

A Light Sail Astrobiology Precursor Mission to Enceladus and Europa

Manasvi Lingam^{a,b,*}, Adam Hibberd^c and Andreas M. Hein^{d,c}

^aDepartment of Aerospace, Physics and Space Sciences, Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, 32901, FL, USA

^bDepartment of Physics and Institute for Fusion Studies, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, 78712, TX, USA

^cInitiative for Interstellar Studies (i4is), 27/29 South Lambeth Road, London, SW8 1SZ, UK

^dSnT, University of Luxembourg, 29 Avenue J.F. Kennedy, L-1855, Luxembourg

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

astrobiology
biosignatures
flyby missions
deep space exploration
light sails
Enceladus
Europa

ABSTRACT

Icy moons with subsurface oceans of liquid water rank among the most promising astrobiological targets in our Solar System. In this work, we assess the feasibility of deploying laser sail technology in precursor life-detection missions. We investigate such laser sail missions to Enceladus and Europa, as these two moons emit plumes that seem accessible to in situ sampling. Our study suggests that GigaWatt laser technology could accelerate a 100 kg probe to a speed of $\sim 30 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, thereupon reaching Europa on timescales of 1-4 years and Enceladus with flight times of 3-6 years. Although the ideal latitudes for the laser array vary, placing the requisite infrastructure close to either the Antarctic or Arctic Circles might represent technically viable options for an Enceladus mission. Crucially, we determine that the minimum encounter velocities with these moons (about 6 km s^{-1}) may be near-optimal for detecting biomolecular building blocks (e.g., amino acids) in the plumes by means of a mass spectrometer akin to the Surface Dust Analyzer onboard the *Europa Clipper* mission. In summary, icy moons in the Solar System are potentially well-suited for exploration via the laser sail architecture approach, especially where low encounter speeds and/or multiple missions are desirable.

1. Introduction

Resolving the fundamental question of “*Are we alone?*” has witnessed much progress in the 21st century [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. In particular, a significant amount of attention has been devoted to the so-called icy worlds – also known as ocean worlds – in our Solar System (e.g., Enceladus, Titan, and Europa) that are empirically confirmed to harbor subsurface oceans of liquid water, which is one of the key requirements for life-as-we-know-it [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. Hence, these worlds are widely perceived as promising abodes of extraterrestrial life.

Among these icy worlds, Saturn’s small moon Enceladus (with radius of $\sim 250 \text{ km}$) stands out by virtue of the wealth of data garnered by the *Cassini-Huygens* mission [17]. Enceladus not only hosts liquid water underneath its surface [18, 19, 20], but also satisfies the other major criteria for habitability [21, 22, 23], such as free energy sources [24, 25, 26, 27] and bioessential elements [28, 29, 30].¹ Furthermore, the discovery and modeling of submarine hydrothermal activity is promising [24, 35, 25], because these environments are considered viable sites for engendering prebiotic chemistry and the origin(s) of life [36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41]. A number of theoretical [42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 27] and experimental [48, 49, 50] studies indicate that Enceladus’ internal ocean might be habitable for various species of Earth-based microbes (e.g., hydrogenotrophic methanogens).

Jupiter’s moon, Europa, harbors a deep subsurface ocean that ostensibly contains more liquid water than all of Earth’s oceans combined [4, 6]. The habitability of Europa’s subsurface ocean has been extensively investigated, and while not as much empirical data is available (in comparison to Enceladus), this moon is also presumed to satisfy most of the salient requirements in this respect [e.g., 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 5, 61, 62, 27, 9]. The upcoming *Europa Clipper* mission [63, 64],² and the *JUICE* mission to a comparatively lesser extent [65, 66],³ will significantly enhance our knowledge of Europa’s subsurface ocean.

A striking feature of Enceladus is the existence of a substantial (time-varying) plume [67, 68, 69, 70], which extends up to $\sim 10^4 \text{ km}$ [71]. Likewise, there is evidence for plumes on Europa [72, 73, 74, 75, 76], although these features may be transient [77, 78, 79] and/or harder to detect [80, 81]. The access to plume samples would be valuable because they can shed light on the habitability of the subsurface ocean, as well as potentially enable the detection of molecular biosignatures (i.e., markers of life) [82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88], although unraveling the latter has attendant caveats, subtleties, and lacunae [89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95].

A variety of putative life-detection missions to Enceladus have thus been proposed in the 2020s [96, 97, 98, 99, 100],⁴ many of which have acquired greater relevance in light of the strong recommendation made by the comprehensive 2023-2032 *Decadal Strategy for Planetary Science and Astrobiology* for a flagship mission to Enceladus that would arrive at this moon in the early 2050s [102, pg. 7]. The mission concept highlighted in the Decadal Strategy was the

*Corresponding author

✉ mlingam@fit.edu (M. Lingam)

ORCID(S): 0000-0002-2685-9417 (M. Lingam); 0000-0003-1116-576X (A. Hibberd); 0000-0003-1763-6892 (A.M. Hein)

¹Previous models suggested that dissolved phosphorus might be scarce in Enceladus’ ocean [31, 32], but this prediction has been overturned by recent empirical and computational findings [33, 30, 34].

²<https://europa.nasa.gov/>

³https://www.esa.int/Science_Exploration/Space_Science/Juice

⁴Similar recommendations have been advanced for Europa, such as the *Europa Lander* mission concept [101].

Enceladus Orbilander concept [103], but alternatives such as the *Enceladus Multiple Flyby* mission were also outlined. From a technological standpoint, the implementation of a plume fly-through mission is much easier than direct (i.e., in situ) exploration of the subsurface ocean [104].

For missions that are geared toward sampling the plume(s), the encounter velocity of the spacecraft is rendered crucial from the perspective of identifying putative biosignatures. A multitude of publications have advocated for optimal encounter velocities in the range of around 4-6 km s⁻¹ [105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111], although a few studies based on other in situ techniques have posited either lower [112, 86, 113] or higher [114] speeds. Hence, mission concepts that seek to analyze the plume(s) of icy moons with subsurface oceans (i.e., ocean worlds) should ideally minimize the encounter velocity of the spacecraft with the moon and its plume(s), as this constraint could maximize the prospects of detecting putative biosignatures.

Mission proposals to ocean worlds have hitherto relied on rocket propulsion in combination with flyby maneuvers. However, an inherent limitation of rocket propulsion is the associated mass budget and cost of the mission. In this context, propellant-free propulsion, notably light sails, could be used, which are often low thrust and can only accommodate a low-mass payload; fortunately, recent advances in hardware and software are swiftly reducing the mass and cost of the payload [115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121]. We will, therefore, explore the capacity of light sails powered by laser arrays (i.e., laser sails) – which do not necessitate onboard propellant – to effectuate a life-detection mission to Enceladus and Europa. The concept of light sails originated approximately a century ago [122, 123], while laser sails were proposed in the mid 20th century [124, 125]. However, research pertaining to laser sails has only taken off during the last decade [126, 127, 128], driven in large part, either directly or indirectly, by the *Breakthrough Starshot* initiative [129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 6, 136, 137].⁵

While it is true that light sails have not been currently employed in actual deep space missions, we underscore the fact that the technology readiness level (TRL) of solar sails, which are closely associated with laser sails, is as high as 7 to 9 [138, 139]. To give specific examples, the *IKAROS* [140] and *LightSail 2* [141, 142] spacecraft have demonstrated capabilities for achieving interplanetary missions; more recently, a prototype of a SunDiver technology demonstrator spacecraft is under development [139, 143]. Moreover, the technical details of designing and deploying solar and laser sails have witnessed extensive theoretical research [144, 145, 146, 131, 132, 138, 137, 127, 128].

Selecting concrete targets (Enceladus or Europa) and delineating the specifics of precursor astrobiology missions to these worlds permits us to analyze and illuminate the pros (and cons) of employing laser sails in the exciting domain of carrying out extensive deep space exploration of the outer Solar System – a new era envisioned by several publications [6, 127, 147, 148, 149, 139] – which constitutes

a key rationale for this paper. To the best of our knowledge, laser sail mission concepts to Enceladus or Europa have not been explicated so far despite the aforementioned benefits.

This paper assesses and subsequently demonstrates the viability of an astrobiology precursor mission to Enceladus and Europa based on a light sail architecture powered by a GigaWatt laser array. The viability is demonstrated by the identification of mission architectures where the sailcraft would encounter both bodies at relative velocities that would enable plume sampling. In Section 2, we describe the numerical code and setup used for computing optimal laser sail trajectories to Europa and Enceladus. We follow this up by presenting the major results for Europa and Enceladus in Section 3. The implications of our analysis with regard to sending life-detection missions to ocean worlds by means of laser sails are outlined in Section 4. Finally, we take stock and summarize our conclusions in Section 5.

2. Methods

The orbital dynamics analysis herein utilizes a modified version of the MATLAB code *Optimum Interplanetary Trajectory Software* (OITS) (see [150]), and further harnesses the Non-Linear Problem (NLP) solving software MIDACO [151, 152, 153]. The theory and structure underpinning OITS, in addition to the MATLAB code itself, can all be accessed from [150]. Note that OITS has been successfully employed for trajectory design and analysis in a variety of Solar System contexts, ranging from interstellar objects on hyperbolic orbits to terrestrial planets like Venus [e.g., 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163].

Yet, to ensure that our treatment is as self-contained as possible, we will first describe the salient assumptions and formulas underpinning OITS. First and foremost, OITS supposes that the velocity changes (ΔV) exerted by thrust are impulsive, i.e., in other words these changes are instantaneous (and therefore equivalent to infinite thrust). Although this supposition is evidently applicable to high thrust propulsion schemes such as chemical rockets, nevertheless it may also be invoked for modeling the velocity change at Earth induced by a laser beam on a light sail [132, 137, 164, 165].

Second, the trajectory of the spacecraft (namely, the laser sail in this instance) is taken to be regulated exclusively by the gravitational attraction exerted by the Sun (whose gravitational parameter is $\mu_{\odot} = GM_{\odot} \approx 1.33 \times 10^{20} \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-2}$) until the laser sail enters within the Laplace sphere of influence (SoI) [166, 167] of a user-specified planet, such as Saturn or Jupiter. In Figure 1, we have depicted the SoIs of the outer planets from Jupiter to Neptune, as well as the dwarf planet Pluto for the sake of contrast.

E denotes the home planet (Earth) and P represents the host planet orbited by the target moon under consideration. If we depart from the former at time t_e , and arrive at the latter at time t_p (clearly, causality demands $t_p > t_e$), we can derive from these times (and given objects), an initial position vector \vec{r}_e and final target position vector \vec{r}_p , respectively [168]. These positions are solely expressible as a function of time, because they are calculated accurately by using appropriate

⁵<https://breakthroughinitiatives.org/initiative/3>




Figure 1: The Laplace sphere of influence computed for the four planets of the outer Solar System, as well as for Pluto.

interpolation functions in the NASA SPICE software library available from NAIF [169, 170],⁶ and exploiting the relevant SPICE kernel files.

Now, equipped with the above t_e , t_p , \vec{r}_e and \vec{r}_p , it is found that there exist two different solution routes connecting E to P via two conic arcs, which we shall christen the *long way* and *short way* (see [171, Chapter 5]). It is worth mentioning that these two transfer arcs will necessarily lie in the plane made by \vec{r}_e and \vec{r}_p , and further that the angle α swept at the Sun by the laser sail on the *short way* is derived from

$$\vec{r}_p \cdot \vec{r}_e = |\vec{r}_p| |\vec{r}_e| \cos(\alpha), \quad (1)$$

where $\vec{r}_p \cdot \vec{r}_e$ is the dot product of \vec{r}_p , \vec{r}_e and $|\dots|$ is the magnitude of the given vector. The corresponding angle for the *long way* naturally translates to $2\pi - \alpha$. This problem of determining the two trajectory solutions, *long way* and *short way*, between two points in space and with a given time-of-flight (in this case equal to $t_p - t_e$) is equivalent to the classic Lambert problem [166, Chapter 7]. A method of solving this orbital dynamics problem is provided in [172] and [171, Chapter 5], and its applicability to OITS is elaborated in [173]. Note that OITS operates under the assumption $\alpha < 2\pi$, i.e., there are no complete orbital revolutions.

Clearly, to model a laser sail encounter with, say, a moon of Saturn, the gravitational field of Saturn must be taken into account. Currently, OITS only models this field if the spacecraft happens to be in transit, i.e., using Saturn for a gravitational assist, but not if the actual target (viz. the moon) itself is within Saturn's influence. However, this issue can be addressed by harnessing a *patched conic* approximation and the useful notion of an *intermediate point*, defined as a point in space whose radial distance from some reference body is user-specified, but whose polar angles of longitude and latitude (θ and ϕ) are allowed to be free and therefore can be optimized by the NLP solver in question. An extensive description of the *intermediate point* approach used in this work is furnished in [173].

⁶<https://naif.jpl.nasa.gov/naif/toolkit.html>

If we select the target moon's host planet (Saturn in our example) as the reference body for the *intermediate point*, and take that planet's (i.e., Saturn's) SoI as its radial distance, then we end up with the scenario illustrated in Figure 2. We label this *intermediate point* as $IP2$, and we define this as the entry point of a laser sail into Saturn's SoI, having traversed the heliocentric trajectory arc from Earth, which is depicted in Figure 3. We remark that $IP2$ is defined to possess a position vector, \vec{r}_2 , relative to the center of P , defined by the planet's (Saturn's) SoI radius, and further by the planetocentric longitude (θ) and latitude (ϕ); the latter two serve as optimization parameters for MIDACO.

Referring now to Figure 3, we witness the same trajectory from a heliocentric perspective. In this scenario, the heliocentric arrival point at Saturn's SoI is modeled via an *intermediate point* labeled as $IP1$ (note that $IP1$ is the same point as $IP2$, albeit in a different frame), located at heliocentric position \vec{r}_1 given by:

$$\vec{r}_1 = \vec{r}_p + \vec{r}_2, \quad (2)$$

which follows from the simple rules of changing frames (Galilean relativity). This equation tells us that \vec{r}_1 is not only a function of θ and ϕ , but also of t_p , with the latter specifying the position of the planet \vec{r}_p . The above (2) when combined with (3) below constitute the *patched conic* approximation referenced previously.

Finally, let us refer to Figure 4, where we revert back to the planetocentric axis system. We must now transform the laser sail's heliocentric arrival velocity vector, \vec{v}_1 , into the planetocentric frame, by subtracting the planet's heliocentric velocity, \vec{v}_p in accordance with the rules of Galilean relativity, thereupon yielding

$$\vec{v}_2 = \vec{v}_1 - \vec{v}_p, \quad (3)$$

where \vec{v}_2 represents the light sail velocity relative to the planet. The subsequent planetocentric arc from $IP2$ at time t_2 to the target moon (denoted by M) of the given planet (viz., Saturn) at time t_M (where t_M fully specifies the moon's position \vec{r}_M , along the lines stated earlier), can also be computed in a similar fashion by means of this method, which is elaborated in [172].

The optimization criterion chosen throughout this paper is to minimize the encounter velocity of the laser sail with the target moon, denoted by V_{ENC} ; note that the subscript 'ENC' denotes 'encounter', and not 'Enceladus'. In turn, the imposition of this objective then necessarily constrains the hyperbolic excess speed to which the laser sail is accelerated when it departs Earth. The reasons for this choice of guiding objective are twofold:

- The slower the laser sail moves with respect to the target moon, the more is the quantity and quality of data that might be garnered from the encounter.
- When V_{ENC} is lowered, the severity of fragmentation and/or destruction of any organic compounds as the laser sail travels through a plume will be reduced,




Figure 2: Planetocentric definition of IP2 associated with the arrival of the light sail spacecraft (s/c) at the target planet's Sol, in conjunction with the relevant planetocentric parameters shown for the setup described in Section 2.

and therefore these compounds may be more readily captured and characterized.

Furthermore, MIDACO permits the specification of equality constraints. Most importantly, for the problem setup tackled in this paper, this feature takes the form of a continuity constraint from the heliocentric frame to the planetocentric frame as follows. If \vec{v}_{IP1} is the velocity at $IP1$ in the heliocentric frame and \vec{v}_{IP2} is the velocity at $IP2$ in the planetocentric frame, then the continuity equality constraint from 3 is given by

$$|\vec{v}_{IP1} - \vec{v}_{IP2} - \vec{v}_p| = 0. \quad (4)$$

In addition, there is one inequality constraint applied to the trajectory optimization software, namely, to constrain the periapsis point (measured relative to the host planet) of the laser sail as it approaches the moon from $IP2$, to not fall below a specified lower bound. This constraint is vital because it allows the laser sail to fly past the host planet with no danger of collision, and consequently enables the probe to transmit measurements and observational data back to Earth for analysis. In this study, the minimum periapsides are conservatively chosen to be just marginally lower than the semimajor axes of the target moons in question.

Moreover, by adopting these constraint values, rapid convergence to the optimal solution is attainable, since optimal conditions (to wit, minimum V_{ENC}) are expected when the moon is at an extreme displacement from its host planet, in the plane containing the two vectors $\vec{h}_1 = \vec{r}_M \times \vec{v}_{s/c}$ and $\vec{h}_2 = \vec{v}_{s/c} \times \vec{h}_1$, where \vec{r}_M is the planetocentric position

vector of the target moon at intercept and $\vec{v}_{s/c}$ is the planetocentric velocity vector of the spacecraft at this moment.

