Astrometric Parallax Measurements with JWST for Localization of Near-Earth Objects

SRIRAM S. ELANGO \mathbb{D}^1 and Abraham Loeb \mathbb{D}^2

¹Harvard College, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA ²Center for Astrophysics — Harvard & Smithsonian (CfA), 60 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

ABSTRACT

We propose the use of the James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) in simultaneous observations with an Earth-based telescope for parallax measurements to tightly constrain the orbital trajectory of hazardous near-Earth objects (NEOs). We demonstrate the significant reduction in localization error with varying epochs of observation at the potential time-of-impact via a Monte Carlo simulated case study of 2024 YR4, an Apollo-type near-Earth asteroid. By leveraging the L2-Earth baseline and the considerable parallax angles formed, we highlight the unexplored potential for improved localization of NEOs through parallax observations with JWST.

Keywords: Near-Earth Objects (1092); Close Encounters (255); JWST (2291); Astronomical Methods (1043); Astronomical Techniques (1684)

1. INTRODUCTION

A massive asteroid impact on Earth carries existential consequences. Asteroids with a diameter $d_a \gtrsim 100 \text{ km}$ pose the greatest threat to life on Earth (J.-M. Salotti 2022; S. Hawking 2018; D. Sloan et al. 2017; N. H. Sleep et al. 1989; M. M. Marinova et al. 2011; W. Napier 2015; M. Galiazzo et al. 2019). Asteroids with sizes comparable to the Chicxulub asteroid impact $d_a \sim 10$ km can trigger K/T level mass-extinction events with the elimination of $\sim 76\%$ of fossilizable species (K. O. Pope et al. 1998; C. R. Chapman & D. Morrison 1994; O. B. Toon et al. 1997; L. W. Alvarez et al. 1980). Within the 140 m $< d_a < 1$ km range, asteroids can cause substantial localized catastrophes ranging from city-level destruction to significant global effects (climate alteration, earthquakes or tsunamis) (C. R. Chapman & D. Morrison 1994; C. M. Rumpf et al. 2017; D. L. Mathias et al. 2017).

More than 90% of asteroids with $d_a > 1$ km have been detected, thereby lowering the probability of nearterm extinction-level events to near-zero (N. CNEOS 2024; J.-M. Salotti 2022; D. Morrison 1992; G. H. Stokes 2003). However, less than 50% of asteroids within the 140 m < $d_a < 1$ km threshold have been discovered, failing to meet the 90% threshold outlined by the U.S. Congress (N. JPL 2022; NASA 2023). Even among the known Near Earth Objects (NEOs), many possess considerable uncertainties in orbital trajectories due to observational errors and are challenging to constrain due to their small dimensions and limited albedoes ($\overline{p_{v, dark}} \simeq 0.03$, $\overline{p_{v, light}} \simeq 0.17$)¹ (P. Plait 2025; A. Morbidelli et al. 2020; D. Nesvornỳ et al. 2024). Therefore, it is vital that, upon initial detection, hazardous NEOs should be as tightly constrained as possible with minimal positional error to assess impact probability at the time of closest approach to Earth.

The prevailing orbit determination techniques include the Lagrange Planetary Equations (LPEs) and Gauss's Method in which orbital trajectory uncertainties are primarily propagated by errors in distance measurements (M. B. Fernandes et al. 2025; A. Milani & G. Gronchi 2010; C. Zhai et al. 2022). Optimizing astrometry observational techniques to minimize error in distance measurements of NEOs achieves the desired objective of orbital trajectory constraints. These distance measurements are acquired by different methods of parallax (traditional geocentric two-observatory parallax, topocentric parallax, rotational reflex velocity [RRV], diurnal parallax), with the latter three methods summarized in detail by M. B. Fernandes et al. (2025).

Traditional geocentric two-observatory parallax utilizes simultaneous observations at two separated Earth-

¹ D. Nesvornỳ et al. 2024 assume NEO albedo distribution can be approximated using the summation of two Rayleigh distributions with $\overline{p_v}$ constants as scale parameters.

based observatories to measure the angle of the shift of the NEO with respect to the background stars (E. M. Alvarez & R. K. Buchheim 2012). Topocentric parallax is designed to employ the rotation of the Earth from single (diurnal parallax) or multiple Earth-based observatories at various times, thereby obtaining distinct vantage points (M. B. Fernandes et al. 2025; C. Zhai et al. 2022; E. M. Alvarez & R. K. Buchheim 2012). The Rotational Reflex Velocity (RRV) method requires only one Earth-based observatory and uses the rotation of the Earth and the corresponding angular reflex motion of the asteroids (M. B. Fernandes et al. 2025; A. N. Heinze & S. Metchev 2015; B. Guo et al. 2023).

