

# Testing general relativity in the solar system: present and future perspectives

Fabrizio De Marchi<sup>1</sup>  and Gael Cascioli 

Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Sapienza University of Rome,  
Via Eudossiana, 18, 00184 Rome, Italy

E-mail: [fabrizio.demarchi@uniroma1.it](mailto:fabrizio.demarchi@uniroma1.it)

Received 8 October 2019, revised 23 December 2019

Accepted for publication 13 January 2020

Published 7 April 2020



CrossMark

## Abstract

The increasing precision of spacecraft radiometric tracking data experienced in the last number of years, coupled with the huge amount of data collected and the long baselines of the available datasets, has made the direct observation of Solar System dynamics possible, and in particular relativistic effects, through the measurement of some key parameters as the post-Newtonian parameters, the Nordtvedt parameter  $\eta$  and the graviton mass.

In this work we investigate the potentialities of the datasets provided by the most promising past, present and future interplanetary missions to draw a realistic picture of the knowledge that can be reached in the next 10–15 years. To this aim, we update the semi-analytical model originally developed for the BepiColombo mission, to take into account planet–planet relativistic interactions and eccentricity-induced effects and validate it against well-established numerical models to assess the precision of the retrieval of the parameters of interest.

Before the analysis of the results we give a review of some of the hypotheses and constrained analysis schemes that have been proposed until now to overcome geometrical weaknesses and model degeneracies, proving that these strategies introduce model inconsistencies. Finally we apply our semi-analytical model to perform a covariance analysis on three groups of interplanetary missions: (1) those for which data are available now (e.g. Cassini, MESSENGER, MRO, Juno), (2) in the next years (BepiColombo) and (3) still to be launched as JUICE and VERITAS (this latter is waiting for the approval).

**Keywords:** relativity, radioscience, celestial mechanics, orbit determination

(Some figures may appear in colour only in the online journal)

<sup>1</sup> Author to whom any correspondence should be addressed.

## 1. Introduction

Precise radio tracking between spacecrafts and Earth stations is a well established technique, used since decades and is a widely used method to access Solar System dynamics.

Range, range-rate and angular (e.g.  $\Delta DOR$ ) measurements are used, in the standard least-squares orbit determination procedure, for several purposes, in particular to improve the Solar System ephemerides or to perform fundamental physics experiments.

The purpose of this work is to analyze the most promising past, present and future planetary missions to draw a realistic picture of the achievable degree of accuracy in the description of Solar System dynamics in the next 10–15 years. Planetary missions are by themselves multidisciplinary, carrying a variety of instruments tailored for the investigation of one or more crucial features for the characterization of planets or satellites. Typically they are aimed to the determination of the gravity field, surface imaging, the study of the atmosphere (or at least the exosphere), the magnetic field, etc. Most missions involve orbiters or landers, rather than flyby probes, which are suited for long-lasting observation campaigns. In the context of this work, we are interested in the orbital part of the missions only, characterized by the capacity of a high-precision determination of the position and velocity (the state vector) of the probe relative to the target body center of mass; and thus by the possibility of high-precision determination of the state vector of the target body itself with respect to the Solar System fundamental plane. In this work we consider separately seven interplanetary space missions. Two of them (MESSENGER (MSG), Cassini) have ceased their operation in 2015 and 2017 respectively, three are currently active (Mars Reconnaissance Orbit (MRO), BepiColombo (BC), Juno), one approved but still to be launched (JUICE). Finally, we also consider the proposed, but still not approved, Venus orbiter named VERITAS as a test case for future Venus orbiters equipped with state-of-the-art tracking systems.

In the limit of ‘weak field’, which is a good approximation for the Solar System environment, the Einstein field equations can be expressed in terms of small deviations from Newton’s laws [1]. More generally, these deviations are usually parametrised by the set of coefficients called post-Newtonian (PN) parameters. In the Newtonian theory of gravity they are all zero, but in General Relativity (GR) some of them are, by definition, unity. Therefore, their precise measurement can be used to test GR in the Solar System. The PN parameters  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$  are nonzero in case of violation of the Einstein’s principle of relativity (i.e. the laws of physics are independent of the reference frame). The parameters  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  (in GR both equal to 1) are related, respectively, to the degree of nonlinearity of gravitation and to the space curvature generated by a unit rest mass. In addition to its dynamical role (i.e. it appears into the equations of motion), the parameter  $\gamma$  controls the so-called ‘Shapiro delay’ [2] to the light-time of a radio beam, the delay being enhanced when the radio beam passes in proximity of the Sun.

The description of gravity in GR as a mere geometric effect is based on the Equivalence Principle (EP), which states that the gravitational mass appears to be equal in value to the inertial one. A possible violation of the EP has been tested several times in the last centuries and up to now it has never been measured [3].

The ‘weak form’ (WEP) of the EP states the universality of the free falling of test particles in an external field. Conversely, the ‘strong form’ (SEP) generalizes this effect to bodies whose gravity field is not negligible (e.g. planets or stars).

The most widely accepted theory that accounts for SEP violation relates the inertial and gravitational masses through the self-gravitational potential of the involved bodies scaled by the Nordtvedt parameter  $\eta$  which is related to PN parameters by the Nordtvedt equation (valid for metric theories) [1, 4]

$$\eta = 4\bar{\beta} - \bar{\gamma} - \alpha_1 - \frac{2}{3}\alpha_2; \quad \text{with } \bar{\beta} = \beta - 1; \quad \bar{\gamma} = \gamma - 1 \quad (1)$$

which is derived from the assumption that the metric tensor  $g_{ij}$  is symmetric.

Other parameters we are interested in are the GM (i.e. the product of Newton constant and mass) of the Sun (hereafter  $\mu_0$ ), its rate of change in time  $\zeta = \dot{\mu}_0/\mu_0$  (not to be confused with PN parameter  $\zeta$ ), the gravitational oblateness of the Sun  $J_{2\odot}$  and the angular momentum of the Sun  $S_\odot$  which can be inferred by observing the Lense–Thirring effect [5].

Finally, we also add to the list the Compton wavelength  $\lambda_g$  of the graviton which, as proposed by [6], can be measured by Earth–Mars ranging.

The parameters described above produce effects on the long-term trajectories of the Solar System bodies. It is well known that ranging data are more suited to convey informations about long-term perturbations than range-rate, which are the main source of information about ‘local’ and fast-changing accelerations. Generally speaking, Doppler data are used to resolve the trajectory of the probe around the host planet center of mass, while the range data are used to resolve the motion of the planet center of mass with respect to Solar System barycenter.

For this reason, the experiments devoted to fast-changing signals (e.g. planetary gravity fields), which are based mainly on range-rate measurements, are in practice uncorrelated to fundamental physics ones. Therefore, we can neglect the motion of the probes around the reference planet and focus on the Earth-to-planet distance perturbation.

Unfortunately, our knowledge about most of Solar System asteroids masses and positions in time is not exact. Thus, assuming these quantities as perfectly known in our model would introduce spurious signals resulting in biases on the estimated parameters and in the underestimation of their formal uncertainties.

When dealing with simulated data these effects can be detected by comparing the true errors (estimated minus expected values) and the formal errors, but, dealing with real data, the true errors are unknown.

An example: the current uncertainty of Jupiter GM is  $1.5\text{--}2.0 \text{ km}^3 \text{ s}^{-2}$  [7], leading to a perturbation on the Earth–Mercury range of about 20–30 mm (see [8], table IV, appendix E). In figure 1 we show this effect (red line).


For comparison, in the same figure (black line) we report the Earth–Mercury range perturbation due to  $\eta = 10^{-4}$  (i.e. the current accuracy about  $\eta$ ).

The two signals are very similar because the perturbation due to  $\eta$  depends on the position of the Sun with respect to the Solar System Barycenter that, in turn, is determined mainly by Jupiter mass and position. Anyway, the signals are not identical (the Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.87), therefore it is still possible to measure  $\eta$  with an accuracy below the  $10^{-4}$  level [8, 9]. However, this also means that to further reduce the uncertainty of  $\eta$  it is necessary to improve the knowledge of the Jupiter GM. This is true, in general for all parameters we are interested in: precise estimations are strongly conditioned by the accuracy on the ephemerides and masses of the Solar System bodies.

This paper is structured as follows: in section 2 we describe the mathematical model we used for the covariance analysis, in section 3 we report details about the missions considered, in section 4 we discuss the results and finally, in section 5 we draw the conclusions.

## 2. Mathematical model

The model was originally developed to be applied to MORE (Mercury Orbiter Radioscience Experiment) onboard BepiColombo (BC). Its original purpose was to calculate the signals



**Figure 1.** Red line: Earth–Mercury spurious signal on range caused by a  $1.5 \text{ km}^3 \text{ s}^{-2}$  biased assumption of the Jupiter’s GM. Black line: Earth–Mercury range perturbation due to  $\eta = 10^{-4}$ . Both signals have been calculated using the ‘non-homogeneous’ contribution only of the equations of motion (see appendix A for details).

relative to a set of perturbing parameters on the Earth–Mercury range and to obtain the corresponding covariance matrix.

Details about the model can be found in [8], where they concluded that, despite the uncertainties of the masses of Solar System bodies and ephemerides, BC mission could improve the estimation of the parameter  $\eta$  up to 1 order of magnitude with respect to the current knowledge.

In the work here presented, we report on some important updating and improvements to the model, leading to partially different conclusions.

First of all the code has been generalised to model the range measurements, as a function of the set of parameters we are interested in, between two arbitrary planets of the Solar System.

Here we briefly summarize the structure of the code. We adopt the notation of [10], we define  $\mathbf{r}_i$  as the coordinates the planet  $i$  in an inertial reference frame,  $\mathbf{r}_{ij} = \mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_i$  as the vector from  $i$  to  $j$  and  $r_{ij} = \|\mathbf{r}_{ij}\|$  its modulus.

We number the planets from 1 (Mercury) to 8 (Neptune), while 0 is referred to the Sun. In the following we indicate with  $i$  and  $k$  the two planets, where  $i$  is the nearest to the Sun.