It is instructive at this juncture to derive a minimum encounter velocity $V_{ENC,min}$ of a spacecraft sent from Earth E to the target moon M orbiting another planet P . To this end, we adopt a heliocentric minimum energy *Hohmann transfer* [171, Chapter 6], to take the spacecraft (labeled by S) from E to P ; on implementing the conservation of energy, we obtain

$$|\vec{v}_s|^2 - \frac{2\mu_\odot}{|\vec{r}_p|} = -\frac{\mu_\odot}{a}, \quad (5)$$

where \vec{v}_s is the heliocentric velocity of the spacecraft on arrival at the planet P 's SoI, and the semimajor axis a in the above formula is given by $2a = |\vec{r}_p| + |\vec{r}_e|$. Upon inserting this expression into (5), this leads to

$$|\vec{v}_s|^2 = \frac{2\mu_\odot |\vec{r}_e|}{a|\vec{r}_p|} \quad (6)$$

Converting to a planetocentric frame velocity \vec{v}'_s , and assuming circular orbits for the planets, we may end up with

$$|\vec{v}'_s| = |\vec{v}_p| - |\vec{v}_s|. \quad (7)$$

Finally, on determining the minimum encounter velocity with M – namely, presuming that M is situated in a circular orbit around its host planet, and moreover, supposing that the approach trajectory is coplanar with M – and also postulating that \vec{v}'_s represents the velocity at infinity with respect to the




Figure 5: Minimum encounter velocities feasible for laser sail missions to various major moons of Saturn.




Figure 6: Minimum encounter velocities feasible for laser sail missions to various major moons of Jupiter.

to some notable moons of Saturn and Jupiter are depicted in Figures 5 and 6, respectively. All moons entail hypervelocity impacts, which are interpreted to be impacts that fulfill the criterion $V_{ENC} > 3 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. Furthermore, with $V_{ENC} \approx 6 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, Enceladus and Europa are at the upper end of the velocity threshold where the sampling and detection of molecular biosignatures via in situ instruments may be viable, as elucidated in Sections 1 and 4.1.

3. Results

As indicated earlier, the analysis is conducted primarily for a putative laser sail mission to Enceladus, and secondarily for a similar mission to Europa; the pertinent orbital elements for these moons are provided in Table 1.

Results were generated for a specific year of launch, conservatively chosen to be 2045, and also for an entire orbital cycle of the given host planet. The latter analysis allows the full range of Earth and host planet alignments to be evaluated, and therefore an overall global minimum for this planet can be deduced. Saturn possesses an orbital period of about 30 yr, based on which launch years between 2035 and 2065 were considered. For the other target, Jupiter,

Orbital Parameter	Enceladus (Saturn)	Europa (Jupiter)
a (km)	238,320	671,150
i (°)	28.05	1.88
Period (days)	1.37	3.55
e	0.0056	0.0094
Speed (km s^{-1})	12.62	13.74

Table 1

Pertinent orbital parameters for Enceladus and Europa where the reference frame is ECLIPJ2000 from SPICE that is centered on the host planet




Figure 7: Minimum encounter velocity (in km s^{-1}) of the laser sail with Saturn's moon Enceladus (left-hand axis) and the optimal launch date in 2045 (right-hand axis), versus the flight duration (in days).

the shorter ~ 12 yr period motivated a launch year window spanning 2040 to 2052.

From the above paragraph, it is evident that the laser sail infrastructure is presumed to be built and operational ~ 10 -40 yr in the future; for example, the fiducial date of 2045 translates to ~ 20 yr in the future. The required timeline of having the laser sail infrastructure assembled in a few decades is consistent with current predictions, such as the *Breakthrough Starshot* initiative [129, 130, 137]. Last, but not least, a launch date of 2045 would lead to the light sail reaching the target moon (Europa or Enceladus) circa 2050, which broadly matches the timeline prescribed for the Enceladus flagship mission recommended by the *2023-2032 Decadal Strategy for Planetary Science and Astrobiology*, as outlined in Section 1.

3.1. Enceladus

The green curves in Figure 7 illustrate the minimum encounter velocity V_{ENC} (left-hand y-axis) of the laser sail as it approaches Enceladus. The solid curve illustrates minima for launch years ranging from 2035 to 2065, whereas the dashed curve is specifically for launch dates in the year 2045; the blue dash-dotted curve indicates the corresponding launch date for the year 2045 (right-hand y-axis). In this plot, the horizontal x-axis represents the total flight duration in days. Given that a *Hohmann transfer* to Saturn is known to




Figure 8: Encounter velocity in km s^{-1} (green dots and curve) and flight duration in yr (blue dots and curve) as a function of the hyperbolic excess velocity for 2045 launch date of a laser sail to Saturn's moon Enceladus.

entail a flight duration of ~ 2200 days, from this plot, we ascertain that the minimum V_{ENC} would be approximately 6 km s^{-1} for this duration. This number displays excellent agreement with the rationale laid out in (5) to (8), and the minimum V_{ENC} calculated for Enceladus in Figure 5. This agreement is therefore a confirmation of the fidelity of the results generated by this software in comparison to theoretical expectations.

Figure 8 explicates the modeled mission parameters for the launch year 2045 with the x-axis now representing the hyperbolic excess speed required at Earth to reach Enceladus over a range of V_{ENC} (left-hand y-axis) and flight durations (right-hand y-axis). Note that the lowest possible V_{ENC} for this year is marginally higher than what could be achieved in theory, and is 6.4 km s^{-1} for a hyperbolic excess of $V_{\infty} = 20.4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. This latter value can be used to calculate the characteristic energy $C_3 = V_{\infty}^2$ required from the laser beam, yielding $C_3 \approx 416 \text{ km}^2\text{s}^{-2}$.

We now explore how various relevant parameters evolve from year to year across the entire range of launch dates from 2035 to 2065. If, for example, we inspect Figure 9, the evolution of the minimum V_{ENC} over the course of this 30 yr period is made manifest. For a launch in December 2039, V_{ENC} acquires a minimum value of 5.93 km s^{-1} , which appears to be marginally lower than the minimum shown for Enceladus in Figure 5. Upon further analysis of this data point, it is found that the speed of Enceladus relative to Saturn ($|\vec{v}_M|$ in (8)) is higher than the value used to derive Figure 5, due to fluctuations in Enceladus's orbital parameters a and e ; these fluctuations are, in turn, caused by perturbing gravitational forces. The inclusion of these additional effects entirely explains the apparent inconsistency.

On consulting Figure 9, we witness a periodicity in the minima of ~ 17 yr and in the maxima of ~ 13 yr. These minima are found to occur in 2039 and 2056, whereas the maxima arise in 2049 and 2062. Furthermore, it should be recognized that the fluctuations in a and e , highlighted in the




Figure 9: Minimum encounter velocity in km s^{-1} of the laser sail with Saturn's moon Enceladus as a function of the launch date (in the 30 yr period 2035-2065).




Figure 10: Launch declination (in deg) and associated geographical region(s) as a function of the launch date over a complete orbital cycle of Saturn, namely, amounting to a 30 yr period spanning 2035 to 2065.

prior paragraph, have a bearing on the optimal conditions for intercept of the laser sail with Enceladus, as well as how close the host planet (Saturn) is to its ascending or descending nodes with respect to the ecliptic plane, which represent approximate minimum energy (and therefore, minimum arrival velocity) conditions for a spacecraft launched from Earth.

Figure 10 displays the dependency of the declination on the launch year, with the latter ranging from 2035 to 2065 (i.e., one complete orbital period of Saturn). The declination referenced in this plot is actually the declination of the hyperbolic excess velocity at Earth (\vec{v}_{∞}), as measured in the widely utilized NASA SPICE J2000 reference frame [174]. The geographical region(s) on planet Earth corresponding to the computed declination are also delineated in Figure 10.

The optimal laser array locations on Earth, in terms of providing the longest launch windows lasting approximately 9-10 yr, are within the Arctic and Antarctic circles,


Antarctica: Laser Sail Launch Declinations in 2045 for Optimal Arrival at Enceladus


Figure 11: Regions in the Antarctic compatible with achieving an optimal laser sail encounter velocity with Saturn's moon Enceladus for a 2045 launch date.

although the minimum V_{ENC} trajectories, in 2039 and 2056 unfortunately occur at crossover points where the declination changes each year quite considerably. Although the Arctic or Antarctic seem, *prima facie*, like inconvenient locations for laser sail launches, the technical advantages of locating the laser infrastructure in the Arctic or Antarctic are elucidated in [175].⁷ Figure 11 demarcates the possible locations of the laser infrastructure in the year 2045 for achieving an optimal encounter velocity with Enceladus – in Antarctica somewhere within the two red geographic parallels.

3.2. Europa

Next, we shall tackle one of the moons of Jupiter, Europa for reasons sketched in Section 1. Jupiter is endowed with an orbital period of 11.9 yr, owing to which an entire orbital period between 2040 to 2052 was investigated for launches, as stated previously. In tandem with this long term study, a specific launch year of 2045 was chosen, to wit, the same as that adopted for Enceladus.

The salient findings are depicted in Figures 12 and 13. Collectively, these plots demonstrate that 2045 is largely, albeit involving a wide range of flight durations, an optimal year for launch to Europa. This inferred result is corroborated by Figure 14, from which we also notice that the variations in V_{ENC} follow a ~ 6 yr cycle with periodicity evinced by the minima and maxima. The global minimum of about 6.3 km s^{-1} in the chosen time period displays excellent agreement with the theoretical prediction in Figure 6, thereby serving to bolster the robustness of the results derived from our simulations and code.

The declination (of Earth hyperbolic excess velocity) against launch year from 2040 to 2052 is shown in Figure 15.

⁷We caution, however, that this paper does not explore the ethical or legal challenges of constructing the infrastructure in the Arctic or Antarctic, both of which are significant. This statement is also applicable to other regions foregrounded by this work.




Figure 12: Minimum encounter velocity (in km s^{-1}) of the laser sail with Jupiter's moon Europa (left-hand axis) and the optimal launch dates in 2045 (right-hand axis), versus the flight duration (in days). Note that the thin blue dash-dotted curve signifies the long-term (secular) variation of the launch date with flight duration.

We find a pattern akin to that of Figure 10 for Enceladus, in the sense that a cyclical relationship is manifested. Optimal encounter velocities with Europa would occur around the peaks and troughs of declination, namely, at approximately -30° and $+30^\circ$, respectively. The latter includes several major countries for the putative laser architecture location: India, Pakistan, Nepal, China, Northern Sahara may all be suitable in principle.

Finally, a general observation with regard to both Enceladus and Europa is warranted. On account of the constraint of minimum encounter velocities, the optimal latitude for the laser infrastructure is subject to considerable variation




Figure 13: Encounter velocity in km s^{-1} (green dots and curve) and flight duration in yr (blue dots) as a function of the hyperbolic excess velocity for 2045 launch date of a laser sail to Jupiter's moon Europa.




Figure 15: Launch declination (in deg) as a function of the launch date over a complete orbital cycle of Jupiter, amounting to a 12 yr period spanning 2040 to 2052.




Figure 14: Minimum encounter velocity in km s^{-1} of the laser sail with Jupiter's moon Europa as a function of the launch date (in the 12 yr period encompassing 2040-2052).

from year to year. However, once the presumed laser sail infrastructure is installed at some location, the figures and exposition outlined hitherto suggest that an encounter velocity fairly close to the global minimum could be achieved at this location after a suitable wait period.

4. Implications and Discussion

Now, we shall explicate some of the ramifications arising from the results in the preceding section.

4.1. Encounter velocity and biosignatures

From Figure 9, we ascertain that the global minimum encounter velocity of a laser sail with Enceladus in the 2035-2065 interval is $V_{E,S} \approx 5.9 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. Likewise, from Figure 14, the corresponding global minimum for the encounter with Europa is $V_{E,J} \approx 6.3 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. In both instances, therefore, it is likely that the minimum encounter velocity

achievable is around $V_0 \equiv 6 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, which is supported by the theoretical calculations reported in Figures 5 and 6.

It is now instructive to compare our findings with prior experimental work on detecting biosignatures in the plume(s) at different encounter velocities. Research indicates that encounter velocities of approximately $4\text{--}6 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ are potentially optimal (i.e., attaining maximal sensitivity limits) for detecting biosignatures through one powerful method described below [106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111], and the above value of V_0 is close to the upper limit of this range. However, a few publications have suggested other techniques, and concluded that lower encounter velocities of $< 3 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ [112, 86] or higher encounter velocities of $> 6 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ [114] would be suitable.

The majority of these publications employed an empirical approach called Laser Induced Liquid Beam Ion Desorption (LILBID) [176, 177, 178], which mimics hypervelocity impacts of ice grains in space (akin to those in the plume) with onboard spacecraft instrumentation that consequently trigger the formation of ions. The ensuing mass spectra of these ions can be detected and analyzed by impact ionization mass spectrometers, such as the SURface Dust Analyzer (SUDA) of the upcoming *Europa Clipper* mission [179].⁸ Hence, the identification of molecular biosignatures is feasible, at least in principle, by current instrumentation if certain concentration and encounter velocity limits are fulfilled.

We will now delve deeper into some of the aforementioned papers to highlight the relevant findings.

- LILBID experiments by [106] concluded that select amino acids could be detected at molar concentrations of $\sim 1 \text{ nM}$, peptides at $\sim 0.1 \text{ }\mu\text{M}$, and fatty acids at $\sim 10 \text{ nM}$; however, these results are sensitive to salinity, among other factors. The optimal encounter speeds, in the sense of maximizing sensitivity, were estimated to be $4\text{--}10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ for amino acids, $4\text{--}10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ for peptides, and $3\text{--}6 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ for fatty acids. The latter

⁸<https://europa.nasa.gov/spacecraft/instruments/suda/>

belong to the important class of lipids, which might be fairly well preserved in plume materials [180, 92].

- The salinity of Enceladus might be lower than that of seawater on Earth [181]. For the case of intermediate salinity with 0.1 M sodium chloride, [107] concluded, on the basis of LILBID experiments, that some amino acids and fatty acids might be detectable at molar concentrations of $\sim 1 \mu\text{M}$ and $\sim 100 \mu\text{M}$, respectively. If the relative abundances of amino acids and fatty acids can be determined, these ratios may enable differentiating between abiotic and biotic sources for these molecules (as elucidated shortly hereafter). In addition, [107] estimated that the optimal encounter velocities for amino acids and fatty acids incorporated in grains from salty environments are $5\text{--}10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ and $3\text{--}6 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, respectively.
- Reactive molecular dynamics simulations by [108] and [110] concluded that optimal spacecraft encounter velocities should be for $4\text{--}6 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ for fatty acids and amino acids enclosed in ice grains, but even at higher velocities, a small fraction of these organics were predicted to escape fragmentation. For example, at an encounter velocity of 7.5 km s^{-1} , about 50% of alanine, arginine, and histidine (all biological amino acids) remain intact [110, Figure 7]; this result was relatively less sensitive to salt concentration.
- [109] studied the mass spectra of biomolecules from *Escherichia coli* and *Sphingopyxis alaskensis* using the LILBID approach. In matrices with 0.01 M sodium chloride, DNA nucleobases were detectable at concentrations as low as $\sim 1 \text{ ppmw}$ (i.e., around $10 \mu\text{M}$). The optimal encounter velocities were estimated to be $4\text{--}8 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ for DNA, $4\text{--}7 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ for metabolic intermediates (e.g., amino acids), and $3\text{--}6 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ for fatty acids. However, even at higher encounter speeds of $7\text{--}10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, distinctive mass spectra of fragments derived from these biomolecules were discernible.
- Via the LILBID approach, [182] and [183] performed a comprehensive analysis of the mass spectra of various organic molecules as a function of the salt content associated with the ice grains. It was found that the detectability of these organics declined at higher salt concentrations, which was consistent with prior findings. The optimal encounter velocities were estimated to be $4\text{--}8 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ for these organic molecules.

Based on the above exposition, it is plausible that the laser sail mission concept could achieve near-optimal encounter velocities (i.e., close to V_0), as viewed from the perspective of impact ionization mass spectrometry, with the plume(s) of Enceladus and Europa.

In turn, these encounter velocities might allow an impact ionization mass spectrometer (akin to SUDA) to not only identify organic molecules – provided that their concentrations exceed appropriate thresholds for detection – but

also measure their relative abundances, thereby serving as a potential avenue for discovering molecular biosignatures; the chief reason is because biological pathways tend to preferentially synthesize or utilize some biomolecular building blocks over others, whereas abiotic processes ostensibly do not display the same degree of selectivity [184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190]. Moreover, impact ionization mass spectrometry can theoretically record 10^4 to 10^5 ice grains in a single flyby, and discern biosignatures even if only a single grain harbors life; such sensitivity surpasses the capability of most analytical techniques [191].

As a brief aside, generalizing beyond impact ionization mass spectra, it is worth underscoring that mass spectrometry, either by itself or in tandem with other analytical chemistry techniques (e.g., gas chromatography), constitutes a powerful and flexible tool for discovering myriad biosignatures in astrobiological settings [192, 193, 194], including those markers that may be partly agnostic to the specific biochemistry of putative extraterrestrial life [195, 196].

