional degradation due to the pointing errors. As a consequence of the scaling symmetry, the orbit of Didymos secondary relative to the primary can be estimated with approximately the same relative uncertainty of the Didymos primary-AIM position. As expected, if pictures of only Didymos primary are taken, the estimation of the secondary orbit degrades significantly, by up to a factor of 110. The binary orbital period can be estimated with a 1-sigma uncertainty of about 14 minutes at 35 km, during ECP, decreasing to 0.64 minutes at 2 km, during PDP. As a reference, the DART impact on the secondary is expected to change the period by about 4 minutes (Cheng et al., 2016).

The GM of Didymos primary can be estimated with a relative 1-sigma uncertainty of about 2% at 35 km, improving with smaller distances to about 0.01% at 2 km. The information about the GM of Didymos primary is provided by both Doppler and optical measurements. The Doppler shift provides a measurement of the bending of the trajectory of AIM due to the gravity of the Didymos system, while optical navigation images provide a measurement of the primary GM reconstructing the orbital motion of the secondary, but they are affected by the scaling symmetry. The best accuracies are obtained using both Doppler and optical navigation images, so that the formal uncertainty decreases by more than a factor of 10, with respect to Doppler only and optical only. The quadrupole of Didymos primary cannot be fully estimated, even during the PDP.

The GM of Didymos secondary can be estimated at a level of about 5% at 35 km, improving with smaller distances to about 1% at 2 km (both 1-sigma). The GM of Didymos secondary is estimated mainly from optical measurements of Didymos primary, i.e. observing the wobble of the body around the common center of mass due to the mutual orbital motion, as proposed by (Grieger and Kuppers, 2016). In fact, for every pericenter radius the best results are obtained using only optical measurements, because the number of pictures acquired during the arc is maximized. Moreover, for distances larger than 5 km the estimation degrades significantly, by a factor of 20, if only optical measurements of Didymos secondary are taken. As a comparison, processing only pictures of the primary the estimation uncertainty increases only by about 15%. On the other hand, for distances smaller than 5 km the uncertainty increases by only 50%, in both cases. This is because the gravitational effect of Didymos secondary on AIM becomes significant, and consequently the Doppler-only uncertainty starts decreasing, even if it remains higher than the Optical case by a factor of 2. For larger distances, the GM cannot be estimated using Doppler only. However, using both Doppler and optical measurements the GM estimation becomes more reliable and robust (e.g. to a Sun phase angle constraint), while its formal uncertainty increases by less than 10%. The quadrupole of Didymos secondary cannot be estimated.

1 Applying the Sun phase angle constraint to the optical measurements the uncertainty increases significantly
2 only for shorter distances, because the number of pictures which can be processed decreases. For example,
3 at 35 km it is possible to find a geometry which keeps the phase angle below the maximum allowed value
4 for the entire arc duration, while at 2 km the constraint can be satisfied at most for half the arc duration,
5 reducing the number of optical measurements by about a factor of 2.

6 During DCP1 the orientation of the pole of Didymos primary and secondary can be estimated at a level of
7 about 0.1 deg and 0.4 deg (1-sigma), respectively; the libration amplitude, period and phase of Didymos
8 secondary can be estimated at a level of 0.03 deg (which corresponds roughly to a surface displacement of
9 about 0.05 m, at the equator), 9.7 s, and 6.7 deg, respectively (all 1-sigma). The pole drift of the secondary
10 cannot be estimated with sufficient accuracy. It is interesting to note that the uncertainties in the rotational
11 states increase with smaller distances: this is because they can be estimated only through optical
12 measurements, whose number decreases with the distance because of the Sun phase angle constraint.

13 The single-arc estimations, obtained using only one flyby, were compared to each other and to the multi-
14 arc estimation to study how the synchronization between AIM and Didymos secondary orbits affects the
15 experiment performance (Table 10). As a result, the synchronization of the two orbits does not play a
16 significant role in the estimation accuracy, especially if the optical observables are used: for example, the
17 uncertainties in Didymos primary and secondary GMs change by less than a factor of 1.2 and 1.5,
18 respectively. Moreover, when the estimation is driven by optical observables, as for the GM of the
19 secondary, the ratio between the single-arc and multi-arc uncertainties is about $\sqrt{8} \approx 2.8$, i.e. the square
20 root of the number of flybys. This is an indication that each flyby provides roughly the same information
21 content and can be considered as an independent measurement. On the other side, if the information
22 content provided by Doppler observables is not negligible, as for the GM of the primary, the multi-arc
23 estimation can improve the single-arc uncertainty up to a factor of 8.

24 The orbital geometry proved to be a driving factor of the estimation accuracy, because it defines: the
25 gravitational pull on the trajectory, measured by the Doppler observables; the number of pictures which
26 may be acquired, due to the Sun phase angle constraint; the surface coverage of the landmarks visible in
27 the pictures of the two bodies. In particular, by decreasing the pericenter radius we obtain smaller
28 uncertainties, by up to a factor of 100. Then, at a given pericenter distance, changes to the orbital plane
29 cause the uncertainties to change by a factor of 10-100. Given the criticality of the optical measurements,
30 the flyby geometry should be selected to optimize the number of pictures and the landmark coverage.

