

Reply to "Comment on 'Evidence of the gravitomagnetic field of Mars' " by K. Krogh

Lorenzo Iorio
Viale Unità di Italia 68, 70125
Bari (BA), Italy
tel. 0039 328 6128815
e-mail: lorenzo.iorio@libero.it

Abstract

In this note we reply to the criticisms by Krogh concerning some aspects of the recent frame-dragging test performed by Iorio by exploiting the Root-Mean-Square (RMS) orbit overlap differences of the out-of-plane component N of the orbit of the Mars Global Surveyor (MGS) spacecraft in the gravitational field of Mars. A linear fit of the full time series of the entire MGS data (4 February 1999–14 January 2005) yields a normalized slope 1.03 ± 0.41 (with 95% confidence bounds). Other linear fits to different data sets confirm the agreement with general relativity. The alleged huge systematic effects induced by the mismodeling in the martian gravitational field claimed by authors cited by Krogh are neatly absent in the MGS out-of-plane record. The non-gravitational forces affect at the same level of the gravitomagnetic one the in-plane orbital components of MGS, not the out-of-plane one. Moreover, they experience high-frequency variations which does not matter in the present case in which secular effects are relevant.

PACS: 04.80.-y, 04.80.Cc, 95.10.Ce, 95.55.Pe, 96.30.Gc, 96.12.Fe

1 Introduction

Iorio (2006, 2007) proposed an interpretation of the time series of the RMS orbit overlap differences (Konopliv et al., 2006) of the out-of-plane part N of the orbit of the Martian polar artificial satellite Mars Global Surveyor (MGS) over a time span ΔP of about 5 years (14 November 1999–14 January 2005 in (Iorio, 2007)) in terms of the general relativistic gravitomagnetic Lense-Thirring effect. It turned out that the average of such a time series over ΔP , normalized to the predicted Lense-Thirring out-of-plane mean shift over the same time span, is $\mu = 1.0018 \pm 0.0053$.

Our interpretation has recently been questioned by Krogh (2007). The remarks concerning the analysis presented in (Iorio, 2006, 2007) mainly deal

with I) The observable used: Iorio (2006, 2007) would have misinterpreted the MGS data II) The confrontation between the prediction of the gravitomagnetic Lense-Thirring shift and the data over the chosen time span ΔP : Iorio (2006, 2007) would have incorrectly compared the 1.6 m value of the out-of-plane average orbit error released by Konopliv et al. (2006) for the entire MGS data set to the Lense-Thirring shift calculated for a shorter time interval ΔP III) The data set used: Iorio (2006, 2007) discarded some of the initial months of the MGS data set IV) The bias-neglected by Iorio (2006, 2007)—due to the multipolar expansion of the Newtonian part of the martian gravity field, as pointed out in (Sindoni et al., 2007; Felici, 2007) quoted by Krogh (2007) V) The impact of the atmospheric drag, neglected by Iorio (2006, 2007)

Below we present our reply which, basically, consists of the following points. As further, independent tests, here we present various linear fits¹ to *different data sets* including, among others, the *full* time series of the *entire MGS data* (4 February 1999–14 January 2005) as well; the predictions of general relativity turn out to be *always confirmed*. The analytical calculation of the competing aliasing effects due to both the gravitational and non-gravitational perturbations, which affect the *in-plane* orbital components of MGS, do *not* show up in the real data. Moreover, the non-conservative forces, whose steadily refined modeling mainly improved the *in-plane* orbital components of MGS, *not* the *normal* one, exhibit high-frequency, non-cumulative in time variations.

We wish to note that, although available on the www.arXiv.org website since 14 May 2007, the latest version v10 of (Iorio, 2007) is not considered by Krogh (2007), whose paper, submitted on 29 January 2007, was in final form on 25 June 2007. This is an unfortunate circumstance since some additional important material present there (and, in fact, in all the versions successive to v8 posted on www.arXiv.org on 16 February 2007) clarify many of the issues raised by Krogh (2007).