Finally, we call  $\mathbf{q}$  the list of  $N$  parameters involved for the covariance analysis. All  $q_j$  are very small, consequently the perturbation on the  $i$ -to- $k$  distance can be expressed as a first order Taylor series expansion around the nominal solution. To get the perturbations on the range measurements due to  $q_j$  we follow this procedure:

1. we write the forces per unit mass  $\delta \mathbf{a}_i^j$  on body  $i$  and  $\delta \mathbf{a}_k^j$  on body  $k$ ;
2. by solving the Hill’s equations of motion [11] (see appendix A for a detailed description) assuming null initial conditions we obtain the secular displacements  $\delta \mathbf{r}_i^j$  and  $\delta \mathbf{r}_k^j$  and the range perturbed vector  $\delta \mathbf{r}_{ik}^j = \delta \mathbf{r}_k^j - \delta \mathbf{r}_i^j$ ;
3. the perturbed vector is finally projected along the the  $i$ -to- $k$  direction to obtain the perturbation  $\delta \rho_{ik}^j(\mathbf{q})$  on the range.

Initial conditions of  $i$  and  $k$  belong to  $\mathbf{q}$ . Their signatures are computed using the homogeneous solution equation (A.13) of Hill’s equations.

All perturbations that will be treated, in the Hill's frame, are expressed as the sum of polynomial and sinusoidal (resonant and non-resonant) functions of time. The corresponding solutions of the Hill's equations are reported in appendix A.

Finally, after imposing *a priori* for all parameters based on their current or expected (in the case of future missions) accuracies, we calculate the covariance matrix (see section 2.2).

### 2.1. Improving the model

First of all, we include the effect of the orbital eccentricity of Mercury since it is considerably larger ( $e_1 = 0.205$ ) than those of the other planets. Moreover, we add to the model described in [8] the following parameters: the Eddington parameter  $\gamma$ , the preferred frame parameters ( $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$ ), the angular momentum of the Sun ( $S_\odot$ ) and the Compton wavelength of the graviton ( $\lambda_g$ ). Finally, we also consider the effects of the uncertainties on the positions of planets and asteroids.

The model does not include the  $z$ -coordinates since orbital inclinations of the most massive bodies are in general very small.

For validation purposes, the ranging signatures obtained with the model presented in this work have been compared to numerically integrated ones. The results in the case of a simulated Earth–Mercury ranging experiment are reported in figure C1.

The analytical model shows to be in good agreement with the numerical solution presenting small deviations, due mainly to our co-planar approximation. These small deviations (that are in the order of 15%–20% in terms of relative error) map into negligible differences in terms of variance and covariance on the solve-for parameters. More specifically, it can be proven that a relative error  $e_r$  on the range signatures maps into an error of the order of  $e_r$  (in a worst-case assumption corresponding to an additive and constant error) on the formal uncertainty of the solve-for parameters, meaning that, for the purposes of this work, the approximation introduced by the co-planar assumption is justified.

The signatures of some parameters in the ranging data, for the 5 different ranging options here considered (Earth–Mercury, Earth–Venus, Earth–Mars, Earth–Jupiter, Earth–Saturn), are displayed in appendix D.

**2.1.1. Mercury's eccentricity.** In our co-planar approximation we use the longitude of the perihelion  $\varpi = \Omega + \omega$  where  $\Omega$  is the longitude of the ascending node and  $\omega$  is the argument of perihelion.

The heliocentric cartesian position of body  $i$  is  $\mathbf{r}_{0i} = \{x_{0i}, y_{0i}\}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} x_{0i} &= r(t) [\cos \nu(t) \cos \varpi - \sin \nu(t) \sin \varpi]; \\ y_{0i} &= r(t) [\sin \nu(t) \cos \varpi + \cos \nu(t) \sin \varpi] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\nu$  is the true anomaly. We define  $R_{0i}$  the semimajor axis of body  $i$ ,  $t^p$  as the epoch of the passage at the perihelion and  $t' = t - t^p$ .

The terms  $(r \cos \nu, r \sin \nu)$  in equation (2) at the first order of the elliptical expansion are [12]

$$\begin{aligned} r \cos \nu &= R_{0i} \cos(n_i t') + e_i \frac{R_{0i}}{2} [\cos(2n_i t') - 3] + O(e_i^2); \\ r \sin \nu &= R_{0i} \sin(n_i t') + e_i \frac{R_{0i}}{2} \sin(2n_i t') + O(e_i^2); \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $n_i = \sqrt{(\mu_0 + \mu_i)/R_{0i}^3}$  is the mean motion.

The accuracy of equation (3), and consequently of the model in general, is  $O(e_i^2) \approx 4\%$  (for Mercury), which is sufficient for our purposes.

Referring to the circular orbit approximation, we define the radial/transverse unit vector

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{u}_r^i &= \{\cos(\Phi_i + \varpi_i), \sin(\Phi_i + \varpi_i), 0\}; \\ \mathbf{u}_t^i &= \{-\sin(\Phi_i + \varpi_i), \cos(\Phi_i + \varpi_i), 0\};\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

where

$$\Phi_i = n_i(t - t_i^p). \quad (5)$$

Finally, from equation (2), the vector  $\mathbf{r}_{0i}$ , projected along these directions, is [13]

$$\mathbf{r}_{0i} \approx R_{0i}\mathbf{u}_r^i + e_i\mathbf{R}_i^e \quad (6)$$

where

$$\mathbf{R}_i^e = R_{0i}(-\cos \Phi_i \mathbf{u}_r^i + 2 \sin \Phi_i \mathbf{u}_t^i) \quad (7)$$

is the first-order correction for eccentricity.

The formulas necessary to express the forces described in this section in terms of the Mercury's orbital eccentricity are reported in appendix B.

**2.1.2. Planetary perturbations on range.** In [8] only the perturbations due to uncertainties of GMs were considered, for completeness we include also the uncertainties on the positions of the bodies.

Define  $\mathbf{p}$  a vector containing the orbital parameters and the GM of a planet/asteroid. It can be expressed as  $\mathbf{p} = \bar{\mathbf{p}} + \delta\mathbf{p}$ , where  $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$  are adopted values (e.g. from an arbitrary set of ephemerides) and  $\delta\mathbf{p}$  are small deviations between true and the adopted values.

Orbits are assumed co-planar and the eccentricity of Mercury is assumed to be known, therefore the elements of  $\mathbf{p}$  are: radius ( $R_{0j}$ ) of the orbit, the GM ( $\mu_j$ ) and longitude of the perihelion ( $\varpi_j$ ) (the mean motion has been expressed in terms of  $\mu_j$  and  $R_{0j}$ ). We considered  $N = 353$  perturbers among planets and asteroids, so the parameters to be included into the original sample are  $3 \times N$ .

The trajectory of body  $i$ , in heliocentric coordinates, can be obtained by solving

$$\ddot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i} = -\frac{\mu_0 + \mu_i}{r_{0i}^3}\mathbf{r}_{0i} + \sum_{j \neq i \neq 0} \mu_j \left( \frac{\mathbf{r}_{ij}}{r_{ij}^3} - \frac{\mathbf{r}_{0j}}{r_{0j}^3} \right). \quad (8)$$

Since  $\mu_j \ll \mu_0$  the deviation from the Keplerian orbit is small (in the interval of time of our interest) and the term into summation can be calculated by assuming unperturbed orbits for each  $j$ .

As said above, we assume  $e_j = 0 \forall j \neq 1$ .

Equation (8) can be re-written in the Hill's frame [11] by using equation (B.1b) and equation (B.3) (with  $n = 3$ ) and solved for planets  $i$  and  $k$  (see appendix A and [8] for details) finding the analytical expression of  $\mathbf{r}_{ik}(\delta\mathbf{p})$ .

Expanding at the first order this quantity and summing over all bodies, the perturbations are

$$\delta\mathbf{r}_{ik} = \sum_{j \neq i \neq k} \left[ \delta\mu_j \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}_{ik}}{\partial \mu_j} \Big|_{\bar{\mu}_j} + \delta R_{0j} \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}_{ik}}{\partial R_{0j}} \Big|_{\bar{R}_{0j}} + \delta\varpi_j \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}_{ik}}{\partial \varpi_j} \Big|_{\bar{\varpi}_j} \right]. \quad (9)$$

Finally, the range perturbation is

$$\delta\rho_{ik} \approx \frac{\delta\mathbf{r}_{ik} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{ik}}{R_{ik}} \quad (10)$$

and the factor  $1/R_{ik}$  can be obtained using equation (B.4).

**2.1.3. Dynamical effects of  $\gamma$  and other parameters.** Defining  $\mu_0$  as the current ( $t = t_0$ ) estimated value of the GM of the Sun, we can write the true GM as

$$\mu_{0,\text{true}}(t) = \mu_0 [1 + \zeta(t - t_0)] + \delta\mu_0 \quad (11)$$

where  $\mu_0$  is the current best estimate and  $\delta\mu_0$  is the offset.

We also re-consider the perturbation due to the gravitational flattening of the Sun. In [8] the inclination of the Sun's equator was included, however its effect is smaller than the one triggered by the eccentricity of the Mercury's orbit. Therefore we decide to neglect the first effect and include the second one.

Neglecting planet–planet interactions, the force per unit mass on body  $i$  due to  $\bar{\gamma}$ ,  $\bar{\beta}$ ,  $\delta\mu_0$ ,  $\zeta$  and  $J_{2\odot}$  is [1]

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathbf{a}_i^{\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\beta}, \delta\mu_0, \zeta, J_{2\odot}} = \frac{\mu_0}{r_{0i}^3} & \left[ - \left( \zeta t + \frac{\delta\mu_0}{\mu_0} \right) \mathbf{r}_{0i} + 2(\bar{\beta} + \bar{\gamma}) \frac{\mu_0}{c^2} \frac{\mathbf{r}_{0i}}{r_{0i}} \right. \\ & \left. - J_{2\odot} \frac{3}{2} \frac{R_{\odot}^2}{r_{0i}^2} \mathbf{r}_{0i} - \bar{\gamma} \frac{\dot{r}_{0i}^2}{c^2} \mathbf{r}_{0i} + 2\bar{\gamma} \frac{\mathbf{r}_{0i} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i}}{c^2} \dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where  $R_{\odot}$  is the Sun's radius. The terms into equation (12) can be written in the Hill's frame by using equation (B.1a). Again, neglecting planet–planet interactions, for preferred-frame parameters the perturbation on the orbit of body  $i$  is [1]

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathbf{a}_i^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2} = \frac{\mu_0}{2c^2 r_{0i}^3} & \left[ \alpha_1 (\mathbf{w} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i}) \mathbf{r}_{0i} + 3\alpha_2 (\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{0i})^2 \frac{\mathbf{r}_{0i}}{r_{0i}^2} \right. \\ & \left. - \alpha_1 (\mathbf{r}_{0i} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i}) \mathbf{w} - 2\alpha_2 (\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{0i}) \mathbf{w} + w^2 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) \mathbf{r}_{0i} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $w^2 = \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{w}$  and

$$\mathbf{w} = 3.69 \times 10^5 \{-0.970, 0.139, -0.197\} \text{ m s}^{-1} \quad (14)$$

is the velocity of the Solar System Barycenter (SSB) relative to the thermal microwave background radiation [14] that represents the 'preferred frame'.