As a consequence of existing parallax methods being Earth-based, distance inferences of NEOs utilize limited baselines d_b (often at most $d_b \approx 2R_{\oplus}$) and corresponding minor parallax angles, yielding high uncertainties (M. B. Fernandes et al. 2025). This is no longer the case with the addition of JWST in 2022, which resides at the L2 Lagrange point forming a baseline with Earth of $d_b \approx 235R_{\oplus}$ (J. P. Gardner et al. 2006). Through simultaneous two-observatory parallax, with one observatory being JWST, the other Earth-based, exceptionally significant parallax angles can be formed (depending on the orbital trajectory geometries of the NEO, Earth, and JWST) allowing accurate distance measurements and therefore acquiring tighter constraints on the desired NEO orbit.

Particular high-sensitivity instrumentation within JWST such as NIRCam (C. A. Beichman et al. 2012) and MIRI (I. Argyriou et al. 2023) have already been proven to function at an unprecedented level for asteroid observation and analysis, demonstrating its potential for parallax observations of desired NEOs (A. Y. Burdanov et al. 2025; A. S. Rivkin et al. 2023; T. G. Müller et al. 2023).

We demonstrate the potential for Earth-JWST parallax in the particular case of 2024 YR4 which was estimated to have a peak Earth impact probability of 3.1% on March 2025 and a 3 on the Torino scale before that estimate reduced to a near-zero likelihood of impact (R. G. Andrews 2025). The NEO is planned to be observed via JWST during March – May 2025 and potentially in later years, and is therefore a good representative example of a potential NEO of concern that would benefit from the unique parallax method presented in this study (A. Rivkin et al. 2025; Josh 2025).

In this paper, we simulate the proposed simultaneous two-observatory L2-Earth parallax method on the NEO 2024 YR4 to demonstrate the improved localization achieved at the time-of-impact. The parallax observation method and Monte Carlo time-of-impact simulation procedures are documented in Section 2. The localization error and the valid orbits obtained are discussed in Section 3. Our conclusions and future considerations are summarized in Section 4.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Observation Simulation Procedures

2024 YR4 was detected by the Asteroid Terrestrialimpact Last Alert System (ATLAS) in Chile on December 27, 2024 (ATLAS 2025; NASA 2025). As such, we query 2024 YR4, Earth, JWST, and Sun ephemeris vector table data via the NASA JPL Horizons System (referred to as Horizons) (N. JPL 2025) for the general observation period between December 27, 2024 and June 15, 2025 (approximated date where 2024 YR4 extends beyond JWST visibility). We query *Horizons* for the stated time-frame to acquire vector data (see format in Table 1) at a time-step of 1 hour and a defined origin location of the Solar System Barycenter (SSB) (defined as 500@0 in *Horizons*). We utilize only the Julian date (datetime_jd) and the respective position vector $\vec{N_t} = [N_x(t), N_y(t), N_z(t)]$ where $\vec{N_t}$ represents the astronomical body of concern $(\vec{J}_t \text{ as JWST}, \vec{A}_t \text{ as 2024})$ YR4, \vec{S}_t as Sun, \vec{E}_t as Earth) for a time-step t.

Table 1. NASA JPL Horizons System Vector Table Data of Earth (399) at JD 2460671.5 (N. JPL 2025). We obtained 4081 rows of the specified format/data detailed for each astronomical object for the selected time frame of December 27, 2024 to June 15, 2025.

| targetname | datetime_jd | datetime_str |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Earth (399) | 2460671.5 | A.D. 2024-Dec-27 00:00:00.0000 |
| x (AU) | y (AU) | z (AU) |
| -0.09784228839992797 | 0.9742594830258415 | 0.0001274652661564422 |
| vx (AU/d) | vy (AU/d) | vz (AU/d) |
| -0.01740724842040341 | -0.001674968390396767 | 4.602493842846188e-07 |
| lighttime (d) | range (AU) | range_rate (AU/d) |
| 0.005655157603847823 | 0.9791601860331683 | 7.282898321308521e-05 |

The selected time frame of December 27, 2024 to June 15, 2025 is not entirely observable by JWST due to its limited Field of Regard (FoR). The JWST FoR is an annulus centered on the position of the Sun, allowing observation of astronomical objects within the range of 85° and 135° off the Sun-line (see Figure 1 from JWST 2025a) (G. S. F. Center 2006).

This constraint must be accounted for within the observation simulation for an accurate representation. We calculate the observable periods of JWST by extracting θ_t between $\vec{V}_{JA,t}$ and $\vec{V}_{JS,t}$ and identifying if θ_t satisfies the JWST FoR angle condition $85^\circ < \theta_t < 135^\circ$. We consider observations via JWST exclusively during the



Figure 1. JWST Celestial Sphere FoR Constraints (taken from JWST 2025a). JWST can observe astronomical targets safely within the defined range of 85° and 135° off the Sunline. Only ~ 39% of the full sky is observable on any given day (N. Science 2024), limiting the opportunity to observe and constrain NEOs.

time intervals where the JWST FoR angle conditions are fulfilled.

We further determine the optimal time of each observation for any set of N number of observations by selecting the time with the minimum parallax distance error Δd_t defined as,

$$\Delta d_t = d_t \times \frac{\delta_{\text{avg}}}{p_t}, \quad \delta_{\text{avg}} = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\delta_1^2 + \delta_2^2} \tag{1}$$

Here d_t is the true distance to 2024 YR4 (AU), δ_1 and δ_2 are the uncertainties of JWST and an Earth-based telescope respectively (in radians), and p_t is the parallax angle (in radians).

