TRAJECTORY ANALYSIS FOR THE NUCLEUS AND DUST OF COMET C/2013 A1 (SIDING SPRING)
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ABSTRACT
Comet C/2013 A1 (Siding Spring) will experience a high velocity encounter with Mars on 2014 October 19 at a distance of 135,000 km ± 5000 km from the planet center. We present a comprehensive analysis of the trajectory of both the comet nucleus and the dust tail. The nucleus of C/2013 A1 cannot impact on Mars even in the case of unexpectedly large nongravitational perturbations. Furthermore, we compute the required ejection velocities for the dust grains of the tail to reach Mars as a function of particle radius and density and heliocentric distance of the ejection. A comparison between our results and the most current modeling of the ejection velocities suggests that impacts are possible only for millimeter to centimeter size particles released more than 13 AU from the Sun. However, this level of cometary activity that far from the Sun is considered extremely unlikely. The arrival time of these particles spans a 20-minute time interval centered at 2014 October 19 at 20:09 TDB, i.e., around the time that Mars crosses the orbital plane of C/2013 A1. Ejection velocities larger than currently estimated by a factor >2 would allow impacts for smaller particles ejected as close as 3 AU from the Sun. These particles would reach Mars from 19:13 TDB to 20:40 TDB.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Comet C/2013 A1 (Siding Spring) was discovered on 2013 January at the Siding Spring observatory (McNaught et al. 2013). Shortly after discovery it was clear that C/2013 A1 was headed for a close encounter with Mars on 2014 October 19. C/2013 A1 is on a near parabolic retrograde orbit and will have a high relative velocity with respect to Mars of about 56 km s⁻¹ during the close approach.

If the comet has no significant nongravitational perturbations, the trajectory of the nucleus consistent with the present set of astrometric observations rules out an impact on Mars. However, comet orbits are generally difficult to predict. As the comet gets closer to the Sun cometary activity can result in significant nongravitational perturbations (Marsden et al. 1973) that in turn can lead to significant deviations from the purely gravitational (“ballistic”) trajectory. In the case of C/2013 A1, cometary activity was already visible in the discovery observations, when the comet was at more than 7 AU from the Sun (T. L. Farnham et al. 2014, in preparation; Ye & Hui 2014).

Besides the effect of nongravitational perturbations, dust grains in the tail of the comet could reach Mars and possibly damage spacecrafts orbiting Mars, i.e., NASA’s Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter, NASA’s Mars Odyssey, ESA’s Mars Express, NASA’s MAVEN, and ISRO’s MOM. Vaubaillon et al. (2014) and Moorhead et al. (2014) show that dust grains can reach Mars if they are ejected from the nucleus with a sufficiently high velocity.

The modeling of the ejection velocities is in continuous evolution. As the comet gets closer to the inner solar system we have additional observations that provide constraints to the ejection velocities of dust grains. In particular, by making use of observations from HST/WFC3, Swift/UVOT, and WISE, T. L. Farnham et al. (2014, in preparation) and Tricarico et al. (2014) find ejection velocities lower than those derived by Vaubaillon et al. (2014) and Moorhead et al. (2014), thus significantly reducing the hazard due to dust grains in the comet tail.

In this paper, we study the trajectory of C/2013 A1’s nucleus, including the contribution of nongravitational perturbations. We also present an analysis of the required ejection velocities for the dust grains to reach Mars. This analysis can be used as a reference as the understanding and the modeling of the dust grain ejection velocities evolve.

2. BALLISTIC TRAJECTORY
We examined all ground-based optical astrometry (right ascension and declination angular pairs) reported to the Minor Planet Center4 as of 2014 March 15. To remove biased contributions from individual observatories we conservatively excluded from the orbital fit batches of more than four observations in the same night with mean residuals larger than 0.5′, and batches of three or four observations showing mean residuals larger than 1′. We also adopted the outlier rejection scheme of Carpino et al. (2003) with χrej = 2. To the remaining 597 optical observations we applied the standard one arcsecond data-weights used for comet astrometry. Figure 1 shows the residuals of C/2013 A1’s observations against our new orbit solution (JPL solution 46).