It can be seen from equations (12) and (13) how the eccentricity of the orbit of body  $i$  reduces the degeneracy among parameters.

**2.1.4. Lense–Thirring effect.** The nonzero angular momentum of a celestial body produces a secular precession of both the longitude of the ascending node and the argument of perihelion of a test particle orbiting around it. It is a relativistic correction called 'Lense–Thirring effect' [5]. It can be used to test the GR (when measured by probes orbiting around the Earth) or, assuming the GR to be exact, it can provide a direct measurement of the angular momentum of the Sun (we will consider this latter case) [15].

The perturbation on body  $i$  is [10]

$$\delta\mathbf{a}_{\text{LT}}^i = GS_{\odot} \frac{\gamma + 1}{c^2 r_{0i}^3} \left[ -\mathbf{s} \times \dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i} + 3 \frac{(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{0i})(\mathbf{r}_{0i} \times \dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i})}{r_{0i}^2} \right], \quad (15)$$



where  $S_\odot = 1.92 \times 10^{41} \text{ kg m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$  [15, 16] is the modulus of the angular momentum of the Sun and  $\mathbf{s}$  is the unit vector which indicates its direction.

We neglect the second term into square brackets because the cross product is a vector along the  $z$ -axis and in our co-planar approximation it cannot be detected. The term  $(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{0i})$  is also very small because  $\mathbf{s}$  is near aligned along  $z$ -axis.

We express the angular momentum of the Sun as  $S_\odot = k_{\text{LT}} M_\odot R_\odot^2 \Omega_\odot$  where  $\Omega_\odot = 2.864 \times 10^{-6} \text{ rad/s}$  is the angular velocity at the equator [17] and  $k_{\text{LT}}$  the normalized moment of inertia (i.e. the parameter to be estimated).

Assuming  $\gamma = 1$ , after some algebra we get

$$\delta \mathbf{a}_{\text{LT}}^i \approx k_{\text{LT}} \frac{2\mu_0 R_\odot^2 \Omega_\odot}{c^2} \left[ \frac{\dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i}}{r_{0i}^3} \times \{0, 0, 1\} \right]. \quad (16)$$

The expression in the Hill's frame of the term into square brackets of equation (16) is reported in equation (B.1f).

**2.1.5. Shapiro delay.** The Shapiro delay [2] is one of the consequences of the space-time curvature in the proximity of the Sun. It affects both range and Doppler data and it can be used to measure the parameter  $\gamma$  in an independent way from the dynamical effect described in section 2.1.3.

Regarding the signature on the range, the following term [10]

$$\delta r_{ik}^{\bar{\gamma}} = \bar{\gamma} \frac{\mu_0}{c^2} \log \frac{r_{0i} + r_{0k} + r_{ik}}{r_{0i} + r_{0k} - r_{ik}} \quad (17)$$

must be added to the dynamical effect of  $\bar{\gamma}$  ( $i$  and  $k$  are the inner and the outer planets, respectively).

From equation (17) one can notice how the signal is maximized during the  $i$ -Sun- $k$  alignments. They can occur during the cruise phases as well during the orbital phases.

The perturbation in equation (17) can be evaluated with good approximation (for our purposes) by using the formulas appendix B.

**2.1.6. Compton wavelength of the graviton.** The gravitational potential for a system of bodies in the case of a massive graviton is [6]

$$U = -G \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{m_i m_j}{r_{ij}} e^{-r_{ij}/\lambda_g} \quad (18)$$

where  $\lambda_g$  is the *Compton wavelength* of the graviton which, in General Relativity, is infinity.

Several tests have been proposed in the last decades for the measurement of this parameter. They are based on the observations of galaxy clusters [18, 19] as well as on the solar-system dynamics. For a comprehensive work regarding the measurements of the graviton mass see e.g. [20]. In the last years, the previous lower limit  $\lambda_g > 2.8 \times 10^{12} \text{ km}$  (obtained by measurements based on solar-system dynamics [21]), has been increased to  $\lambda_g > 1.6 \times 10^{13} \text{ km}$  thanks to direct detection of gravitational waves (three events GW150914, GW151226 and GW170104) [22]. Recently, in [6] it has been forecasted that the lower limit of  $\lambda_g$  could be increased to  $1.2\text{--}2.2 \times 10^{14} \text{ km}$  thanks to precise measurements of the perihelion advance of Mars obtained from MRO data.

In this work we check this prediction taking into account also the correlations of  $\lambda_g$  with all other parameters. Neglecting the planet-planet interaction, the force per unit mass on planet  $i$  is



$$\mathbf{a}_i = -\frac{\mu_0}{r_{0i}^3} \left[ 1 - \frac{r_{0i}^2}{2\lambda_g^2} \right] \mathbf{r}_{0i} + O(1/\lambda_g^3). \quad (19)$$

Therefore, using equation (B.1b) with  $n = 1$ , the perturbation due to the massive graviton is

$$\delta \mathbf{a}_i^{\lambda_g} = \frac{\mu_0}{2\lambda_g^2} (\mathbf{u}_r^i + 2e_i \sin \Phi_i \mathbf{u}_t^i). \quad (20)$$

The (small) parameter belonging to  $\mathbf{q}$  is  $1/\lambda_g^2$  and its formal error, say  $\sigma_g$ , extracted from the covariance matrix, gives the lower limit to the Compton wavelength of the graviton

$$\lambda_g > 1/\sqrt{\sigma_g}. \quad (21)$$

As an example, we plot in figure 2 the signature on the Earth–Mercury range due to  $\bar{\gamma} = 10^{-5}$  and  $\lambda_g = 10^{14}$  km. We compare the ones obtained by solving the Hill’s equations (with and without eccentricity of Mercury) with those obtained by numerical integration. The contribution of the eccentricity of Mercury’s orbit is apparent.

**2.1.7. Non-gravitational forces.** Non-gravitational forces, for our purposes, must be treated as a source of systematic noise. The modelling of some non-gravitational forces (i.e. solar pressure or thermal effects) might not be accurate enough for the scope of precise orbit determination, thus the perturbation induced by these forces must be calibrated or, thanks to the EP, directly measured by an onboard accelerometer (it is the case of BC) and subtracted from the dynamical model. For the mission JUICE, the accelerometer will be necessary to measure the displacement of the onboard antenna with respect to the center of mass due to the sloshing of the propellant [23].

The calibration of the non-gravitational forces, usually composed by both stochastic and deterministic contributions, is commonly tackled with a multi-arc strategy (see [24] for a detailed description).

In this work, for simplicity, we take into account these effects in an indirect way, by assuming conservative values for the accuracy of the single measurements. In particular, to all measurements we associate uncertainties that are always a factor 2 or 3 larger than the observed (or predicted, in the case of future missions) RMS.


**2.1.8. Aging of the transponder.** The on-board transponder develops a cumulative offset that corresponds to a drift in the range signal. This phenomenon is called ‘aging’ of the transponder. In the case of MSG, a linear trend leading to an offset of  $<1$  m over 7 years, attributed to the aging of the transponder, has been observed and removed from the radiometric data [9]. For BC, the onboard self-calibrating system is expected to reduce the aging to less than a few cm after 1 year, this effect can be absorbed by a monotonic function of time [25]. Therefore, we added the following effect to the range signals

$$\delta \rho_{ik} = \rho_{\text{start}} + \Delta \rho \frac{t - t_{\text{start}}}{t_{\text{end}} - t_{\text{start}}} \quad (22)$$

and  $(\rho_{\text{start}}, \Delta \rho)$  are parameters to be estimated.

## 2.2. Covariance analysis and a priori

Given the set of  $N$  parameters  $\mathbf{q}$ , our purpose is the calculus of their RMS, which are the square roots of the diagonal elements of the covariance matrix. We take into account also the



**Figure 2.** Signature on the Earth–Mercury range due to  $\bar{\gamma} = 10^{-5}$  (top) and  $\lambda_g = 10^{14}$  km (bottom). Blue: numerical integration, green: analytical model (assuming  $e = 0$ ), orange: analytical model with first order eccentricity of Mercury’s orbit included.

current knowledge about some (or all) parameters, so we will use *a priori*, that can be seen as additional ‘observations’ [24].

The simplest way is to express them as a set of  $M$  linear combinations of elements of  $\mathbf{q}$

$$f_n^P = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{nm}(q_m - q_{m,\text{true}}); \quad n = 1, \dots, M \quad (23)$$

where  $a_{nm}$  are constant coefficients and  $f_n^P$  are normally distributed with zero mean and variance  $\sigma_n^P$  which is the accuracy of the *a priori* information.

The normal and covariance matrices are

$$\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{H} + (\mathbf{H}^P)^T \mathbf{W}^P \mathbf{H}^P; \quad \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{C}^{-1} \quad (24)$$

where  $\mathbf{H}$  and  $\mathbf{H}^P$  are the design matrices

$$H_{lm} = \frac{\partial \rho_{ik}(t_l)}{\partial q_m}; \quad l = 1, \dots, N_d; \quad m = 1, \dots, N; \quad (25)$$

$$H_{nm}^P = \frac{\partial f_n^P}{\partial q_m}; \quad m = 1, \dots, N; \quad n = 1, \dots, M$$

**Table 1.** Current knowledge about GMs and positions of the Solar System planets.

Body	Radial position Unc. (km)	Along track position Unc. (mas)	GM Unc. (km <sup>3</sup> s <sup>-2</sup> )
Mercury	0.020	0.2	0.9 [28]
Venus	0.004	0.2	0.006 [29]
Earth	0.002	0.2	0.0043 [29]
Mars	0.002	0.2	0.00028 [29]
Jupiter	1.5	4.0	2.0 [7]–1.0 [27]
Saturn	0.2	0.2	1.1 [29]
Uranus	50.	5.0	7.0 [29]
Neptune	200.	5.0	10.0 [29]

where  $N_d$  is the number of observations (i.e the  $i$ -to- $k$  range measurements and  $\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{W}^P$  are weight matrices, here assumed to be diagonal

$$W_{lm} = \frac{\delta_{lm}}{\sigma_l^2}; \quad l, m = 1, \dots, N_d;$$

$$W_{mn}^P = \frac{\delta_{mn}}{(\sigma_n^P)^2}; \quad m, n = 1, \dots, M \quad (26)$$

with  $\delta_{ij}$  being the Kroneker delta.