To accomplish this, we first compute the parallax angle p_t for all times t by extracting θ_t between $\vec{V}_{EA,t}$ and $\vec{V}_{JA,t}$ and defining $p_t = \frac{\theta_t}{2}$. To obtain the true distance d_t , we note that the midpoint \vec{M}_t between \vec{E}_t and \vec{J}_t is where d_t is measured from (see Figure 2). Thus, $\vec{M_t} = \frac{\vec{E_t} + \vec{J_t}}{2}$ and $d_t = \|\vec{A_t} - \vec{M_t}\|$. We define δ_1 as 0.0055" due to JWST having 5.5 mas absolute pointing accuracy with science target acquisition for NIR instruments (JWST 2025b). We define δ_2 as 0.1". Converting to the desired units and evaluating equation (1)at each time-step t provides a corresponding Δd_t for each possible observation time. To obtain the optimal time observation sets with varying N number of observations, we implement an iterative dynamic algorithm with the following conditions: (i) only utilizing observation epochs within the observable window of JWST and *(ii)* enforcing a minimum gap of 7 days between observations. This algorithm then identifies the globally optimal observation time solution sets that minimize Δd_t

for each observation conducted. Table 2 provides the optimal observation times with the respective Δd_t for N number of observations between 1 and 8 that satisfy the JWST FoR constraints.²

 Table 2. Optimal Observation Sets of 2024 YR4

| Set | Observation | Date-Time | Error (R_{\oplus}) |
|-----|-------------|---|----------------------|
| 1 | 1 | 2025-03-12 00:00:00 | 1.50138923 |
| | 1 | 2025-03-08 16:59:59 | 1.51519681 |
| 2 | 2 | 2025-03-15 16:59:59 | 1.51732833 |
| | 1 | 2025-03-07 16:00:00 | 1.52553993 |
| 3 | 2 | 2025-03-14 16:00:00 | 1.50967560 |
| | 3 | 2025-03-21 16:00:00 | 1.60461508 |
| | 1 | 2025-03-07 16:00:00 | 1.52553993 |
| 4 | 2 | 2025-03-14 16:00:00 | 1.50967560 |
| - | 3 | 2025-03-21 16:00:00 | 1.60461508 |
| | 4 | 2025-03-28 16:00:00 | 1.78926146 |
| | 1 | 2025-03-07 16:00:00 | 1.52553993 |
| | 2 | 2025-03-14 16:00:00 | 1.50967560 |
| 5 | 3 | 2025-03-21 16:00:00 | 1.60461508 |
| | 4 | 2025-03-28 16:00:00 | 1.78926146 |
| | 5 | 2025-04-04 16:00:00 | 2.04064868 |
| | 1 | 2025-03-07 16:00:00 | 1.52553993 |
| | 2 | 2025-03-14 16:00:00 | 1.50967560 |
| 6 | 3 | 2025-03-21 16:00:00 | 1.60461508 |
| 0 | 4 | 2025-03-28 16:00:00 | 1.78926146 |
| | 5 | 2025-04-04 16:00:00 | 2.04064868 |
| | 6 | 2025-04-11 16:00:00 | 2.35704217 |
| | 1 | 2025-03-07 16:00:00 | 1.52553993 |
| | 2 | 2025-03-14 16:00:00 | 1.50967560 |
| | 3 | 2025-03-21 16:00:00 | 1.60461508 |
| 7 | 4 | 2025-03-28 16:00:00 | 1.78926146 |
| | 5 | 2025-04-04 16:00:00 | 2.04064868 |
| | 6 | 2025-04-11 16:00:00 | 2.35704217 |
| | 7 | 2025-04-18 16:00:00 | 2.75285531 |
| 8 | 1 | 2025-03-07 16:00:00 | 1.52553993 |
| | 2 | 2025-03-14 16:00:00 | 1.50967560 |
| | 3 | 2025-03-21 16:00:00 | 1.60461508 |
| | 4 | 2025-03-28 16:00:00 | 1.78926146 |
| | 5 | $2025\text{-}04\text{-}04 \ 16\text{:}00\text{:}00$ | 2.04064868 |
| | 6 | 2025-04-11 16:00:00 | 2.35704217 |
| | 7 | 2025-04-18 16:00:00 | 2.75285531 |
| | 8 | 2025-04-25 16:00:00 | 3.22239554 |

We visualize the parallax geometry of a single observation epoch in Figure 2 on the plane formed by the

 $^{^2}$ A maximum of 8 observations are selected as the 8th observation date is the approximated time where 2024 YR4 is too dim for Earth-based (ground) telescopes.



