



Publication Year	2016
Acceptance in OA	2020-05-13T15:34:55Z
Title	Cellinoid shape model for Hipparcos data
Authors	Lu, Xiao-Ping, CELLINO, Alberto, Hestroffer, Daniel, Ip, Wing-Huen
Publisher's version (DOI)	10.1016/j.icarus.2015.12.006
Handle	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12386/24801
Journal	ICARUS
Volume	267

Accepted Manuscript

Cellinoid Shape Model for Hipparcos Data

Xiao-Ping Lu, Alberto Cellino, Daniel Hestroffer, Wing-Huen Ip

PII: S0019-1035(15)00556-4

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2015.12.006>


Reference: YICAR 11827

To appear in: *Icarus*

Received Date: 5 May 2015

Revised Date: 12 November 2015

Accepted Date: 5 December 2015



Please cite this article as: Lu, X-P., Cellino, A., Hestroffer, D., Ip, W-H., Cellinoid Shape Model for Hipparcos Data, *Icarus* (2015), doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2015.12.006>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Cellinoid Shape Model for Hipparcos Data

Xiao-Ping Lu^{a,b}, Alberto Cellino^c, Daniel Hestroffer^d, Wing-Huen Ip^{b,e}

^a*Faculty of Information Technology, Macau University of Science and Technology, Macau, China*

^b*Space Science Institute, Macau University of Science and Technology, Macau, China*

^c*INAF, Astronomical Observatory of Torino, strada Osservatorio 20, 10025 Pino, Torinese, Italy*

^d*IMCCE, Observatoire de Paris, 77 Av. Denfert Rochereau, 75014 Paris, France*

^e*Institute of Astronomy, National Central University, Taiwan*

Abstract

Being intermediate between a regular triaxial ellipsoid shape and a more complex convex shape, the so-called “cellinoid” shape model consists of eight octants of eight ellipsoids with the constraint that neighbouring octants share two common axes. The resulting variety of possible shapes, obtained at the cost of only three extra parameters to be added to models of regular ellipsoids, can be employed to efficiently simulate asteroids with irregular shapes. This article shows how the cellinoid shape model can be applied to the inversion of sparse photometric data, such as Hipparcos data. In order to make the model more efficient and convenient to use, an error analysis is discussed and numerically confirmed. Finally, we determine physical parameters of several asteroids, including their shape, rotational period and pole orientation, by applying our model to Hipparcos data.

Keywords: Asteroids, Photometry, Sparse data, Shape model, Hipparcos data

2010 MSC: 00-01, 99-00

1. Introduction

A statistical analysis of the main physical parameters of asteroids, including their shape and spin properties, is important in order to shed some light on the early phases of formation of the solar system, as well as its subsequent evolution. Generally, the primary data source for deriving these parameters is the analysis of lightcurves obtained

Corresponding author

Email address: (Xiao-Ping Lu)

via ground-based telescopes. However, among the more than 600,000 asteroids discovered so far, less than 3,000 of them have at least one lightcurve (Warner et al., 2009). Fortunately, there are several large sky survey projects, both past and present, that have obtained photometric observations of asteroids from the ground and from space. Gaia,
 10 launched at the end of 2013, is a large mission whose aim is to chart a three dimensional map of our galaxy. It is observing and recording the positions of hundreds of thousands of stars, as well as obtaining highly accurate photometric data of the bodies within the solar system, primarily asteroids (Jordi et al., 2010; Cellino and Dell’Oro, 2012). Unlike classical lightcurves, the photometric data collected of asteroids by satellites are
 15 sparse. For every asteroid observed in the main belt, there may be about 70 photometric snapshots in total. The problem of deriving spin and shape parameters from these sparse data are not trivial. In this article, we present a detailed technique and search strategy to make the cellinoid shape model stable and efficient when deriving these parameters. As Gaia is currently collecting data, which are not yet publically
 20 available, HIPPARCOS (High-Precision PARallax Collecting Satellite) data are used instead in our analysis to test the algorithm. Hipparcos was a satellite launched by ESA, the European Space Agency, in 1989, which collected some sparse photometric data for a small number of asteroids. Gaia was conceived to dramatically increase and improve the results of Hipparcos both in measured precision and the number of targets
 25 observed.