*A priori* have been assumed according to the current knowledge of the parameters involved.

For planets, the current uncertainties about GMs and ephemerides are reported in table 1, the last ones being based on the comparison among the recent ephemerides DE430, INPOP15a and EPM2014 [26]. We used these values for planetary  $\sigma(\mu_j), \sigma(R_{0j}), \sigma(\varpi_j)$ . Thanks to the data carried by Juno mission, in the next future the GM of Jupiter will be likely reduced to  $\sigma(\mu_5) = 1.0 \text{ km}^3 \text{ s}^{-2}$  [27] therefore we adopt this value.

Among the 345 minor bodies we consider, two are trans-neptunians (Pluto, Eris) for which we used (500 km, 20 mas) for radial/along-track uncertainties. All other bodies are asteroids belonging to the main belt and we assumed a positioning error of (100 km, 10 mas).

To summarize, *a priori* have been used for:

1. Parameters related to planets and asteroids:  $\mu_j, R_{0j}$  and  $\varpi_j$ ;
2. Nordtvedt equation (1). Being an exact relation, in practice it corresponds to express one of the parameters as a function of the others. This can be done by adopting a small, but nonzero, value for  $\sigma_n$ . Following [30], we put  $\sigma_n^P = 10^{-8}$ ;
3. initial state vectors for planets  $i$  and  $k$  based on the values into table 1 (see section 2.2.1 for a detailed description);
4. parameters  $\beta, \gamma, \eta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu_0, J_{2\odot}, \zeta, k_{LT}$  and  $\lambda_g$  using as *a priori* the values reported in table 4.

**2.2.1. A priori on initial conditions.** Initial conditions can be expressed in barycentric ( $\mathbf{r}_i, \dot{\mathbf{r}}_i, \mathbf{r}_k, \dot{\mathbf{r}}_k$ ) as well as heliocentric ( $\mathbf{r}_{0i}, \dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i}, \mathbf{r}_{0k}, \dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0k}$ ) coordinates.

In our model, the natural setup is the heliocentric one. The evolution of the state vector in terms of the initial conditions is given by equation (A.13) where initial conditions  $\{r_0, t_0, \dot{r}_0, \dot{t}_0\}$  are relative to the Hill's frame (they are related to heliocentric coordinates by equation (A.3) evaluated at  $t = 0$ ).

We can pass to barycentric coordinates by using

$$\mathbf{r}_i = \mathbf{r}_{0i} - (1 + \eta\Omega_0) \frac{\sum_{j \neq 0} \mu_j \mathbf{r}_{0j}}{\sum_j \mu_j} + O(\eta^2) \quad (27)$$

where  $\Omega_i$  is the ratio between self-gravitational and rest energy of body  $i$  (for the Sun  $\Omega_0 = -3.52 \times 10^{-6}$ ) [8].

From equation (27), the passage to a barycentric configuration implies the introduction of a signal proportional to  $\eta$ , to be added to the ‘heliocentric’ one which is obtained by solving the equation of motion

$$\ddot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i} = -\frac{\mu^*}{r_{0i}^3} \mathbf{r}_{0i} + \eta \sum_{j \neq i \neq 0} \mu_j \left( \Omega_i \frac{\mathbf{r}_{ij}}{r_{ij}^3} - \Omega_0 \frac{\mathbf{r}_{0j}}{r_{0j}^3} \right) \quad (28)$$

where

$$\mu^* = \mu_0 + \mu_i + \eta(\Omega_0 \mu_i + \Omega_i \mu_0), \quad (29)$$

see [8] for details.

It results that the ‘barycentric’ signal largely dominates the heliocentric one, of about a factor 10 (for a comparison see top panels of figure D1).

Unfortunately, this advantage cannot be used: an hypothetical exact knowledge about one or more barycentric initial conditions is equivalent to an information about the real position of the Sun. However, this latter depends on the inertial masses of the Solar System bodies, therefore on  $\eta$ , so we created a self-referential loop.

The Sun-SSB distance is  $\|\mathbf{r}_0\| \approx 7-8 \times 10^5$  km and the current uncertainty on the Nordtvedt parameter is  $\Delta\eta \approx 10^{-4}$ . The uncertainty on the *real* position of the Sun due to a possible SEP violation is

$$\Delta\eta \Omega_0 \|\mathbf{r}_0\| \approx 1 \text{ m}. \quad (30)$$

We verified that this is a qualitative ‘dividing line’ for the *a priori* on initial positions of bodies  $i$  and  $k$ . If they are larger, the resulting formal error of  $\eta$  is nearly the same in both barycentric or heliocentric configurations. In the other case, while in the heliocentric setup the RMS of  $\eta$  remains stable, in the other configuration it becomes about 1 order of magnitude smaller.

Since the output must be independent of the configuration adopted, we conclude that the descoping strategy (the assumption of exact knowledge of some elements of the initial state vector [8, 30, 31]), when applied to a barycentric setup, leads to an unphysical RMS of  $\eta$ .

For the same reason, in this work we do not adopt constraints on rotations and rescaling [8, 31–32].

*A priori* on initial conditions are sufficient to lock the rotation around z-axis and the constraint on the rescaling, as was for the descoping strategy, implicitly adds information about the real position of the Sun with respect to the SSB.

Moreover, we retain that the rescaling is in fact not necessary since the astronomical unit has been redefined as a conventional unit of length (resolution B2, IAU XXVIII General Assembly 2012) and the GM of the Sun is now among the parameters to be estimated.

In [30] it has been argued that the formal accuracies of the parameters depend on the reference epoch at which the initial state vector is estimated.

We believe that this effect is a consequence of erroneously maintaining the same set of *a priori* on constraints (such as descoping or rescaling) when changing the estimation epoch. In appendix F we prove that, if the *a priori* matrix is properly propagated by using the state transition matrix  $\Phi(t_1, t_0)$  the formal uncertainties remain unchanged.

### 3. Missions and datasets

Here we report an overview of the main characteristics of the interplanetary missions we considered. We use for our analysis a set of simulated normal points with associated errors. The normal points are a derived measurement representing the relative distance between Earth and the barycenter of the planetary system the probe is orbiting in [33].

The points with an impact parameter  $b < b_{\min}$  must be discarded because of the effect of the solar plasma noise. In the case of missions able to establish a coherent multifrequency radio link a nearly complete suppression of the plasma noise can be achieved [17]. Notably BC and JUICE are (or will be) equipped with a Ka-band Transponder that enables a X/X (7.2 GHz uplink / 8.4 GHz downlink), X/Ka (7.2 GHz / 32.5 GHz) and Ka/Ka (34 GHz / 32.5 GHz) band multifrequency link. For these missions we adopt  $b_{\min} = 7R_{\odot}$ , in agreement with the latest numerical simulations performed for BC [34]. For the missions employing a single frequency X-band two-way link (all the others except VERITAS) we discard all the data collected for  $b < b_{\min} = 73.5R_{\odot}$  corresponding to a Sun-Earth-Probe (SEP) angle of  $20^{\circ}$ .

Finally, the Ka/Ka link is not expected for VERITAS, so only a partial calibration of the plasma noise will be possible. Therefore, we adopt an intermediate value of  $b_{\min} = 40R_{\odot}$  that can be translated into a SEP of about  $10.5^{\circ}$ .

The precision of each normal point depends on:

- The real data sampling:  $n$  points can be equivalent to one point with RMS rescaled by a factor  $1/\sqrt{n}$  or equivalently, the measurement RMS can be rescaled to different integration times as:

$$\sigma'_{\rho} = \sigma_{\rho} \sqrt{\frac{T'_C}{T_C}} \quad (31)$$

where  $\sigma_{\rho}$  is the range RMS,  $T_C$  is the integration time and  $(\cdot)'$  denotes rescaled quantities.

- The radio-link technology: a standard X-band ranging system can provide ranging measurements with an accuracy limited to a few meters, a regenerative pseudo-noise ranging system, employed on BC, VERITAS and JUICE, can reach an absolute precision of some tenths of centimeters [34, 35].

The code we developed can deal only with Earth-to-planet range data, so particular attention must be applied when assigning the RMS of the Cassini and JUICE simulated normal points since neither Cassini nor JUICE are placed on circular orbits around Saturn or Jupiter, respectively, for the entire duration of the missions. Orbits are in general highly elliptic with several flybys of the satellites. This implies that the uncertainty in the positioning of the central body may, and in general does, vary along the duration of the mission. Specific assumptions have been made for these two missions, in order to deal correctly with this issue (see below for details).

In the following we describe case-by-case the generation of the simulated normal points.


1. The scientific objectives of MSG were the study of the geology, geophysics, exosphere and magnetosphere of Mercury. It has been launched in 2004. After a flyby encounter of Earth (2005), two of Venus (2006–2007) and three of Mercury (2008–2009) it began a highly elliptical orbital phase ( $200 \text{ km} \times 15\,000 \text{ km}$  altitude, period: 12 h) around Mercury on March 18, 2011 until crashing on the surface 4 years later, on April 30, 2015.

The spacecraft tracking is based on a two-way X-band link as described in [36]. We simulated a 4.1 yrs mission, a data spacing of 10h and an associated RMS of 1m, that is conservatively compliant with the measured performances of MSG [9].