Figure 2. Parallax Geometry Visualization of Single Observation Epoch. Plane constructed via the Gram–Schmidt Orthogonalization algorithm with observation vector set $\{V_{AE}, V_{AJ}\}$. Orthonormal basis formed with \vec{u} as unit vector along V_{AE} and \vec{w} as unit vector perpendicular to \vec{u} in the direction of V_{AJ} . All 3D vectors and points are projected into (\vec{u}, \vec{w}) plane (in units of the Earth's radius).

observation vectors $\vec{V_{AJ}}$ and $\vec{V_{AE}}$ with JWST, Earth, and 2024 YR4 being the triangle vertices. We identify a baseline d_b of $||V_{EJ}|| = 196.842 R_{\oplus}$ at this particular time of observation with a parallax angle $p = 0.17^{\circ}$. We note, as stated earlier, that the magnitude of the bisector vector formed that divides the triangle at the midpoint $\vec{M_t}$ between $\vec{E_t}$ and $\vec{J_t}$ is d_t . The substantial increase in d_b enables a correspondingly significant increase in p, which minimizes equation (1) and therefore allows tighter constraints on 2024 YR4. The average \bar{p} possible via the traditional methods of parallax discussed in Section 1 is vastly smaller due to physical constraints $(d_b \sim 2R_{\oplus})$ than the example p obtained. We emphasize that p can be magnitudes larger than the scenario demonstrated in Figure 2 depending on the particular geometric relationship in the orbits of Earth, JWST, and the NEO-of-concern (see Figure 4a for a potential observable period that contains $p \approx 20^{\circ}$).

In Figure 3 we plot the $\vec{J_t}$, $\vec{E_t}$, $\vec{A_t}$ orbital trajectories, highlighting $\vec{A_t}$ where JWST FoR constraints are satisfied. There are two such regions, however, only the March-May time frame (longer highlighted $\vec{A_t}$ trajectory path) is considered for observations (Josh 2025). An iterative dynamic program obtains a globally optimal set of 8 observation times with 7-day separation for this period (see Table 2). Parallax observations are conducted at stated optimal times (see Table 2) represented by observation vectors $V_{\vec{E}A}$ and $V_{\vec{J}A}$ in Figure 3.



(a) 3D Observation Orbital Geometry from Angle 1



(b) 3D Observation Orbital Geometry from Angle 2



(c) 2D Projected Observation Orbital Geometry on Ecliptic Plane

Figure 3. 3D and 2D Visualization of N = 8 7-Day Separation Observation Set $\{\vec{V_{EA}}, \vec{V_{JA}}\}$ and $\vec{J_t}, \vec{E_t}, \vec{A_t}$ Orbital Trajectories. Plotted for the time frame of December 27, 2024 to June 15, 2025. The global optimal observation time solutions for a set of 8 pairs of observation vectors $\{\vec{V_{EA}}, \vec{V_{JA}}\}$ with 7-day separation is provided in Table 2.



(c) 2024 YR4 Parallax Distance Error Δd_t (R_{\oplus})

Figure 4. Equation (1) Dependent Parameters and Δd_t Output for N=8 7-Day Separation Observation Set. We note that $d_{E,t}$ is not an explicit parameter of equation (1), but the explicit parameter $d_t \sim d_{E,t}$. The highlighted green sections are when JWST FoR conditions are satisfied. The optimal minimum error times are indicated in dashed vertical red lines. X-axis is time plotted in YYYYDDD format. Figure 4a is log-scaled in the Y-axis.

As $\vec{A_t}$ travels to aphelion (Q) away from the JWST-Earth system where $\frac{\partial p}{\partial t}$ is negligible (see Figure 4a), the minimum Δd_t observation times (see Figure 4c) are predominantly dependent on when $\vec{A_t}$ is the closest (see Figure 4c). This behavior often alters when NEOs are in close proximity to the JWST-Earth system where Δd_t tends to be dominated by p_t due to rapid changes in $\frac{\partial p}{\partial t}$ at closest approach. We plot in Figure 4 the equation (1) time-dependent parameters $(p, d_{E,t})$ and output (Δd_t) for the simulated observation period in Figure 3. Upon initial detection of 2024 YR4, an observability window existed with a considerable $p \approx 20^{\circ}$ and minimal $d_{E,t}$, offering a highly accurate localization. In the second observable window, Δd_t had a local minima at t = 3/12/25 which could have been exploited for parallax measurements. Optimizing for ideal p_t and d_t values is essential in scheduling observation times for JWST-Earth parallax measurements.

2.2. Monte Carlo Time-of-Impact Simulation Procedures

The projected potential time-of-impact epoch of 2024 YR4 is December 22, 2032 (NASA 2025). In this section, we implement a Monte Carlo method to compute the localization error (position uncertainty) of 2024 YR4 at the stated epoch for each N set of observations (see Table 2) conducted in Section 2.1 to calculate the reduction in localization error achieved with each additional parallax measurement.