Our force model included solar and planetary perturbations based on JPL’s planetary ephemerides DE431 (Folkner et al. 2014), the gravitational attraction due to the 16 most massive bodies in the main asteroid belt, and the Sun relativistic term. No significant nongravitational forces were evident in the astrometric data and so the corresponding JPL orbit solution is ballistic, identified as number 46. Table 1 contains the orbital elements of the computed solution.

Table 2 provides information on the close encounter between C/2013 A1 and Mars. C/2013 A1 passes through the
orbital plane of Mars 69 minutes before the close approach epoch, while Mars passes through the orbital plane of C/2013 A1 at 20:09 TDB. The Minimum Orbit Intersection Distance (MOID) is the minimum distance between the orbit of the comet and the orbit of Mars (MOID; Gronchi et al. 2007). The MOID points on the two orbits are not on the line of nodes. Mars arrives at the minimum distance point at 20:11 TDB, while C/2013 A1 arrives at the minimum distance point 70 minutes before the close approach, which means that the comet is 171 minutes early for the minimum distance encounter.

A standard tool to analyze planetary encounters is the b-plane (Kizner 1961; Valsecchi et al. 2003), defined as the plane passing through the center of mass of the planet and normal to the inbound hyperbolic approach asymptote. The coordinates on the b-plane described in Valsecchi et al. (2003) are oriented such that the projected heliocentric velocity of the planet is along $−\zeta$. Therefore, $\zeta$ varies with the time of arrival, i.e., a positive $\zeta$ means that the comet arrives late at the encounter while a negative $\zeta$ means that the comet arrives early. On the other hand, $\xi$ is related to the MOID. The b-plane is used on a daily basis for asteroid close approaches to the Earth and computing the corresponding impact probabilities (Milani et al. 2005).

Figure 2 shows the projection of the $3\sigma$ uncertainty ellipsoid of JPL solution 46 on the b-plane. The projection of the velocity of Mars on this plane is oriented as $−\zeta$, while the Mars-to-Sun vector projection is on the left side, at a counterclockwise angle of $186^\circ$ with respect to the $\xi$ axis. The negative $\zeta$ coordinate of the center of the ellipse corresponds to the 171 minute time shift between Mars and C/2013 A1.

3. NONGRAVITATIONAL PERTURBATIONS

Comet trajectories can be significantly affected by nongravitational perturbations due to cometary outgassing. We use the Marsden et al. (1973) comet nongravitational model:

\[
a_{NG} = g(r)(A_1 \hat{r} + A_2 \hat{\dot{r}} + A_3 \hat{n}),
\]

\[
g(r) = \alpha \left( \frac{r}{r_0} \right)^{-m} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{r}{r_0} \right)^n \right]^{-k}
\]

where $r$ is the heliocentric distance, $m = 2.15$, $n = 5.093$, $k = 4.6142$, $r_0 = 2.808$ AU, and $\alpha$ is such that $g(1 \text{ AU}) = 1$. 

Figure 1. Scatter plot of the astrometric residuals in right ascension and declination with respect to JPL solution 46. Crosses correspond to rejected observations, while dots correspond to the observations included in the fit.

Figure 2. Projection of the $3\sigma$ uncertainty of JPL solution 46 on the 2014 October $b$-plane. The nominal prediction for the $b$-plane coordinates is $(\xi, \zeta) = (−27,445, −132,407)$ km. The dashed line represents the projection of the orbit of C/2013 A1 on the $b$-plane. The minimum distance between the orbits of Mars and C/2013 A1 is $\sim 27,400$ km.

### Table 1

J2000 Heliocentric Ecliptic Orbital Parameters of JPL Orbit Solution 46

| Parameter                              | Value               |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Epoch TDB                             | 2013 Aug 1.0        |
| Eccentricity                           | 1.0006045(61)       |
| Perihelion distance (AU)               | 1.3990370(73)       |
| Time of perihelion passage (TDB)       | 2014 Oct 25.3868(14) |
| Longitude of node (°)                  | 300.974337(84)      |
| Argument of perihelion (°)             | 2.43550(33)         |
| Inclination (°)                        | 129.026659(32)      |

**Notes.** Numbers in parentheses indicate the $1\sigma$ formal uncertainties of the corresponding (last two) digits in the parameter value.