In the past, the methods that were used to derive asteroid shapes from photometric data were based on polyhedron models of regular triaxial ellipsoids (Surdej and Surdej, 1978). Karttunen (1989) presented a method for modelling asteroid brightness variation based on a triaxial ellipsoid shape, and he also discussed and modelled spherical
 30 concavities to mimic macroscopic shadowing and albedo. Additionally, Karttunen and Bowell (1989) discussed the influences of scattering, and concluded that lightcurves amplitudes depend very strongly on body shape. This was then confirmed by Cellino et al. (1989). Ohba et al. (2003) analysed pole orientation based on a triaxial ellipsoid shape for the target asteroid of the MUSES-C mission, (25143) 1998 SF36. Drummond et al.
 35 (2010) employed the ellipsoid model to estimate the physical properties of the ESA Rosetta target asteroid (21) Lutetia, such as its dimensions, rotational pole and bulk

density. Cellino et al. (2009) applied the ellipsoid model to Hipparcos data using a genetic inversion method, and showed that sparse photometric data could also be exploited when estimating the physical parameters of asteroids. Lu et al. (2013) introduced a numerical algorithm based on the ellipsoid model to efficiently calculate the rotational periods and pole orientations of asteroids.

The regular triaxial ellipsoid model, which has three parameters, is simple but efficient when applied to the task of simulating asteroid shapes. However, due to the symmetric structure of the ellipsoid, it has a limited capability for determining the photometric variation of objects that possess more complex shapes. Kaasalainen and Lamberg (1992a,b) presented a method to simulate complex asteroid shapes using a convex polyhedron representation. They used the Gaussian curvature function to describe the surface of an asteroid via spherical harmonics, instead of its radial function, which made the algorithm numerically stable and the solutions were seen to converge. The very good performances of this model were proven through applications to the cases of several asteroids for which several lightcurves are available (Kaasalainen and Torppa, 2001; Kaasalainen et al., 2001). Furthermore, Kaasalainen et al. (2012) made the method more efficient by employing Lebedev quadrature to calculate the surface integration. Kaasalainen's method performs very well when simulating asteroids with irregular shapes, as also confirmed by laboratory experiments (Kaasalainen et al., 2005).

As described previously, the simple triaxial ellipsoid can efficiently derive approximate, but generally acceptable, solutions to the physical parameters of asteroids (Santana-Ros et al., 2015), while the convex model can derive more accurate estimates from many lightcurves that cover a wide range of observing geometries. Commonly we have at our disposal for some objects either several lightcurves taken at just one apparition, or sets of sparse photometric snapshots taken at various epochs by sky surveys. This is the main reason why the ellipsoid shape model has been employed very frequently until now. However, the symmetric shape of a triaxial ellipsoid has some limitations when used to simulate the irregular shapes of many asteroids. Cellino et al. (1989) presented a definition of the shape model, which consisted of eight octants from eight ellipsoids with the constraint of neighbouring octants sharing the same two semi-axes. Based on this shape, it is possible to simulate the behaviour of a large variety of convex and complex shapes.

Lu et al. (2014) firstly called the shape ‘cellinoid’ and presented a theoretical method to derive physical parameters from lightcurves based on the cellinoid model. Furthermore, Lu and Ip (2015) introduced a technique that reduces lightcurves to make the method more efficient, and applied the cellinoid shape model to multiple lightcurves observed in various geometries. The cellinoid shape model includes three more parameters than the regular triaxial ellipsoid shape model, and can be employed to simulate the asymmetric shape structure of irregular asteroids. The computational cost is not increased hugely, while the accuracy of derived physical parameters from several lightcurves is higher than the ellipsoid model (Lu et al., 2014). Moreover, the shape and the physical parameters could be refined by using more lightcurves observed in various geometries (Lu and Ip, 2015).

This article focuses on the application of the cellinoid shape model to sparse datasets, such as Hipparcos data. As the photometric data are sparse, the whole inverse process is different to the ones employed for lightcurves, and the detailed technique and search strategy are introduced. Additionally, as the number of the sparse data are limited, the error propagation is analyzed carefully. In this article, the whole cellinoid shape model for sparse datasets are presented in Section 2 and the theoretical analysis for its error propagation is discussed in Section 3. Then, the whole process is examined by applying it to a simulated asteroid with the exact cellinoid shape in Section 4. Finally, the cellinoid shape model for sparse datasets are applied to the Hipparcos data in Section 5. The resulting physical parameters for some asteroids are listed and compared with known results obtained from other methods. At the end, the conclusion is presented and future work is discussed.