31 8. Conclusions

32 The main result of this paper is that the proposed AIM gravity Radio Science Experiment at Didymos proved
33 feasible. The expected performances were assessed through numerical simulations, based upon a complete
34 and realistic dynamical model of the Didymos system, and taking into account all the most important
35 accelerations acting on the AIM spacecraft and Didymos secondary. Conservative assumptions on the
36 mission scenario and the technological capabilities of the space and ground segment were made. As a
37 result, the formal uncertainties provided by this study are expected to be representative of the real
38 accuracies achievable by the AIM Radio Science Experiment.

39 Shorter pericenter distances increase the attainable accuracy, but good results can already be obtained at
40 large distances using optical navigation images. During the Early Characterization Phase of the mission,
41 when the AIM-Didymos distances will be in the order of 35 km, the masses of Didymos primary and
42 secondary can be estimated to about 2% and 5% (1-sigma), respectively, using 8 flybys dedicated to gravity
43 science. Moving to 10 km, as expected during the Detailed Characterization Phase 1, the uncertainties
44 decrease to 0.2% and 1.6% (1-sigma), assuming the same number of flybys. Finally, performing low-altitude
45 flybys with a pericenter of 2 km, as during the Payload Deployment Phase, the 1-sigma uncertainties in the
46 masses of Didymos primary and secondary can reach the lowest values of 0.01% and 1%, respectively.

1 However, with the assumed concept of operations and number of flybys, the higher degree gravity of both
2 primary and secondary are not fully observable.

3 Given the small mass of the Didymos system, optical navigation images proved to be crucial to improve the
4 estimation accuracy of the scientific parameters of interest. The GM of Didymos primary is provided by
5 both Doppler and optical measurements, while the GM of the secondary is mainly given observing the
6 wobble of the primary around the common center of mass due to the mutual orbital motion. Moreover,
7 the optical measurements are essential also to retrieve the secondary orbital motion around the primary,
8 which can be estimated to better than 10 m (1-sigma), and the rotational states of both primary and the
9 secondary, which can be estimated to about 0.1 deg and 0.4 deg (1-sigma), respectively. The libration
10 amplitude, period, and phase of Didymos secondary can be estimated to about 0.03 deg (0.05 m on the
11 equator surface), 9.7 s, and 6.7 deg, respectively (1-sigma).
12
13

14 Different measurement strategies were compared. As a result, it is recommended to use always both
15 Doppler and optical measurements because, even if this measurement strategy does not provide always
16 the best performances for all the estimated parameters, it proved much more reliable and robust, e.g. to
17 constraints in the Sun phase angle, and it allows to better break the scaling symmetry inherent to the
18 optical measurements.
19
20

21 Regarding the experiment geometry, the AIM spacecraft operations shall be designed to optimize the
22 optical measurements coverage of both bodies and maximize the number of pictures collected during the
23 flybys.
24

25 Future developments of this work may include an assessment of the observability of the DART impact on
26 Didymos secondary, and in particular of the effects on its orbital and rotational motion, to better constraint
27 the impact performances. Another area of interest is to study methodologies to improve the estimation of
28 higher gravity degrees of the primary and secondary, to better study their internal mass distribution. This
29 would require staying within the sphere of influence of Didymos for longer times, thus a possibility is to
30 exploit satellite-to-satellite range and range-rate measurements between AIM and one or more CubeSats
31 orbiting within the system, and/or the lander deployed on the secondary. Another possibility to be
32 investigated is to exploit periodic or quasi-periodic orbits closer to Didymos, such as terminator orbits or
33 interior retrograde orbits (Dell'Elce et al., 2017)(Lasagni Manghi et al., 2017), that may be used by AIM
34 during the final phase of the mission.
35
36
37
38
39

40 9. Acknowledgements

41 The research described in this paper was carried out at the University of Bologna and University of Pisa in
42 the framework of ESA contract No. 4000117778/16/F/MOS "Radio Science Investigation with AIM". The
43 authors want to express their gratitude to the personnel involved in the AIM project who gave precious
44 suggestions for completing this study, and in particular Jesus Gil Fernandez, Borja Garcia Gutierrez, Michael
45 Khan and Michael Kueppers from the European Space Agency, Julie Bellerose from NASA/JPL and Patrick
46 Michel from the Observatoire de la Côte d'Azur. Special thanks go to Shantanu Naidu and Lance Benner
47 from NASA/JPL for making available their polyhedral shape model of Didymos primary prior to publication.
48 MZ, PT and DM wish to acknowledge Caltech and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory for granting the University
49 of Bologna a license to an executable version of MONTE Project Edition S/W.
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 References

57 Bills, B.G., Asmar, S.W., Konopliv, A.S., Park, R.S., Raymond, C.A., 2014. Harmonic and statistical analyses of
58 the gravity and topography of Vesta. *Icarus* 240, 161–173. doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2014.05.033
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Cheng, A.F., Atchison, J., Kantsiper, B., Rivkin, A.S., Stickle, A., Reed, C., Galvez, A., Carnelli, I., Michel, P.,
2 Ulamec, S., 2015. Asteroid Impact and Deflection Assessment mission. *Acta Astronaut.* 115, 262–269.
3 doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2015.05.021

4 Cheng, A.F., Michel, P., Jutzi, M., Rivkin, A.S., Stickle, A., Barnouin, O., Ernst, C., Atchison, J., Pravec, P.,
5 Richardson, D.C., 2016. Asteroid Impact & Deflection Assessment mission: Kinetic impactor. *Planet. Space*
6 *Sci.* 121, 27–35. doi:10.1016/j.pss.2015.12.004
7

