Anderson *et al.* Reply: In his Comment [1] Murphy proposes that the anomalous acceleration seen in the Pioneer 10/11 spacecraft [2] can be "explained, at least in part, by nonisotropic radiative cooling of the spacecraft." So, the question is, does "at least in part" mean this effect comes near to explaining the anomaly? We argue it does not [3].

Murphy considers radiation of the power of the main-bus electrical systems from the rear of the craft. For the Pioneers, the aft has a louver system, and the "louver system acts to control the heat rejection of the radiating platform . . . A bimetallic spring, thermally coupled radiatively to the platform, provides the motive force for altering the angle of each blade. In a closed position the heat rejection of the platform is minimized by virtue of the 'blockage' of the blades while open louvers provide the platform with a nearly unobstructed view of space." [4]

If these louvers were open, then, Murphy calculates this would produce an acceleration $a_0 = 9.2 \times 10^{-8}\ \mathrm{cm\,s^{-2}}$. Murphy uses numbers for thermal radiation that correspond to the position of the spacecraft near Jupiter, i.e., 5.5 AU. At that time, the spring temperature was about 56 °F, meaning the opening angle of the louvers was down to 20°. This reduces his estimate for the effective a_0 to $a \equiv \sin(20°)a_0 = 3.2 \times 10^{-8}\ \mathrm{cm\,s^{-2}}$.

However, our effect could only be seen well beyond 5.5 AU; i.e., further than 10–15 AU. By 9 AU the actuator spring temperature had already reached ~40°. This means the louver doors were closed (i.e., the louver angle was zero) from there on out. Thus, from our quoting of the radiation properties above, any contribution of the thermal radiation to the Pioneer anomalous acceleration should be small. (Certainly it would not be expected to be higher than it was at a 20° opening angle [5].)

In 1984, Pioneer 10 was about 33 AU and the power was about 105 W. (Always reduce the effect of the total power numbers by 8 W to account for the radio-beam power.) In 1987, 1992, and 1996 the craft was at ~41, ~55, and ~65 AU, respectively, and the power was ~95, ~80, and ~70 W. The louvers were inactive. No decrease in a_P was seen.

We conclude that this proposal cannot explain the anomalous Pioneer acceleration.

Heat radiation should be a more significant systematic for Ulysses than for the Pioneers. However, in principle, this could be separated out since accelerations along the lines of sight towards the Earth and towards the Sun could be differentiated. This is one of the reasons why a detailed calculation of the Ulysses orbit from the near-Jupiter encounter to Sun perihelion was undertaken, using CHASMP.

This turned out to be a much more difficult calculation than imagined. Because of a failed nutation damper, an inordinate number of spacecraft maneuvers were required (257). Even so, the analysis has now been completed. The results are disheartening. For an unexpected reason, any fit is not significant. The anomaly is dominated by (what appear to be) gas leaks. That is, after each maneuver the measured anomaly changes. The measured anomalies randomly change sign and magnitude. The values go up to about an order of magnitude larger than a_P. So, although the Ulysses data was useful for range/Doppler checks to test models, like Galileo it could not provide a good number for a_P.

The gas leaks so far found in the Pioneers are about an order of magnitude too small to explain a_P. Even so, we feel that some systematic or combination of systematics (such as heat or gas leaks) will most likely explain the anomaly. However, such an explanation has yet to be demonstrated.

John D. Anderson,[1] Philip A. Laing,[2] Eunice L. Lau,[1]
Anthony S. Liu,[3] Michael Martin Nieto,[4]
and Slava G. Turyshev[1]
[1]Jet Propulsion Laboratory
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California 91109
[2]The Aerospace Corporation
2350 E. El Segundo Boulevard
El Segundo, California 90245-4691
[3]Astrodynamic Sciences
2393 Silver Ridge Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90039
[4]Theoretical Division (MS-B285)
Los Alamos National Laboratory, University of California
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

Received 21 January 1999
PACS numbers: 04.80.Cc, 95.10.Eg, 95.55.Pe

[1] E. M. Murphy, preceding Comment, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1890 (1999); gr-qc/9810015.
[2] J. D. Anderson, P. A. Laing, E. L. Lau, A. S. Liu, M. M. Nieto, and S. G. Turyshev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2858 (1998); for further details see gr-qc/9903024.
[3] From the present wording of his Comment, it appears Murphy does not disagree too strongly with this statement. Indeed, in a private communication from J. D. A. to Murphy on 6 October 1998, it was pointed out that the Pioneers have louvered doors and not fins as radiators. This, by itself, obviated the "prosaic explanation" of the original eprint [1] by a large factor.
[4] Pioneer Project NASA/ARC Document No. PC-202.
[5] Any change of the louver angle should result in a spin change due to the thermal radiation. This is because of the orientation of the louvers around the bus on the spacecraft. We detect no such change.