4.2. Payload, energy, and cost considerations

It is evident from Section 4.1 that the identification of molecular biosignatures may be theoretically viable through impact ionization mass spectrometry. The next step involves selecting an appropriate scientific payload (going beyond a single mass spectrometer), whose mass is denoted by M_{pl} . For a given M_{pl} and hyperbolic excess velocity of the laser sail, it is possible to obtain heuristic estimates of the total mass of the spacecraft (M_{ls}), the required total energy and power, and the total mission cost (C_{ls}).

Multiple mission concepts geared toward exploring Enceladus or Europa have been proposed, each endowed with their own set of objectives and accompanying scientific payloads. A handful of these concepts are summarized in the following list, and some of the salient details are furnished in Table 2. Upon consulting these sources, a broad range of values for M_{pl} are apparently expected, depending on the scope of the mission concept.

- In the recently ended *Cassini-Huygens* mission [197], the scientific payload onboard the *Cassini* orbiter, which comprised > 10 instruments, had a mass of $M_{pl} \approx 336 \text{ kg}$;⁹ the total mission cost at the time of launch was \$3.9 billion.¹⁰ These specifications are quite close to that of the *Europa Clipper* mission, with $M_{pl} \approx 352 \text{ kg}$, a spacecraft dry mass of $\sim 2600 \text{ kg}$, and a cost of $> \$4$ billion.¹¹
- The comprehensive orbiter-lander *Enceladus Orbiter-lander* mission concept was proposed by [103, 88]

⁹Refer to Table 2.4.3 of: <https://sci.esa.int/documents/33648/36003/1567254416901-cassini-huygens.pdf>

¹⁰<https://solarsystem.nasa.gov/missions/cassini/mission/quick-facts/>

¹¹https://europa.nasa.gov/system/internal_resources/details/original/116_Europa-Clipper-Newsletter-External-vol2issue1_FINAL.pdf

Mission	World	Mission type	Payload mass	Predicted total cost
Cassini-Huygens	Enceladus	flyby	336 kg	\$3.9 billion
Europa Clipper	Europa	flyby	352 kg	> \$4 billion
Enceladus Orbilander	Enceladus	orbiter-lander	130 kg	\$2.5 billion
Tiger	Enceladus	flyby	80 kg	\$636 million
Moonraker	Enceladus	flyby	40 kg	\$500-1000 million
ETNA	Enceladus	orbiter-lander	197 kg	N/A
AXE	Enceladus	flyby	16 kg	\$810 million

Table 2

A synopsis of astrobiology (habitability and/or life-detection) missions to Enceladus and Europa, along with their mission type, anticipated payload mass, and total cost; the latter is specified at the time of either launching the mission or in a chosen fiducial year (such as 2022).

to explicitly address the question of whether Enceladus' subsurface ocean contains life.¹² With a total of 13 scientific instruments (a high-resolution mass spectrometer among them), the payload mass was estimated to be $M_{pl} \approx 130$ kg. The dry mass of the spacecraft was predicted to be ~ 2800 kg, and the mission cost (excluding that of the launch vehicle) was determined to be about \$2.5 billion in 2025.

- The flyby *Tiger* mission concept was proposed by [96] to assess the habitability of Enceladus' ocean by sampling the plume to detect organics. The four instrument payload, including a mass spectrometer, amounted to $M_{pl} \approx 80$ kg. The dry mass of the spacecraft was ~ 1000 kg, and the predicted cost was \$636 million in 2022.
- The flyby *Moonraker* mission concept was proposed by [98] to gauge the habitability of Enceladus' ocean, the mechanisms underpinning the South Polar Terrain, and the formation of the moon. A suite of eight instruments, with an ion and neutral mass spectrometer, was estimated to yield $M_{pl} \approx 40$ kg. The spacecraft had total dry mass of ~ 1250 kg, and a cost in the range of \sim \$500-1000 million in 2022.
- The orbiter-lander *Enceladus Touchdown aNalyzing Astrobiology* (ETNA) mission concept was proposed by [97] to search for (pre)biotic signatures in the plume and assess the habitability of Enceladus' ocean. A total of seven scientific instruments, including a laser desorption/ablation mass spectrometer, had a mass of $M_{pl} \approx 197$ kg (of which the majority was a radio science instrument). The lander and orbiter had a dry mass of ~ 100 kg and ~ 550 kg, respectively.
- The flyby *Astrobiology eXploration at Enceladus* (AXE) mission concept was proposed by [100] to seek out molecular biosignatures, and perform related geophysical investigations. A minimal payload mass of $M_{pl} \approx 16$ kg was selected, consisting of a quadrupole ion trap mass spectrometer, among other instruments.

¹²A detailed breakdown of the mission concept is provided in: <https://ntrs.nasa.gov/citations/20205008712>

The dry mass of the spacecraft could be ~ 1400 kg, and the predicted cost was \$810 million in 2022.

As implied earlier, the scientific payload mass spans more than one order of magnitude, which is not surprising in view of the diversity of these missions concepts. Our goal in this study is to focus on a relatively simple precursor astrobiology mission, albeit with the express understanding that this analysis can be readily generalized to more complex missions (with extended instrumentation) by means of boosting M_{pl} and the other model parameters accordingly.

We adopt a fiducial low-end mass of $M_{pl} \approx 16$ kg, identical to that of the AXE mission concept [100]. Our rationale is that we focus on a precursor astrobiology mission, which is therefore meant to serve as a proof-of-concept. Note that this payload is sufficiently higher than the ~ 5 kg mass of SUDA [198], whose importance was elucidated in Section 4.1. Hence, other instruments (e.g., camera; nephelometer) can be incorporated with the goal of characterizing habitability and/or garnering contextual information. Breakthroughs in portable mass spectrometers could bring down the mass further without compromising functionality [199], or enhance sensitivity for the same mass [200].

We will assume that the total mass of the payload (i.e., sans the sail itself) is $M_{I_s} \sim 100$ kg for the above configuration, thereby warranting classification as a SmallSat [201]. The posited spacecraft may host, *inter alia*, an 8 kg avionics system for command and data handling, a ~ 10 kg Radioisotope Thermoelectric Generator for power,¹³ and a < 10 kg high-gain antenna designed for the outer Solar System [202]. We note that our choice of M_{I_s} is consistent with [203, Equation 1], where we have used a lunar-type mission scaling in lieu of an interplanetary mission because the latter has additional mass budget for subsystems associated with (interplanetary) propulsion, which are neglected in the laser sail architecture. Moreover, if the spacecraft were to be launched in the 2040s, it is plausible that the rapid pace of miniaturization will lower the necessary mass [204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 201].

As another point of comparison, although not a life-detection mission, the *New Horizons* spacecraft had a 30 kg payload and a 400 kg dry mass [209]; its total cost

¹³<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11214-019-0623-9>

Sail parameter	Estimate
Sail diameter	~ 100 m
Sail mass	~ 20 kg
Peak radiated power	$\sim 10^9$ W
Capital expenditure	$\sim \$1$ million kg^{-1}
Payload energetics cost	$\sim \$2$ million kg^{-1}

Table 3

Approximate laser sail parameters for a precursor astrobiology mission to Enceladus or Europa with a 100 kg spacecraft (sans the sail apparatus) with launch speed of $10^{-4} c$. The last two rows are expressed as cost per unit mass of the spacecraft for reasons indicated in the text.

was approximately \$780 million.¹⁴ Interestingly, the above values for the scientific payload and spacecraft mass are close to that of the *Pluto Kuiper Express* mission concept from the 1990s, which involved a 9 kg payload and a 175 kg spacecraft [209]. To reiterate the theme from the prior paragraph, advances in material science [206], communications [210], and scientific instrumentation are swiftly driving down the mass requirements.

Next, we turn our attention to the final launch speed v_i of the laser sail from Earth. On inspecting Figures 8 and 13, we determine that the encounter velocity at Enceladus and Europa are minimized for a hyperbolic excess velocity of $v_\infty \approx 20$ km s^{-1} and $v_\infty \approx 10$ km s^{-1} , respectively. From the conservation of energy, we have

$$v_i^2 = v_\infty^2 + \frac{2\mu_\oplus}{R_\oplus}, \quad (9)$$

from which we conclude that $v_i \lesssim 30$ km s^{-1} after consulting Figures 8 and 13. Hence, to leading order, we approximate the velocity to which the laser sail must be accelerated by $v_i \approx 10^{-4} c$, where c is the speed of light.

Equipped with $M_{Is} \sim 100$ kg and $v_i \approx 10^{-4} c$ as the inputs, we invoke the cost-optimized laser sail model of [132], whose key findings are depicted in [147, Table 2] and [164, Figure 7], with the essential condition of grid-based power supply. Some of the major results of this model, drawn from these two references, are tabulated in Table 3. We are now in a position to obtain a heuristic estimate of the cost attributable to this precursor astrobiology mission. Before doing so, we emphasize that the substantial mass and low velocity of the spacecraft jointly aid in suppressing the hazards (e.g., impacts by gas and dust; electromagnetic forces; hydrodynamic drag) that would otherwise prove significant for extremely lightweight (viz., gram-mass), relativistic laser sails [211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217].

To leading order, the total cost can be crudely written down as the sum of the capital expenditure; the energy costs of launching the spacecraft (taken to be ~ 100 kg); and the costs of research and development, production, and testing associated with the spacecraft.¹⁵ The first two terms are

¹⁴<https://www.planetary.org/space-policy/cost-of-new-horizons>

¹⁵The scientific instruments onboard the light sail are conservatively identical to those from the 2010s/2020s, and are therefore presumed to entail a much lower cost in the 2040s [204].

extracted from the last two rows of Table 3 (which display cost per unit mass), and we nominally adopt $\sim \$0.2$ million kg^{-1} for the last term of the trio [cf. 218, Figure 2-2]; this value is lower than certain 2010 SmallSat technology by a factor of 2-3 [219, Table 5], and might thus be realizable in the 2040s. On combining these terms together for the launch of a *single* light sail, we end up with

$$C_{Is} \sim \$3.2 \text{ million} \left(\frac{M_{Is}}{1 \text{ kg}} \right), \quad (10)$$

but if we consider a scenario wherein $\mathcal{N}_{Is} \geq 1$ light sails are launched, the above formula is modified to

$$C_{Is} \sim \$1 \text{ million} (1 + 2.2 \mathcal{N}_{Is}) \left(\frac{M_{Is}}{1 \text{ kg}} \right). \quad (11)$$

On substituting $M_{Is} \sim 100$ kg in (10), we obtain a total cost of around \$320 million. If we compare this result with the proposed missions delineated previously, especially the AXE mission concept (which has similar parameters), it might be feasible that the laser sail mission could be executed at a total cost that is a few times lower than conventional designs based on chemical propulsion. However, one noteworthy caveat that we shall touch on shortly is that the laser sail only permits a single flyby, whereas the concepts summarized earlier featured multiple flybys and/or landings.

A couple of avenues whereby C_{Is} in (11) may be reduced are plausible. First, the capital and operating expenditures were derived on the basis of extrapolated rates for grid power, infrastructure, and so forth, which are at a nascent stage vis-à-vis light sail architectures. The drop in prices arising from maturation of such technologies would lead to a corresponding reduction in the total mission cost. We will briefly elaborate on this theme with regard to improvements in laser technology and dropping prices in this area.

The (ground-based) laser array contributes to the capital expenditure and energetics cost in Table 3, constructed from [164, Figure 7] and [147, Table 2]. An extrapolation of current laser price trends suggests that a scaling of $\lesssim \$0.1$ W^{-1} is attainable by the end of the 2030s ([137, Figure 2] and [220, Figure 4-4]); this value may drop further to $\sim \$0.01$ W^{-1} for GigaWatt technology in the 2040s [137, 220]. For a peak power of $\sim 10^8$ W – required for a 100 kg payload, as per Table 3 – we are led toward a laser cost of $\sim \$5$ – 50 million, to wit, less than the estimated total cost of \$320 million, thus serving as a consistency check. Likewise, this laser cost is smaller than the capital expenditure and the energy cost for launching the 100 kg payload, as calculated from Table 3, along expected lines.

However, the above extrapolation might be conservative, because it does not fully account for the swift pace of crucial breakthroughs in laser technology [221, 222, 223, 224, 225]. To highlight just a representative example, photonic-crystal surface-emitting lasers (PCSELs) are single-mode semiconductor lasers capable of high power and high beam-quality [226, 227, 228]. PCSELs can deliver a laser power up to 1 kW from an emitter of < 10 mm in size [229], and have

empirically achieved a brightness of $\sim 1 \text{ GW cm}^{-2} \text{ sr}^{-1}$ [230]. Hence, technological advances in individual lasers (e.g., PCSELS), phase sensing and control [231, 232, 233, 234], among several other factors, may render laser sail propulsion both realistic and affordable. This is an active area of research that goes beyond the scope of this work.

Second, by leveraging the fact that spacecraft miniaturization is proceeding apace – in conjunction with innovative developments in autonomous vehicles, space robotics, machine learning,¹⁶ and onboard computing [115, 116, 205, 235, 236, 117, 118, 119, 120, 237, 121, 238] – it is conceivable that life-detection missions could be implemented at progressively smaller payload and spacecraft masses in the decade(s) to come, irrespective of the type of propulsion (e.g., chemical or light sail). In this case, as revealed by (10) and (11), the mission cost would decline commensurately. We now illustrate this point quantitatively below.

CubeSats are already under development or evaluation for interplanetary missions [239, 240, 241, 242, 208], and their viability for boosting our knowledge of astrobiology appears promising [243, 244, 245, 246]. Let us consider a typical 1U CubeSat with a mass of $M_{Is} \approx 1 \text{ kg}$, and suppose that $\mathcal{N}_{Is} \approx 1000$ of them are launched toward an ocean world (e.g., Enceladus). On substituting these parameters in (11), we arrive at a total cost of roughly \$2.2 billion, i.e., which is lower than the *New Horizons* mission. Since each one of these CubeSats can perform a single flyby in principle, about 1000 flybys ought to be theoretically possible at this cost.

Hence, even though the science return from a single CubeSat will probably be low (i.e., limited by the onboard instrumentation), the cumulative return should be considerable because of the sheer number of spacecraft at play. A bevy of publications have therefore advocated a flotilla of small spacecraft to expand space exploration [247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 148, 253]. Last, but not least, the high number of CubeSats enables the incorporation of a diverse portfolio of instruments (e.g., different instruments on each spacecraft) and/or building significant redundancy (i.e., many spacecraft carrying similar instruments). On the whole, it is thus not an exaggeration to contend that the deployment of small spacecraft propelled by laser arrays may help revolutionize our understanding of the Solar System.

4.3. Combining laser sails with onboard (chemical) propulsion

As mentioned a few paragraphs above, one of the disadvantages of the laser sail mission concept is that each spacecraft would accomplish a single flyby (i.e., encounter) with the plume(s) of Enceladus or Europa at a given velocity. While this limitation does exist, it is one that can be overcome by including a suitable onboard propulsion system, since we have effectively assumed so far that no such propulsion system has been incorporated.

If an onboard propulsion system is available, then the relative velocity during the encounter can be reduced from

V_{ENC} to $V_{\text{ENC}} - \Delta v$, where Δv is supplied by the propulsion system. In an extreme case, after setting $\Delta v \approx V_{\text{ENC}}$, we could potentially place the spacecraft in orbit around the target moon [171, Chapter 8]. Note that the addition of propulsion increases the mass budget in accordance with the classic rocket equation [e.g., 254, 255],

$$\frac{\Delta v}{v_{\text{ex}}} \approx \ln \left(\frac{M'_{Is}}{M_{Is}} \right), \quad (12)$$

where v_{ex} is the effective exhaust velocity, M'_{Is} is the new total mass (namely, the initial mass at the time of launch), while M_{Is} is the original spacecraft mass introduced in Section 4.2, and constitutes the de facto final mass. Once the new mass M'_{Is} has been determined, the results in Section 4.2 must be updated, with M'_{Is} substituted in place of M_{Is} , such as in both (10) and (11).

As an example, let us choose $\text{N}_2\text{O}_4/\text{MMH}$ (monomethylhydrazine) propellant, which has a fairly high boiling point (thus mitigating the amount of cryogenic equipment) and substantial exhaust velocity of $v_{\text{ex}} \approx 3.3 \text{ km s}^{-1}$;¹⁷ and Δv is specified to be V_0 from Section 4.1 (i.e., the near-minimum encounter velocity sans onboard propulsion). After substituting these values into (12), we end up with $M'_{Is} \approx 6.16 M_{Is}$. Therefore, for a $M_{Is} \sim 100 \text{ kg}$ spacecraft (this mass was motivated earlier), invoking (10) and then replacing M_{Is} with M'_{Is} translates to a total mission cost of about \$2 billion, which is distinctly higher than the flyby mission designs outlined in Section 4.2, but is approximately equal to the cost of either past/current flagship missions or proposed orbiters/landers.