2. Cassini was a NASA mission devoted to the study of Saturn and its environment. Launched on October 15, 1997, it started the orbital phase around Saturn on July 1st, 2004. After several flybys around the Saturn's satellites and the deployment of the lander Huygens on the Titan surface, it performed close passes by the rings of Saturn until the final plunge into Saturn's atmosphere on September 15, 2017. Although equipped with a Ka-band transponder, during the Saturnian system tour Cassini was tracked only through a dual-frequency link (X/X, X/Ka) that does not allow a complete plasma noise cancellation scheme. For this reason we considered a  $b_{\min}$  corresponding to a  $SEP = 20^\circ$ . We simulated a 13.2 yrs mission and, for the accuracy of its reconstruction of the Earth–Saturn distance, we consider two cases: 100 m (optimistic) and 1 km (conservative) with a data spacing of 24h.
3. MRO is a still operating NASA mission devoted to the study of Mars. It has been launched on 2005 and the orbital insertion around Mars was accomplished on March 12, 2006. The orbit is nearly circular (250 km  $\times$  316 km of altitude). The tracking system operates with a single-frequency two-way X-band link and employs a DSN standard sequential tone ranging scheme [37], that allows a ranging accuracy of the order of few meters over typical integration times (5 min). We simulated a 12 yrs mission with a data spacing of 10h and an RMS of 1 m.
4. Juno is a currently operating NASA mission devoted to the study of Jupiter. It entered in a polar, highly elliptical (75600 km  $\times$  8.1 million km), orbit around Jupiter on July 5, 2016. As for Cassini, the radio-link is established through X/X, X/Ka-band links. We simulated a 4.9 yrs mission with a data spacing of 53 d and an RMS of 50 m. These values are motivated by the highly elliptical orbits of Juno, that allow the precise determination of Jupiter position only at perijoves, that occur every 53 d. The value of the RMS reflects the current uncertainties in the reconstruction of Juno position [38].
5. BC, an ESA-JAXA mission, has been launched on October 19, 2018 and it will enter into Mercury orbit on December 5, 2025. After the orbit insertion there will be the release of two spacecraft. The first one, the Mercury Magnetospheric Orbiter (MMO) will study of the exosphere and the magnetosphere. The other one, the Mercury Planetary Orbiter (MPO), will be placed on a low altitude polar orbit (480 km  $\times$  1500 km altitude, 2.3h period). Onboard the MPO there is an experiment (MORE) devoted to (i) the improvement of the gravity field and rotational state of Mercury (with respect to previous estimates by MSG) and (ii) to perform tests of GR theory. The tracking of the spacecraft is ensured by high accuracy X/X, X/Ka and Ka/Ka band range and Doppler links between the MPO spacecraft and DSN/ESA stations. We generated synthetic normal points for a nominal mission of 2 yrs with a data spacing of 10h and an associated RMS of 4 cm. This assumption is conservatively compliant with the expected performances of the BC ranging for which performances of about  $1.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ cm s}^{-1}$  (at 1000 s integration time) and 15 cm in range (at 300 s integration time) are expected [39].
6. JUICE (JUperiter ICy moons Explorer) is an ESA space mission focused on the study of the icy moons of Jupiter [23]. The launch is set for June 2022 and it will reach the Jupiter system on October 2029.

An orbital phase around Ganymede is planned (5 months of high elliptical orbit plus 4 months of 500 km circular orbit) after several flybys of Europa and Callisto (2.6 yr).

The radio link technology will be the same as the one used on MPO (BC) so the range measurements will have a precision of some cm. However, the positioning error of Jupiter



**Figure 3.** Ratio between the current uncertainties of the parameters and their expected RMS, for all missions. Regarding  $\lambda_g$  we imposed a reference value of  $10^{13}$  km.

**Table 2.** Results for the covariance analysis applied to missions in operation and/or concluded. *A priori* used are reported in table 4 (step 1). We indicate with  $\Delta$  the spacing between consecutive simulated normal points expressed in hours (or days in the case of Juno).

	MSG	MRO	Juno	Cassini
Duration (yr)	4.1	12.0	4.9	13.2
RMS (m)	1.0	1.0	50.0	100.0
$\Delta$ (h)	10.0	10	53d	24
$b_{\min} [R_{\odot}]$	73.7	73.7	73.7	73.7
$\beta$	$4.8 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-5}$	$5.9 \times 10^{-5}$	$5.7 \times 10^{-5}$
$\gamma$	$2.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-5}$
$\eta$	$1.9 \times 10^{-4}$	$6.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-4}$
$\alpha_1$	$1.1 \times 10^{-6}$	$7.4 \times 10^{-7}$	$6.0 \times 10^{-6}$	$5.9 \times 10^{-6}$
$\alpha_2$	$9.6 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.9 \times 10^{-7}$	$3.4 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.9 \times 10^{-5}$
$\mu_0$ (km <sup>3</sup> s <sup>-2</sup> )	0.35	0.25	0.42	0.42
$J_{2\odot}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-8}$
$\zeta$ (yr <sup>-1</sup> )	$4.1 \times 10^{-14}$	$7.8 \times 10^{-15}$	$4.3 \times 10^{-14}$	$4.2 \times 10^{-14}$
$k_{LT}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$
$\lambda_g$ (km)	$3.4 \times 10^{13}$	$1.0 \times 10^{14}$	$8.3 \times 10^{12}$	$5.1 \times 10^{13}$

with respect to the Earth is expected to be of the order of some meters (during the orbital phase to Ganymede [40]). We assume an RMS of 10m during the Ganymede orbital phase and a conservative value of 100m otherwise.

7. VERITAS (Venus Emissivity, Radio Science, InSAR, Topography, and Spectroscopy) is a proposed NASA Discovery-class mission aimed at the exploration of Venus, for which a 2.7 years (4 Venus cycles) orbital phase is planned. The proposed radio link technology



**Table 3.** Results for the covariance analysis applied to BC (using *a priori* reported in table 4, step 2) and to JUICE/VERITAS (using *a priori*, based on BC results, reported in table 4, step 3). We indicate with  $\Delta$  the spacing between consecutive simulated normal points. In some cases, since we assumed conservative *a priori* (see table 4 step 2), some accuracies are larger than those expected after BC indicated by ‘\*’. This means that in these cases the improvement is negligible.

	BC	JUICE	VERITAS
Duration (yr)	2.0	2.6 & 0.8	2.7
RMS (m)	0.04	100.0 & 10.0	0.04
$\Delta$ (h)	10	10	10
$b_{\min}$ [ $R_{\odot}$ ]	7.0	7.0	40.0
$\beta$	$1.7 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.6 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-5}$
$\gamma$	$1.0 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.0 \times 10^{-6}$ *	$1.9 \times 10^{-6}$ *
$\eta$	$6.9 \times 10^{-5}$	$6.2 \times 10^{-5}$	$5.6 \times 10^{-5}$
$\alpha_1$	$3.4 \times 10^{-7}$	$5.0 \times 10^{-7}$ *	$4.0 \times 10^{-7}$ *
$\alpha_2$	$6.7 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-7}$ *	$7.7 \times 10^{-8}$ *
$\mu_0$ ( $\text{km}^3 \text{s}^{-2}$ )	0.08	0.10 *	0.08
$J_{2\odot}$	$2.8 \times 10^{-9}$	$4.5 \times 10^{-9}$ *	$4.3 \times 10^{-9}$ *
$\zeta$ ( $\text{yr}^{-1}$ )	$9.2 \times 10^{-15}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-14}$ *	$9.5 \times 10^{-15}$ *
$k_{\text{LT}}$	$5.3 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$ *	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$ *
$\lambda_g$ (km)	$1.1 \times 10^{14}$	$1.0 \times 10^{14}$	$1.1 \times 10^{14}$

will enable the same performances as MPO (BC). We decided to analyze this proposed mission as a placeholder for possible future missions to Venus equipped with state-of-the-art tracking systems. We simulated a 2.7 yrs mission (starting from May 2028) a data spacing of 10h and an RMS of 4 cm.

#### 4. Results and discussion

First, a preliminary check is conducted analyzing all considered missions imposing the same set of *a priori* (reported in table 4). This first analysis can be considered as a ‘base case scenario’ with respect to the realistic approach that is adopted later on. This is intended to assess preliminarily the effectiveness of each mission with respect to the current state of the art. In figure 3 we report, for each parameter, the ratio between the current uncertainty and the RMS attainable under the aforementioned hypotheses. MRO and BC stand out as most performing among the current and the ‘new’ missions respectively. The detailed numerical values used for figure 3 are reported in table E1.

The actual data analysis approach will be different because, in general, new missions always benefit from the results of the previous ones.

We simulate this approach in three steps: first, by imposing as *a priori* the current knowledge about the parameters we get the covariance matrices for the missions which are currently operative and/or concluded (MSG, Juno, Cassini, MRO).

Afterwards, taking advantage of the results of these missions we define the new set of *a priori* (table 4, step 2) and we use it for the covariance analysis of BC.

Finally, since VERITAS (if confirmed) and JUICE will start to collect data not before year 2028, when the mission BC will be finished, we use the expected results of BC (table 4, step

**Table 4.** *A priori* adopted on the parameters for the covariance analysis in different cases. Step 1: for missions currently operative and/or finished (VEX, MSG, Juno, Cassini, MRO). Step 2: for BC. Step 3: for JUICE and VERITAS.

Parameter	Step 1 (Current)	Step 2 (After MRO, ecc.)	Step 3 (After BC)
$\beta$	$7.0 \times 10^{-5}$ [34]	$3.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.0 \times 10^{-5}$
$\gamma$	$2.3 \times 10^{-5}$ [41]	$2.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.0 \times 10^{-6}$
$\eta$	$4.4 \times 10^{-4}$ [34]	$1.0 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-4}$
$\alpha_1$	$6.0 \times 10^{-6}$ [16]	$1.0 \times 10^{-6}$	$5.0 \times 10^{-7}$
$\alpha_2$	$3.5 \times 10^{-5}$ [16]	$5.0 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-7}$
$\mu_0$ (km <sup>3</sup> s <sup>-2</sup> )	0.42 <sup>a</sup>	0.30	0.10
$J_{2\odot}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-8}$ [30]	$1.1 \times 10^{-8}$	$4.5 \times 10^{-9}$
$\zeta$ (yr <sup>-1</sup> )	$4.3 \times 10^{-14}$ [25]	$1.0 \times 10^{-14}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-14}$
$k_{LT}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$ [43]	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$
$\lambda_g$ (km)	None	$9.0 \times 10^{13}$	$1.0 \times 10^{14}$

<sup>a</sup> For the GM of the Sun we adopted 3 times the uncertainty reported in [42].

3) to define a new set of *a priori* (table 4, step 3) to be considered in the covariance analysis of JUICE/VERITAS.

In all cases we adopt a conservative approach to define the set of *a priori* at each step (results have been rounded up). Moreover, we adopt in all cases the same set of *a priori* for planets/asteroids ephemerides and GMs even if, in the next 15 years, they will be definitely improved. Results for MSG, Juno, Cassini and MRO are reported in table 2, while for BC, JUICE and VERITAS are in table 3.

Comparing the current knowledge (step 1) to the results in table 2 one can notice that the data from MRO are the most promising among the current missions: the improvement, with respect to the current knowledge, spans from a factor 1.7 ( $\mu_0$ ) to 100 ( $\alpha_2$ ) for all parameters except for  $\gamma$ ,  $J_{2\odot}$  and  $k_{LT}$ .

Even in the optimistic case (RMS 100 m), the results obtained from Cassini data are in general worse than those of MRO.