8 Dell’Elce, L., Baresi, N., Naidu, S.P., Benner, L.A.M., Scheeres, D.J., 2017. Numerical investigation of the
9 dynamical environment of 65803 Didymos. *Adv. Sp. Res.* 59, 1304–1320. doi:10.1016/j.asr.2016.12.018
10

11 Evans, S., Taber, W., Drain, T., Smith, J., Wu, H., Guevara, M., Sunseri, R., Evans, J., 2016. Monte: the Next
12 Generation of Mission Design & Navigation Software. 6th International Conference on Astrodynamics Tools
13 and Techniques, Darmstadt, Germany.
14 <https://indico.esa.int/indico/event/111/session/30/contribution/177/material/paper/0.pdf>
15
16

17 Fang, J., Margot, J.-L., 2012. Near-Earth Binaries and Triples: Origin and Evolution of Spin-Orbital Properties.
18 *Astron. J.* 143, 24. doi:10.1088/0004-6256/143/1/24
19

20 Godard, B., Budnik, F., Munoz, P., Morley, T., 2015. Orbit Determination of Rosetta Around Comet
21 67P/Churyumov-Gerasimenko. 25th International Symposium on Space Flight Dynamics, Munich, Germany,
22 2015. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004
23
24

25 Grieger, B., Koppers, M., 2016. Determining the mass of Didymos’ secondary by visual imaging.
26 Presentation at the EGU General Assembly. Abstract published in Geophysical Research Abstracts, 18,
27 EGU2016-12296. <http://meetingorganizer.copernicus.org/EGU2016/EGU2016-12296.pdf>
28

29 Herfort, Ulrich, and C. Casas. Trajectory Preparation for the Approach of Spacecraft Rosetta to Comet
30 67P/Churyumov-Gerasimenko. 25th International Symposium on Space Flight Dynamics, Munich, Germany,
31 2015. http://issfd.org/2015/files/downloads/papers/074_Herfort.pdf
32
33

34 Iess, L., Jacobson, R.A., Ducci, M., Stevenson, D.J., Lunine, J.I., Armstrong, J.W., Asmar, S.W., Racioppa, P.,
35 Rappaport, N.J., Tortora, P., 2012. The tides of Titan. *Science* 337, 457–459. doi:10.1126/science.1219631
36

37 Iess, L., Di Benedetto, M., James, N., Mercolino, M., Simone, L., Tortora, P., 2014. Astra: Interdisciplinary
38 study on enhancement of the end-to-end accuracy for spacecraft tracking techniques. *Acta Astronaut.* 94,
39 699–707. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2013.06.011
40

41 Iess, L., Stevenson, D.J., Parisi, M., Hemingway, D., Jacobson, R.A., Lunine, J.I., Nimmo, F., Armstrong, J.W.,
42 Asmar, S.W., Ducci, M., Tortora, P., 2014. The gravity field and interior structure of Enceladus. *Science* 344,
43 78–80. doi:10.1126/science.1250551
44
45

46 Kato, T., Van Der Ha, J.C., 2012. Precise modelling of solar and thermal accelerations on Rosetta. *Acta*
47 *Astronaut.* 72, 165–177. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2011.09.009
48

49 Konopliv, A.S., Asmar, S.W., Park, R.S., Bills, B.G., Centinello, F., Chamberlin, A.B., Ermakov, A., Gaskell,
50 R.W., Rambaux, N., Raymond, C.A., Russell, C.T., Smith, D.E., Tricarico, P., Zuber, M.T., 2014. The Vesta
51 gravity field, spin pole and rotation period, landmark positions, and ephemeris from the Dawn tracking and
52 optical data. *Icarus* 240, 103–117. doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2013.09.005
53
54

55 Lasagni Manghi, R., Modenini, D., Zannoni M., Tortora P., 2017. Preliminary Orbital Analysis for a Cubesat
56 Mission to the Didymos Binary Asteroid System, submitted to *Advances in Space Research.*
57

58 Margot, J.-L., Pravec, P., Taylor, P., Carry, B., Jacobson, S., 2015. Asteroid Systems: Binaries, Triples, and
59 Pairs, in: *Asteroids IV*, 355–374, University of Arizona, Tucson. doi:10.2458/azu_uapress_9780816532131-
60 ch019
61
62
63
64
65

1 Michel, P., Cheng, A., Kuppers, M., Pravec, P., Blum, J., Delbo, M., Green, S.F., Rosenblatt, P., Tsiganis, K.,
2 Vincent, J.B., Biele, J., Ciarletti, V., Herique, A., Ulamec, S., Carnelli, I., Galvez, A., Benner, L., Naidu, S.P.,
3 Barnouin, O.S., Richardson, D.C., Rivkin, A., Scheirich, P., Moskovitz, N., Thirouin, A., Schwartz, S.R., Campo
4 Bagatin, A., Yu, Y., 2016. Science case for the Asteroid Impact Mission (AIM): A component of the Asteroid
5 Impact & Deflection Assessment (AIDA) mission. *Adv. Sp. Res.* 57, 2529–2547.
6 doi:10.1016/j.asr.2016.03.031

7
8 Modenini, D., Tortora, P., 2014. Pioneer 10 and 11 orbit determination analysis shows no discrepancy with
9 Newton-Einstein laws of gravity. *Phys. Rev. D* 90, 022004. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.022004

10
11 Moyer, T. D., 1971. Mathematical formulation of the Double-Precision Orbit Determination Program
12 (DPODP). Technical Report 32-1527, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena (CA).