To round off our discussion, we note that the arguments in the closing paragraphs of Section 4.2 are still valid. To recapitulate, if M_{Is} , and consequently M'_{Is} from (12), are reduced due to technological progress in miniaturization, in principle we could deploy a flotilla of laser sails to ocean worlds for analyzing their habitability, which may greatly boost the ensuing cumulative scientific return. For instance, if we adopt $M_{Is} \approx 1 \text{ kg}$ for a canonical 1U CubeSat as before, then we obtain $M'_{Is} \approx 6.16 \text{ kg}$ from the above paragraph. In turn, we calculate that $\mathcal{N}_{Is} \sim 184$ for a total mission cost of \$2.5 billion, after utilizing (11) and swapping M_{Is} with M'_{Is} . In other words, nearly 200 CubeSat-like spacecraft might be placed in orbit around Europa and/or Enceladus for the same cost as the *New Horizons* mission.

5. Conclusion

Ocean worlds (i.e., icy worlds with subsurface oceans) rank among the most promising targets for life-detection missions in the future because they fulfill most/all of the core criteria for habitability. Moreover, plumes on Enceladus and Europa suggest that it may be feasible to sample their interior and possibly search for molecular biosignatures. Hence, a plethora of such astrobiological missions to Enceladus and

¹⁶In the context of machine learning, these breakthroughs can be effectively harnessed to detect agnostic molecular biosignatures [196].

¹⁷<http://www.astronautix.com/n/n2o4mmh.html>

Europa have been proposed, such as the *Enceladus Orbilander* with an arrival date in the early 2050s; all these missions are powered by chemical propulsion.

However, alternatives to chemical propulsion are garnering attention, notably light sails driven by solar radiation (solar sails) or lasers (laser sails). Light sails offer two major advantages: (1) lower mass and cost requirements owing to the potential absence of onboard fuel; and (2) faster flight times, because they can attain high terminal speeds. Furthermore, with advances in hardware (e.g., robotics) and software (e.g., artificial intelligence), future spacecraft are likely to become progressively miniaturized, thus permitting flotillas of low-mass spacecraft to survey worlds in our Solar System in a cost- and/or energy-efficient fashion; this modality is well-suited for light sails.

Motivated by the preceding two paragraphs, this paper focused on the icy moons Enceladus and Europa, and investigated whether an astrobiology precursor mission could survey these ocean worlds through a laser sail architecture. The following key features emerged from our analysis of optimal laser sail trajectories to Enceladus and Europa (with an emphasis on the former):

- Relatively short transit intervals of 3-6 years are achievable for missions to Enceladus, while the equivalent timescales for Europa are 1-4 years.
- The minimum encounter velocity of the spacecraft with the plume(s) is predicted to be around 6 km s⁻¹ for both Europa and Enceladus. Interestingly, this speed is close to the upper range of the optimal velocity necessary for detecting biomolecular building blocks (e.g., amino acids and lipids) via impact ionization mass spectrometers akin to SUDA onboard *Europa Clipper* mission.
- Several locations are technically suitable for the light sail infrastructure: the Antarctic or Arctic Circles seem promising options for a mission to Enceladus, with optimal launch windows of nearly 10 years.
- A 100 kg spacecraft can be launched using GigaWatt laser technology. The heuristic cost of a flyby mission to Enceladus is loosely estimated to be \$320 million using a cost-optimization model, which is smaller than or comparable to flyby missions with similar payloads involving chemical propulsion. With advancements in laser technology and energy generation/storage, the mission cost could decline further.
- The light sail architecture may be coupled to chemical propulsion, thereby enabling orbiter or lander missions to be realized at an overall mission cost potentially comparable to analogous missions based exclusively on chemical propulsion.
- If spacecraft miniaturization proceeds as per current forecasts, it might be viable to send a flotilla of hundreds of ~ 1 kg SmallSats, to survey the icy moons at a total cost lesser than the New Horizons mission.

This paper does not address all facets of a putative laser sail mission to Enceladus and Europa, since that would not be practical. Some of the central aspects that warrant subsequent investigation include: (1) selection and actualization of scientific instruments (beyond the mass spectrometer and camera); (2) guidance, navigation, and control of laser sails (especially in the vicinity of ocean worlds); (3) design and implementation of power and communication subsystems; and (4) a rigorous cost analysis of the mission.

Notwithstanding the additional research needed, our study suggests that astrobiology precursor missions to ocean worlds in our Solar System (notably Enceladus and Europa) are not only theoretically feasible but may be rendered advantageous in the near future due to intrinsic benefits of light sails (potential absence of onboard fuel and short flight times). Hence, we conclude by advocating that forthcoming mission concepts by governmental agencies and private enterprises (e.g., *Breakthrough Starshot*) should accord light sail architectures serious consideration.

Acknowledgements

We thank the reviewers for their helpful comments, which helped improve the manuscript.

References

- [1] W. T. Sullivan, J. Baross, *Planets and Life: The Emerging Science of Astrobiology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [2] D. A. Rothery, I. Gilmour, M. A. Sephton (Eds.), *An Introduction to Astrobiology*, 3rd Edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [3] D. Schulze-Makuch, L. N. Irwin, *Life in the Universe: Expectations and Constraints*, 3rd Edition, Cham: Springer, 2018. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-97658-7.
- [4] C. S. Cockell, *Astrobiology: Understanding Life in the Universe*, 2nd Edition, Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2020.
- [5] V. S. Meadows, G. N. Arney, B. E. Schmidt, D. J. Des Marais (Eds.), *Planetary Astrobiology*, Space Science Series, Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2020.
- [6] M. Lingam, A. Loeb, *Life in the Cosmos: From Biosignatures to Technosignatures*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2021.
- [7] K. W. Plaxco, M. Gross, *Astrobiology: An Introduction*, 3rd Edition, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2021.
- [8] J. Bennett, S. Shostak, N. Schneider, M. MacGregor, *Life in the Universe*, 5th Edition, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2022.
- [9] M. Lingam, A. Balbi, *From Stars to Life: A Quantitative Approach to Astrobiology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2024.
- [10] F. Nimmo, R. T. Pappalardo, Ocean worlds in the outer solar system, *J. Geophys. Res. Planets* 121 (8) (2016) 1378–1399. doi:10.1002/2016JE005081.
- [11] J. I. Lunine, Ocean worlds exploration, *Acta Astronaut.* 131 (2017) 123–130. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2016.11.017.
- [12] A. R. Hendrix, T. A. Hurford, L. M. Barge, M. T. Bland, J. S. Bowman, W. Brinckerhoff, B. J. Buratti, M. L. Cable, J. Castillo-Rogez, G. C. Collins, S. Diniega, C. R. German, A. G. Hayes, T. Hoehler, S. Hosseini, C. J. A. Howett, A. S. McEwen, C. D. Neish, M. d. Neveu, S. D. Vance, The NASA Roadmap to Ocean Worlds, *Astrobiology* 19 (1) (2019) 1–27. doi:10.1089/ast.2018.1955.
- [13] K. P. Hand, C. Sotin, A. Hayes, A. Coustenis, On the Habitability and Future Exploration of Ocean Worlds, *Space Sci. Rev.* 216 (5) (2020) 95. doi:10.1007/s11214-020-00713-7.
- [14] A. R. Hendrix, T. Hurford, G. W. Patterson, K. E. Mandt, C. B. Beddingfield, R. J. Cartwright, J. C. Castillo-Rogez, R. M. C. Lopes,

- S. M. Howell, L. C. Quick, M. Neveu, M. J. Poston, A. C. Mills, Potential Ocean Worlds, in: *Bull. Am. Astron. Soc.*, Vol. 53, 2021, p. 212. doi:10.3847/25c2cfcb.07c8cfbe.
- [15] J. C. Castillo-Rogez, K. Kalousová, Ocean Worlds In Our Solar System, *Elements* 18 (3) (2022) 161–166. doi:10.2138/gselements.18.3.161.
- [16] C. R. German, D. K. Blackman, A. T. Fisher, P. R. Girguis, K. P. Hand, T. M. Hoehler, J. A. Huber, J. C. Marshall, K. R. Pietro, J. S. Seewald, E. L. Shock, C. Sotin, A. M. Thurnherr, B. M. Toner, Ocean System Science to Inform the Exploration of Ocean Worlds, *Oceanography* 35 (1) (2022) 16–22. doi:10.5670/oceanog.2021.411.
- [17] L. Spilker, Cassini-Huygens' exploration of the Saturn system: 13 years of discovery, *Science* 364 (6445) (2019) 1046–1051. doi:10.1126/science.aat3760.
- [18] F. Postberg, S. Kempf, J. Schmidt, N. Brilliantov, A. Beinsen, B. Abel, U. Buck, R. Srama, Sodium salts in E-ring ice grains from an ocean below the surface of Enceladus, *Nature* 459 (7250) (2009) 1098–1101. doi:10.1038/nature08046.
- [19] J. Waite, J. H., W. S. Lewis, B. A. Magee, J. I. Lunine, W. B. McKinnon, C. R. Glein, O. Mousis, D. T. Young, T. Brockwell, J. Westlake, M. J. Nguyen, B. D. Teolis, H. B. Niemann, R. L. McNutt, M. Perry, W. H. Ip, Liquid water on Enceladus from observations of ammonia and ⁴⁰Ar in the plume, *Nature* 460 (7254) (2009) 487–490. doi:10.1038/nature08153.
- [20] P. C. Thomas, R. Tajeddine, M. S. Tiscareno, J. A. Burns, J. Joseph, T. J. Loredo, P. Helfenstein, C. Porco, Enceladus's measured physical libration requires a global subsurface ocean, *Icarus* 264 (2016) 37–47. arXiv:1509.07555, doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2015.08.037.
- [21] C. P. McKay, A. Davila, C. R. Glein, K. P. Hand, A. Stockton, Enceladus Astrobiology, Habitability, and the Origin of Life, in: P. M. Schenk, R. N. Clark, C. J. A. Howett, A. J. Verbiscer, J. H. Waite (Eds.), *Enceladus and the Icy Moons of Saturn*, Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2018, pp. 437–452. doi:10.2458/azu_uapress_9780816537075-ch021.
- [22] M. L. Cable, C. Porco, C. R. Glein, C. R. German, S. M. MacKenzie, M. Neveu, T. M. Hoehler, A. E. Hofmann, A. R. Hendrix, J. Eigenbrode, F. Postberg, L. J. Spilker, A. McEwen, N. Khawaja, J. Hunter Waite, P. Wurz, J. Helbert, A. Anbar, J.-P. de Vera, J. Núñez, The Science Case for a Return to Enceladus, *Planet. Sci. J.* 2 (4) (2021) 132. doi:10.3847/PSJ/abfb7a.
- [23] G. Choblet, G. Tobie, A. Buch, O. Čadek, L. M. Barge, M. BĀ'hounková, E. Campubri, C. Freissinet, M. Hedman, G. Jones, V. Lainey, A. Le Gall, A. Lucchetti, S. MacKenzie, G. Mitri, M. Neveu, F. Nimmo, K. Olsson-Francis, M. Panning, F. Postberg, J. Saur, J. Schmidt, Y. Sekine, T. Shibuya, C. Sotin, O. Soucek, C. Szopa, T. Usui, S. Vance, T. Van Hoolst, Enceladus as a potential oasis for life: Science goals and investigations for future explorations, *Exp. Astron.* 54 (2-3) (2022) 809–847. doi:10.1007/s10686-021-09808-7.
- [24] H.-W. Hsu, F. Postberg, Y. Sekine, T. Shibuya, S. Kempf, M. Horányi, A. Juhász, N. Altobelli, K. Suzuki, Y. Masaki, T. Kuwatani, S. Tachibana, S.-I. Sirono, G. Moragas-Klostermeyer, R. Srama, Ongoing hydrothermal activities within Enceladus, *Nature* 519 (7542) (2015) 207–210. doi:10.1038/nature14262.
- [25] J. H. Waite, C. R. Glein, R. S. Perryman, B. D. Teolis, B. A. Magee, G. Miller, J. Grimes, M. E. Perry, K. E. Miller, A. Bouquet, J. I. Lunine, T. Brockwell, S. J. Bolton, Cassini finds molecular hydrogen in the Enceladus plume: Evidence for hydrothermal processes, *Science* 356 (6334) (2017) 155–159. doi:10.1126/science.aai8703.
- [26] C. Ray, C. R. Glein, J. H. Waite, B. Teolis, T. Hoehler, J. A. Huber, J. Lunine, F. Postberg, Oxidation processes diversify the metabolic menu on Enceladus, *Icarus* 364 (2021) 114248. arXiv:2012.08582, doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2020.114248.
- [27] J. M. Weber, T. C. Marlin, M. Prakash, B. L. Teece, K. Dzurilla, L. M. Barge, A Review on Hypothesized Metabolic Pathways on Europa and Enceladus: Space-Flight Detection Considerations, *Life* 13 (8) (2023) 1726. doi:10.3390/life13081726.
- [28] F. Postberg, N. Khawaja, B. Abel, G. Choblet, C. R. Glein, M. S. Gudipati, B. L. Henderson, H.-W. Hsu, S. Kempf, F. Klenner, G. Moragas-Klostermeyer, B. Magee, L. Nölle, M. Perry, R. Reviol, J. Schmidt, R. Srama, F. Stolz, G. Tobie, M. Trieloff, J. H. Waite, Macromolecular organic compounds from the depths of Enceladus, *Nature* 558 (7711) (2018) 564–568. doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0246-4.
- [29] N. Khawaja, F. Postberg, J. Hillier, F. Klenner, S. Kempf, L. Nölle, R. Reviol, Z. Zou, R. Srama, Low-mass nitrogen-, oxygen-bearing, and aromatic compounds in Enceladean ice grains, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* 489 (4) (2019) 5231–5243. doi:10.1093/mnras/stz2280.
- [30] F. Postberg, Y. Sekine, F. Klenner, C. R. Glein, Z. Zou, B. Abel, K. Furuya, J. K. Hillier, N. Khawaja, S. Kempf, L. Noelle, T. Saito, J. Schmidt, T. Shibuya, R. Srama, S. Tan, Detection of phosphates originating from Enceladus's ocean, *Nature* 618 (7965) (2023) 489–493. doi:10.1038/s41586-023-05987-9.
- [31] M. Y. Zolotov, An oceanic composition on early and today's Enceladus, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 34 (23) (2007) L23203. doi:10.1029/2007GL031234.
- [32] M. Lingam, A. Loeb, Is Extraterrestrial Life Suppressed on Subsurface Ocean Worlds due to the Paucity of Bioessential Elements?, *Astron. J.* 156 (4) (2018) 151. arXiv:1806.00018, doi:10.3847/1538-3881/aada02.
- [33] J. Hao, C. R. Glein, F. Huang, N. Yee, D. C. Catling, F. Postberg, J. K. Hillier, R. M. Hazen, Abundant phosphorus expected for possible life in Enceladus's ocean, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 119 (39) (2022) e2201388119. doi:10.1073/pnas.2201388119.
- [34] N. G. Randolph-Flagg, T. Ely, S. M. Som, E. L. Shock, C. R. German, T. M. Hoehler, Phosphate availability and implications for life on ocean worlds, *Nat. Commun.* 14 (2023) 2388. doi:10.1038/s41467-023-37770-9.
- [35] G. Choblet, G. Tobie, C. Sotin, M. BĀ'hounková, O. Čadek, F. Postberg, O. Souček, Powering prolonged hydrothermal activity inside Enceladus, *Nat. Astron.* 1 (2017) 841–847. doi:10.1038/s41550-017-0289-8.
- [36] W. Martin, J. Baross, D. Kelley, M. J. Russell, Hydrothermal vents and the origin of life, *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 6 (11) (2008) 805–814. doi:10.1038/nrmicro1991.
- [37] M. J. Russell, L. M. Barge, R. Bhartia, D. Bocanegra, P. J. Bracher, E. Branscomb, R. Kidd, S. McGlynn, D. H. Meier, W. Nitschke, T. Shibuya, S. Vance, L. White, I. Kanik, The Drive to Life on Wet and Icy Worlds, *Astrobiology* 14 (4) (2014) 308–343. doi:10.1089/ast.2013.1110.
- [38] Y. Sekine, T. Shibuya, F. Postberg, H.-W. Hsu, K. Suzuki, Y. Masaki, T. Kuwatani, M. Mori, P. K. Hong, M. Yoshizaki, S. Tachibana, S.-I. Sirono, High-temperature water-rock interactions and hydrothermal environments in the chondrite-like core of Enceladus, *Nat. Commun.* 6 (2015) 8604. doi:10.1038/ncomms9604.
- [39] L. M. Barge, L. M. White, Experimentally Testing Hydrothermal Vent Origin of Life on Enceladus and Other Icy/Ocean Worlds, *Astrobiology* 17 (9) (2017) 820–833. doi:10.1089/ast.2016.1633.
- [40] W. Takahagi, K. Seo, T. Shibuya, Y. Takano, K. Fujishima, M. Saitoh, S. Shimamura, Y. Matsui, M. Tomita, K. Takai, Peptide Synthesis under the Alkaline Hydrothermal Conditions on Enceladus, *ACS Earth Space Chem.* 3 (11) (2019) 2559–2568. doi:10.1021/acsearthspacechem.9b00108.
- [41] M. J. Russell, The “Water Problem”(sic), the Illusory Pond and Life's Submarine Emergence—A Review, *Life* 11 (5) (2021) 429. doi:10.3390/life11050429.
- [42] A. Affholder, F. Guyot, B. Sauterey, R. Ferrière, S. Mazevet, Bayesian analysis of Enceladus's plume data to assess methanogenesis, *Nat. Astron.* 5 (2021) 805–814. doi:10.1038/s41550-021-01372-6.
- [43] A. Affholder, F. Guyot, B. Sauterey, R. Ferrière, S. Mazevet, Putative Methanogenic Biosphere in Enceladus's Deep Ocean: Biomass, Productivity, and Implications for Detection, *Planet. Sci. J.* 3 (12) (2022) 270. doi:10.3847/PSJ/aca275.
- [44] P. M. Higgins, C. R. Glein, C. S. Cockell, Instantaneous Habitable Windows in the Parameter Space of Enceladus' Ocean, *J. Geophys.*