Table 3. True 2024 YR4 Orbital Elements at December 27, 2024 (N. JPL 2025)

| Parameter | Value |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Semimajor Axis (a) | 2.447589641022944 AU |
| Eccentricity (e) | 0.6560404707845989 |
| Inclination (i) | $3.422423121936059^{\circ}$ |
| Longitude of Ascending Node (Ω) | 271.9072914654213° |
| Argument of Perihelion (ω) | 132.9212426001236° |
| Time of Perihelion Passage (T_p) | $2460636.44097958219~(\mathrm{JD})$ |

The true Keplerian orbital values of 2024 YR4 are retrieved via *Horizons* for the initial detection date of December 27, 2024 (see Table 3) and are propagated using a standard analytic Keplerian propagator for the general observation period to obtain the true orbit $\vec{A_{true}}$. The 2024 YR4 orbital value uncertainties (1- σ) are further queried (see Table 4) where 10 million perturbed orbital value sets { $a\pm\sigma, e\pm\sigma, u\pm\sigma, \Omega\pm\sigma, \omega\pm\sigma$ } are generated via uniform distribution random sampling.

Table 4. One Sigma Uncertainties for Orbital Elements of2024 YR4 (N. JPL 2025)

| Parameter | Uncertainty $(1-\sigma)$ |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Semimajor Axis (a) | $1.8916 \times 10^{-5} (AU)$ |
| Eccentricity (e) | 2.6997×10^{-6} |
| Inclination (i) | $1.71342463 \times 10^{-7}$ rad |
| Longitude of Ascending Node (Ω) | $1.50777249 \times 10^{-7}$ rad |
| Argument of Perihelion (ω) | $2.29266451 \times 10^{-7}$ rad |



Figure 5. Histogram of Monte Carlo Valid Perturbed Orbit Deviations $\|\vec{\delta_I}\|$ from True Orbit at Time-of-Impact Epoch for each N Observation Group. The error on the horizontal axis is normalized by the Earth's radius. Each N observation group plot includes respective standard deviation (σ) and mean (μ) of $\|\vec{\delta_I}\|$ values. The histogram is normalized to form a probability density curve and bin size is determined by the Rice rule.

0.00

Error (R_{\oplus})

For each N set of observations (see Table 2), an effective distance error σ_{eff} is calculated for every observation *i* conducted within the individual set, where the raw parallax distance error $\Delta d_t = \sigma_{\text{p}}$ is taken as the effective distance error for the first observation $\sigma_{\text{eff},1}$, and every subsequent observation has a calculated effective distance error $\sigma_{\text{eff},i}$ through combining the previous observation effective distance error $\sigma_{\text{eff},i-1}$ with the current observation raw parallax distance error $\sigma_{p,i}$ using the weighted average formula (see equation 2).

0.000

Error (R_{\oplus})

$$\sigma_{\text{eff},1} = \sigma_{\text{p}}$$

$$\sigma_{\text{eff},i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{\sigma_{\text{eff},i-1}^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma_{p,i}^2}}}, \quad \text{for } i \ge 2$$
(2)

Each generated perturbed orbital value set is iterated across all N sets of observations, where for each observation set, the candidate perturbed orbit $\vec{A_{per}}$ is propagated to an optimal observation time *i* (see Table 2) in time-ascending order where a heliocentric vector position $\vec{A_{per}}_{i}$ is obtained and an effective distance error $\sigma_{\text{eff},i}$ is calculated. The midpoint $\vec{M_i} = \frac{\vec{E_i} + \vec{J_i}}{2}$ is used to compute the line-of-sight unit vector $\hat{D_i} = \frac{A_{\text{true},i} - \vec{M_i}}{\|A_{\text{true},i} - \vec{M_i}\|}$ from the midpoint position to the true asteroid posi-

tion. The deviation error vector $\vec{\delta_i} = \vec{A_{\text{per, i}}} - \vec{A_{\text{true, i}}}$ between the perturbed asteroid and the true asteroid position is decomposed into longitudinal $\delta_{\parallel,i} = \delta_i \cdot D_i$ and transverse $\delta_{\perp,i} = \|\vec{\delta_i} - (\vec{\delta_{\parallel,i}})\hat{D}\|$ scalar components. If $\delta_{\parallel,i} > \sigma_{\text{eff},i}$ or $\delta_{\perp,i} > (\delta_{\text{avg}}) \|\vec{A_{\text{true},i}} - \vec{M_i}\|$ where δ_{avg} (defined in equation 1) is in radians, then the candidate perturbed orbit is rejected for that specific observation set and will continue to be evaluated in the same method for the remaining observation sets. If the error conditions are fulfilled for the specific observation time i, the candidate perturbed orbit will be propagated to the next observation time i + 1 in the observation set where δ_{i+1} will be computed to determine the validity of the orbit once again. If the candidate is within $\delta_{\parallel,i}$ and $\delta_{\perp,i}$ error constraints for all observation times in an observation set, it is accepted as a valid orbit for that observation set and the candidate is then evaluated for the remaining observation sets. This procedure occurs for the 10 million perturbed candidate orbits until all valid orbits are identified for each observation set. The valid orbits are then propagated to the time-of-impact epoch Iand the localization error $\sigma_{\|\vec{\delta_I}\|,N}$ for each observation set is computed by evaluating the standard deviation of $\|\delta_I\| = \|A_{\text{per, I}} - A_{\text{true, I}}\|$ of all respective valid orbits.