13
14 Moyer, T. D., 2000. Formulation for Observed and Computed Values of Deep Space Network Data Types for
15 Navigation. Wiley, Hoboken (NJ). doi:10.1002/0471728470

16
17 Osip, D.J., Rivkin, A.S., Pravec, P., Moskovitz, N., Thirouin, A., Scheirich, P., Oszkiewicz, D.A., Richardson,
18 D.C., Polishook, D., Ryan, W., Thomas, C., Busch, M.W., Cheng, A.F., Michel, P., 2016. The Observing
19 Working Group for the Asteroid Impact & Deflection Assessment (AIDA) Mission. AAS/Division for Planetary
20 Sciences Meeting Abstracts, 48. <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2016DPS....4812322O>

21
22 Pardo de Santayana, R., Lauer, M., 2015. Optical Measurements for Rosetta Navigation Near the Comet.
23 25th International Symposium on Space Flight Dynamics, Munich, Germany.
24 http://issfd.org/2015/files/downloads/papers/062_Pardo.pdf

25
26 Pravec, P., Scheirich, P., Kušnirák, P., Šarounová, L., Mottola, S., Hahn, G., Brown, P., Esquerdo, G., Kaiser,
27 N., Krzeminski, Z., Pray, D.P., Warner, B.D., Harris, A.W., Nolan, M.C., Howell, E.S., Benner, L.A.M., Margot,
28 J.L., Galád, A., Holliday, W., Hicks, M.D., Krugly, Y.N., Tholen, D., Whiteley, R., Marchis, F., DeGraff, D.R.,
29 Grauer, A., Larson, S., Velichko, F.P., Cooney, W.R., Stephens, R., Zhu, J., Kirsch, K., Dyvig, R., Snyder, L.,
30 Reddy, V., Moore, S., Gajdoš, Š., Világi, J., Masi, G., Higgins, D., Funkhouser, G., Knight, B., Slivan, S.,
31 Behrend, R., Grenon, M., Burki, G., Roy, R., Demeautis, C., Matter, D., Waelchli, N., Revaz, Y., Klotz, A.,
32 Rieugné, M., Thierry, P., Cotrez, V., Brunetto, L., Kober, G., 2006. Photometric survey of binary near-Earth
33 asteroids. *Icarus* 181, 63–93. doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2005.10.014

34
35 Richardson, D.C., Barnouin, O.S., Benner, L.A.M., Bottke Jr., W.F., Campo Bagatín, A., Cheng, A.F.,
36 Hirabayashi, M., Maurel, C., McMahon, J.W., Michel, P., Murdoch, N., Naidu, S.P., Pravec, P., Rivkin, A.S.,
37 Scheeres, D.J., Scheirich, P., Tsiganis, K., Zhang, Y., Group, the A.D. and P.P. of D.W., 2016. Dynamical and
38 physical properties of 65803 Didymos. 47th Lunar and Planetary Science Conference, 1501.
39 doi:10.1038/ngeo2474.

40
41 Scheirich, P., Pravec, P., 2009. Modeling of lightcurves of binary asteroids. *Icarus* 200, 531–547.
42 doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2008.12.001

43
44 Tortora, P., Zannoni, M., Hemingway, D., Nimmo, F., Jacobson, R.A., Iess, L., Parisi, M., 2016. Rhea gravity
45 field and interior modeling from Cassini data analysis. *Icarus* 264, 264–273.
46 doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2015.09.022

47
48 Tsoulis, D., Jamet, O., Verdun, J., Gonindard, N., 2009. Recursive algorithms for the computation of the
49 potential harmonic coefficients of a constant density polyhedron. *J. Geod.* 83, 925–942.
50 doi:10.1007/s00190-009-0310-9

51
52 Werner, R.A., 1997. Spherical harmonic coefficients for the potential of a constant-density polyhedron.
53 *Comput. Geosci.* 23, 1071–1077. doi:10.1016/S0098-3004(97)00110-6

1 Werner, R.A., Scheeres, D.J., 1997. Exterior gravitation of a polyhedron derived and compared with
2 harmonic and mascon gravitation representations of asteroid 4769 Castalia. *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.* 65,
3 313–344. doi:10.1007/BF00053511

4 Wieczorek, M.A., Phillips, R.J., 1998. Potential anomalies on a sphere: Applications to the thickness of the
5 lunar crust. *J. Geophys. Res.* 103, 1715. doi:10.1029/97JE03136
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figures




Figure 1 Gravitational model of Didymos primary: absolute value of spherical harmonics normalized coefficients up to degree 20; RMS of coefficients for each degree; fit of degree RMS using Kaula's rule (best fit $K: 5.47 \times 10^{-3}$).




Figure 2 Example of spacecraft trajectories during 8 radio science flybys, defined by the following parameters: $r_p = 2$ km, $i = 90$ deg, $\Omega_p = 0$ deg, $\omega_p = 0$ deg. For clarity, the spacecraft trajectory is represented only during a time interval of 8 h around the flyby closest approach. The trajectory of the spacecraft during different arcs is represented using different colors, but no difference are visible, because the same initial conditions are used. The position of the spacecraft and Didymos secondary at the pericenter epoch is identified by a colored circle. Each arc is identified by a different color, as described in the legend. The adopted reference frame is: +z Didymos pole; +x along Earth direction, perpendicular to z; center in the Didymos system center of mass.