- Res. Planets 126 (11) (2021) e06951. doi:10.1029/2021JE006951.
- [45] M. Lingam, A. Loeb, Physical Constraints on Motility with Applications to Possible Life on Mars and Enceladus, *Planet. Sci. J.* 2 (3) (2021) 101. arXiv:2101.06876, doi:10.3847/PSJ/abfe06.
- [46] L. I. Tenelanda-Osorio, J. L. Parra, P. Cuartas-Restrepo, J. I. Zuluaga, Enceladus as a Potential Niche for Methanogens and Estimation of Its Biomass, *Life* 11 (11) (2021) 1182. doi:10.3390/Life11111182.
- [47] M. Goumas, M. Lingam, Bioenergetic Modeling of Methanogens In Europa's Subsurface Ocean Environment, in: AAS/Division for Planetary Sciences Meeting Abstracts, Vol. 55 of AAS/Division for Planetary Sciences Meeting Abstracts, 2023, p. 315.10.
- [48] R.-S. Taubner, P. Pappenreiter, J. Zwicker, D. Smrzka, C. Pruckner, P. Kolar, S. Bernacchi, A. H. Seifert, A. Krajete, W. Bach, J. Peckmann, C. Paulik, M. G. Firneis, C. Schleper, S. K. M. R. Rittmann, Biological methane production under putative Enceladus-like conditions, *Nat. Commun.* 9 (2018) 748. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-02876-y.
- [49] N. Y. Wagner, D. T. Andersen, A. S. Hahn, S. S. Johnson, Survival strategies of an anoxic microbial ecosystem in Lake Untersee, a potential analog for Enceladus, *Sci. Rep.* 12 (2022) 7376. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-10876-8.
- [50] M. J. Roche, M. G. Fox-Powell, R. E. Hamp, J. M. Byrne, Iron reduction as a viable metabolic pathway in Enceladus' ocean, *Int. J. Astrobiol.* 22 (5) (2023) 539–558. doi:10.1017/S1473550423000125.
- [51] C. F. Chyba, K. P. Hand, Life Without Photosynthesis, *Science* 292 (5524) (2001) 2026–2027. doi:10.1126/science.1060081.
- [52] C. F. Chyba, C. B. Phillips, Possible ecosystems and the search for life on Europa, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 98 (3) (2001) 801–804. doi:10.1073/pnas.98.3.801.
- [53] C. F. Chyba, C. B. Phillips, Europa as an Abode of Life, *Orig. Life Evol. Biosph.* 32 (1) (2002) 47–67. doi:10.1023/A:1013958519734.
- [54] K. P. Hand, C. F. Chyba, J. C. Priscu, R. W. Carlson, K. H. Nealson, Astrobiology and the Potential for Life on Europa, in: R. T. Pappalardo, W. B. McKinnon, K. K. Khurana (Eds.), *Europa*, Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2009, pp. 589–629.
- [55] M. E. Brown, K. P. Hand, Salts and Radiation Products on the Surface of Europa, *Astron. J.* 145 (4) (2013) 110. arXiv:1303.0894, doi:10.1088/0004-6256/145/4/110.
- [56] S. A. Kattenhorn, L. M. Prockter, Evidence for subduction in the ice shell of Europa, *Nat. Geosci.* 7 (10) (2014) 762–767. doi:10.1038/ngeo2245.
- [57] J. Kimura, N. Kitadai, Polymerization of Building Blocks of Life on Europa and Other Icy Moons, *Astrobiology* 15 (6) (2015) 430–441. arXiv:1506.06600, doi:10.1089/ast.2015.1306.
- [58] S. D. Vance, K. P. Hand, R. T. Pappalardo, Geophysical controls of chemical disequilibria in Europa, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 43 (10) (2016) 4871–4879. doi:10.1002/2016GL068547.
- [59] M. J. Russell, A. E. Murray, K. P. Hand, The Possible Emergence of Life and Differentiation of a Shallow Biosphere on Irradiated Icy Worlds: The Example of Europa, *Astrobiology* 17 (12) (2017) 1265–1273. doi:10.1089/ast.2016.1600.
- [60] M. Lingam, A. Loeb, Subsurface exolife, *Int. J. Astrobiol.* 18 (2) (2019) 112–141. doi:10.1017/S1473550418000083.
- [61] K. M. Soderlund, K. Kalousova, J. J. Buffo, C. R. Glein, J. C. Goodman, G. Mitri, G. W. Patterson, F. Postberg, M. Rovira-Navarro, T. Rückriemen, J. Saur, B. E. Schmidt, C. Sotin, T. Spohn, G. Tobie, T. Van Hoolst, S. D. Vance, B. Vermeersen, Ice-Ocean Exchange Processes in the Jovian and Saturnian Satellites, *Space Sci. Rev.* 216 (5) (2020) 80. doi:10.1007/s11214-020-00706-6.
- [62] M. A. Hesse, J. S. Jordan, S. D. Vance, A. V. Oza, Downward Oxidant Transport Through Europa's Ice Shell by Density-Driven Brine Percolation, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 49 (5) (2022) e2021GL095416. doi:10.1029/2021GL095416.
- [63] S. M. Howell, R. T. Pappalardo, NASA's Europa Clipper—a mission to a potentially habitable ocean world, *Nat. Commun.* 11 (2020) 1311. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-15160-9.
- [64] S. D. Vance, K. L. Craft, E. Shock, B. E. Schmidt, J. Lunine, K. P. Hand, W. B. McKinnon, E. M. Spiers, C. Chivers, J. D. Lawrence, N. Wolfenbarger, E. J. Leonard, K. J. Robinson, M. J. Styczinski, D. M. Persaud, G. Steinbrügge, M. Y. Zolotov, L. C. Quick, J. E. C. Scully, T. M. Becker, S. M. Howell, R. N. Clark, A. J. Dombard, C. R. Glein, O. Mousis, M. A. Sephton, J. Castillo-Rogez, F. Nimmo, A. S. McEwen, M. S. Gudipati, I. Jun, X. Jia, F. Postberg, K. M. Soderlund, C. M. Elder, Investigating Europa's Habitability with the Europa Clipper, *Space Sci. Rev.* 219 (8) (2023) 81. doi:10.1007/s11214-023-01025-2.
- [65] O. Grasset, M. K. Dougherty, A. Coustenis, E. J. Bunce, C. Erd, D. Titov, M. Blanc, A. Coates, P. Drossart, L. N. Fletcher, H. Hussmann, R. Jaumann, N. Krupp, J. P. Lebreton, O. Prieto-Ballesteros, P. Tortora, F. Tosi, T. Van Hoolst, JUPITER ICY moons Explorer (JUICE): An ESA mission to orbit Ganymede and to characterise the Jupiter system, *Planet. Space Sci.* 78 (2013) 1–21. doi:10.1016/j.pss.2012.12.002.
- [66] O. Witasse, JUICE (Jupiter Icy Moon Explorer): A European mission to explore the emergence of habitable worlds around gas giants, in: EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts, EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts, 2021, pp. EGU21–15330. doi:10.5194/egusphere-egu21-15330.
- [67] C. J. Hansen, L. Esposito, A. I. F. Stewart, J. Colwell, A. Hendrix, W. Pryor, D. Shemansky, R. West, Enceladus' Water Vapor Plume, *Science* 311 (5766) (2006) 1422–1425. doi:10.1126/science.1121254.
- [68] J. H. Waite, M. R. Combi, W.-H. Ip, T. E. Cravens, R. L. McNutt, W. Kasprzak, R. Yelle, J. Luhmann, H. Niemann, D. Gell, B. Magee, G. Fletcher, J. Lunine, W.-L. Tseng, Cassini Ion and Neutral Mass Spectrometer: Enceladus Plume Composition and Structure, *Science* 311 (5766) (2006) 1419–1422. doi:10.1126/science.1121290.
- [69] B. D. Teolis, M. E. Perry, C. J. Hansen, J. H. Waite, C. C. Porco, J. R. Spencer, C. J. A. Howett, Enceladus Plume Structure and Time Variability: Comparison of Cassini Observations, *Astrobiology* 17 (9) (2017) 926–940. doi:10.1089/ast.2017.1647.
- [70] C. J. Hansen, L. W. Esposito, A. R. Hendrix, Ultraviolet observation of Enceladus' plume in transit across Saturn, compared to Europa, *Icarus* 330 (2019) 256–260. doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2019.04.031.
- [71] G. L. Villanueva, H. B. Hammel, S. N. Milam, V. Kofman, S. Faggi, C. R. Glein, R. Cartwright, L. Roth, K. P. Hand, L. Paganini, J. Spencer, J. Stansberry, B. Holler, N. Rowe-Gurney, S. Protopapa, G. Strazzulla, G. Liuzzi, G. Cruz-Mermy, M. El Moutamid, M. Hedman, K. Denny, JWST molecular mapping and characterization of Enceladus' water plume feeding its torus, *Nat. Astron.* arXiv:2305.18678, doi:10.1038/s41550-023-02009-6.
- [72] W. B. Sparks, K. P. Hand, M. A. McGrath, E. Bergeron, M. Cracraft, S. E. Deustua, Probing for Evidence of Plumes on Europa with HST/STIS, *Astrophys. J.* 829 (2) (2016) 121. arXiv:1609.08215, doi:10.3847/0004-637X/829/2/121.
- [73] W. B. Sparks, B. E. Schmidt, M. A. McGrath, K. P. Hand, J. R. Spencer, M. Cracraft, S. E. Deustua, Active Cryovolcanism on Europa?, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* 839 (2) (2017) L18. arXiv:1704.04283, doi:10.3847/2041-8213/aa67f8.
- [74] X. Jia, M. G. Kivelson, K. K. Khurana, W. S. Kurth, Evidence of a plume on Europa from Galileo magnetic and plasma wave signatures, *Nat. Astron.* 2 (2018) 459–464. doi:10.1038/s41550-018-0450-z.
- [75] H. Arnold, L. Liuzzo, S. Simon, Magnetic Signatures of a Plume at Europa During the Galileo E26 Flyby, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 46 (3) (2019) 1149–1157. doi:10.1029/2018GL081544.
- [76] H. L. F. Huybrighs, E. Roussos, A. Blöcker, N. Krupp, Y. Futaana, S. Barabash, L. Z. Hadid, M. K. G. Holmberg, O. Lomax, O. Witasse, An Active Plume Eruption on Europa During Galileo Flyby E26 as Indicated by Energetic Proton Depletions, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 47 (10) (2020) e87806. doi:10.1029/2020GL087806.
- [77] L. Roth, J. Saur, K. D. Retherford, D. F. Strobel, P. D. Feldman, M. A. McGrath, F. Nimmo, Transient Water Vapor at Europa's South Pole, *Science* 343 (6167) (2014) 171–174. doi:10.1126/science.1247051.
- [78] W. B. Sparks, M. Richter, C. deWitt, E. Montiel, N. Dello Russo, J. M. Grunsfeld, M. A. McGrath, H. Weaver, K. P. Hand, E. Bergeron, W. Reach, A Search for Water Vapor Plumes on Europa using

- SOFIA, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* 871 (1) (2019) L5. arXiv:1901.00086, doi:10.3847/2041-8213/aafb0a.
- [79] L. Paganini, G. L. Villanueva, L. Roth, A. M. Mandell, T. A. Hurford, K. D. Retherford, M. J. Mumma, A measurement of water vapour amid a largely quiescent environment on Europa, *Nat. Astron.* 4 (2020) 266–272. doi:10.1038/s41550-019-0933-6.
- [80] T. O. Winterhalder, H. L. F. Huybrighs, Assessing JUICE's ability of in situ plume detection in Europa's atmosphere, *Planet. Space Sci.* 210 (2022) 105375. doi:10.1016/j.pss.2021.105375.
- [81] R. Dayton-Oxland, H. L. F. Huybrighs, T. O. Winterhalder, A. Mahieux, D. Goldstein, In-situ detection of Europa's water plumes is harder than previously thought, *Icarus* 395 (2023) 115488. arXiv:2302.06614, doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2023.115488.
- [82] C. P. McKay, C. C. Porco, T. Altheide, W. L. Davis, T. A. Kral, The Possible Origin and Persistence of Life on Enceladus and Detection of Biomarkers in the Plume, *Astrobiology* 8 (5) (2008) 909–919. doi:10.1089/ast.2008.0265.
- [83] C. P. McKay, A. D. Anbar, C. Porco, P. Tsou, Follow the Plume: The Habitability of Enceladus, *Astrobiology* 14 (4) (2014) 352–355. doi:10.1089/ast.2014.1158.
- [84] B. Cavalazzi, F. Westall, *Biosignatures for Astrobiology, Advances in Astrobiology and Biogeophysics*, Cham: Springer, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-96175-0.
- [85] M. Neveu, A. D. Anbar, A. F. Davila, D. P. Glavin, S. M. MacKenzie, C. M. Phillips-Lander, B. Sherwood, Y. Takano, P. Williams, H. Yano, Returning Samples from Enceladus for Life Detection, *Front. Astron. Space Sci.* 7 (2020) 26. doi:10.3389/fspas.2020.00026.
- [86] R. A. Mathies, J. S. New, M. Golozar, A. L. Butterworth, On the Feasibility of Informative Biosignature Measurements Using an Enceladus Plume Organic Analyzer, *Planet. Sci. J.* 2 (4) (2021) 163. doi:10.3847/PSJ/ac0e9b.
- [87] J. S. New, B. Kazemi, V. Spathis, M. C. Price, R. A. Mathies, A. L. Butterworth, Quantitative evaluation of the feasibility of sampling the ice plumes at Enceladus for biomarkers of extraterrestrial life, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 118 (37) (2021) e2106197118. doi:10.1073/pnas.2106197118.
- [88] S. M. MacKenzie, M. Neveu, A. F. Davila, J. I. Lunine, M. L. Cable, C. M. Phillips-Lander, J. L. Eigenbrode, J. H. Waite, K. L. Craft, J. D. Hofgartner, C. P. McKay, C. R. Glein, D. Burton, S. P. Kounaves, R. A. Mathies, S. D. Vance, M. J. Malaska, R. Gold, C. R. German, K. M. Soderlund, P. Willis, C. Freissinet, A. S. McEwen, J. R. Brucato, J.-P. P. de Vera, T. M. Hoehler, J. Heldmann, Science Objectives for Flagship-Class Mission Concepts for the Search for Evidence of Life at Enceladus, *Astrobiology* 22 (6) (2022) 685–712. doi:10.1089/ast.2020.2425.
- [89] M. A. Pasek, Plume Sample Modification at Icy Moons: Implications for Biosignatures, *Front. Astron. Space Sci.* 7 (2020) 14. doi:10.3389/fspas.2020.00014.
- [90] J. L. Eigenbrode, R. Gold, J. S. Canham, E. Schulze, A. F. Davila, A. Seas, T. Errigo, F. Kujawa, D. Kusnierkiewicz, C. Lorentson, C. McKay, Contamination Control for Ultra-Sensitive Life-Detection Missions, *Front. Space Technol.* 2 (2021) 734423. doi:10.3389/frspt.2021.734423.
- [91] L. M. Barge, L. E. Rodriguez, J. M. Weber, B. P. Theiling, Determining the “Biosignature Threshold” for Life Detection on Biotic, Abiotic, or Prebiotic Worlds, *Astrobiology* 22 (4) (2022) 481–493. doi:10.1089/ast.2021.0079.
- [92] T. L. Salter, J. S. Watson, J. H. Waite, M. A. Sephton, Hydrothermal Processing of Microorganisms: Mass Spectral Signals of Degraded Biosignatures for Life Detection on Icy Moons, *ACS Earth Space Chem.* 6 (10) (2022) 2508–2518. doi:10.1021/acsearthspacechem.2c00213.
- [93] C. Gillen, C. Jeancolas, S. McMahon, P. Vickers, The Call for a New Definition of Biosignature, *Astrobiology* 23 (11) (2023) 1228–1237. doi:10.1089/ast.2023.0010.
- [94] C. Malaterre, I. L. ten Kate, M. Baqué, V. Debaille, J. L. Grenfell, E. J. Javaux, N. Khawaja, F. Klenner, Y. J. Lara, S. McMahon, K. Moore, L. Noack, C. H. L. Patty, F. Postberg, Is There Such a Thing as a Biosignature?, *Astrobiology* 23 (11) (2023) 1213–1227. doi:10.1089/ast.2023.0042.
- [95] J. S. W. Tan, T. L. Salter, J. S. Watson, J. H. Waite, M. A. Sephton, Organic Biosignature Degradation in Hydrothermal and Serpentinizing Environments: Implications for Life Detection on Icy Moons and Mars, *Astrobiology* 23 (10) (2023) 1045–1055. doi:10.1089/ast.2022.0144.
- [96] E. M. Spiers, J. M. Weber, C. Venigalla, A. M. Annex, C. P. Chen, C. Lee, P. C. Gray, K. J. McIntyre, J. R. Berdis, S. R. Carberry Mogan, P. do Vale Pereira, S. Kumar, W. O'Neill, E. A. Czajka, P. E. Johnson, A. Pascuzzo, S. Tallapragada, D. Phillips, K. Mitchell, A. Nash, J. Scully, L. Lowes, Tiger: Concept Study for a New Frontiers Enceladus Habitability Mission, *Planet. Sci. J.* 2 (5) (2021) 195. doi:10.3847/PSJ/ac19b7.
- [97] A. N. Deutsch, P. Panicucci, L. I. Tenelanda-Osorio, V. Da Poian, Y. H. Cho, C. Venigalla, T. Mathanlal, E. Castillo Specia, G. González Peytaví, A. Guarriello, O. Gunasekara, L. Jones, M. Krasteva, J. Pouplin, N. Villanueva, S. Zaref, The ETNA mission concept: Assessing the habitability of an active ocean world, *Front. Astron. Space Sci.* 9 (2022) 1028357. doi:10.3389/fspas.2022.1028357.
- [98] O. Mousis, A. Bouquet, Y. Langevin, N. André, H. Boithias, G. Durré, F. Faye, P. Hartogh, J. Helbert, L. Iess, S. Kempf, A. Masters, F. Postberg, J. B. Renard, P. Vernazza, A. Vorburger, P. Wurz, D. H. Atkinson, S. Barabash, M. Berthomier, J. Brucato, M. Cable, J. Carter, S. Cazaux, A. Coustenis, G. Danger, V. Dehant, T. Fornaro, P. Garnier, T. Gautier, O. Groussin, L. Z. Hadid, J. C. Ize, I. Kolmasova, J. P. Lebreton, S. Le Maistre, E. Lellouch, J. I. Lunine, K. E. Mandt, Z. Martins, D. Mimoun, Q. Nenon, G. M. Muñoz Caro, P. Rannou, H. Rauer, P. Schmitt-Kopplin, A. Schneeberger, M. Simons, K. Stephan, T. Van Hoolst, J. Vaverka, M. Wieser, L. Wörner, Moonraker: Enceladus Multiple Flyby Mission, *Planet. Sci. J.* 3 (12) (2022) 268. arXiv:2211.00721, doi:10.3847/PSJ/ac9c03.
- [99] E. Nathan, K. Balachandran, P. Cappuccio, J. Di, K. Doerksen, A. Gloder, M. Li, L. Massarweh, T. Peev, S. Santra, M. Rovira-Navarro, D. Limonchik, A multi-lander New Frontiers mission concept study for Enceladus: SILENUS, *Front. Astron. Space Sci.* 9 (2022) 246. doi:10.3389/fspas.2022.995941.
- [100] K. M. Seaton, S. Gyalay, G. Stucky de Quay, E. R. Burnett, C. A. Denton, B. Doerr, K. Ebadi, S. Eckert, I. T. W. Flynn, C. I. Honniball, S. Hume, C. L. Kling, J. C. Marohnic, J. Milton, C. A. Mondro, R. G. Nuno, C. M. Rooney, B. E. Strauss, A. Nash, J. E. C. Scully, Astrobiology eXploration at Enceladus (AXE): A New Frontiers Mission Concept Study, *Planet. Sci. J.* 4 (6) (2023) 116. doi:10.3847/PSJ/acd119.
- [101] K. P. Hand, C. B. Phillips, A. Murray, J. B. Garvin, E. H. Maize, R. G. Gibbs, G. Reeves, A. M. S. Martin, G. H. Tan-Wang, J. Krajewski, K. Hurst, R. Crum, B. A. Kennedy, T. P. McElrath, J. C. Gallon, D. Sabahi, S. W. Thurman, B. Goldstein, P. Estabrook, S. W. Lee, J. A. Dooley, W. B. Brinckerhoff, K. S. Edgett, C. R. German, T. M. Hoehler, S. M. Hörst, J. I. Lunine, C. Paranicas, K. Neelson, D. E. Smith, A. S. Templeton, M. J. Russell, B. Schmidt, B. Christner, B. Ehlmann, A. Hayes, A. Rhoden, P. Willis, R. A. Yingst, K. Craft, M. E. Cameron, T. Nordheim, J. Pitesky, J. Scully, J. Hofgartner, S. W. Sell, K. J. Barltrop, J. Izraelevitz, E. J. Brandon, J. Seong, J. P. Jones, J. Pasalic, K. J. Billings, J. P. Ruiz, R. V. Bugga, D. Graham, L. A. Arenas, D. Takeyama, M. Drummond, H. Aghazarian, A. J. Andersen, K. B. Andersen, E. W. Anderson, A. Babuscia, P. G. Backes, E. S. Bailey, D. Balentine, C. G. Ballard, D. F. Berisford, P. Bhandari, K. Blackwood, G. S. Bolotin, E. A. Bovre, J. Bowkett, K. T. Boykins, M. S. Bramble, T. M. Brice, P. Briggs, A. P. Brinkman, S. M. Brooks, B. B. Buffington, B. Burns, M. L. Cable, S. Campagnola, L. A. Cangahuala, G. A. Carr, J. R. Casani, N. E. Chahat, B. K. Chamberlain-Simon, Y. Cheng, S. A. Chien, B. T. Cook, M. Cooper, M. DiNicola, B. Clement, Z. Dean, E. A. Cullimore, A. G. Curtis, J. P. d. l. Croix, P. D. Pasquale, E. M. Dodd, L. A. Dubord, J. A. Edlund, R. Ellyin, B. Emanuel, J. T.