For  $\lambda_g$ , our result agrees with the forecast of [6] regarding the data analysis of MRO (the lower limit we found is  $1.03 \times 10^{14}$  km).

Regarding MSG, the values we found are in general larger than those reported by [9] since we take into account the uncertainty of the Earth's orbit, and the parameters  $\gamma$ ,  $\alpha_1$ ,  $\alpha_2$ . For all missions, the contributions to the measurements of the Sun's angular momentum and  $J_2$  are negligible.

Based on these results, we build the set of *a priori* reported in table 4 (step 2).

Regarding BC, a large improvement (a factor 20) with respect to the results of MRO is expected for the parameter  $\gamma$ . A factor 2–4 of improvement is expected for  $\alpha_1$ ,  $\alpha_2$ ,  $\mu_0$  and  $J_{2\odot}$ . No significant improvements are expected for the other parameters.

Finally, we found that no improvements of the results of BC are expected after the JUICE and VERITAS range data analysis.

## 5. Conclusion

In this work we analyzed the possible outcomes in terms of tests of General Relativity, of the radio tracking data analysis of some past, present and future planetary missions. The results we presented have to be intended as a roadmap to guide future data analysis campaigns aiming to set a new and tighter level of accuracy of validation of the General Relativity theory. The approach we employed is based on an updated version of the covariance analysis method, described in [8], which was initially conceived for the BepiColombo Relativity experiment.

The approach is fully analytical: all the perturbations on planetary orbits are calculated by solving the Hill's equations.


The updating concerns the introduction of the preferred frame parameters ( $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$ ), Eddington parameter  $\gamma$ , Compton wavelength of the graviton ( $\lambda_g$ ) and Lense–Thirring effect of the Sun. We also included the aging of the transponder, the effect of the eccentricity of the Mercury's orbit and the uncertainties of the ephemerides for planets and minor bodies. Finally, the code has been extended to deal with the perturbations between two arbitrary bodies orbiting around the Sun.

With these characteristics the code is suitable to compare the sensitivity to each parameter for space missions orbiting around inner or outer planets.

The method has been first validated by comparing the signatures of the parameters we are interested in with the numerical results for a simulated radio tracking between Earth and Mercury. We verified that the analytical model presents minor discrepancies with respect to the validation model, mainly due to the minor neglected effects, that do not yield to significant differences on the results, in terms of formal uncertainties. Afterwards, we sequentially performed a covariance analysis to (1) five still operative and/or finished interplanetary missions (2) to BepiColombo and (3) to two missions still to be launched (JUICE) and/or approved (VERITAS). Each step benefits from the results of the previous one. We conclude that a significant improvement of the current knowledge can come after the analysis of the range data of MRO. The next important improvement, mainly for the parameter  $\gamma$ , will be carried out by BC data. We want to stress that our simulations are based on a data analysis strategy that considers only one mission at a time, eventually employing as *a priori* the results of other missions. It has been preliminarily shown in [44] that a strategy based on the simultaneous data analysis of several missions might lead to a further reduction of the formal uncertainties on the parameters of interest via an effective reduction of their correlations. Thus our results represent the first, but fundamental, step towards future combined analysis works.

## Acknowledgments

The research presented in this work has been carried out at Sapienza University of Rome under a partial sponsorship of the Italian Space Agency within the scope of the contract ASI/2007/1/082/06/0. The authors would like to acknowledge A Genova for suggesting the relevance of including the mass of the graviton in the analysis, P Racioppa for comments that greatly improved appendix F, P Cappuccio, V Notaro, D Durante, L Iess for the fruitful discussions about the uncertainty associated with the measurements of JUICE, Juno and Cassini, G Schettino and G Tommei for the continuous confrontation on the rescaling constraint. Finally, the authors would also like to acknowledge the two anonymous referees for their careful reading of the manuscript and for their remarks and suggestions.



**Figure A1.** Scheme of the Hill's rotating frame.

## Appendix A. Hill's equations and particular solutions

The equations of motion of a planet  $i$  in heliocentric coordinates are

$$\ddot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i} = -\frac{\mu_0 + \mu_i}{r_{0i}^3} \mathbf{r}_{0i} + \delta \mathbf{f} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where the first term is the Sun's attraction and  $\delta \mathbf{f}$  represents all small perturbations to the Keplerian 2-body orbit, including (i) the planet–planet interactions (ii) the Sun's acceleration with respect to the Solar System Barycenter (iii) forces due to the parameters of our interest.

Consider a rotating frame (the Hill's frame) defined as follows: (1) the origin rotates around the Sun on the ecliptic plane with angular velocity equal to the mean motion  $n_i$  and distance equal to the semimajor axis  $R_{0i}$ ; (2) the axes are radial ( $r$ ), along-track ( $t$ ) and out-of-plane ( $w$ ). With respect to a fixed frame, they are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_r^i &= \{\cos(n_i t + \varphi_i), \sin(n_i t + \varphi_i), 0\}, \\ \mathbf{u}_t^i &= \{-\sin(n_i t + \varphi_i), \cos(n_i t + \varphi_i), 0\}, \\ \mathbf{u}_w^i &= \{0, 0, 1\}; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where  $\varphi_i$  is the initial phase. Defining  $\{\delta r_i, \delta t_i, \delta w_i\}$  the position of the planet  $i$  (see figure A1) in the Hill's frame, the transformations from/to heliocentric coordinates ( $\mathbf{r}_{0i}, \dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i}, \ddot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i}$ ) are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}_{0i} &= (R_{0i} + \delta r_i) \mathbf{u}_r^i + \delta t_i \mathbf{u}_t^i + \delta w_i \mathbf{u}_w^i; \\ \dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i} &= (\dot{\delta r}_i - n_i \delta t_i) \mathbf{u}_r^i + [n_i (R_{0i} + \delta r_i) + \dot{\delta t}_i] \mathbf{u}_t^i + \dot{\delta w}_i \mathbf{u}_w^i; \\ \ddot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i} &= [\ddot{\delta r}_i - 2n_i \dot{\delta t}_i - n_i^2 (R_{0i} + \delta r_i)] \mathbf{u}_r^i + [\ddot{\delta t}_i + 2n_i \dot{\delta r}_i - n_i^2 \delta t_i] \mathbf{u}_t^i + \ddot{\delta w}_i \mathbf{u}_w^i. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Assuming that all components are small with respect to  $R_{0i}$ , the Sun's attraction into From equations (A.3) and (A.1) can be expanded at the first order (see equation (B.1b) with  $n = 3$  and  $e_i = 0$ ). Equation (A.1) in the Hill's frame becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \ddot{r}_i - 2n_i \delta \dot{t}_i - 3n_i^2 \delta r_i &= \delta \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i^i; \\
\delta \ddot{t}_i + 2n_i \delta \dot{r}_i &= \delta \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i^i; \\
\delta \ddot{w}_i + n_i^2 \delta w_i &= \delta \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{u}_w^i.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

All perturbations  $\delta \mathbf{f}$  described in this work can be expressed, in the Hill's frame, in terms of sinusoidal and polynomials functions of time, the bigger degree being 3. Neglecting the out-of-plane components, the equations of motion to be solved are

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \ddot{r}_i - 2n_i \delta \dot{t}_i - 3n_i^2 \delta r_i &= \sum_{i=0}^3 A_{r,i} t^i + \sum_j [C_{r,j} \cos(n_j t) + S_{r,j} \sin(n_j t)] + \hat{C}_r \cos(n_i t) + \hat{S}_r \sin(n_i t); \\
\delta \ddot{t}_i + 2n_i \delta \dot{r}_i &= \sum_{i=0}^3 A_{t,i} t^i + \sum_j [C_{t,j} \cos(n_j t) + S_{t,j} \sin(n_j t)] + \hat{C}_t \cos(n_i t) + \hat{S}_t \sin(n_i t);
\end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

where all  $(A, S, C, \hat{S}, \hat{C})$  coefficients are constants depending on the given perturbation. We indicated with the symbol  $(\wedge)$  the *resonant* terms. Non-resonant frequencies  $n_j \neq n_i$  are arbitrary.

Being equation (A.5) linear, the most general solution is the sum of polynomial (*pol*), resonant (*res*), non-homogeneous (*nh*) and homogeneous (*h*) terms (we drop the index  $i$  for simplicity)

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta r &= \delta r_{\text{pol}} + \delta r_{\text{res}} + \delta r_{\text{nh}} + \delta r_h; \\
\delta t &= \delta t_{\text{pol}} + \delta t_{\text{res}} + \delta t_{\text{nh}} + \delta t_h.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

Solutions for polynomial trends are

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta r_{\text{pol}} &= \mathcal{P}_R \cdot \{A_{r0}, A_{r1}, A_{r2}, A_{r3}, A_{t0}, A_{t1}, A_{t2}, A_{t3}\}; \\
\delta t_{\text{pol}} &= \mathcal{P}_T \cdot \{A_{r0}, A_{r1}, A_{r2}, A_{r3}, A_{t0}, A_{t1}, A_{t2}, A_{t3}\};
\end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_R &= \left\{ \frac{1}{n^2}, \frac{t}{n^2}, \frac{n^2 t^2 - 2}{n^4}, \frac{t(n^2 t^2 - 6)}{n^4}, \frac{2t}{n}, \frac{n^2 t^2 - 2}{n^3}, \frac{2t(n^2 t^2 - 6)}{3n^3}, \frac{n^4 t^4 - 12n^2 t^2 + 24}{2n^5} \right\}; \\
\mathcal{P}_T &= \left\{ -\frac{2t}{n}, -\frac{t^2}{n}, -\frac{2t(n^2 t^2 - 6)}{3n^3}, \frac{6t^2}{n^3}, -\frac{t^4}{2n}, -\frac{3t^2}{2}, \frac{4t}{n^2}, -\frac{t^3}{2}, \frac{4t^2}{n^2}, -\frac{t^4}{4}, -\frac{24t}{n^4} + \frac{4t^3}{n^2} - \frac{3t^5}{20} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.8}$$