Error (R_{\oplus})

0.000

Error (R_{\oplus})

3. RESULTS

Table 5 summarizes the results obtained from Figure 5 where the standard deviation of $\|\vec{\delta_I}\|$ (which is equivalently defined as the localization error $\sigma_{\|\vec{\delta_I}\|,N}$) for valid orbits are evaluated for all observation groups. As anticipated, the localization error reduces with each additional observation conducted acquiring a 1- σ localization error of 1.42 R_{\oplus} , smaller than the Earth's diameter, after 8 parallax measurements with the parameters defined in Section 2.³

Table 5. Standard Deviation (σ) and Mean (μ) of $\|\vec{\delta_I}\|$ Error Values for each Observation Group (N). Results summarized from Figure 5 and 6.

| Observation Group | Standard Deviation (σ) | Mean (μ) |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| N = 1 | 2.71 R_{\oplus} | 4.39 R_{\oplus} |
| N = 2 | $2.68~R_\oplus$ | 4.28 R_\oplus |
| N = 3 | $2.64 R_\oplus$ | 4.13 R_{\oplus} |
| N = 4 | $2.55 R_{\oplus}$ | 3.90 R_{\oplus} |
| N = 5 | $2.38 R_\oplus$ | 3.54 R_{\oplus} |
| N = 6 | $2.05 R_\oplus$ | 3.03 R_{\oplus} |
| N = 7 | $1.68 R_\oplus$ | 2.53 R_{\oplus} |
| N = 8 | 1.42 R_{\oplus} | 2.17 R_\oplus |

Figure 6 (top) details the correlation for the localization error as a function of the number of observations conducted. A linear correlation $\left(\frac{\partial \sigma_{\parallel} \|_{\delta_{T}^{\parallel}}}{\partial N} \approx 0.3 \text{ AU}\right)$ exists with steep reductions in localization error within the domain $N \in [4, 8]$. This segment is assumed to be approximately where the inflection point is located of a logistic decline curve which asymptotes to a steadystate critical localization error dependent on the angular uncertainty of the JWST-Earth telescope system δ_{avg} and the time-dependent parallax distance error σ_{p} of the NEO-of-concern as it traverses away from JWST-Earth and towards aphelion (Q).

It is important to note that δ_{avg} and consequently σ_{p} can be minimized by utilizing an Earth-based telescope with minimal δ_2 arcsecond uncertainty (see equation 1) such as the Hubble Space Telescope (HST) with a δ_2 of $\approx 0.007''$ (G. Beals et al. 1988). HST and other similar high-precision telescopes should be utilized as the Earthbased telescope in order to obtain more optimal orbital constraints in the scenario of when the NEO-of-concern is particularly hazardous with an elevated likelihood of collision with Earth.

The Y-axis within Figure 6 (bottom) is defined as the probability percentage of a candidate orbit (any within

the 10 million generated via Monte Carlo) being accepted as a valid orbit (procedure defined in Section 2.2) for an individual observation set (see Table 6 for explicit results). Figure 6 (*bottom*) demonstrates the inverse linear relationship between the percentage of allowed orbits (%) and the number of observations conducted where 0.7% of candidate orbits are eliminated with each additional observation.



Figure 6. Localization Error (Standard Deviation of $\|\vec{\delta_I}\|$ Error $[R_{\oplus}]$) per Observation Group (top). Probability of Allowed Orbits (%) per Observation Group (bottom). The probability of allowed orbits is computed by dividing the number of valid orbits for each observation group (see Table 6) by the total orbits possible (10 million) and taking the percentage. A linear regression line (plotted in dashed red) is fitted to the probability points, determining the decrease in probability percentage per observation group (slope) to be ≈ 0.07 .

Table 6. Amount and Percentage of Allowed Orbits for EachObservation Group. Results summarized from Figure 6.

| Observation Group | Allowed Orbits | Allowed Orbits (%) |
|-------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| N = 0 | 10,000,000 | 100.00% |
| N = 1 | 84,153 | 0.8415% |
| N = 2 | 74,526 | 0.7453% |
| N = 3 | 69,057 | 0.6906% |
| N = 4 | 63,909 | 0.6391% |
| N = 5 | 57,217 | 0.5722% |
| N = 6 | 49,190 | 0.4919% |
| N = 7 | 41,880 | 0.4188% |
| N = 8 | 36,392 | 0.3639% |

Table 6 provides the explicit number of allowed orbits for each observation group and the respective probability percentage. With 1 parallax measurement, the number of valid orbits decreases by $\sim 10^6$ with a reduction in probability percentage of 99.1585%. A linear relationship then exists for all subsequent observations where the allowed orbits for a set of 8 observations are constrained to be 36,392 out of 10^7 potential orbits with a 0.3639% probability.

³ Conducting the Monte Carlo simulation for 10 observations with 7-day separation achieves a 1- σ localization error of $\sigma_{\parallel \delta_{I} \parallel} \approx 1 R_{\oplus}$.