- Foster, A. J. Ganino, G. J. Garner, M. T. Gibson, M. Gildner, K. J. Glazebrook, M. E. Greco, W. M. Green, S. J. Hatch, M. M. Hetzel, W. A. Hoey, A. E. Hofmann, R. Ionasescu, A. Jain, J. D. Jasper, J. R. Johannessen, G. K. Johnson, I. Jun, A. B. Katake, S. Y. Kim-Castet, D. I. Kim, W. Kim, E. F. Klonicki, B. Kobeissi, B. D. Kobie, J. Kochocki, M. Kokorowski, J. A. Kosberg, K. Kriechbaum, T. P. Kulkarni, R. L. Lam, D. F. Landau, M. A. Lattimore, S. L. Laubach, C. R. Lawler, G. Lim, J. Y. Lin, T. E. Litwin, M. W. Lo, C. A. Logan, E. Maghasoudi, L. Mandrake, Y. Marchetti, E. Marteau, K. A. Maxwell, J. B. M. Namee, O. McIntyre, M. Meacham, J. P. Melko, J. Mueller, D. A. Muliere, A. Mysore, J. Nash, H. Ono, J. M. Parker, R. C. Perkins, A. E. Petropoulos, A. Gaut, M. Y. P. Gomez, R. P. Casillas, M. Preudhomme, G. Pyrzak, J. Rapinchuk, J. M. Ratliff, T. L. Ray, E. T. Roberts, K. Roffo, D. C. Roth, J. A. Russino, T. M. Schmidt, M. J. Schoppers, J. S. Senent, F. Serricchio, D. J. Sheldon, L. R. Shiraiishi, J. Shirvanian, K. J. Siegel, G. Singh, A. R. Sirota, E. D. Skulsky, J. S. Stehly, N. J. Strange, S. U. Stevens, E. T. Sunada, S. P. Tepsuporn, L. P. C. Tosi, N. Trawny, I. Uchenik, V. Verma, R. A. Volpe, C. T. Wagner, D. Wang, R. G. Willson, J. L. Wolff, A. T. Wong, A. K. Zimmer, K. G. Sukhatme, K. A. Bago, Y. Chen, A. M. Deardorff, R. S. Kuch, C. Lim, M. L. Syvertson, G. A. Arakaki, A. Avila, K. J. DeBruin, A. Frick, J. R. Harris, M. C. Heverly, J. M. Kawata, S. K. Kim, D. M. Kipp, J. Murphy, M. W. Smith, M. D. Spaulding, R. Thakker, N. Z. Warner, C. R. Yahner, M. E. Young, T. Magner, D. Adams, P. Bedini, L. Mehr, C. Sheldon, S. Vernon, V. Bailey, M. Briere, M. Butler, A. Davis, S. Ensor, M. Gannon, A. Haapala-Chalk, T. Hartka, M. Holdridge, A. Hong, J. Hunt, J. Iskow, F. Kahler, K. Murray, D. Napolillo, M. Norkus, R. Pfisterer, J. Porter, D. Roth, P. Schwartz, L. Wolfarth, E. H. Cardiff, A. Davis, E. W. Grob, J. R. Adam, E. Betts, J. Norwood, M. M. Heller, T. Voskuilen, P. Sakievich, L. Gray, D. J. Hansen, K. W. Irick, J. C. Hewson, J. Lamb, S. C. Stacy, C. M. Brotherton, A. S. Tappan, D. Benally, H. Thigpen, E. Ortiz, D. Sandoval, A. M. Ison, M. Warren, P. G. Stromberg, P. M. Thelen, B. Blasy, P. Nandy, A. W. Haddad, L. B. Trujillo, T. H. Wiseley, S. A. Bell, N. P. Teske, C. Post, L. Torres-Castro, C. Grosso, M. Wasiolek, Science Goals and Mission Architecture of the Europa Lander Mission Concept, *Planet. Sci. J.* 3 (1) (2022) 22. doi:10.3847/PSJ/ac4493.
- [102] NASEM, Origins, Worlds, and Life: A Decadal Strategy for Planetary Science and Astrobiology 2023-2032, Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2022.
- [103] S. M. MacKenzie, M. Neveu, A. F. Davila, J. I. Lunine, K. L. Craft, M. L. Cable, C. M. Phillips-Lander, J. D. Hofgartner, J. L. Eigenbrode, J. Waite, J. Hunter, C. R. Glein, R. Gold, P. J. Greenauer, K. Kirby, C. Bradburne, S. P. Kounaves, M. J. Malaska, F. Postberg, G. W. Patterson, C. Porco, J. I. Núñez, C. German, J. A. Huber, C. P. McKay, J.-P. de Vera, J. R. Brucato, L. J. Spilker, The Enceladus Orbilander Mission Concept: Balancing Return and Resources in the Search for Life, *Planet. Sci. J.* 2 (2) (2021) 77. doi:10.3847/PSJ/abe4da.
- [104] B. Dachwald, S. Ulamec, F. Postberg, F. Sohl, J.-P. de Vera, C. Waldmann, R. D. Lorenz, K. A. Zacny, H. Hellard, J. Biele, P. Rettberg, Key Technologies and Instrumentation for Subsurface Exploration of Ocean Worlds, *Space Sci. Rev.* 216 (5) (2020) 83. doi:10.1007/s11214-020-00707-5.
- [105] S. A. Bowden, J. Parnell, M. J. Burchell, Survival of organic compounds in ejecta from hypervelocity impacts on ice, *Int. J. Astrobiol.* 8 (1) (2009) 19–25. doi:10.1017/S147355040900442X.
- [106] F. Klenner, F. Postberg, J. Hillier, N. Khawaja, R. Reviol, F. Stolz, M. L. Cable, B. Abel, L. Nölle, Analog Experiments for the Identification of Trace Biosignatures in Ice Grains from Extraterrestrial Ocean Worlds, *Astrobiology* 20 (2) (2020) 179–189. doi:10.1089/ast.2019.2065.
- [107] F. Klenner, F. Postberg, J. Hillier, N. Khawaja, M. L. Cable, B. Abel, S. Kempf, C. R. Glein, J. I. Lunine, R. Hodyss, R. Reviol, F. Stolz, Discriminating Abiotic and Biotic Fingerprints of Amino Acids and Fatty Acids in Ice Grains Relevant to Ocean Worlds, *Astrobiology* 20 (10) (2020) 1168–1184. doi:10.1089/ast.2019.2188.
- [108] A. Jaramillo-Botero, M. L. Cable, A. E. Hofmann, M. Malaska, R. Hodyss, J. Lunine, Understanding Hypervelocity Sampling of Biosignatures in Space Missions, *Astrobiology* 21 (4) (2021) 421–442. doi:10.1089/ast.2020.2301.
- [109] M. Dannenmann, F. Klenner, J. Bönigk, M. Pavlista, M. Napoleoni, J. Hillier, N. Khawaja, K. Olsson-Francis, M. L. Cable, M. J. Malaska, B. Abel, F. Postberg, Toward Detecting Biosignatures of DNA, Lipids, and Metabolic Intermediates from Bacteria in Ice Grains Emitted by Enceladus and Europa, *Astrobiology* 23 (1) (2023) 60–75. doi:10.1089/ast.2022.0063.
- [110] J. A. Schulze, D. E. Yilmaz, M. L. Cable, M. Malaska, A. E. Hofmann, R. P. Hodyss, J. I. Lunine, A. C. T. van Duin, A. Jaramillo-Botero, Effect of Salts on the Formation and Hypervelocity-Induced Fragmentation of Icy Clusters with Embedded Amino Acids, *ACS Earth Space Chem.* 7 (1) (2023) 168–181. doi:10.1021/acsearthspacechem.2c00267.
- [111] Z. Ulibarri, T. Munsat, M. Voss, J. Fontanese, M. Horányi, S. Kempf, Z. Sternovsky, Detection of the amino acid histidine and its breakup products in hypervelocity impact ice spectra, *Icarus* 391 (2023) 115319. doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2022.115319.
- [112] J. S. New, R. A. Mathies, M. C. Price, M. J. Cole, M. Golozar, V. Spathis, M. J. Burchell, A. L. Butterworth, Characterizing organic particle impacts on inert metal surfaces: Foundations for capturing organic molecules during hypervelocity transits of Enceladus plumes, *Meteorit. Planet. Sci.* 55 (3) (2020) 465–479. doi:10.1111/maps.13448.
- [113] S. E. Burke, Z. A. Auvil, K. A. Hanold, R. E. Continetti, Detection of intact amino acids with a hypervelocity ice grain impact mass spectrometer, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 120 (50) (2023) e2313447120. doi:10.1073/pnas.2313447120.
- [114] R. G. Fausch, J. Schertenleib, P. Wurz, Reliably analyzing the chemical composition of plumes during flybys at velocities exceeding 5 km/s, in: 2023 IEEE Aerospace Conference, 2023, pp. 1–8. doi:10.1109/AERO55745.2023.10115795.
- [115] Y. Gao, S. Chien, Review on space robotics: Toward top-level science through space exploration, *Sci. Robot.* 2 (7) (2017) eaan5074. doi:10.1126/scirobotics.aan5074.
- [116] L. Kunze, N. Hawes, T. Duckett, M. Hanheide, T. Krajník, Artificial Intelligence for Long-Term Robot Autonomy: A Survey, *IEEE Robot. Autom. Lett.* 3 (4) (2018) 4023–4030. doi:10.1109/LRA.2018.2860628.
- [117] A. A. Omar, M. M. Farag, R. A. Alhamad, Artificial Intelligence: New Paradigm in Deep Space Exploration, in: 2021 14th International Conference on Developments in eSystems Engineering (DeSE), 2021, p. 21723663. doi:10.1109/DeSE54285.2021.9719425.
- [118] M. A. Post, X.-T. Yan, P. Letier, Modularity for the future in space robotics: A review, *Acta Astronaut.* 189 (2021) 530–547. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2021.09.007.
- [119] J. Chen, J. Sun, G. Wang, From Unmanned Systems to Autonomous Intelligent Systems, *Engineering* 12 (2022) 16–19. doi:10.1016/j.eng.2021.10.007.
- [120] B. P. Theiling, L. Chou, V. Da Poian, M. Battler, K. Raimalwala, J. Arevalo, Ricardo, M. Neveu, Z. Ni, H. Graham, J. Elsila, B. Thompson, Science Autonomy for Ocean Worlds Astrobiology: A Perspective, *Astrobiology* 22 (8) (2022) 901–913. doi:10.1089/ast.2021.0062.
- [121] Z. Manchester, A. Loeb, Space: The Ultimate Computational Edge, *IEEE Pervasive Comput.* 22 (2) (2023) 43–48. doi:10.1109/MPRV.2023.3263415.
- [122] F. A. Zander, Flights to other planets, *Technika i Zhizn* 13 (1924) 15.
- [123] J. D. Bernal, The World, the Flesh and the Devil: An Inquiry into the Future of the Three Enemies of the Rational Soul, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1929.
- [124] G. Marx, Interstellar Vehicle Propelled By Terrestrial Laser Beam, *Nature* 211 (5044) (1966) 22–23. doi:10.1038/211022a0.
- [125] J. L. Redding, Interstellar Vehicle propelled by Terrestrial Laser Beam, *Nature* 213 (5076) (1967) 588–589. doi:10.1038/213588a0.