Figure 3 Timeline of an arc of duration T (nominal: 72 h) dedicated to radio science investigations. The arc is symmetrical around the flyby closest approach to the Didymos system (C/A). The arc starts and ends with the orbital maneuvers M_1 and M_2 , respectively. Doppler coverage consists of three 8-h tracking passes around the maneuvers and the flyby C/A, so that only 4 h of data during the first and last tracking passes can be used in the radio science estimation. Between tracking periods, optical observables O_i are acquired, with a sampling time of Δt_o (nominal: 2 h).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 4 Measurement strategies comparison: Didymos primary GM formal 1-sigma uncertainty vs pericenter distance. For each pericenter distance the minimum uncertainty over all the possible orbital planes is displayed.




Figure 5 Measurement strategies comparison: Didymos secondary GM formal 1-sigma uncertainty vs pericenter distance. For each pericenter distance the minimum uncertainty over all the possible orbital planes is displayed.

Tables

Table 1 Reference timeline of the AIM mission adopted in this study.

Event	Date	Duration	Comments
Launch	17/10/2020 06/11/2020	-	Several options possible.
Arrival to Didymos system	24/04/2022	-	At latest.
Early Characterization Phase (ECP)	22/05/2022	~4 weeks	AIM-Didymos distances: about 35 km.
Detailed Characterization Phase Period 1 (DCP1)	19/06/2022	~4 weeks	AIM-Didymos distance reduced to about 10 km.
Payload Deployment Phase (PDP)	17/07/2022	~4 weeks	Possibility to perform a limited number of low altitude flybys to better characterize Didymos system dynamical parameters before CubeSats and Lander deployments.
PDP: CubeSats deployment	31/07/2022 00:00:00 TDB	-	Assumed CubeSats deployment date for this study.
PDP: Lander deployment	07/08/2022 00:00:00 TDB	-	Assumed Lander deployment date for this study.
Detailed Characterization Phase Period 2 (DCP2)	14/08/2022	~4 weeks	Similar to DCP1.
Impact Phase (IP)	11/09/2022	~3 weeks	AIM at a safe distance from Didymos (about 100 km).
IP: DART impact	21/09/2022 00:00:00 TDB	-	Assumed impact date for this study.
Detailed Characterization Phase Period 3 (DCP3)	02/10/2022	~3 months	Gradually return to orbits similar to DCP1 and DCP2.
Disposal Phase	21/12/2022	TBD	
End of Life (EoL)	22/12/2022	-	AIM disposal.

Table 2 Parameters which uniquely defines the AIM trajectory with respect to Didymos during a Radio Science experiment. For each parameter the allowable interval adopted in this study is provided. The adopted quasi-inertial reference frame is: +z Didymos pole; +x along Earth direction, perpendicular to z; center in the Didymos system center of mass.

Parameter	Symbol	Values	Comments
Pericenter radius	r_p	2.0 – 35 km	Different values were studied.
Pericenter velocity	v_p	$1.4 \times v_e = 26.5 - 6.5 \text{ cm/s}$	v_e : escape velocity at pericenter. Higher for smaller pericenter radii and vice versa.
Inclination	i	0–180 deg	Different values covering all possible orbital planes were studied.
Longitude of pericenter	Ω_p	0-360 deg	
Argument of pericenter	ω_p	0-360 deg	
Didymos secondary true anomaly at pericenter epoch	ϑ_p	0–360 deg	The parameter takes into account the synchronization between the spacecraft and Didymos secondary.

Table 3 Order of magnitude of the main accelerations acting on AIM. The nominal values of the AIM and Didymos parameters used to compute the accelerations were: primary gravitational parameter $GM_1 = 3.4903 \times 10^{-8} \text{ km}^3/\text{s}^2$; secondary gravitational parameter $GM_2 = 3.23 \times 10^{-10} \text{ km}^3/\text{s}^2$; primary radius $R_1 = 390 \text{ m}$; secondary radius $R_2 = 82 \text{ m}$; primary $J_2 = 0.012$; secondary $J_2' = 0.077$; AIM area $A = 10 \text{ m}^2$; AIM mass $M = 600 \text{ kg}$; Solar flux at Earth $\Phi_s = 1380 \text{ W/m}^2$; AIM surface absorption coefficient $\alpha = 0.8$; AIM surface temperature normalized difference $\Delta T/T_0 = 0.25$; primary average effective temperature $T_1 = 250 \text{ K}$; primary bond albedo $a_1 = 0.07$.

Contribution	Formula	Acceleration (m/s^2)				
		$r = 1 \text{ km}$	$r = 5 \text{ km}$	$r = 10 \text{ km}$	$r = 20 \text{ km}$	$r = 35 \text{ km}$
Primary monopole	GM_1/r^2	3.5×10^{-5}	1.4×10^{-6}	3.5×10^{-7}	8.8×10^{-8}	2.9×10^{-8}
Secondary monopole	GM_2/r^2	3.2×10^{-7}	1.3×10^{-8}	3.2×10^{-9}	8.0×10^{-10}	2.6×10^{-10}
Primary quadrupole	$3 \left(\frac{GM_1}{r^2} \right) \left(\frac{R_1}{r} \right)^2 J_2$	8.7×10^{-8}	1.4×10^{-10}	8.7×10^{-12}	5.5×10^{-13}	5.8×10^{-14}
Secondary quadrupole	$3 \left(\frac{GM_2}{r^2} \right) \left(\frac{R_2}{r} \right)^2 J_2'$	2.2×10^{-12}	3.6×10^{-15}	2.2×10^{-16}	1.4×10^{-17}	1.5×10^{-15}
Sun gravity perturbation	$2(GM_s/r_s^3)r$	1.3×10^{-11}	6.6×10^{-11}	1.3×10^{-10}	2.7×10^{-10}	4.6×10^{-10}
Solar Radiation Pressure	$\frac{A \Phi_s}{M c}$	7.7×10^{-8}				