4. CONCLUSIONS

We utilize the example of 2024 YR4 to demonstrate the use of JWST in simultaneous observations with an Earth-based telescope for parallax measurements in tightly constraining the orbital trajectory of hazardous NEOs. We identify, via Monte Carlo simulation, a significant reduction in localization error $(1-\sigma)$ at the time-ofimpact epoch of 2024 YR4 to a standard deviation below the diameter of the Earth with 8 epochs of observations spaced 7 days apart. Employing this method for the forthcoming JWST observation of 2024 YR4 may provide refinement in the probability accuracy of collision with the Moon in 2032 (A. Rivkin et al. 2025).

We emphasize how the proposed parallax method exploits the considerable parallax angles and baselines formed from JWST-Earth-NEO orbit positions and consequently obtains accurate distance measurements, allowing the method to be effective at NEO orbit trajectory constraints. The approach is therefore most optimal for NEO orbital trajectories that create extensive parallax angles at a minimal distance away from the JWST-Earth observer system. Nevertheless, the method still demonstrated effectiveness for localization in the 2024 YR4 instance despite the relatively minimal parallax angles formed while the NEO traversed outward towards aphelion at substantial distances. With the likely detection of numerous NEOs in the coming years by the Vera C. Rubin Observatory, the proposed parallax method could be applied to several new NEOs that pose potential existential risks.

We note the limitations of this method concerning the operational logistics of JWST where observational use is especially competitive as a consequence of the importance of JWST to many areas of astrophysics research. We hence emphasize the potential necessity for an auxiliary telescope positioned at L2 designed exclusively for NEO detection and localization for planetary defense and national security purposes (A. Loeb 2025). A more comprehensive surveillance and targeting system for hazardous NEOs could exist in the form of NEO-specific telescopes positioned at all Lagrange points thereby eliminating existing NEO blindspots and enabling the continuous observation of hazardous NEOs irrespective of their orbital trajectory in relation to Earth.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the Harvard College Research Program (HCRP), the Galileo Project, and the Black Hole Initiative for support of this work. Sriram tremendously thanks his research advisor, Professor Abraham Loeb, for his never-ending and continuous support, and for providing immense inspiration in the pursuit of exploring untried ideas in science.

Software: NASA JPL Horizons System (N. JPL 2025), SciencePlots (J. D. Garrett 2021), Matplotlib (J. D. Hunter 2007), Numpy (C. R. Harris et al. 2020), Astropy (Astropy Collaboration et al. 2013, 2018, 2022), ChatGPT (OpenAI 2025a; J. Achiam et al. 2023; A. Hurst et al. 2024; OpenAI 2025b), DeepSeek (D. Guo et al. 2025), Anthropic (Anthropic 2025a,b)

REFERENCES

- Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., et al. 2023, arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774
- Alvarez, E. M., & Buchheim, R. K. 2012, in The Society for Astronomical Sciences 31st Annual Symposium on Telescope Science, held May 22-24, 2012 at Big Bear Lake, CA. Edited by Brian D. Warner, Robert K. Buchleim, Jerry L. Foote, and Dale Mais. Published by Society for Astronomical Sciences, 2012., pp. 45-58, Vol. 31, 45–58
- Alvarez, L. W., Alvarez, W., Asaro, F., & Michel, H. V. 1980, Science, 208, 1095
- Andrews, R. G. 2025, The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2025/02/18/science/asteroid-2024-yr4-impact.html

| UE3 |
|--|
| Anthropic. 2025a, Anthropic. |
| https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/ |
| bd2a28d2535bfb0494cc8e2a3bf135d2e7523226/Model- |
| Card-Claude-2.pdf |
| Anthropic. 2025b, Anthropic. |
| https://assets.anthropic.com/m/785e231869ea8b3b/ |
| original/claude-3-7-sonnet-system-card.pdf |
| Argyriou, I., Glasse, A., Law, D. R., et al. 2023, Astronomy |
| & Astrophysics, 675, A111 |
| Astropy Collaboration, Robitaille, T. P., Tollerud, E. J., |
| et al. 2013, A&A, 558, A33, |
| doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201322068 |
| Astropy Collaboration, Price-Whelan, A. M., Sipőcz, B. M., |
| et al. 2018, AJ, 156, 123, doi: $10.3847/1538\text{-}3881/\mathrm{aabc4f}$ |
| |

Astropy Collaboration, Price-Whelan, A. M., Lim, P. L., et al. 2022, ApJ, 935, 167, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac7c74

ATLAS. 2025, https://atlas.fallingstar.com/

Beals, G., Crum, R., Dougherty, H., et al. 1988, Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics, 11, 119

Beichman, C. A., Rieke, M., Eisenstein, D., et al. 2012, in Space Telescopes and Instrumentation 2012: Optical, Infrared, and Millimeter Wave, Vol. 8442, SPIE, 973–983