- [126] P. Lubin, A Roadmap to Interstellar Flight, *J. Br. Interplanet. Soc.* 69 (2016) 40–72.
- [127] P. Lubin, *The Path to Transformational Space Exploration. Volume 1: Fundamentals of Directed Energy*, Singapore: World Scientific, 2022. doi:10.1142/11918-vol1.
- [128] P. Lubin, *The Path to Transformational Space Exploration. Volume 2: Applications of Directed Energy*, Singapore: World Scientific, 2022. doi:10.1142/11918-vol2.
- [129] Z. Merali, Shooting for a star, *Science* 352 (6289) (2016) 1040–1041.
- [130] P. Daukantas, Breakthrough Starshot, *Opt. Photonics News* 28 (5) (2017) 26. doi:10.1364/OPN.28.5.000026.
- [131] H. A. Atwater, A. R. Davoyan, O. Ilic, D. Jariwala, M. C. Sherrott, C. M. Went, W. S. Whitney, J. Wong, Materials challenges for the Starshot lightsail, *Nat. Mater.* 17 (10) (2018) 861–867. doi:10.1038/s41563-018-0075-8.
- [132] K. L. G. Parkin, The Breakthrough Starshot system model, *Acta Astronaut.* 152 (2018) 370–384. arXiv:1805.01306, doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2018.08.035.
- [133] S. P. Worden, J. Drew, P. Klupar, Philanthropic Space Science: The Breakthrough Initiatives, *New Space* 6 (4) (2018) 262–268. doi:10.1089/space.2018.0027.
- [134] R. Heller, G. Anglada-Escudé, M. Hippke, P. Kervella, Low-cost precursor of an interstellar mission, *Astron. Astrophys.* 641 (2020) A45. arXiv:2007.12814, doi:10.1051/0004-6361/202038687.
- [135] D. G. Messerschmitt, P. Lubin, I. Morrison, Challenges in Scientific Data Communication from Low-mass Interstellar Probes, *Astrophys. J., Suppl. Ser.* 249 (2) (2020) 36. arXiv:1801.07778, doi:10.3847/1538-4365/aba126.
- [136] A. R. Davoyan, J. N. Munday, N. Tabiryann, G. A. Swartzlander, L. Johnson, Photonic materials for interstellar solar sailing, *Optica* 8 (5) (2021) 722. doi:10.1364/OPTICA.417007.
- [137] S. P. Worden, W. A. Green, J. Schalkwyk, K. Parkin, R. Q. Fugate, Progress on the Starshot laser propulsion system, *Appl. Opt.* 60 (31) (2021) H20. doi:10.1364/AO.435858.
- [138] S. Gong, M. Macdonald, Review on solar sail technology, *Astrody-namics* 3 (2) (2019) 93–125. doi:10.1007/s42064-019-0038-x.
- [139] S. G. Turyshev, D. Garber, L. D. Friedman, A. M. Hein, N. Barnes, K. Batygin, M. E. Brown, L. Cronin, A. R. Davoyan, A. Dubill, T. M. Eubanks, S. Gibson, D. M. Hassler, N. R. Izenberg, P. Kervella, P. D. Mauskopf, N. Murphy, A. Nutter, C. Porco, D. Riccobono, J. Schalkwyk, K. B. Stevenson, M. V. Sykes, M. Sultana, V. T. Toth, M. Velli, S. P. Worden, Science opportunities with solar sailing smallsats, *Planet. Space Sci.* 235 (2023) 105744. arXiv:2303.14917, doi:10.1016/j.pss.2023.105744.
- [140] Y. Tsuda, O. Mori, R. Funase, H. Sawada, T. Yamamoto, T. Saiki, T. Endo, J. Kawaguchi, Flight status of IKAROS deep space solar sail demonstrator, *Acta Astronaut.* 69 (9-10) (2011) 833–840. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2011.06.005.
- [141] D. A. Spencer, B. Betts, J. M. Bellardo, A. Diaz, B. Plante, J. R. Mansell, The LightSail 2 solar sailing technology demonstration, *Adv. Space Res.* 67 (9) (2021) 2878–2889. doi:10.1016/j.asr.2020.06.029.
- [142] J. R. Mansell, J. M. Bellardo, B. Betts, B. Plante, D. A. Spencer, LightSail 2 Solar Sail Control and Orbit Evolution, *Aerospace* 10 (7) (2023) 579. doi:10.3390/aerospace10070579.
- [143] J. Karlapp, R. Heller, M. Tajmar, Ultrafast transfer of low-mass payloads to Mars and beyond using aerographite solar sails, arXiv e-prints (2023) arXiv:2308.16698 arXiv:2308.16698, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2308.16698.
- [144] C. R. McInnes, *Solar Sailing: Technology, Dynamics and Mission Applications*, Springer Praxis Books, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1999. doi:10.1007/978-1-4471-3992-8.
- [145] G. Vulpetti, *Fast Solar Sailing: Astrodynamics of Special Sailcraft Trajectories*, Space Technology Library, Dordrecht: Springer, 2012. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-4777-7.
- [146] B. Fu, E. Sperber, F. Eke, Solar sail technology-A state of the art review, *Prog. Aerosp. Sci.* 86 (2016) 1–19. doi:10.1016/j.paerosci.2016.07.001.
- [147] S. G. Turyshev, P. Klupar, A. Loeb, Z. Manchester, K. Parkin, E. Witten, S. P. Worden, Exploration of the outer solar system with fast and small sailcraft, arXiv e-prints (2020) arXiv:2005.12336 arXiv:2005.12336, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2005.12336.
- [148] G. Santi, A. J. Corso, D. Garoli, G. E. Lio, M. Manente, G. Favaro, M. Bazzan, G. Pioletti, N. Andriolli, L. Strambini, D. Pavarin, L. Badia, R. Proietti Zaccaria, P. Lubin, R. Ragazzoni, M. G. Pelizzo, Swarm of lightsail nanosatellites for Solar System exploration, *Sci. Rep.* 13 (11) (2023) 19583. arXiv:2208.10980, doi:10.1038/s41598-023-46101-3.
- [149] H.-T. Tung, A. R. Davoyan, Low-Power Laser Sailing for Fast-Transit Space Flight, *Nano Lett.* 22 (3) (2022) 1108–1114. doi:10.1021/acs.nanolett.1c04188.
- [150] A. Hibberd, Github Repository for OITS (2017). URL https://github.com/AdamHibberd/Optimum_Interplanetary_Trajectory
- [151] M. Schlüter, J. A. Egea, J. R. Banga, Extended Ant Colony Optimization for non-convex Mixed Integer Nonlinear Programming, *Comput. Oper. Res.* 36 (7) (2009) 2217–2229. doi:10.1016/j.cor.2008.08.015.
- [152] M. Schlüter, M. Gerdtts, The Oracle Penalty Method, *J. Glob. Optim.* 47 (2) (2010) 293–325. doi:10.1007/s10898-009-9477-0.
- [153] M. Schlueter, S. O. Erb, M. Gerdtts, S. Kemble, J.-J. Rückmann, MIDACO on MINLP space applications, *Adv. Space Res.* 51 (7) (2013) 1116–1131. doi:10.1016/j.asr.2012.11.006.
- [154] A. M. Hein, N. Perakis, T. M. Eubanks, A. Hibberd, A. Crowl, K. Hayward, R. G. Kennedy, R. Osborne, Project Lyra: Sending a spacecraft to 1I/Oumuamua (former A/2017 U1), the interstellar asteroid, *Acta Astronaut.* 161 (2019) 552–561. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2018.12.042.
- [155] A. Hibberd, A. M. Hein, T. M. Eubanks, Project Lyra: Catching 1I/Oumuamua - Mission opportunities after 2024, *Acta Astronautica* 170 (2020) 136–144. arXiv:1902.04935, doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2020.01.018.
- [156] A. M. Hein, M. Lingam, T. M. Eubanks, A. Hibberd, D. Fries, W. P. Blase, A Precursor Balloon Mission for Venusian Astrobiology, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* 903 (2) (2020) L36. arXiv:2009.11826, doi:10.3847/2041-8213/abc347.
- [157] A. Hibberd, A. M. Hein, Project Lyra: Catching 1I/Oumuamua-Using Nuclear Thermal Rockets, *Acta Astronaut.* 179 (2021) 594–603. arXiv:2008.05435, doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2020.11.038.
- [158] A. Hibberd, N. Perakis, A. M. Hein, Sending a spacecraft to interstellar comet 2I/Borisov, *Acta Astronaut.* 189 (2021) 584–592. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2021.09.006.
- [159] A. M. Hein, T. M. Eubanks, M. Lingam, A. Hibberd, D. Fries, J. Schneider, P. Kervella, R. Kennedy, N. Perakis, B. Dachwald, Interstellar Now! Missions to Explore Nearby Interstellar Objects, *Adv. Space Res.* 69 (1) (2022) 402–414. doi:10.1016/j.asr.2021.06.052.
- [160] A. Hibberd, A. M. Hein, T. M. Eubanks, R. G. Kennedy, Project Lyra: A mission to 1I/Oumuamua without Solar Oberth Manoeuvre, *Acta Astronaut.* 199 (2022) 161–165. arXiv:2201.04240, doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2022.07.032.
- [161] A. Hibberd, M. Lingam, A. M. Hein, Can We Fly to Planet 9?, arXiv e-prints (2022) arXiv:2208.10207 arXiv:2208.10207, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2208.10207.
- [162] A. Hibberd, Project Lyra: Another possible trajectory to 1I/Oumuamua, *Acta Astronaut.* 211 (2023) 431–434. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2023.06.029.
- [163] A. Hibberd, Project Lyra: The Way to Go and the Launcher to Get There, arXiv e-prints (2023) arXiv:2305.03065 arXiv:2305.03065, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2305.03065.
- [164] K. L. G. Parkin, Cost-Optimal Laser-Accelerated Lightsails, arXiv e-prints (2022) arXiv:2205.13138 arXiv:2205.13138, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2205.13138.
- [165] D. Messerschmitt, P. Lubin, I. Morrison, Optimal mass and speed for interstellar flyby with directed-energy propulsion, arXiv e-prints

- (2022) arXiv:2206.13929arXiv:2206.13929.
- [166] D. A. Vallado, *Fundamentals of astrodynamics and applications*, 2nd Edition, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.
- [167] G. R. Hintz, *Orbital Mechanics and Astrodynamics: Techniques and Tools for Space Missions*, Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2022. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-96573-0.
- [168] J. M. A. Danby, *Fundamentals of Celestial Mechanics*, 2nd Edition, Richmond: Willmann-Bell, Inc., 1988.
- [169] C. H. Acton, Ancillary data services of NASA's Navigation and Ancillary Information Facility, *Planet. Space Sci.* 44 (1) (1996) 65–70. doi:10.1016/0032-0633(95)00107-7.
- [170] C. Acton, N. Bachman, B. Semenov, E. Wright, A look towards the future in the handling of space science mission geometry, *Planet. Space Sci.* 150 (2018) 9–12. doi:10.1016/j.pss.2017.02.013.
- [171] H. Curtis, *Orbital Mechanics for Engineering Students*, revised fourth Edition, Amsterdam: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2020.
- [172] R. R. Bate, D. D. Mueller, J. E. White, *Fundamentals of astrodynamics*, New York: Dover Publications, 1971.
- [173] A. Hibberd, Intermediate Points for Missions to Interstellar Objects Using Optimum Interplanetary Trajectory Software, arXiv e-prints (2022) arXiv:2205.10220arXiv:2205.10220.
- [174] C. H. Acton, NASA's SPICE System Models the Solar System, in: I. M. Wytrzyszczak, J. H. Lieske, R. A. Feldman (Eds.), *IAU Colloq. 165: Dynamics and Astrometry of Natural and Artificial Celestial Bodies*, 1997, p. 257.
- [175] P. Lubin, W. Hettel, The path to interstellar flight, *Acta Futura* 12 (2020) 9–44. doi:10.5281/zenodo.3874099. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3874099>
- [176] W. Kleinekofort, J. Avdiev, B. Brutschy, A new method of laser desorption mass spectrometry for the study of biological macromolecules, *Int. J. Mass Spectrom. Ion Process.* 152 (2-3) (1996) 135–142. doi:10.1016/0168-1176(95)04330-6.
- [177] A. Charvat, E. Lugovoj, M. Faubel, B. Abel, New design for a time-of-flight mass spectrometer with a liquid beam laser desorption ion source for the analysis of biomolecules, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* 75 (5) (2004) 1209–1218. doi:10.1063/1.1710704.
- [178] F. Klenner, M. Umair, S. H. G. Walter, N. Khawaja, J. Hillier, L. Nölle, Z. Zou, M. Napoleoni, A. Sanderink, W. Zuschneid, B. Abel, F. Postberg, Developing a Laser Induced Liquid Beam Ion Desorption Spectral Database as Reference for Spaceborne Mass Spectrometers, *Earth Space Sci.* 9 (9) (2022) e02313. doi:10.1029/2022EA002313.
- [179] W. Goode, S. Kempf, J. Schmidt, Mapping the surface composition of Europa with SUDA, *Planet. Space Sci.* 227 (2023) 105633. doi:10.1016/j.pss.2023.105633.
- [180] K. Bywaters, C. R. Stoker, J. Batista Do Nascimento, Nelio, L. Lemke, Towards Determining Biosignature Retention in Icy World Plumes, *Life* 10 (4) (2020) 40. doi:10.3390/life10040040.
- [181] W. Kang, T. Mittal, S. Bire, J.-M. Campin, J. Marshall, How does salinity shape ocean circulation and ice geometry on Enceladus and other icy satellites?, *Sci. Adv.* 8 (29) (2022) eabm4665. arXiv:2104.07008, doi:10.1126/sciadv.abm4665.
- [182] M. Napoleoni, F. Klenner, N. Khawaja, J. K. Hillier, F. Postberg, Mass Spectrometric Fingerprints of Organic Compounds in NaCl-Rich Ice Grains from Europa and Enceladus, *ACS Earth Space Chem.* 7 (4) (2023) 735–752. doi:10.1021/acsearthspacechem.2c00342.
- [183] M. Napoleoni, F. Klenner, L. Hortal Sánchez, N. Khawaja, J. K. Hillier, M. S. Gudipati, K. P. Hand, S. Kempf, F. Postberg, Mass Spectrometric Fingerprints of Organic Compounds in Sulfate-Rich Ice Grains: Implications for Europa Clipper, *ACS Earth Space Chem.* 7 (9) (2023) 1675–1693. doi:10.1021/acsearthspacechem.3c00098.
- [184] C. P. McKay, What Is Life—and How Do We Search for It in Other Worlds?, *PLoS Biol.* 2 (9) (2004) e302. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0020302.
- [185] E. D. Dorn, K. H. Neelson, C. Adami, Monomer Abundance Distribution Patterns as a Universal Biosignature: Examples from Terrestrial and Digital Life, *J. Mol. Evol.* 72 (3) (2011) 283–295. arXiv:1101.1013, doi:10.1007/s00239-011-9429-4.
- [186] A. F. Davila, C. P. McKay, Chance and Necessity in Biochemistry: Implications for the Search for Extraterrestrial Biomarkers in Earth-like Environments, *Astrobiology* 14 (6) (2014) 534–540. doi:10.1089/ast.2014.1150.
- [187] C. D. Georgiou, D. W. Deamer, Lipids as Universal Biomarkers of Extraterrestrial Life, *Astrobiology* 14 (6) (2014) 541–549. doi:10.1089/ast.2013.1134.
- [188] C. D. Georgiou, Functional Properties of Amino Acid Side Chains as Biomarkers of Extraterrestrial Life, *Astrobiology* 18 (11) (2018) 1479–1496. doi:10.1089/ast.2018.1868.
- [189] R.-S. Taubner, K. Olsson-Francis, S. D. Vance, N. K. Ramkissoon, F. Postberg, J.-P. de Vera, A. Antunes, E. Camprubi Casas, Y. Sekine, L. Noack, L. Barge, J. Goodman, M. Jebbar, B. Journaux, Ö. Karatekin, F. Klenner, E. Rabbow, P. Rettberg, T. Rückriemen-Bez, J. Saur, T. Shibuya, K. M. Soderlund, Experimental and Simulation Efforts in the Astrobiological Exploration of Exoceans, *Space Sci. Rev.* 216 (1) (2020) 9. doi:10.1007/s11214-020-0635-5.
- [190] P. Schwendner, A. Riedo, D. J. Melton, P. Horvath, R. Lindner, P. Ehrenfreund, K. Beblo-Vranesovic, P. Rettberg, E. Rabbow, F. Westall, A. Bashir, C. Moissl-Eichinger, L. Garcia-Descalzo, F. Gomez, R. Amils, V. P. Marteinsson, N. Walter, C. S. Cockell, Microbial Metabolism of Amino Acids—Biologically Induced Removal of Glycine and the Resulting Fingerprint as a Potential Biosignature, *Front. Astron. Space Sci.* 9 (2022) 781542. doi:10.3389/fspas.2022.781542.
- [191] F. Klenner, J. Bönigk, M. Napoleoni, M. Dannemann, N. Khawaja, J. Hillier, K. Olsson-Francis, F. Postberg, One is Enough: Identifying Cell Material in a Single μm -sized Ice Grain Emitted by Enceladus or Europa, in: *AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts*, Vol. 2022, 2022, pp. P55G–1654.
- [192] V. Abrahamsson, I. Kanik, In-situ Organic Biosignature Detection Techniques for Space Applications, *Front. Astron. Space Sci.* 9 (2022) 360. doi:10.3389/fspas.2022.959670.
- [193] K. M. Seaton, M. L. Cable, A. M. Stockton, Analytical Chemistry Throughout This Solar System, *Annu. Rev. Anal. Chem.* 15 (2022) 197–219. doi:10.1146/annurev-anchem-061020-125416.
- [194] T. L. Salter, B. A. Magee, J. H. Waite, M. A. Sephton, Mass Spectrometric Fingerprints of Bacteria and Archaea for Life Detection on Icy Moons, *Astrobiology* 22 (2) (2022) 143–157. doi:10.1089/ast.2020.2394.
- [195] L. Chou, P. Mahaffy, M. Trainer, J. Eigenbrode, R. Arevalo, W. Brinckerhoff, S. Getty, N. Grefenstette, V. Da Poian, G. M. Fricke, C. P. Kempes, J. Marlow, B. Sherwood Lollar, H. Graham, S. S. Johnson, Planetary Mass Spectrometry for Agnostic Life Detection in the Solar System, *Front. Astron. Space Sci.* 8 (2021) 173. doi:10.3389/fspas.2021.755100.
- [196] H. J. Cleaves, G. Hystad, A. Prabhu, M. L. Wong, G. D. Cody, S. Economou, R. M. Hazen, A robust, agnostic molecular biosignature based on machine learning, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 120 (41) (2023) e2307149120. doi:10.1073/pnas.2307149120.
- [197] D. L. Matson, L. J. Spilker, J.-P. Lebreton, The Cassini/Huygens Mission to the Saturnian System, *Space Sci. Rev.* 104 (1) (2002) 1–58. doi:10.1023/A:1023609211620.
- [198] S. Kempf, N. Altobelli, C. Briois, E. Grün, M. Horanyi, F. Postberg, J. Schmidt, R. Srama, Z. Sternovsky, G. Tobie, M. Zolotov, SUDA: A Dust Mass Spectrometer for Compositional Surface Mapping for a Mission to Europa, in: *European Planetary Science Congress*, Vol. 9, 2014, pp. EPSC2014–229.
- [199] Z. Yang, Z. Ren, Y. Cheng, W. Sun, Z. Xi, W. Jia, G. Li, Y. Wang, M. Guo, D. Li, Review and prospect on portable mass spectrometer for recent applications, *Vacuum* 199 (2022) 110889. doi:10.1016/j.vacuum.2022.110889.
- [200] R. G. Fausch, J. A. Schertenleib, P. Wurz, Advances in Mass Spectrometers for Flyby Space Missions for the Analysis of Biosignatures