### Table 2

Close Approach Data for JPL Orbit Solution 46

| Parameter                              | Value               |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Close approach epoch (±3σ)             | 2014 Oct 19 18:30 TDB ±3 minutes |
| Close approach distance (±3σ)          | 134,680 km ± 4520 km |
| Asymptotic relative velocity ($v_\infty$)| 55.96 km s$^{-1}$   |
| MOID                                   | 27,414 km           |
| Node crossing distance                 | 27,563 km           |
| Mars’s arrival at line of nodes        | 2014 Oct 19 20:09 (TDB) |
| C/2013 A1’s arrival at line of nodes   | 2014 Oct 19 21:21 (TDB) |
| Mars’s arrival at MOID                 | 2014 Oct 19 20:11 (TDB) |
| C/2013 A1’s arrival at MOID            | 2014 Oct 19 17:20 (TDB) |
Therefore, $A_1$, $A_2$, and $A_3$ are free parameters that give the nongravitational acceleration at 1 AU in the radial–transverse–normal reference frame defined by $\mathbf{r}$, $\mathbf{i}$, $\mathbf{n}$.

The observational data set available for C/2013 A1 does not allow us to estimate the nongravitational parameters $A_i$. Still, nongravitational accelerations could cause statistically significant deviations at the close approach epoch. To deal with this problem, we analyzed the properties of known nongravitational parameters in the comet catalog. Figure 3 shows the known $A_1$ and $A_2$ in the catalog. $A_3$ values have an order of magnitude similar to that of $A_2$. Figure 4 contains scatter plots of nongravitational parameters showing the correlation between these parameters. For comets with an orbit similar to that of C/2013 A1, i.e., with large orbital period (>60 years) and high eccentricity (>0.9), values of $A_1$ are on average $\sim 10^{-8}$ AU day$^{-2}$, but they can be as large as $\sim 10^{-6}$. $A_2$ and $A_3$ are generally one order of magnitude smaller, i.e., on average they are $\sim 10^{-9}$ AU day$^{-2}$ but can be as large as $\sim 10^{-7}$ AU day$^{-2}$. We can see that $A_1$ is generally one order of magnitude larger than $A_2$ and $A_3$, which makes sense since the radial component is usually the largest for nongravitational accelerations.

According to the properties of the comet population we considered three different scenarios as described in Table 3:

- **Ballistic**: $0 \pm 0$ AU day$^{-2}$ for all other comets. The dashed line corresponds to the total magnitude of C/2013 A1.
- **Reference**: $0 \pm 0$ AU day$^{-2}$ for all other comets. The dashed line corresponds to the total magnitude of C/2013 A1.
- **Wide**: $0 \pm 0$ AU day$^{-2}$ for all other comets.

The ballistic scenario corresponds to JPL solution 46; the “reference” scenario uses typical values of the nongravitational parameters; the “wide” scenario assumes extreme values of the nongravitational parameters. We selected the $A_1$ uncertainty so that its range would span from 0 AU day$^{-2}$ to twice the nominal value at $3\sigma$. For $A_2$ and $A_3$ the nominal value is 0 AU day$^{-2}$ since these components can be either positive or negative, while $A_1$ can only be positive.

