# Asteroid orbital inversion using Markov-chain Monte Carlo methods

Karri Muinonen<sup>1,2</sup>, Dagmara Oszkiewicz<sup>3,4,1</sup>, Tuomo Pieniluoma<sup>1</sup>, Mikael Granvik<sup>1</sup> & Jenni Virtanen<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Finland
<sup>2</sup>Finnish Geodetic Institute, Masala, Finland
<sup>3</sup>Lowell Observatory, Flagstaff, Arizona, U.S.A.
<sup>4</sup>Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona, U.S.A.

Solar System science before and after Gaia, Pisa, Italy, May 4-6, 2011

## Introduction

- Asteroid orbit determination is one of the oldest inverse problems
- Paradigm change from deterministic to probabilistic treatment near the turn of the millennium
- Uncertainties in orbital elements, ephemeris uncertainties, collision probabilities, classification
- Identification of asteroids, linkage of asteroid observations
- Incorporation of statistical orbital inversion methods into the Gaia/DPAC data processing pipeline
- Markov-chain Monte Carlo (MCMC, Oszkiewicz et al. 2009)
- > OpenOrb open source software (Granvik et al. 2009)

#### **Statistical inversion**

> Observation equation

$$\Psi = \Psi(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{t}) + \varepsilon$$

A posteriori
 probability density
 function (p.d.f.)

> A priori p.d.f., Jeffreys or uniform

$$p_p(\mathbf{P}) \propto p_{pr}(\mathbf{P})p(\mathbf{\psi}|\mathbf{P})$$

$$p_{pr}(\mathbf{P}) \propto \sqrt{\det \Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{P})}$$

> Observational error p.d.f., multivariate normal

$$p(\varepsilon;\Lambda) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2N} \sqrt{\det \Lambda}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{T}\Lambda^{-1}\varepsilon\right]$$

## **Statistical inversion**

> A posteriori p.d.f. for orbital elements

Linearization

$$p_{p}(\mathbf{P}) \propto \sqrt{\det \Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{P})} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\chi^{2}(\mathbf{P})\right]$$
$$\chi^{2}(\mathbf{P}) = \Delta\Psi^{T}(\mathbf{P})\Lambda^{-1}\Delta\Psi(\mathbf{P})$$
$$\Psi(\mathbf{P},t) = \Psi(\mathbf{P}_{ls},t) + \sum_{j=1}^{6}\Delta\mathbf{P}_{j}\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial\mathbf{P}_{j}}(\mathbf{P}_{ls},t)$$

> A posteriori p.d.f. in the linear approximation

$$p_{p}(\mathbf{P}) \propto \sqrt{\det \Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{P}_{ls})} \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2}\Delta \mathbf{P}^{T} \Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{P}_{ls})\Delta \mathbf{P}\right]$$

Covariance matrix for orbital elements

$$\Sigma(\mathbf{P}_{ls}) = \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{P}}{\partial \psi}\right)_{ls}^{T} \Sigma(\psi) \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{P}}{\partial \psi}\right)_{ls}$$

# **MCMC** ranging

Initial orbital inversion using exiguous astrometric data (short observational time interval and/or a small number of observations)

#### Ranging algorithm

- Select two observation dates
- Vary topocentric distances and values of R.A. and Decl.
- From two Cartesian positions, compute elements and  $\chi^2$  against all the observations
- In MC ranging, systematic sampling and weighted sample elements
- How to sample using MCMC?