2 Our arguments

- 1) The entire MGS data set was subdivided by Konopliv et al. (2006) in 388 (not 442, as claimed by Krogh (2007)) smaller time intervals of data called arcs. For MGS, the lengths of the arcs vary from 4

¹Krogh (2007), submitted on 29 January 2007 and in final form on 25 June 2007, *ignores* similar arguments present in (Iorio, 2007) since v8 version appeared on 16 February 2007; the latest version v10 dates back to 14 May 2007.

to 6 days, so to cover many orbital revolutions (≈ 2 h). For each arc, the spacecraft position and the velocity, among other things, were estimated and used as starting point for a numerical propagation of the satellite's motion by means of the dynamical models which, in the case of MGS, did not include the general relativistic gravitomagnetic force. Contiguous arcs were overlapped by an amount of just 2 h, i.e. one orbital revolution, and the² RMS spacecraft position difference among the predicted positions propagated from the estimated ones in the previous arc and the estimated positions of the subsequent arc was computed. Since the arc overlaps cover just about one orbit, such RMS differences, in fact, account for any among measurement errors, random errors, systematic bias due to mismodeling/unmodeling dynamical forces yielding secular, i.e. averaged over one orbital revolution, effects, whatever their physical origin may be. Indeed, RMS of orbit solution overlaps are *commonly used in satellite geodesy as useful and significant indicators of the overall orbit accuracy* (Tapley et al., 2004; Lucchesi and Balmino, 2006). Conversely, they are also used to gain information about *systematic errors coming from inaccurate modeling of the forces acting on the spacecraft*. For details see (Tapley et al., 2004; Lucchesi and Balmino, 2006). Of course, such a technique is insensitive to short-period effects, i.e. having frequencies higher than the orbital one: only dynamical features of motion with time-scales equal to, or larger than one orbital period can be sensed by such orbit overlap differences. Moreover, the average orbit error $\langle \Delta N_{\text{diff}} \rangle$ of about 1.6 m does not refer to this or that particular arc overlap; instead, it comes from the mean of the entire set of RMS orbit overlap differences for the chosen time span ΔP and is well representative of those un-modelled/mis-modelled forces yielding effects which do not average out over ΔP , as it is just the case of the Lense-Thirring signal. Time-varying patterns exhibiting well-defined periodicities-including also measurement errors like, e.g., those related to the Earth-Mars geometry-are, instead, mainly averaged out yielding little or no contribution to the average orbit error. Incidentally, from the above discussion about the meaning of the average orbit error, it should be apparent that it does not make sense to look for the error of the error, as, instead, seemingly required by Krogh (2007) when he

²We acknowledge the use of wrong terminology in (Iorio, 2006), as noted by Krogh (2007), although we feel that the complaint of plagiarism that seems to be raised by Krogh (2007) in his footnote 1, pag. 5710 against Iorio (2007) about such a matter sounds a bit excessive.

blames Iorio (2007) for not having included the uncertainty in $\langle \Delta N_{\text{res}} \rangle$. Another criticism by Krogh (2007) is that the RMS overlap differences would be unable to specify any orbital precession.