Figure 5 shows the position difference among the three scenarios compared to the position uncertainty of the ballistic solution. The available observations put a strong constraint on the trajectory of C/2013 A1 for heliocentric distances between 3 AU and 8 AU from the Sun. Outside of this distance range we

**Table 3**

| Scenario     | $A_1$ (AU day$^{-2}$) | $A_2$ (AU day$^{-2}$) | $A_3$ (AU day$^{-2}$) |
|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Ballistic    | $0 \pm 0$             | $0 \pm 0$             | $0 \pm 0$             |
| Reference    | $(1 \pm 1) \times 10^{-8}$ | $(0 \pm 2) \times 10^{-9}$ | $(0 \pm 2) \times 10^{-9}$ |
| Wide         | $(1 \pm 1) \times 10^{-6}$ | $(0 \pm 2) \times 10^{-7}$ | $(0 \pm 2) \times 10^{-7}$ |
Table 4

Close Approach Parameters and Uncertainties for the Three Scenarios

| Scenario  | $\xi$ (km) | $\zeta$ (km) | $3\sigma$ SMA (km) | TCA (TDB) ± $3\sigma$          |
|-----------|------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| Ballistic | -27,445    | -132,407     | 4789              | 2014 Oct 19 18:30 ± 3 minutes |
| Reference | -25,865    | -131,671     | 5047              | 2014 Oct 19 18:30 ± 3 minutes |
| Wide      | 128,124    | -58,610      | 174,882           | 2014 Oct 19 19:15 ± 45 minutes |

Notes. The table shows the $b$-plane coordinates, the semimajor axis of the $3\sigma$ uncertainty projected on the $b$-plane, and the time of closest approach.

Figure 5. Magnitude of the position difference between the reference and ballistic solutions, and between the wide and ballistic solutions, as a function of heliocentric distance. The dashed line is the semimajor axis of the $1\sigma$ uncertainty ellipsoid of the ballistic solution.

Figure 6. Projection on the $b$-plane of the $3\sigma$ position uncertainty of C/2013 A1 according to different scenarios for nongravitational perturbations. The ballistic and reference solutions are almost indistinguishable.

Figure 7. Expected evolution of the $b$-plane position uncertainty. The curves represent the semimajor axis of the projection on the $b$-plane of the $3\sigma$ uncertainty ellipse for the three scenarios. The vertical bar corresponds to 2014 June 18 when the solar elongation of C/2013 A1 becomes larger than 60°.

4. UNCERTAINTY EVOLUTION

The predictions and the uncertainty provided so far are based on the optical astrometry available as of 2014 March 15. At the time of submission of this paper (2014 April), comet C/2013 A1 was difficult to observe because of the low solar elongation. On 2014 June 18 the solar elongation becomes larger than 60° and we therefore expect observations to resume, which will help in further constraining the trajectory of C/2013 A1. To quantify the effect of future optical astrometry, we simulated geocentric optical observations, with two observations every five nights.

Figure 7 shows the evolution of the position uncertainty on the $b$-plane. The curves represent the semimajor axis of the projection of the $3\sigma$ uncertainty ellipsoid on the $b$-plane.
The ballistic and reference solution curves are close, with an uncertainty that goes from the current 5000 km to less than 1000 km when all the pre-encounter observations are accounted for. The wide solution has a much larger uncertainty that decreases to a minimum of about 6000 km.

Figure 8 shows the 3σ uncertainty evolution for the close approach epoch. The ballistic and reference scenarios have a current uncertainty of 3 minutes and this uncertainty decreases to less than 0.2 minutes right before the close approach. For the wide scenario the uncertainty goes from 45 minutes down to 1–2 minutes.

As already discussed in Section 3, the wide solution produces predictions significantly different from the ballistic and reference solutions. Thus, at some point observations will reveal the uncertainty evolution to the nominal values of $A_1$ assumed for the different scenarios, we can see that large nongravitational accelerations to the level assumed in the wide scenario are detectable about 90 days before the close encounter. On the other hand, the reference solution becomes distinct from the ballistic solution only a couple of weeks before the encounter.

Some skilled observers are capable of gathering comet observations even for solar elongations smaller than 60°. Therefore, we also simulated observations using 40° as a lower threshold for the solar elongation, which makes it possible to collect new observations for C/2013 A1 starting on 2014 May 7. However, the improvement in the uncertainties discussed above is a factor of 1.3 or less and is therefore not relevant.