Resonant contributions are in the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta r_{\text{res}} &= \mathcal{R}_R \cdot \{\hat{S}_r, \hat{C}_r, \hat{S}_t, \hat{C}_t\}; \\
\delta t_{\text{res}} &= \mathcal{R}_T \cdot \{\hat{S}_r, \hat{C}_r, \hat{S}_t, \hat{C}_t\};
\end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_R &= \left\{ -\frac{t \cos(nt)}{2n}, \frac{t \sin(nt)}{2n}, -\frac{t \sin(nt)}{n}, -\frac{t \cos(nt)}{n} \right\}; \\
\mathcal{R}_T &= \left\{ \frac{nt \sin(nt) + \cos(nt)}{n^2}, \frac{nt \cos(nt) - \sin(nt)}{n^2}, \frac{\sin(nt) - 2nt \cos(nt)}{n^2}, \frac{2nt \sin(nt) + \cos(nt)}{n^2} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.10}$$

Non-homogeneous solutions are ( $n_j \neq n$ )

$$\begin{aligned}\delta r_{nh} &= \sum_j \mathcal{N}_{R,j} \cdot \{S_{r,j}, C_{r,j}, S_{t,j}, C_{t,j}\}; \\ \delta t_{nh} &= \sum_j \mathcal{N}_{T,j} \cdot \{S_{r,j}, C_{r,j}, S_{t,j}, C_{t,j}\};\end{aligned}\tag{A.11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}_{R,j} &= \left\{ \frac{\sin(n_j t)}{n^2 - n_j^2}, \frac{\cos(n_j t)}{n^2 - n_j^2}, \frac{2n \cos(n_j t)}{n_j^3 - n^2 n_j}, \frac{2n \sin(n_j t)}{n^2 n_j - n_j^3} \right\}; \\ \mathcal{N}_{T,j} &= \left\{ \frac{2n \cos(n_j t)}{n^2 n_j - n_j^3}, \frac{2n \sin(n_j t)}{n_j^3 - n^2 n_j}, \frac{(n_j^2 + 3n^2) \sin(n_j t)}{n_j^2 (n^2 - n_j^2)}, \frac{(n_j^2 + 3n^2) \cos(n_j t)}{n_j^2 (n^2 - n_j^2)} \right\}.\end{aligned}\tag{A.12}$$

Finally, defining the initial conditions  $\{r_0, t_0, \dot{r}_0, \dot{t}_0\} = \{\delta r_i(0), \delta t_i(0), \delta \dot{r}_i(0), \delta \dot{t}_i(0)\}$ , the homogeneous solutions are

$$\begin{aligned}\delta r_h &= -[3r_0 + (2\dot{t}_0/n)] \cos(nt) + (\dot{r}_0/n) \sin(nt) + 4r_0 + 2\dot{t}_0/n; \\ \delta t_h &= t_0 - 2\dot{r}_0/n - (6nr_0 + 3t_0)t + [6r_0 + (4\dot{t}_0/n)] \sin(nt) + (2\dot{r}_0/n) \cos(nt).\end{aligned}\tag{A.13}$$

## Appendix B. First order corrections for eccentricity

In this section we report the first-order expansions used in the calculus of the perturbations described in section 2.1.

All terms into equations (12), (13), (16), (20) and (28) can be written using equation (6) and the following formulas (where  $n \neq 0$ )

$$\frac{1}{(r_{0i})^n} \approx \frac{1}{(R_{0i})^n} (1 + e_i n \cos \Phi_i);\tag{B.1a}$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{r}_{0i}}{(r_{0i})^n} \approx \frac{1 + e_i \cos \Phi_i (n-1)}{R_{0i}^{n-1}} \mathbf{u}_r^i + e_i \frac{2 \sin \Phi_i}{R_{0i}^{n-1}} \mathbf{u}_t^i;\tag{B.1b}$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i} \approx n_i R_{0i} \mathbf{u}_r^i + e_i n_i R_{0i} (\sin \Phi_i \mathbf{u}_r^i + \cos \Phi_i \mathbf{u}_t^i);\tag{B.1c}$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{r}_{0i} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i}}{r_{0i}^3} \dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i} \approx e_i n_i^2 \sin \Phi_i \mathbf{u}_t^i;\tag{B.1d}$$

$$(\dot{r}_{0i})^2 \frac{\mathbf{r}_{0i}}{r_{0i}^3} \approx n_i^2 (1 + 4e_i \cos \Phi_i) \mathbf{u}_r^i + 2e_i n_i^2 \sin \Phi_i \mathbf{u}_t^i;\tag{B.1e}$$

$$\frac{\dot{\mathbf{r}}_{0i}}{r_{0i}^3} \times \{0, 0, 1\} \approx \frac{n_i}{R_{0i}^2} [1 + 4e_i \cos \Phi_i \mathbf{u}_r^i + e_i \sin \Phi_i \mathbf{u}_t^i];\tag{B.1f}$$

Regarding the planet–planet interactions terms, assuming  $e_j = 0$  for all  $j \neq i$ , from equation (6) the  $i$ -to- $j$  vector is

$$\mathbf{r}_{ij} = \mathbf{R}_{ij} - e_i \mathbf{R}_i^e\tag{B.2}$$

where  $\mathbf{R}_{ij} = R_{0j}\mathbf{u}_r^j - R_{0i}\mathbf{u}_r^i$  is the same vector in circular approximation. We get

$$\frac{\mathbf{r}_{ij}}{(r_{ij})^n} \approx \frac{1}{(R_{ij})^n} \left[ \mathbf{R}_{ij} + e_i \left( \mathbf{R}_i^e + n \frac{\mathbf{R}_i^e \cdot \mathbf{R}_{ij}}{R_{ij}^2} \right) \right] \quad (\text{B.3})$$

that has been used to evaluate the  $(ij)$ -term into equations (8) and (28).

Finally, the quantity  $1/(R_{ij})^n$  can be obtained in terms of sinusoidal functions by applying the power-reduction formulae to the well known series expansion (valid for  $R_{0i} < R_{0k}$ )

$$\frac{1}{R_{ij}} = \frac{1}{R_{0j}} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{R_{0i}}{R_{0k}} \right)^l P_l(\cos \Phi_{ij}) \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where  $P_l$  are the Legendre polynomials.

### Appendix C. Validation of the code. Comparison with numerical results

Here we report a comparison between the numerical and analytical perturbations on a simulated set of Earth–Mercury range data due to some parameters of our interest. The numerical simulations have been performed using Jet Propulsion Laboratory’s software MONTE [45]. A number of parameters of our interest are already implemented in MONTE (such as  $\gamma, \beta, k_{\text{LT}}, J_{2\odot}$ ). For the remaining parameters we custom-implemented the forces and partial derivatives, basing on the expression reported in [8, 31, 46]. A certain number of effects we neglected are at the origin of the discrepancies ( $\approx 15\%$ – $20\%$ ) first of all, the equations of motion we used are valid for small eccentricities of bodies  $i$  and  $k$  (in figure D1 Mercury and Earth, respectively). Moreover, we neglected planet–planet interactions (except for the parameter  $\eta$  [8]), orbital inclinations, while eccentricities of the perturbing bodies have been modeled with a first order expansion only.

### Appendix D. Range perturbations for different missions

Here we report a collection of the signals of some parameters for different missions. Regarding  $\eta$  we report a comparison between ‘barycentric’ and ‘heliocentric’ signatures (see section 2.2.1). In some cases ( $\beta, \gamma, J_{2\odot}$  and  $k_{\text{LT}}$ ) the advantage of a mission to Mercury is apparent. For  $\lambda_g$ , on the contrary, the Earth–Jupiter and Earth–Saturn range signals are the largest ones.


### Appendix E. Performance test for all missions

For all missions considered in this work, we report the outputs relative to the same set of *a priori* (i.e. the current knowledge about the parameters, see section 4 for details).


### Appendix F. Constraint proof

In this appendix we prove that in a minimum variance least squares (MVLS) orbit determination problem, in which linear constraints on the solve-for parameters are applied, the covariance matrix is independent of the epoch at which the constraints are specified. The general solution of the MVLS can be written as





**Figure C1.** Comparison between numerical (black points) and analytical (red points) Earth–Mercury range perturbations due to some parameters of our interest.



**Figure D1.** Perturbations on range signal due to some parameters of our interest in different cases: Earth-Mercury (blue), Earth-Venus (yellow), Earth-Mars (green), Earth-Jupiter (red) and Earth-Saturn (black).

**Table E1.** Results for the covariance analysis applied to all missions with the current uncertainties as *a priori*.

	MSG	MRO	Juno	Cassini	BC	JUICE	VERITAS
Duration (yr)	4.1	12.0	4.9	13.2	2.0	2.6 & 0.8	2.7
RMS (m)	1.0	1.0	50.0	100.0	0.04	100.0 & 10.0	0.04
$\Delta$ (h)	10.0	10	53d	24	10	10	10
$b_{\min}$ [ $R_{\odot}$ ]	73.7	73.7	73.7	73.7	7.0	7.0	40.0
$\beta$	$4.8 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-5}$	$5.9 \times 10^{-5}$	$5.7 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.6 \times 10^{-5}$	$5.9 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.6 \times 10^{-5}$
$\gamma$	$2.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-5}$	$8.5 \times 10^{-6}$
$\eta$	$1.9 \times 10^{-4}$	$6.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.9 \times 10^{-4}$
$\alpha_1$	$1.1 \times 10^{-6}$	$7.4 \times 10^{-7}$	$6.0 \times 10^{-6}$	$5.9 \times 10^{-6}$	$5.6 \times 10^{-7}$	$5.9 \times 10^{-6}$	$8.6 \times 10^{-7}$
$\alpha_2$	$9.6 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.9 \times 10^{-7}$	$3.4 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.9 \times 10^{-5}$	$7.4 \times 10^{-8}$	$2.9 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.3 \times 10^{-7}$
$\mu_0$ ( $\text{km}^3 \text{s}^{-2}$ )	0.35	0.25	0.42	0.42	0.15	0.42	0.26
$J_{2\odot}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-8}$	$4.6 \times 10^{-9}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-8}$
$\zeta$ ( $\text{yr}^{-1}$ )	$4.1 \times 10^{-14}$	$7.8 \times 10^{-15}$	$4.3 \times 10^{-14}$	$4.2 \times 10^{-14}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-14}$	$4.3 \times 10^{-14}$	$3.8 \times 10^{-14}$
$k_{\text{LT}}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.3 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$
$\lambda_g$ (km)	$3.4 \times 10^{13}$	$1.0 \times 10^{14}$	$8.3 \times 10^{12}$	$5.1 \times 10^{13}$	$8.8 \times 10^{13}$	$1.5 \times 10^{13}$	$6.6 \times 10^{13}$