To reply to all such criticisms we decide to perform another, independent test of our hypothesis. First, by linearly fitting³ the *full time series* of (Konopliv et al., 2006), after having rescaled the data points in order to shift the zero point of the time-series to the middle of the data span, we get a slope of $-0.64 \pm 0.26 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$, (with 95% confidence bounds), while the predicted Lense-Thirring MGS out-of-plane rate (customarily defined *positive along* the spacecraft’s orbital angular momentum) amounts to 0.62 m yr^{-1} . The obtained minus sign is due to the fact that Konopliv et al. (2006) defined the normal direction to be positive in the *opposite* direction of the MGS orbital angular momentum (Konopliv 2007, private communication). Should such a linear fit be used as indicator of the existence of the Lense-Thirring effect, its relativistic prediction would be fully confirmed within the experimental error; instead, the hypothesis of a null effect would be rejected at 2.4 sigma level. Then, we also repeat our procedure by fitting with a straight line the entire data set *without full January 2001*, mainly affected by likely measurement errors which, according to Krogh (2007), would mimic the Lense-Thirring effect, getting $-0.61 \pm 0.26 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$. *The removal of the entire year 2001*, mainly affected by angular momentum wheel desaturation operations, yields $-0.57 \pm 0.28 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$. Another linear fit to the time series after removing the last month (December 2004-January 2005) yields $-0.62 \pm 0.27 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$. Similar arguments concerning the linear fit of the data, present in (Iorio, 2007) since v8 posted on the www.arXiv.org website on 16 February 2007, were ignored by Krogh (2007), although the final version of his paper, submitted on 29 January 2007, dates 25 June 2007.

Such results reply to the criticisms II) and III) as well concerning ΔP , to which a large part of (Krogh, 2007) is devoted.

- IV) Krogh (2007) quotes (Sindoni et al., 2007) in which analytical calculation about the corrupting impact of various physical parameters of Mars through the classical node precessions induced by the even zonal harmonic coefficients J_ℓ of the multipolar expansion of the Newtonian part of the martian gravitational potential are presented. In

³It may be just the case to note that, since the plots in Fig. 3 of (Konopliv et al., 2006) are *semi-logarithmic*, one should *not* visually look for a straight line in them.

particular, [Sindoni et al. \(2007\)](#) use the first five even zonals $J_2...J_{10}$ along with their associated errors from former global solutions for the Mars' gravity field, the uncertainty in the Mars' GM and in the MGS semimajor axis and inclination, plug them into analytical formulas for the classical secular node precessions and conclude that, since the resulting effect is tens of thousand times larger than the Lense-Thirring effect on MGS, this would be fatal for any attempt to detect the gravitomagnetic frame-dragging with such a spacecraft.

The point is that *such figures*, as others which can be obtained from more accurate calculation, *must ultimately be compared with the reality of the data*, i.e. the RMS orbit overlap differences of MGS.

We, in fact, repeated such calculation by considering also the other even zonals up to J_{20} along with the latest errors of the MGS95J global solution and including the uncertainties in the Mars' radius as well. By summing, in a root-sum-square fashion, such terms we get a mean bias of 78.9 m d^{-1} in the out-of-plane MGS orbital component: by linearly summing them we get an upper bound of 111.6 m d^{-1} . Such figures clearly show how they are by far not representative of the real MGS orbit. Indeed, over a time span of 5 years we would have an *enormous mean shift as large as 144 km* (root-sum-square calculation) or *203 km* (linear sum). Interestingly, even if the set of the RMS overlap differences of MGS were to be considered as representative of a single orbital arc 6 d long only, the conclusion would be the same: indeed, in *this* case, the total cross-track mean shift due to the martian gravitational potential *would amount to 473.1 m* (root-sum-square) or *669.6 m* (linear sum).

In regard to [\(Felici, 2007\)](#), quoted by [Krogh \(2007\)](#) as well, let us recall again that the RMS orbit overlap differences are just used to account, in general, for all the measurement/systematic errors giving an indication of the overall orbit accuracy ([Tapley et al., 2004](#); [Lucchesi and Balmino, 2006](#)). The important point is that *they cancel out, by construction*, errors, systematic or not, *common to consecutive arcs*—it would just be the case of a bias like that described by [Felici \(2007\)](#)—, while effects like the Lense-Thirring one, accumulating in time, are, instead, singled out ([Lucchesi and Balmino, 2006](#)).