5. DUST TAIL

Though an impact of the nucleus of C/2013 A1 on Mars is ruled out, there is a chance that dust particles in the tail could reach Mars and some of the orbiting spacecrafts. Due to their small size, the motion of dust particles is strongly affected by solar radiation pressure. It is therefore convenient to use the $\beta$ parameter (Burns et al. 1979), i.e., the non-dimensional number corresponding to the ratio between solar radiation pressure and solar gravity. In terms of physical properties, $\beta$ is proportional to the area-to-mass ratio and inversely proportional to both the density and to the radius of the particle:

$$\beta = \frac{0.57 Q}{a \rho}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $a$ is the particle radius in $\mu$m, $\rho$ is the density in g/cm$^3$, and $Q$ is the solar radiation pressure efficiency coefficient.

For each ejected particle, the location on the $b$-plane for the Mars encounter is determined by the $\beta$ parameter, the heliocentric distance $r$ at which the particle is ejected (or the ejection epoch), and the ejection velocity $\Delta v$. Figure 10 shows the typical behavior using as an example $\beta = 0.01$ and $\Delta v = |\Delta v| = 10$ m s$^{-1}$. For each given $\beta$, we have a curve on the $b$-plane corresponding to zero ejection velocity. This curve can be parameterized by the heliocentric distance at which the ejection takes place. Finally, the ejection velocity $\Delta v$ yields dispersion around the curve: the larger the $\Delta v$ the wider the dispersion.

The ejection velocity depends on the particle size and density, as well as the heliocentric distance at which the particle is ejected (Whipple 1951). Since cometary activity is very hard to predict,
modeling the ejection velocities is a complicated task and is subject to continuous updates as additional observations are available. Therefore, we decided to adopt a different approach: for given ejection distance and parameter, we computed the minimum required to reach Mars. In mathematical terms we look for the tridimensional that is a minimum point of under the constraint that the particle reaches Mars, i.e., \( (\xi, \zeta) r, \beta, \Delta v) = (0, 0) \).

This problem is a typical example of finding the minima of a function subject to equality constraints. Thus, we can solve this problem by means of the Lagrange multipliers, i.e., the \( \Delta v \) we are looking for must satisfy the following system of equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\left\{ (\xi, \zeta)(r, \beta, \Delta v) = (0, 0) \\
&\frac{\partial |\Delta v|^2}{\partial \Delta v} = \lambda_1 \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \Delta v}(r, \beta, \Delta v) + \lambda_2 \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial \Delta v}(r, \beta, \Delta v),
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \) are free parameters. To solve this system, we first tested the linearity of \( (\xi, \zeta) \) in \( \Delta v \) and then linearized system \( (3) \) around \( \Delta v = 0 \), thus obtaining the following linear system:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\{ (\xi, \zeta)(r, \beta, \Delta v) = (\xi, \zeta)(r, \beta, 0) + \frac{\partial (\xi, \zeta)}{\partial \Delta v}(r, \beta, 0)\Delta v = (0, 0) \\
&2\Delta v = \lambda_1 \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \Delta v}(r, \beta, 0) + \lambda_2 \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial \Delta v}(r, \beta, 0).
\end{align*}
\]

\[ (4) \]

To compute the required \( \Delta v \), we followed these steps:

1. We uniformly sampled \( \beta \) in log scale with factor of 10 steps between \( 10^{-6} \) and 1;
2. We sampled \( r \) from 1.4 AU to 30 AU by using a 10 day step along the trajectory;
3. For each couple \( (r, \beta) \) we computed the \( b \)-plane coordinates \( (\xi, \zeta) \) obtained without ejection velocity as well as a finite difference approximation of the \( (\xi, \zeta) \) partials with respect to \( \Delta v \);
4. We solved system \( (4) \).

We scaled the resulting \( \Delta v \) to account for the size of Mars and the \( 3\sigma \) uncertainty of the particle projection on the \( b \)-plane. For this analysis, we used the ballistic solution as reference trajectory.