Thermal Recoil Pressure	$\frac{4 A \Phi_s \alpha \Delta T}{9 M c T_0}$	6.8 x10 ⁻⁹				
Primary thermal re-emission	$\frac{A \sigma T_1^4 (R_1/r)^2}{M c}$	1.9 x10 ⁻⁹	7.5 x10 ⁻¹¹	1.9 x10 ⁻¹¹	4.7 x10 ⁻¹²	1.5 x10 ⁻¹²
Primary albedo	$\frac{A \Phi_s}{M c} a_1 \left(\frac{R_1}{r}\right)^2$	8.2 x10 ⁻¹⁰	3.3 x10 ⁻¹¹	8.2 x10 ⁻¹²	2.0 x10 ⁻¹²	6.7 x10 ⁻¹³

Table 4 Shape model of AIM assumed for this study.

Component	Area (m ²)	Specular Reflectivity	Diffusive Reflectivity	Comments
HGA	2.5	0.0	0.327	Fixed HGA. Diameter: 1.8 m.
Bus top/bottom	3.6	0.0735	0.252	One two-sided flat plate. Dimensions: 2.0x1.8 m.
Bus sides	3.7	0.0735	0.252	One two-sided flat plate. Dimensions: 2.1x1.8 m.
Bus front/rear	4.2	0.0735	0.252	One two-sided flat plate. No shadowing with HGA. Dimensions: 2.1x2.0 m.
Solar Arrays	5.6	0.038	0.052	Fixed solar arrays. One two-sided flat plate with total area of the two arrays.

Table 5 Rotational model of Didymos primary and secondary. The base reference frame is Earth Mean Orbit at J2000 (EMO2000). The reference epoch is April 24th, 2022.

Parameter	Value	Comments	
Didymos Primary	α_0	310 deg	Pole solution II of (Scheirich and Pravec, 2009).
	α_1	0.0 deg/century	Not measured at present. Assumed zero.
	δ_0	-84 deg	Pole solution II of (Scheirich and Pravec, 2009).
	δ_1	0.0 deg/century	Not measured at present. Assumed zero.
	w_0	0.0 deg	This term defines the prime meridian. Assumed zero.
	w_1	159.29 deg/h	From rotation period.
Didymos Secondary	α_0	-49.97 deg	Fitted to a dynamical synchronous model.
	α_1	-25.58 deg/century	Fitted to a dynamical synchronous model.
	δ_0	-84.01 deg	Fitted to a dynamical synchronous model.

δ_1	6.76 deg/century	Fitted to a dynamical synchronous model.
w_0	190.14 deg	Fitted to a dynamical synchronous model.
w_1	30.37 deg/h	Fitted to a dynamical synchronous model.
w_a	1.0 deg	Consistent with (Richardson et al., 2016).
ω	30.20 deg/h	Assumed equal to the average orbital period.
φ	6.71 deg	Fitted to a dynamical synchronous model.

Table 6 Gravitational model of Didymos primary and Secondary: spherical harmonics normalized coefficients of degree 2, rounded to 2 decimal places, for clarity. For Didymos primary, a full 20-degree model was adopted in the simulations. The reference radii for the primary and the secondary are 0.43 km and 0.103 km, respectively. The adopted GMs for the primary and the secondary are $3.4903 \times 10^{-8} \text{ km}^3/\text{s}^2$ and $3.23 \times 10^{-10} \text{ km}^3/\text{s}^2$, respectively.

l	m	Didymos primary		Didymos secondary	
		C _{lm}	S _{lm}	C _{lm}	S _{lm}
2	0	-5.44e-03	0.0	-7.67e-02	0.0
2	1	4.09e-05	-1.58e-05	0.0	0.0
2	2	-1.41e-04	2.31e-03	2.06e-02	0.0

Table 7 Filter setup summary.