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0 = (\mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{H})^{-1} \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y} \quad (\text{F.1})$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0$  is the vector of differential corrections to the solve-for parameters computed at epoch  $t = t_0$ ,  $\mathbf{H}$  is the design matrix,  $\mathbf{W}$  is the weight matrix (that in the MVLS corresponds to the inverse of the observation noise covariance matrix) and  $\mathbf{y}$  is the observation deviation vector (for the derivation of the solution see [47]). Note that we did not include *a priori* informations in the solution for a matter of simplicity, but their inclusion would be straightforward. One or more linear constraints (as for example fixing the X coordinate of the Earth at a certain epoch) can be introduced in the problem and the easiest way to factor them in is to treat them as additional observations. We can write a generic set of  $n_c$  linear constraints as

$$c_0 = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_0 - M(t) = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_C) \quad (\text{F.2})$$

$\mathbf{C}$  is the matrix (of dimensions  $n_c \times n$ , with  $n$  the number of state parameters) describing the linear combination of state parameters entering the constraint,  $M$  is the set of constrained values and  $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_C)$  denotes a normal distribution with 0 mean and covariance matrix  $\Sigma_C$ . Note that in the MVLS approach the weights associated to  $c_0$  correspond to  $\Sigma_C^{-1}$ . If the constraints are given at the estimation epoch (i.e. at  $t = t_0$ ) the design matrix, when the constraints are factored in, becomes:

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{H}} \\ \frac{\partial c_0}{\partial \mathbf{x}_0} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{H}} \\ \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{F.3})$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{H}}$  is the partition of  $\mathbf{H}$  relative to the actual radiometric observations and  $\frac{\partial c_0}{\partial \mathbf{x}_0} = \mathbf{C}$  is the additional block due to the constraints. The weight matrix can be in the same way partitioned as

$$\mathbf{W} = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} \bar{\mathbf{W}} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \Sigma_C^{-1} \end{array} \right]. \quad (\text{F.4})$$

thus the inverse of the state covariance matrix at time  $t_0$ ,  $\mathbf{P}^{-1}$  can be written as:

$$\mathbf{P}^{-1} = \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{H} = \bar{\mathbf{H}}^T \bar{\mathbf{W}} \bar{\mathbf{H}} + \mathbf{C}^T \Sigma_C^{-1} \mathbf{C}. \quad (\text{F.5})$$

In general, the constraints can be specified at any time ( $t = t_1$ ) different from the estimation epoch:

$$\mathbf{c}_1 = \mathbf{C}^* \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{M}_1(t) = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_C). \quad (\text{F.6})$$

The constraints must provide the same amount of information independently of the epoch at which they are specified. This means that the partial derivatives of the constraints with respect to the state vector must remain unchanged. Thus, without losing generality, we can write:

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{c}_1}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{c}_0}{\partial \mathbf{x}_0} \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_0}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1} = \mathbf{C} \Phi(t_0, t_1) = \mathbf{C} \Phi^{-1}(t_1, t_0) \quad (\text{F.7})$$

Where  $\Phi(t_1, t_0)$  is the state transition matrix that maps the state from  $t_0$  to  $t_1$  (for a complete discussion about the state transition matrix refer to [47]). From (F.7) we can write:

$$\mathbf{C}^* = \mathbf{C} \Phi^{-1}(t_1, t_0). \quad (\text{F.8})$$

Using the constraints given at epoch  $t_1$  the mapping matrix (referred always to the estimation epoch  $t_0$ ):

$$\mathbf{H} = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \bar{\mathbf{H}} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{c}_1}{\partial \mathbf{x}_0} \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \bar{\mathbf{H}} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{c}_1}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1} \Phi(t_1, t_0) \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \bar{\mathbf{H}} \\ \mathbf{C}^* \Phi(t_1, t_0) \end{array} \right]. \quad (\text{F.9})$$

Then the covariance matrix:

$$\mathbf{P}^{-1} = \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{H} = \bar{\mathbf{H}}^T \bar{\mathbf{W}} \bar{\mathbf{H}} + \Phi^T(t_1, t_0) \mathbf{C}^{*T} \Sigma_C^{-1} \mathbf{C}^* \Phi(t_1, t_0) \quad (\text{F.10})$$

and substituting (F.8) in (F.12)

$$\mathbf{P}^{-1} = \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{H} = \bar{\mathbf{H}}^T \bar{\mathbf{W}} \bar{\mathbf{H}} + \Phi^T(t_1, t_0) (\Phi^T(t_1, t_0))^{-1} \mathbf{C}^T \Sigma_C^{-1} \mathbf{C} \Phi^{-1}(t_1, t_0) \Phi(t_1, t_0). \quad (\text{F.11})$$

Thus:

$$\mathbf{P}^{-1} = \bar{\mathbf{H}}^T \bar{\mathbf{W}} \bar{\mathbf{H}} + \mathbf{C}^T \Sigma_C^{-1} \mathbf{C}. \quad (\text{F.12})$$

We proved that if the *a priori* uncertainties on the constraints are properly mapped the inverse of the covariance matrix is unchanged. We can conclude that also the covariance matrix will remain unchanged.

## ORCID iDs

Fabrizio De Marchi  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3217-369X>

Gael Cascioli  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9070-7947>

## References

- [1] Will C M 1993 *Theory and Experiment in Gravitational Physics* ed C M Will (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) p 396
- [2] Shapiro I I 1964 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** 789
- [3] Adelberger E G, Gundlach J H, Heckel B R, Hoedl S and Schlamminger S 2009 *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **62** 102
- [4] Nordtvedt K Jr 1970 *ApJ* **161** 1059
- [5] Lense J and Thirring H 1918 *Phys. Z.* **19** 156–63
- [6] Will C M 2018 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **35** 17LT01
- [7] Folkner W M *et al* *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **44** 4694
- [8] De Marchi F, Tommei G, Milani A and Schettino G 2016 *Phys. Rev. D* **93** 123014
- [9] Genova A, Mazarico E, Goossens S, Lemoine F G, Neumann G A, Smith D E and Zuber M T 2018 *Nat. Commun.* **9** 289
- [10] Moyer T D 2003 *Formulation for Observed and Computed Values of Deep Space Network Data Types for Navigation* (JPL Deep Space Communications and Navigation System Center of Excellence (DESCANSO)) (New York: Wiley) (<https://doi.org/10.1002/0471728470>)
- [11] Clohessy W H and Wiltshire R S 1960 *J. Aerosp. Sci.* **27** 653
- [12] Brouwer D and Clemence G M 1961 *Methods of Celestial Mechanics* (New York: Academic) (<https://doi.org/10.1016/C2013-0-08160-1>)
- [13] De Marchi F, Pucacco G and Bassan M 2012 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **29** 035009
- [14] Durrer R 2015 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **32** 124007
- [15] Iorio L 2012 *Solar Phys.* **281** 815
- [16] Iorio L 2014 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **23** 1450006
- [17] Bertotti B, Comoretto G and Iess L 1993 *Astron. Astrophys.* **269** 608–16
- [18] Goldhaber A S and Nieto M M 1974 *Phys. Rev. D* **9** 1119
- [19] Hare M G 1973 *Can. J. Phys.* **51** 431
- [20] de Rham C, Deskins J T, Tolley A J and Zhou S Y 2017 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89** 025004
- [21] Talmadge C, Berthias J P, Hellings R W and Standish E M 1988 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61** 1159
- [22] Bernus L, Minazzoli O, Fienga A, Gastineau M, Laskar J and Deram P 2019 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123** 161103
- [23] Cappuccio P, Di Benedetto M, Cascioli G and Iess L 2018 *Adv. Astron. Sci.* **167** 3551–61
- [24] Milani A and Gronchi G F 2010 *Theory of orbital determination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- [25] Schettino G and Tommei G 2016 *Universe* **2** 21
- [26] Hohenkerk C *et al* 2016 *Trans. Int. Astron. Union A* **29** 1
- [27] Notaro V 2019 private communication
- [28] Mazarico E, Genova A, Goossens S, Lemoine F G, Neumann G A, Zuber M T, Smith D E and Solomon S C 2014 *J. Geophys. Res.* **119** 2417
- [29] Luzum B *et al* 2011 *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.* **110** 293
- [30] Schettino G, Serra D, Tommei G and Milani A 2018 *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.* **130** 72
- [31] Milani A, Vokrouhlický D, Villani D, Bonanno C and Rossi A 2002 *Phys. Rev. D* **66** 082001
- [32] De Marchi F and Iess L 2018 *5th IEEE Int. Workshop on Metrology for AeroSpace, MetroAeroSpace 2018—Proc.* pp 203–8
- [33] Standish E and Williams E 1992 *Explanatory Supplement to the Astronomical Almanac* ed P K Seidelmann (Mill Valley, CA: University Books) p 279
- [34] Imperi L, Iess L and Mariani M J 2018 *Icarus* **301** 9025
- [35] Simone L, Maffei M, Gelfusa D and Boscagli G 2008 *2008 10th Int. Workshop on Signal Processing for Space Communications* (Piscataway, NJ: IEEE)
- [36] Srinivasan D K, Perry M E, Fielhauer K B, Smith D E and Zuber M T 2007 *Space Sci. Rev.* **131** 557
- [37] Zuber M T, Lemoine F G, Smith D E, Konopliv A S, Smrekar S E and Asmar S W 2007 *J. Geophys. Res.* **112** 5–7
- [38] Durante D 2019 private communication
- [39] Iess L and Boscagli G 2001 *Planet. Space Sci.* **49** 1597
- [40] Cappuccio P, Hickey A, Durante D, Di Benedetto M, Iess L, Milillo A and Mura A 2020 Ganymede’s gravity, rotational state and exospheric density from juice’s 3gm experiment simulation to be (submitted)

- [41] Bertotti B, Iess L and Tortora P 2003 *Nature* **425** 374
- [42] Fienga A, Laskar J, Exertier P, Manche H and Gastineau M 2015 *Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astron.* **123** 325
- [43] Park R S, Folkner W M, Konopliv A S, Williams J G, Smith D E and Zuber M T 2017 *Astron. J.* **153** 121
- [44] Cascioli G, Genova A, Iess L, Mazarico E and Smith D 2019 *Geophys. Res. Abstr.* **21** 14220
- [45] Evans S, Taber W, Drain T, Smith J, Wu H C, Guevara M, Sunseri R and Evans J 2018 *CEAS Space J.* **10** 79
- [46] Ashby N, Bender P L and Wahr J M 2007 *Phys. Rev. D* **75** 022001
- [47] Tapley B, Schutz B and Born G 2004 *Statistical Orbit Determination* (Amsterdam: Elsevier) (<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-683630-1.X5019-X>)