

COMMENT ON “THE FLYBY ANOMALY AND THE GRAVITATIONAL-MAGNETIC FIELD INDUCED
FRAME-DRAGGING EFFECT AROUND THE EARTH”

V. GURUPRASAD
Inspired Research, New York, USA

ABSTRACT

Independent radar data with larger discrepancies left out in JPL’s 2008 summary on the anomaly has already led to a signal processing cause, and obviates frame-dragging.

Mirza (2019) presents a remarkable fit of enhanced frame-dragging induced by a coupling of gravitation and magnetic fields to the “flyby anomaly” as mainly described in Anderson et al. (2008), and also to its absence in later flybys, but an omission affecting the inference of energy gain in Anderson et al. (2008) undermines this result.

Antreasian & Guinn (1998) had disclosed kilometre-scale discrepancies in range data in NEAR’s flyby against two coherent radars of the space surveillance network (SSN), that were not examined by the Anderson team, as they were too large to fit systematics or relativistic causes. Even the Pioneer anomaly had merited examination only because of its surprising similarity to the Hubble constant (Nieto 2007). The linearity of the radar residuals had been mentioned in Antreasian & Guinn (1998), but their closeness to actual one-way light times remained unnoticed. Whatever their cause, their sign and magnitude signify an apparent doubling of one-way travel times of the telemetry tracking signal that also suffices to explain the anomalous velocity gain ΔV (Guruprasad 2015).

The fit to ΔV was reported to 20%, incidentally same as for the radiation systematic found for the Pioneer anomaly (Turyshev et al. 2012), due to accounting for this excess delay only at the post-encounter signal acquisition. Including the excess delay at the pre-encounter signal loss (LOS) and using the JPL Horizons online trajectory reference (Giorgini 2015) for the light times, as suggested by Bilbao (2016), improves the fit to 1.3%, and also explains the 0.34 s perigee advance in Rosetta I (Morley & Budnik 2006) to 2.3%, which is comparable because of a difference in uplink ramping. The radar residuals were themselves also questioned in Bilbao (2016) as they imply range proportional frequency errors in the two-way Doppler, but the root mean square error and standard deviation in Antreasian & Guinn (1998) already qualifies them as 5σ , and JPL Horizons confirms their scatter is within the radar precisions (Guruprasad 2019).

These fits are also not one-offs: the consistent absence of ΔV in flybys after Cassini, coinciding with a general switch from coherent to incoherent two-way Doppler tracking (Chen et al. 2000; DeBoy et al. 2003), is what prompted one of the authors (JKC) of Anderson et al. (2008) to seek further investigation of the explanation in Guruprasad (2015). The dV_0 cited in Table 1 of Mirza (2019) for MESSENGER is within noise level. The excess delays given by the JPL Horizons light times turn out too large for the carrier loop filter bandwidth in Rosetta II and too small to have stood out in Rosetta III. As such, we have a non-relativistic explanation that is no less complete and has revealed additional details, and relates to actual change in signal processing, whereas relativity has no chance whatsoever of explaining the radar residuals, which had been also seen for Galileo (JKC).

We are thus forced to remark that four years after this Occam’s razor was explained, the physics community remains unaware of kilometre-scale 5σ discrepancies that contradict relativistic ideas for the millimetric anomalies, in part as the signal processing details fall outside of astronomy. The excess delays correlation is simple to verify, however, and scripts to fetch and graph the JPL Horizons data are posted at <https://github.com/earthshrink/flyby-analysis>.

Our further point is that the inference of energy gain in Anderson et al. (2008) also seems a mistake in hindsight, as the observables were “unexpected frequency increase” and “anomalous frequency shift” in the post-encounter Doppler data from the Deep Space Network. The only independent observations were by the SSN radars and had kilometre-scale discrepancies, inconsistent with a kinematic ΔV , whereas the phase lock in coherent tracking would ensure identical delays in the range modulation in any case.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. D., Campbell, J. K., Ekelund, J. E., Ellis, J., & Jordan, J. F. 2008, PRL, 100, 091102
- Antreasian, P. G., & Guinn, J. R. 1998, AIAA
- Bilbao, L. 2016, EPL
- Chen, C.-C., Shambayati, S., Makovsky, A., et al. 2000, Small Deep Space Transponder (SDST) DS1 Technological Validation Report, Tech. rep., Descanso NASA
- DeBoy, C. C., Haskins, C. B., Brown, T. A., et al. 2003, in IEEEAC
- Giorgini, J. D. 2015, IAU General Assembly
- Guruprasad, V. 2015, EPL, 110, 54001
- Guruprasad, V. 2019, in Proc of IEEE NAECON
- Mirza, B. M. 2019, MNRAS, 489, 3232
- Morley, T., & Budnik, F. 2006, in 19th Intl Symp Space Flight Dynamics
- Nieto, M. M. 2007, Europhysics News, 37, 30
- Turyshchev, S. G., Toth, V. T., Kinsella, G., et al. 2012, Phys Rev Lett, 108