- V) In regard to the impact of the non-gravitational perturbations, [Sindoni et al. \(2007\)](#) yield a total un-modelled non-gravitational acceleration of $\approx 10^{-11} \text{ m s}^{-2}$ which is the same order of magnitude of the

Lense-Thirring acceleration induced by Mars on MGS. They neither present any detailed calculation of the effect of such an acceleration on the normal portion of the MGS orbit nor specify if such a magnitude refers to the out-of-plane component. However, some simple considerations can be easily traced: a hypothetical, generic perturbing out-of-plane force 6.7 times larger than the Lense-Thirring one and having the same time signature, i.e. linear in time, should induce a 10.8 m cross-track shift, on average, over the considered time span ΔP . Again, *such a bias is neatly absent from the data*. By the way, as clearly stated in (Konopliv et al., 2006), it is the *along-track* portion of the MGS orbit—left unaffected by the Lense-Thirring force—to be *mainly perturbed by the non-gravitational forces*: indeed, the along-track empirical accelerations fitted by Konopliv et al. (2006) amount just to $\approx 10^{-11} \text{ m s}^{-2}$, which shows that the guess by Sindoni et al. (2007) is somewhat correct, but it refers to the *along-track* component. Time-dependent, periodic signatures would, instead, be averaged out, provided that their characteristic time scales are relatively short, as it is just the case. Indeed, the non-conservative accelerations, which are especially active in the MGS *in-plane* orbital components as clearly stated in (Lemoine et al., 2001; Konopliv et al., 2006), exhibit time-varying patterns over 12 hr (Lemoine et al., 2001) which, hypothetically mapped to the out-of-plane direction, are averaged out over multi-year time spans (and, incidentally, over 6 d as well). To be more definite, in regard to the issue of the impact of the atmospheric drag on the cross-track portion of the orbit of MGS, raised by Krogh (2007), let us note that it requires not only to consider the node Ω , as apparently claimed by Krogh (2007), but also the inclination i according to (Christodoulidis et al., 1988)

$$\Delta N = a \sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{e^2}{2}\right) \left[\frac{(\Delta i)^2}{2} + (\sin i \Delta \Omega)^2\right]}. \quad (1)$$

According to, e.g., Milani et al. (1987), the perturbing acceleration $\mathbf{A}_{\text{drag}}$ due to the atmospheric drag can be cast into the form

$$\mathbf{A}_{\text{drag}} = -\frac{1}{2} Z C_D \frac{S}{M} \rho v \mathbf{v}, \quad (2)$$

where S/M is the spacecraft cross sectional area (perpendicular to the velocity) divided by its mass, C_D is the drag coefficient, ρ is the atmospheric density (assumed to be constant over one orbital revolution),

$\mathbf{v}$ is the satellite velocity in a planetocentric, non-rotating frame of reference and Z is a corrective coefficient accounting for the fact that the atmosphere is not at rest, but rotates with angular velocity ω_A more or less rigidly with the planet; $Z \approx 1$ for polar orbits (Milani et al., 1987). While the secular, i.e. averaged over one orbital period T , drag shift on the node vanishes, it is not so for the inclination: indeed, it turns out (Milani et al., 1987)

$$\langle \Delta i \rangle_T \approx \pi \left(\frac{A_{\text{drag}}}{n^2 a} \right) \frac{\omega_A}{n} + \mathcal{O}(e), \quad (3)$$

where $n = \sqrt{GM/a^3}$ is the Keplerian mean motion. As a result, the orbital plane tends to approach the planet’s equator; the terms in brackets is the ratio of the drag force to the Newtonian monopole. As usual in perturbation theory, a is meant as evaluated on the unperturbed reference ellipse. Thus, the out-of-plane drag shift is from (1)

$$\langle \Delta N_{\text{drag}} \rangle \approx a \frac{\langle \Delta i_{\text{drag}} \rangle}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (4)$$

In the following we will assume that $\omega_A \approx \omega_{\text{Mars}} = 7.10 \times 10^{-5} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Let us see what happens in the (unlikely) worst-case $A_{\text{drag}} \approx 10^{-11} \text{ m s}^{-2}$; it turns out that

$$\langle \Delta N_{\text{drag}} \rangle_T \sim 1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}. \quad (5)$$

But A_{drag} is not constant over time spans days or years long (Forbes et al., 2006), so that such an effect is not a concern here. By the way, even if it was not so, by assuming a $\approx 10\%$ mismodeling in drag—which is, in fact, modeled by Konopliv et al. (2006)–(5), mapped onto about 5 yr, would give a $\approx 0.7\%$ uncertainty.