Parameter		Type	A priori uncertainty (1-sigma)	Comments
Spacecraft state	Position	local	100 km	Spacecraft state with respect to Didymos system center of mass. Virtually unconstrained. Big enough to account for the maneuver errors at the beginning of the arc.
	Velocity	local	1.0 m/s	
Didymos system state	Position	global	100 km	Conservatively assumed equal to three times Rosetta's 1-sigma formal uncertainty of the heliocentric state of comet 67P/Churyumov-Gerasimenko (Godard et al., 2015).
	Velocity	global	1.0 cm/s	
Didymos secondary state	Position	local	0.4 km	10 times the measured uncertainty in semi-major axis. Virtually unconstrained. The corresponding a priori uncertainty in Didymos primary's position is about 20 m.
	Velocity	local	30 mm/s	From the measured uncertainty in semi-major axis, scaled by a factor 10. It corresponds to 20% of the a priori orbital velocity. The corresponding a priori uncertainty in Didymos primary's velocity is about 3 mm/s.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Didymos primary gravity	GM	global	$3.57 \times 10^{-8} \text{ km}^3/\text{s}^2$	From the measured uncertainty in the total mass of Didymos system, scaled by a factor of 10. Virtually unconstrained.
	C_{20}	global	5.44×10^{-2}	Normalized coefficients. Base uncertainty equal to value, then multiplied by a factor of 10. Virtually unconstrained.
	C_{22}	global	1.41×10^{-3}	
	S_{22}	global	2.31×10^{-2}	
	C_{21}	global	1.62×10^{-3}	Normalized coefficient. Computed assuming a maximum misalignment of 10 deg between the body-fixed frame and the principal inertia axes. Virtually unconstrained.
	S_{21}	global	1.67×10^{-3}	
Didymos secondary gravity	GM	global	$5.65 \times 10^{-10} \text{ km}^3/\text{s}^2$	From the measured uncertainties in the total mass of Didymos system and the diameter ratio between primary and secondary, scaled by a factor of 10. Virtually unconstrained.
	C_{20}	global	3.43×10^{-1}	Normalized coefficients. Base uncertainty equal to value, then multiplied by a factor of 10. Virtually unconstrained.
	C_{22}	global	3.19×10^{-1}	
	C_{21}	global	1.59×10^{-2}	Normalized coefficients. Computed assuming a maximum misalignment of 10 deg between the body-fixed frame and the principal inertia axes. Virtually unconstrained.
	S_{21}	global	4.80×10^{-3}	
	S_{22}	global	1.11×10^{-2}	
Didymos primary frame	α_0	global	50 deg	From the measured uncertainties, scaled by a factor of 5. Virtually unconstrained.
	δ_0	global	10 deg	
	α_1	global	$3.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ deg/h}$	Equal to w_1 uncertainty divided by 10. Typically much smaller than the uncertainty in the rotational period.
	δ_1	global	$3.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ deg/h}$	
	w_1	global	$3.5 \times 10^{-2} \text{ deg/h}$	From the measured uncertainty in the orbital period, scaled by a factor of 5.
Didymos secondary frame	α_0	global	50 deg	Same as Didymos primary. Virtually unconstrained.
	δ_0	global	10 deg	
	α_1	global	$7.6 \times 10^{-3} \text{ deg/h}$	Equal to w_1 uncertainty divided by 10. Typically much smaller than the uncertainty in the rotational period.
	δ_1	global	$7.6 \times 10^{-3} \text{ deg/h}$	
	w_1	global	$7.6 \times 10^{-2} \text{ deg/h}$	From the orbital period uncertainty, scaled by a factor of 5.
	w_a	global	50 deg	Virtually unconstrained.
	ω	global	$7.6 \times 10^{-2} \text{ deg/h}$	Equal to w_1 uncertainty.
	φ	global	50 deg	Virtually unconstrained.

SRP	Scale factor	local	1.0	Uncertainty: 100% of the acceleration.
TRP	3 accel.	local	$7.2 \times 10^{-12} \text{ km}^3/\text{s}^2$	100% of the expected value.
Pointing error per picture	3 rotations	local	10 mdeg	From Rosetta.
Didymos primary landmarks position	Scale factor	global	0.1	10% size scale, common to all landmarks.
	Radius	global	39 m	10% of the radius in the three directions, for each landmark.
	Lat., Long.	global	5.7 deg	
Didymos secondary landmarks position	Scale factor	global	0.1	10% size scale, common to all landmarks.
	Radius	global	8.2 m	10% of the radius in the three directions, for each landmark.
	Lat., Long.	global	5.7 deg	

Table 8 Summary of best formal 1-sigma uncertainties achievable by the AIM Radio Science Experiment, using both Doppler and optical measurements. For clarity, only the main parameters of interest are displayed. Three mission phases are compared: Early Characterization Phase (ECP), with a pericenter distance of 35 km; Detailed Characterization Phase 1 (DCP1), with a pericenter distance of 10 km; Payload Deployment Phase (PDP), with a pericenter distance of 2 km. Between brackets the relative uncertainty with respect to a reference value is displayed.

Parameter	Unit	ECP (r = 35 km)	DCP1 (r = 10 km)	PDP (r = 2 km)	Comments
Spacecraft Radial Position	m	320 (0.9%)	7.7 (0.08%)	0.54 (0.03%)	Approximate radial uncertainty at pericenter epoch with respect to Didymos primary (average over all the arcs). Reference value: pericenter radius.
Didymos Secondary Radial Position	m	11 (0.9%)	1.1 (0.09%)	0.55 (0.05%)	Approximate radial uncertainty at pericenter epoch with respect to Didymos primary (average over all the arcs). Reference value: nominal orbital radius (1.18 km).
Didymos Secondary Orbital Period	min	14 (2%)	1.8 (0.3%)	0.64 (0.09%)	Uncertainty at pericenter epoch. Reference value: nominal orbital period (11.9 h).
Didymos Primary GM	km^3/s^2	7.0×10^{-10} (2%)	5.9×10^{-11} (0.2%)	1.8×10^{-11} (0.05%)	Reference value: body GM (primary: $3.4903 \times 10^{-8} \text{ km}^3/\text{s}^2$; secondary: $3.23 \times 10^{-10} \text{ km}^3/\text{s}^2$).
Didymos Secondary GM	km^3/s^2	1.4×10^{-11} (4%)	5.1×10^{-12} (1.6%)	3.2×10^{-12} (1%)	
Didymos Primary Pole	deg	0.25	0.07	0.13	RSS of RA and DEC uncertainties. Didymos secondary frame not estimated