- and Other Complex Molecules, *Universe* 8 (8) (2022) 416. doi: 10.3390/universe8080416.
- [201] B. Yost, S. Weston, G. Benavides, F. Krage, J. Hines, S. Mauro, S. Etchey, K. O'Neill, B. Braun, State-of-the-Art Small Spacecraft Technology, Tech. rep., NASA Ames Research Center (2021). URL https://ntrs.nasa.gov/api/citations/20210021263/downloads/2021_SOA_final_508_updated.pdf
- [202] N. E. Chahat, P. Estabrook, B. T. Cook, High-efficiency dual-band circularly-polarized antenna for harsh environment for telecommunication, uS Patent 10,680,345 (Jun. 2020). URL <https://patentimages.storage.googleapis.com/4d/a1/2b/3cb8b7ef09380d/US10680345.pdf>
- [203] M. Gerberich, S. R. Oleson, Estimation Model of Spacecraft Parameters and Cost Based on a Statistical Analysis of COMPASS System Designs, in: AIAA SPACE 2013 Conference and Exposition, 2013, pp. AIAA 2013–5432. doi:10.2514/6.2013-5432.
- [204] I. Bekey, *Advanced Space System Concepts and Technologies: 2010–2030+, El Segundo: The Aerospace Press, 2003.*
- [205] D. Krejci, P. Lozano, Space Propulsion Technology for Small Spacecraft, *Proc. IEEE* 106 (3) (2018) 362–378. doi:10.1109/JPROC.2017.2778747.
- [206] I. Levchenko, K. Bazaka, T. Belmonte, M. Keidar, S. Xu, Advanced Materials for Next-Generation Spacecraft, *Adv. Mater.* 30 (50) (2018) 1802201. doi:10.1002/adma.201802201.
- [207] A. M. Hein, Z. Burkhardt, T. M. Eubanks, AttoSats: ChipSats, other Gram-Scale Spacecraft, and Beyond, *arXiv e-prints* (2019) arXiv:1910.12559arXiv:1910.12559, doi:10.48550/arXiv.1910.12559.
- [208] C. Cappelletti, S. Battistini, B. Malphrus, *CubeSat Handbook: From Mission Design to Operations*, London: Academic Press, 2020.
- [209] S. A. Stern, The New Horizons Pluto Kuiper Belt Mission: An Overview with Historical Context, *Space Sci. Rev.* 140 (1–4) (2008) 3–21. arXiv:0709.4417, doi:10.1007/s11214-007-9295-y.
- [210] N. Saeed, A. Elzanaty, H. Almorad, H. Dahrouj, T. Y. Al-Naffouri, A. Mohamed-Slim, CubeSat Communications: Recent Advances and Future Challenges, *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.* 22 (3) (2020) 1839–1862. doi:10.1109/COMST.2020.2990499.
- [211] T. Hoang, A. Lazarian, B. Burkhardt, A. Loeb, The Interaction of Relativistic Spacecrafts with the Interstellar Medium, *Astrophys. J.* 837 (1) (2017) 5. arXiv:1608.05284, doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aa5da6.
- [212] T. Hoang, A. Loeb, Electromagnetic Forces on a Relativistic Spacecraft in the Interstellar Medium, *Astrophys. J.* 848 (1) (2017) 31. arXiv:1706.07798, doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aa8c73.
- [213] R. A. London, J. T. Early, Evaluation of the Hazard of Dust Impacts on Interstellar Spacecraft, *J. Br. Interplanet. Soc.* 71 (2018) 133–139.
- [214] T. Hoang, A. Loeb, Can Planet Nine Be Detected Gravitationally by a Subrelativistic Spacecraft?, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* 895 (2) (2020) L35. arXiv:2005.01120, doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ab92a7.
- [215] M. Lingam, A. Loeb, Propulsion of Spacecraft to Relativistic Speeds Using Natural Astrophysical Sources, *Astrophys. J.* 894 (1) (2020) 36. arXiv:2002.03247, doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ab7dc7.
- [216] P. Lubin, A. N. Cohen, J. Erlikhman, Radiation Effects from the Interstellar Medium and Cosmic Ray Particle Impacts on Relativistic Spacecraft, *Astrophys. J.* 932 (2) (2022) 134. arXiv:2201.02721, doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ac6a50.
- [217] K. F. Long, Calculations of Particle Bombardment due to Dust and Charged Particles in the ISM on the Project Starshot Gram-Scale Interstellar Probe, *arXiv e-prints* (2023) arXiv:2307.12160arXiv:2307.12160, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2307.12160.
- [218] R. Skomorohov, C. Welch, A. Hein, In-orbit Spacecraft Manufacturing: Near-Term Business Cases, Tech. rep., International Space University (2016). URL <https://hal.science/hal-01363589v1/file/Skomorohov%20In-orbit%20Spacecraft%20Manufacturing%20-%20Near-term%20Business%20Cases.pdf>
- [219] K. Woellert, P. Ehrenfreund, A. J. Ricco, H. Hertzfeld, Cubesats: Cost-effective science and technology platforms for emerging and developing nations, *Adv. Space Res.* 47 (4) (2011) 663–684. doi: 10.1016/j.asr.2010.10.009.
- [220] A. de Miguel, A techno-economic analysis of the breakthrough starshot beamer, Master's thesis, Technische Universität München (2022).
- [221] C. Jauregui, J. Limpert, A. Tünnermann, High-power fibre lasers, *Nat. Photonics* 7 (11) (2013) 861–867. doi:10.1038/nphoton.2013.273.
- [222] M. N. Zervas, C. A. Codemard, High Power Fiber Lasers: A Review, *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Quantum Electron.* 20 (5) (2014) 219–241. doi: 10.1109/JSTQE.2014.2321279.
- [223] Z. Liu, P. Ma, R. Su, R. Tao, Y. Ma, X. Wang, P. Zhou, High-power coherent beam polarization combination of fiber lasers: progress and prospect [Invited], *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B Opt. Phys.* 34 (3) (2017) A7. doi:10.1364/JOSAB.34.0000A7.
- [224] P. D. Dragic, M. Cavillon, J. Ballato, Materials for optical fiber lasers: A review, *Appl. Phys. Rev.* 5 (4) (2018) 041301. doi:10.1063/1.5048410.
- [225] J. Zuo, X. Lin, High-Power Laser Systems, *Laser Photonics Rev.* 16 (5) (2022) 2100741. doi:10.1002/lpor.202100741.
- [226] S. Noda, Photonic crystal lasers—ultimate nanolasers and broad-area coherent lasers [Invited], *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B Opt. Phys.* 27 (11) (2010) B1. doi:10.1364/JOSAB.27.0000B1.
- [227] S. Noda, K. Kitamura, T. Okino, D. Yasuda, Y. Tanaka, Photonic-Crystal Surface-Emitting Lasers: Review and Introduction of Modulated-Photonic Crystals, *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Quantum Electron.* 23 (6) (2017) 2696883. doi:10.1109/JSTQE.2017.2696883.
- [228] K. Ishizaki, M. De Zoysa, S. Noda, Progress in Photonic-Crystal Surface-Emitting Lasers, *Photonics* 6 (3) (2019) 96. doi:10.3390/Photonics6030096.
- [229] T. Inoue, M. Yoshida, J. Gellera, K. Izumi, K. Yoshida, K. Ishizaki, M. De Zoysa, S. Noda, General recipe to realize photonic-crystal surface-emitting lasers with 100-W-to-1-kW single-mode operation, *Nat. Commun.* 13 (2022) 3262. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-30910-7.
- [230] S. Noda, T. Inoue, M. Yoshida, J. Gellera, M. D. Zoysa, K. Ishizaki, High-power and high-beam-quality photonic-crystal surface-emitting lasers: a tutorial, *Adv. Opt. Photonics* 15 (4) (2023) 977. doi:10.1364/AOP.502863.
- [231] A. Forbes, Structured Light from Lasers, *Laser Photonics Rev.* 13 (11) (2019) 1900140. doi:10.1002/lpor.201900140.
- [232] D. R. Gozzard, L. E. Roberts, J. T. Spollard, P. G. Sibley, D. A. Shaddock, Fast beam steering with an optical phased array, *Opt. Lett.* 45 (13) (2020) 3793. doi:10.1364/OL.393007.
- [233] C. P. Bandutunga, P. G. Sibley, M. J. Ireland, R. L. Ward, Photonic solution to phase sensing and control for light-based interstellar propulsion, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B Opt. Phys.* 38 (5) (2021) 1477. doi:10.1364/JOSAB.414593.
- [234] C. Hongxiang, S. Rongtao, L. Jinhu, C. Qi, M. Pengfei, M. Yanxing, Z. Pu, Research progress of active phase-locking technique of an all-fiber coherent laser array, *High Power Laser Part. Beams* 35 (4) (2023) 041004. doi:10.11884/HPLPB202335.220259.
- [235] A. Freeman, Exploring our solar system with CubeSats and Small-Sats: the dawn of a new era, *CEAS Space J.* 12 (4) (2020) 491–502. doi:10.1007/s12567-020-00298-5.
- [236] J. D. Liddle, A. P. Holt, S. J. Jason, K. A. O'Donnell, E. J. Stevens, Space science with CubeSats and nanosatellites, *Nat. Astron.* 4 (2020) 1026–1030. doi:10.1038/s41550-020-01247-2.
- [237] E. Turan, S. Speretta, E. Gill, Autonomous navigation for deep space small satellites: Scientific and technological advances, *Acta Astronaut.* 193 (2022) 56–74. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2021.12.030.
- [238] M. Wronkiewicz, J. Lee, L. Mandrake, J. Lightholder, G. Doran, S. Mauceri, T. Kim, N. Oborny, T. Schibler, J. Nadeau, J. K. Wallace, E. Moorjani, C. Lindensmith, Onboard Science Instrument Autonomy for the Detection of Microscopy Biosignatures on the Ocean Worlds Life Surveyor, *Planet. Sci. J.* 5 (1) (2024) 19. arXiv:2304.13189, doi:10.3847/PSJ/ad0227.
- [239] R. L. Staehle, D. Blaney, H. Hemmati, D. Jones, A. Klesh, P. Liewer, J. Lazio, M. Wen-Yu Lo, P. Mouroulis, N. Murphy, P. J. Pin-gree, T. Wilson, B. Anderson, I. Channing Chow, C., B. Betts,

- L. Friedman, J. Puig-Suari, A. Williams, T. Svitek, Interplanetary CubeSats: Opening the Solar System to a Broad Community at Lower Cost, *J. Small Satellites* 2 (1) (2013) 161–186. doi:10.1007/s11214-007-9295-y.
- [240] J. Schoolcraft, A. Klesh, T. Werne, MarCO: Interplanetary Mission Development on a CubeSat Scale, in: C. Cruzen, M. Schmidhuber, Y. H. Lee, B. Kim (Eds.), *Space Operations: Contributions from the Global Community*, Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017, pp. 221–231. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-51941-8_10.
- [241] E. T. Jens, A. C. Karp, J. Rabinovitch, A. Conte, B. Nakazono, D. A. Vaughan, Design of Interplanetary Hybrid CubeSat and SmallSat Propulsion Systems, in: 2018 Joint Propulsion Conference, 2018, pp. AIAA 2018–4668. doi:10.2514/6.2018-4668.
- [242] G. Benedetti, N. Bloise, D. Boi, F. Caruso, A. Civita, S. Corpino, E. Garofalo, G. Governale, L. Mascolo, G. Mazzella, M. Quarata, D. Riccobono, G. Sacchiero, D. Teodonio, P. M. Vernicari, Interplanetary CubeSats for asteroid exploration: Mission analysis and design, *Acta Astronaut.* 154 (2019) 238–255. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2018.05.011.
- [243] A. Elsaesser, F. Merenda, R. Lindner, R. Walker, S. Buehler, G. Boer, A. Villa, Y. Hallak, F. Aguado, E. Alberti, B. Wood, SpectroCube: a European 6U nanosatellite spectroscopy platform for astrobiology and astrochemistry, *Acta Astronaut.* 170 (2020) 275–288. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2020.01.028.
- [244] D. J. Robson, C. Cappelletti, Biomedical payloads: A maturing application for CubeSats, *Acta Astronaut.* 191 (2022) 394–403. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2021.11.017.
- [245] D. Calabria, I. Trozzi, E. Lazzarini, A. Pace, M. Zangheri, L. Iannascoli, N. M. Davis, S. S. G. Matadha, T. B. De Albuquerque, S. Pirrotta, M. Del Bianco, G. Impresario, L. Popova, N. Lovecchio, G. de Cesare, D. Caputo, J. Brucato, A. Nascetti, M. Guardigli, M. Mirasoli, AstroBio-CubeSat: A lab-in-space for chemiluminescence-based astrobiology experiments, *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 226 (2023) 115110. doi:10.1016/j.bios.2023.115110.
- [246] S. Massaro Tiede, L. C. Liddell, S. R. Santa Maria, S. Bhattacharya, BioSentinel: A Biological CubeSat for Deep Space Exploration, *Astrobiology* 23 (6) (2023) 631–636. doi:10.1089/ast.2019.2068.
- [247] C. Colombo, C. McInnes, Orbit design for future SpaceChip swarm missions in a planetary atmosphere, *Acta Astronaut.* 75 (2012) 25–41. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2012.01.004.
- [248] F. Y. Hadaegh, S.-J. Chung, H. M. Manohara, On Development of 100-Gram-Class Spacecraft for Swarm Applications, *IEEE Syst. J.* 10 (2) (2016) 673–684. doi:10.1109/JSYST.2014.2327972.
- [249] I. Levchenko, M. Keidar, J. Cantrell, Y.-L. Wu, H. Kuninaka, K. Bazaka, S. Xu, Explore space using swarms of tiny satellites, *Nature* 562 (7726) (2018) 185–187. doi:10.1038/d41586-018-06957-2.
- [250] R. T. Nallapu, J. Thangavelautham, Design of Spacecraft Swarm Flybys for Planetary Moon Exploration, in: *AIAA Scitech 2020 Forum*, 2020, pp. AIAA 2020–0954. doi:10.2514/6.2020-0954.
- [251] T. Timmons, G. Bailet, J. Beeley, C. McInnes, Mars Atmospheric Characterization with a ChipSat Swarm, *J. Spacecraft Rockets* 58 (5) (2021) 1453–1460. doi:10.2514/1.A34970.
- [252] R. t. Nallapu, J. Thangavelautham, Design and sensitivity analysis of spacecraft swarms for planetary moon reconnaissance through co-orbits, *Acta Astronaut.* 178 (2021) 854–869. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2020.10.008.
- [253] A. N. Alvara, L. Lee, E. Sin, N. Lambert, A. J. Westphal, K. S. J. Pister, BLISS: Interplanetary exploration with swarms of low-cost spacecraft, *Acta Astronaut.* 215 (2024) 348–361. arXiv:2307.11226, doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2023.11.027.
- [254] M. Denny, A. McFadzean, *Rocket Science*, Cham: Springer, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-28080-2.
- [255] U. Walter, *Astronautics: The Physics of Space Flight*, 3rd Edition, Cham: Springer, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-74373-8.