Finally, Krogh (2007) remarks that decreasing in the averages of the RMS orbit overlaps occurred in view of constantly improved modeling (Lemoine et al., 2001; Yuan et al., 2001), but he does not recognize that the improved modeling of the non-gravitational forces acting on MGS introduced in (Konopliv et al., 2006) with respect to previous works (Lemoine et al., 2001; Yuan et al., 2001) in which the Lense-Thirring effect was not modelled as well, *only affected in a relevant way just the along-track* RMS overlap differences (a factor 10 better than in (Lemoine et al., 2001; Yuan et al., 2001)), *not the normal ones* (just a factor 2 better than in (Lemoine et al., 2001; Yuan et al., 2001)).

Moreover, if the relativistic signature was removed or not present at all so that the determined out-of-plane RMS overlap differences were only (or mainly) due to other causes like mismodeling or unmodeling in the non-gravitational forces, it is difficult to understand why the along-track RMS overlap differences (middle panel of Figure 3 of (Konopliv et al., 2006)) have almost the same magnitude, since the along-track component of the MGS orbit is much more affected by the non-gravitational accelerations (e.g. the atmospheric drag) than the out-of-plane one.

Acknowledgments

I gratefully thank A. Konopliv, NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL), for having kindly provided me with the entire MGS data set. I am indebted to E. Lisi, P. Colangelo, G. Fogli, S. Stramaglia, and N. Cufaro-Petroni (INFN, Bari) for very stimulating discussions.

References

- Christodoulidis D C, Smith D E, Williamson R G and Klosko S M 1988 *J. Geophys. Res.* **93**(B6) 6216
- Felici G 2007 The meaning of systematic errors, a comment to “Reply to On the Systematic Errors in the Detection of the Lense-Thirring Effect with a Mars Orbiter”, by Lorenzo Iorio *Preprint* arXiv:gr-qc/0703020v2
- Forbes J M Bruinsma S, Lemoine F G, Bowman B R and Konopliv A S 2006 Variability of the Satellite Drag Environments of Earth, Mars and Venus due to Rotation of the Sun American Geophysical Union, Fall Meeting 2006, abstract #SA22A-04
- Iorio L 2006 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23** 5451
- Iorio L 2007 Testing frame-dragging with the Mars Global Surveyor spacecraft in the gravitational field of Mars *Preprint* arXiv:gr-qc/0701042v10 In: L. Iorio (ed.) The Measurement of Gravitomagnetism: A Challenging Enterprise, Chap. 12.2, NOVA Publishers, Hauppauge (NY), 2007. ISBN: 1-60021-002-3.
- Konopliv A S, Yoder C F, Standish E M, Yuan D-N and Sjogren W L 2006 *Icarus* **182** 23

- Krogh K 2007 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **24** 5709
- Lemoine F G et al. 2001 *J. Geophys. Res.* **106** 23359
- Lucchesi D and Balmino G 2006 *Planet. Space Sci.* **54** 581
- Milani A, Nobili A M and Farinella P 1987 *Non-gravitational perturbations and satellite geodesy* (Bristol: Adam Hilger)
- Sindoni G, Paris C and Ialongo P 2007 On the Systematic Errors in the Detection of the Lense-Thirring Effect with a Mars Orbiter *Preprint* arXiv:gr-qc/0701141v1
- Tapley B D, Schutz B E and Born G H 2004 *Statistical Orbit Determination* (Burlington, San Diego, London: Elsevier Academic Press)
- Yuan D N et al. 2001 *J. Geophys. Res.* **106** 23377