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34	Didymos Secondary Pole	deg	N/A	0.37	0.42	during ECP because the distance from Didymos was considered too large to observe landmarks.
	Didymos Secondary Libration Amplitude	deg	N/A	0.03	0.05	Not estimated during ECP because the distance from Didymos is considered too large to observe landmarks.
	Didymos Secondary Libration Period	s	N/A	9.7 (0.02%)	13 (0.03%)	Reference value for libration amplitude: nominal amplitude (1 deg). Reference value for libration period: nominal orbital period (11.9 h).
	Didymos Secondary Libration Phase	deg	N/A	6.7	8.3	
	Didymos Primary Landmarks Position	m	4.0 (1%)	3.5 (0.9%)	4.0 (1%)	RSS of 3-D position uncertainty. Approximate average values over all landmarks. Reference values: average radii (primary: 390 m; secondary: 81.9 m).
	Didymos Secondary Landmarks Position	m	N/A	1.3 (2%)	1.2 (1%)	Didymos secondary landmarks not estimated during ECP because the distance from Didymos is considered too large to observe landmarks.

35 **Table 9 Summary of formal 1-sigma uncertainties achievable using both Doppler and optical measurements, but processing only**
36 **pictures of either Didymos primary or secondary. The same cases as in Table 8 are displayed. For clarity, only a subset of the**
37 **estimated parameters is shown. The ratio between the uncertainties shown Table 8 and those obtained here is also displayed**
38 **between brackets.**

		Didymos Primary Only			Didymos Secondary Only		
Parameter	Unit	ECP (r = 35 km)	DCP1 (r = 10 km)	PDP (r = 2 km)	ECP (r = 35 km)	DCP1 (r = 10 km)	PDP (r = 2 km)
Spacecraft Radial Position	m	510 (1.6)	9.4 (1.2)	0.95 (1.8)	790 (2.5)	14 (1.8)	0.90 (1.7)
Didymos Secondary Radial Position	m	160 (14)	85 (79)	60 (110)	210 (2.0)	3.5 (3.2)	0.86 (1.6)
Didymos Primary GM	km ³ /s ²	1.0 x10 ⁻⁹ (1.5)	6.9 x10 ⁻¹¹ (1.2)	2.9 x10 ⁻¹¹ (1.6)	1.9 x10 ⁻⁹ (2.7)	1.8 x10 ⁻¹⁰ (3.0)	3.2 x10 ⁻¹¹ (1.7)
Didymos Secondary GM	km ³ /s ²	1.6 x10 ⁻¹¹ (1.2)	5.9 x10 ⁻¹² (1.2)	4.3 x10 ⁻¹² (1.3)	3.1 x10 ⁻¹⁰ (23)	1.1 x10 ⁻¹⁰ (22)	4.9 x10 ⁻¹² (1.5)

Table 10 Summary of the formal 1-sigma uncertainties achievable in the single-arc estimations. Each arc is characterized by a different true anomaly ϑ_p of Didymos secondary at the flyby pericenter time. The same cases as in Table 8 are displayed. For clarity, only the GM of Didymos primary and secondary is shown. The ratio between the uncertainties shown Table 8 and those obtained here is also displayed between brackets.

		Didymos Primary GM (km^3/s^2)			Didymos Secondary GM (km^3/s^2)		
Arc Number	Arc ϑ_p (deg)	ECP ($r = 35$ km)	DCP1 ($r = 10$ km)	PDP ($r = 2$ km)	ECP ($r = 35$ km)	DCP1 ($r = 10$ km)	PDP ($r = 2$ km)
1	0	1.9×10^{-9} (2.7)	4.6×10^{-10} (7.9)	8.2×10^{-11} (4.5)	3.9×10^{-11} (2.8)	1.5×10^{-11} (2.9)	9.8×10^{-12} (3.0)
2	45	1.9×10^{-9} (2.7)	4.3×10^{-10} (7.4)	8.0×10^{-11} (4.3)	3.9×10^{-11} (2.8)	1.5×10^{-11} (2.9)	1.1×10^{-11} (3.5)
3	90	1.9×10^{-9} (2.8)	4.2×10^{-10} (7.2)	7.4×10^{-11} (4.0)	3.9×10^{-11} (2.8)	1.5×10^{-11} (2.9)	1.0×10^{-11} (3.1)
4	135	2.0×10^{-9} (2.9)	4.2×10^{-10} (7.2)	7.1×10^{-11} (3.9)	3.9×10^{-11} (2.9)	1.5×10^{-11} (2.9)	1.1×10^{-11} (3.4)
5	180	2.1×10^{-9} (2.9)	4.1×10^{-10} (7.0)	7.1×10^{-11} (3.9)	3.9×10^{-11} (2.8)	1.4×10^{-11} (2.8)	1.2×10^{-11} (3.6)
6	225	2.1×10^{-9} (3.0)	3.9×10^{-10} (6.7)	7.2×10^{-11} (3.9)	3.8×10^{-11} (2.8)	1.4×10^{-11} (2.8)	1.3×10^{-11} (3.7)
7	270	2.1×10^{-9} (3.1)	3.9×10^{-10} (6.6)	7.2×10^{-11} (3.9)	3.9×10^{-11} (2.8)	1.5×10^{-11} (2.9)	8.8×10^{-12} (2.7)
8	315	2.2×10^{-9} (3.1)	3.8×10^{-10} (6.4)	7.5×10^{-11} (4.1)	3.9×10^{-11} (2.8)	1.5×10^{-11} (2.9)	8.6×10^{-12} (2.7)