Burdanov, A. Y., de Wit, J., Brož, M., et al. 2025, Nature, 638, 74

Center, G. S. F. 2006, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center. https://spacese.spacegrant.org/

 $JWST_Mission_Operations_Concept_Document.pdf$

Chapman, C. R., & Morrison, D. 1994, Nature, 367, 33

CNEOS, N. 2024 NASA. https://cneos.jpl.nasa.gov/stats/

Fernandes, M. B., Scolnic, D., Peterson, E., et al. 2025, arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.07881

Galiazzo, M., Silber, E., & Dvorak, R. 2019, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 482, 771

Gardner, J. P., Mather, J. C., Clampin, M., et al. 2006, Space Science Reviews, 123, 485

Garrett, J. D. 2021, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.4106649

Guo, B., Peng, Q., Lin, F., & Cao, J. 2023, The Astronomical Journal, 165, 128

Guo, D., Yang, D., Zhang, H., et al. 2025, arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948

Harris, C. R., Millman, K. J., van der Walt, S. J., et al. 2020, Nature, 585, 357, doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2

Hawking, S. 2018, Brief answers to the big questions (Bantam)

Heinze, A. N., & Metchev, S. 2015, The Astronomical Journal, 150, 124

Hunter, J. D. 2007, Computing in Science & Engineering, 9, 90, doi: 10.1109/MCSE.2007.55

Hurst, A., Lerer, A., Goucher, A. P., et al. 2024, arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276

Josh. 2025, ESA.

https://blogs.esa.int/rocketscience/2025/02/10/jameswebb-space-telescope-will-study-asteroid-2024-yr4/

JPL, N. 2022, NASA. https://www.jpl.nasa.gov/news/usspace-force-releases-decades-of-bolide-data-to-nasa-forplanetary-defense-studies/

JPL, N. 2025, NASA. https://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/horizons/

JWST. 2025a, Space Telescope Science Institute. https://jwst-docs.stsci.edu/#gsc.tab=0

JWST. 2025b, Space Telescope Science Institute. https://jwst-docs.stsci.edu/jwst-observatorycharacteristics-and-performance/jwst-pointingperformance/jwst-pointing-accuracy

Loeb, A. 2025, arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.08478

Marinova, M. M., Aharonson, O., & Asphaug, E. 2011, Icarus, 211, 960 Mathias, D. L., Wheeler, L. F., & Dotson, J. L. 2017, Icarus, 289, 106 Milani, A., & Gronchi, G. 2010, Theory of orbit determination (Cambridge University Press) Morbidelli, A., Delbo, M., Granvik, M., et al. 2020, Icarus, 340, 113631 Morrison, D. 1992, The Spaceguard survey: report of the NASA international near-Earth-object detection workshop, Vol. 107979 (NASA) Müller, T. G., Micheli, M., Santana-Ros, T., et al. 2023, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 670, A53 Napier, W. 2015, Monthly notices of the Royal astronomical society, 448, 27 NASA. 2023 https://www.nasa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/ nasa_-_planetary_defense_strategy_-_final-508.pdf NASA. 2025, NASA. https://science.nasa.gov/solar-system/asteroids/2024yr4/#:~:text=Credit%3A%20ATLAS-,Discovery,Chile%20on%20December%2027%2C%202024. Nesvorný, D., Vokrouhlický, D., Shelly, F., et al. 2024, Icarus, 417, 116110 OpenAI. 2025a, OpenAI. https://openai.com/index/introducing-deep-research OpenAI. 2025b, OpenAI. https://openai.com/index/openai-o3-mini Plait, P. 2025, Scientific American. https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-can-weknow-if-an-asteroid-will-hit-earth/ Pope, K. O., D'Hondt, S. L., & Marshall, C. R. 1998, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 95, 11028 Rivkin, A., Mueller, T., MacLennan, E., et al. 2025, Research Notes of the AAS, 9, 70 Rivkin, A. S., Thomas, C. A., Wong, I., et al. 2023, The Planetary Science Journal, 4, 214 Rumpf, C. M., Lewis, H. G., & Atkinson, P. M. 2017, Geophysical Research Letters, 44, 3433 Salotti, J.-M. 2022, Futures, 138, 102933, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2022.102933 Science, N. 2024, NASA. https://science.nasa.gov/mission/webb/faqs-full/#:~: text=Webb%20can%20observe%20about%2039,the% 20sky%20over%206%20months. Sleep, N. H., Zahnle, K. J., Kasting, J. F., & Morowitz, H. J. 1989, Nature, 342, 139 Sloan, D., Alves Batista, R., & Loeb, A. 2017, Scientific reports, 7, 5419

- Stokes, G. H. 2003, Study to Determine the Feasibility of Extending the Search for Near-Earth Objects to Smaller Limiting Diameters, Report of the Near-Earth Object Science Definition Team (National Aeronautics and Space Administration)
- Toon, O. B., Zahnle, K., Morrison, D., Turco, R. P., & Covey, C. 1997, Reviews of Geophysics, 35, 41
 Zhai, C., Shao, M., Saini, N. S., et al. 2022, Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 134, 015005