## **MCMC** ranging

- Gaussian proposal p.d.f. in the space of two Cartesian positions
- Complex proposal p.d.f. in the space of the orbital elements (not needed!)
- Jacobians and cancellation of symmetric proposal p.d.f.s

$$a_r = \frac{p_p(\mathbf{P}')}{p_p(\mathbf{P}_t)} \frac{p_t(\mathbf{Q}_t; \mathbf{Q}') J_t}{p_t(\mathbf{Q}'; \mathbf{Q}_t) J'}$$
$$J = \det \left| \frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}}{\partial \mathbf{P}} \right|$$

$$a_r = \frac{p_p(\mathbf{P}')}{p_p(\mathbf{P}_t)} \frac{J_t}{J'}$$

If 
$$a_r \ge 1$$
, then  $\mathbf{P}_{t+1} = \mathbf{P}'$ .  
If  $a_r < 1$ , then  $\begin{cases} \mathbf{P}_{t+1} = \mathbf{P}', \text{ with probability } a_r, \\ \mathbf{P}_{t+1} = \mathbf{P}_t, \text{ with probability } 1 - a_r. \end{cases}$ 

# Examples

Observations					
Data set	Parameter	$2004 \text{ HA}_{39}$	2004  QR	$2002 \text{ CX}_{224}$	
Full	Nr of observations	57	19	20	
	First observation	2004 Apr 25	2004 Aug 16	2001 Oct 21	
	Last observation	$2004 { m Sep } 16$	$2004~{\rm Sep}~23$	2003 Oct 24	
	Time interval [day]	144.7	38.3	733.2	
Used	Nr of observations	5	10	6	
	First observation	2004 May 2	2004 Aug 16	2002 Nov 7	
	Last observation	2004 May 6	2004 Aug 18	2002 Nov 28	
	Time interval [day]	4.75	2.04	20.98	

Table 1: The full observational data sets and the data sets used in the computation.

Table 2. Least-squares orbits.					
Object	2004 HA <sub>39</sub>	2004 QR	2002 CX <sub>224</sub>		
a (AU)	2.1493040(34)	2.33155(74)	46.404(57)		
e	0.5368719(72)	0.30163(21)	0.1329(49)		
<i>i</i> (°)	36.2085(3)	6.3566(36)	16.8447(63)		
Ω (°)	204.154337(44)	314.82(1)	42.2592(56)		

#### $T_{-1} = 0$ I as at a supervised sub-

67.32116(11)

 $\omega$  (°)

 $256.12(1.73)^2$  $M_0(^{\circ})$ 345.02807(39) 28.4223(89) <sup>2</sup>The 1– $\sigma$  standard deviations for the orbital elements are given after each element in the units of the last digit shown.

330.701(26)

132.51(1.07)





Fig. 1. A sample of 5000 different orbit solutions for TNO 2002 CX<sub>224</sub> (observational time interval 20.98 d) obtained with MCMC ranging. The following proposal standard deviations were used:  $\sigma_{\alpha_A} = \sigma_{\delta_A} = \sigma_{\alpha_B} = \sigma_{\delta_B} = 0.5''$  for the angular coordinates,  $\sigma_{\rho_A} = \sigma_{\rho_B} = 2.0$  AU for the ranges, and high correlation *Cor* ( $\rho_A$ ,  $\rho_B$ ) = 0.999 between the ranges.



Fig. 2. Distribution of ranges for the observation dates A and B for TNO 2002  $CX_{224}$  (observational time interval 20.98 d) obtained with MCMC ranging (Parameters as in Fig. 1).





Table 3. Methods		
Object	Parameter	
2004 HA <sub>39</sub>	Computation time Acceptance ratio	
2004 QR	Computation time Acceptance ratio	
2002 CX <sub>224</sub>	Computation time Acceptance ratio	
<sup>3</sup> Comparison of MCM		

MCMC ranging	MC ranging
0 min 19.417 s	0 min 48.663 s
0.17	0.05
0 min 6.344 s	1 min 19.170 s
0.54	0.03
0 min 4.525 s	0 min 14.155 s
0.45	0.09 <sup>3</sup>

## Gaia/DPAC DU456 demonstration

- DU456, development unit entitled "Orbital inversion"
- MCMC ranging as standalone Java software including GaiaTools
- Potential for a future online computational tool with a friendly interface

### Conclusion

MCMC ranging more efficient than MC ranging

- Operational within the Gaia/DPAC pipeline and as stand-alone software
- MCMC-Gauss under development and to be incorporated into Gaia/DPAC
- > MCMC-VoV on the drawing board