Figure 11 shows the required \( \Delta v \) needed to reach Mars as a function of the heliocentric distance at which the ejection takes place. For different values of \( \beta \), required \( \Delta v \) to reach Mars as a function of \( \beta \). On the right side of the plot the required velocities are almost the same. This behavior makes sense as the closer we get to Mars the less time is available for solar radiation pressure to affect the trajectory. Therefore, the required ejection velocity is almost independent of the particle size and density. For \( \beta = 1.43 \times 10^{-4} \), we can see that the required velocity goes to zero for heliocentric distances around 22.5 AU. As a matter of fact, the curve on the \( b \)-plane defined by this critical value of \( \beta \) passes through the center of Mars. Thus, if ejected at the right distance, i.e., 22.5 AU, the particle reaches Mars under the action of solar radiation pressure, with no ejection velocity at all. To properly describe the behavior around the critical value of \( \beta \), we added \( 1.43 \times 10^{-4} \) and \( 2 \times 10^{-4} \) to the \( \beta \) sampling. It is also worth noticing that the \( \beta = 0.1 \) curve does not go all the way back to 30 AU because, for such a high \( \beta \), solar radiation pressure is extremely strong and the particle does not even experience the close encounter with Mars if ejected too far in advance.

The results obtained so far can be used to assess the possibility that particles of a given size could reach Mars for a given ejection velocity model. For instance, the best fit for the ejection velocity according to T. L. Farnham et al. (2014, in preparation) is

\[ \Delta v = 418 \text{ m s}^{-1} \left( \frac{\beta}{4} \right)^{0.6} \left( \frac{1 \text{ AU}}{r} \right)^{1.5}. \]  \[ (5) \]

As shown in Figure 12, we can scale the required velocity to \( \beta = 1 \) and make a comparison to the velocity given by \( (5) \). We can see that, according to this ejection velocity model, impacts are possible only for particles with \( \beta \approx 2 \times 10^{-4} \) or smaller ejected at more than \( \sim 16 \text{ AU} \) from the Sun.

Figure 13 shows a comparison to the ejection velocity model considered by Tricarico et al. (2014):

\[ \Delta v = 1.3 \text{ m s}^{-1} \left( \frac{\beta}{5.7 \times 10^{-4}} \right)^{0.5} \left( \frac{5 \text{ AU}}{r} \right)^{-1}. \]  \[ (6) \]

In this case, impacts are possible only for particles ejected more than 13 AU from the Sun and \( \beta \sim 10^{-4} \). The figure also makes
from the ballistic trajectory. On the other hand, unexpectedly large nongravitational accelerations would produce significant deviations that should become detectable in the observation data set by the end of 2014 July. However, even in the case of unexpectedly large nongravitational perturbations, the nucleus C/2013 A1 cannot reach Mars.

To analyze the risk posed by dust grains in the tail, we computed the required ejection velocities as a function of the heliocentric distance at which the particle is ejected and the particle’s β parameter, i.e., the ratio between solar radiation pressure and solar gravity. By comparing our results to the most updated modeling of dust grain ejection velocities, impacts are possible only for β of the order of 10^{-4}, which, for a density of 1 g/cm^3, corresponds to millimeter to centimeter particles. However, the particles have to be ejected at more than 13 AU, which is generally considered unlikely. See Kelley et al. (2014) for a discussion of the maximum liftable grain size at these distances. The arrival times of these particles are in an interval of about 20 minutes around the time that Mars crosses the orbit of C/2013 A1, i.e., 2014 October 19 at 20:09 TDB. In the unlikely case that ejection velocities are larger than currently estimated by a factor >2, impacts are possible for particles with β = 0.001 that are ejected as close as ~3 AU from the Sun. These impacts would take place from 43 minutes to 130 minutes after the nominal ballistic close approach of the nucleus.

As the comet gets closer to the inner solar system, new observations will be available and will allow better constraints on the dust grain ejection velocity profile. Our analysis can be used as a reference to quickly figure out what particles can reach Mars and the heliocentric distance at which they would have to have been ejected. These impacts would take place from 19:13 TDB to 20:40 TDB.

Part of this research was conducted at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under a contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Copyright 2014, California Institute of Technology.
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