2. Cellinoid Shape Model

2.1. Cellinoid Shape

With six semi-axes $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2$, the cellinoid shape model is defined in Fig.(1).

The volume of the cellinoid shape is

$$M = \frac{4}{3}\pi(a_1 + a_2)(b_1 + b_2)(c_1 + c_2) \quad (1)$$




Figure 1: Cellinoid shape model

and its centre is

$$G \begin{pmatrix} \bar{x} \\ \bar{y} \\ \bar{z} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{3}{8}(a_1 & a_2) \\ \frac{3}{8}(b_1 & b_2) \\ \frac{3}{8}(c_1 & c_2) \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

As the cellinoid shape model is asymmetric, its centre varies with respect to the semi-axes. Moreover, its free rotational axis is not the z -coordinate axis, as in the case of an ellipsoid. As described by Lu and Ip (2015), the free rotational axis can be derived by diagonalizing the matrix $C = A - M - B$, where the definitions of A , and B are as follows,

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} I_{xx} & I_{xy} & I_{xz} \\ I_{xy} & I_{yy} & I_{yz} \\ I_{xz} & I_{yz} & I_{zz} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{y}^2 & \bar{z}^2 & \bar{x}\bar{y} & \bar{x}\bar{z} \\ \bar{x}\bar{y} & \bar{x}^2 & \bar{y}^2 & \bar{y}\bar{z} \\ \bar{x}\bar{z} & \bar{y}\bar{z} & \bar{x}^2 & \bar{y}^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

The elements in A have the similar forms, such as

$$I_{xx} = \int (y^2 + z^2) dV = \frac{1}{30} (a_1 - a_2)(b_1^3 - b_2^3)(c_1 - c_2) - (a_1 - a_2)(b_1 - b_2)(c_1^3 - c_2^3)$$

$$I_{xy} = \int (xy) dV = \frac{1}{15} (a_1^2 - a_2^2)(b_1^2 - b_2^2)(c_1 - c_2)$$

2.2. Scattering Law

Muinson et al. (2002) introduced a joint linear-exponential model

$$f(\alpha) = \exp(-\alpha) \quad (5)$$

to simulate the photometric phase curve, where α is the solar phase angle and a , b , and c are three linear parameters, while d is a nonlinear parameter. As the solar phase angle approaches 0, i.e. corresponding to ideal solar opposition, the model can provide a good simulation of real observations. Combining the phase curve function, Kaasalainen et al. (2001) presented a scattering function

$$S(\mu_0, \mu) = f(\alpha) \frac{\mu_0}{\mu} \quad (6)$$

with a weight factor μ , where μ and μ_0 are the projections of the viewing unit vector (the Earth direction) and illuminating unit vector (the Sun direction) on the normal direction of the asteroidal surface. (In other words, μ and μ_0 are the cosines of the emergence angle and of the incidence angle, respectively).

The Hipparcos mission collected photometry of some asteroids from 1989 to 1993 (Perryman et al., 1997; Hestroffer et al., 1998). Different to ground-based observations, Hipparcos photometric data are sparse and are not continuous. Generally, the number of points for most of asteroids in Hipparcos data are less than a few tens. Additionally, the Hipparcos photometric data of asteroids also have poor accuracies (Cellino et al., 2009). Therefore, the number of constraints to effectively simulate the asteroid is limited, which is why the traditional triaxial ellipsoid model is still frequently employed when simulating asteroids. In this article, there are five free parameters when simulating asteroids by the cellinoid shape model, i.e. a_2 , b_1 , b_2 , c_1 and c_2 , where we also assume that $a_1 = 1$. In addition to the pole direction (θ, ϕ) in the ecliptic coordinate system, the rotational period P , initial rotational phase angle ϕ_0 , and five scattering parameters $(a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2)$, the total number of parameters in the cellinoid shape model is thus 14. It is reasonable to search for the best-fitting parameters by applying the cellinoid shape model to Hipparcos data.

2.3. Inverse Process

130 With the definition of the scattering law in Eq.(6), the observed brightness of a given asteroid under a specific viewing geometry, i.e. the position of the Earth and the Sun, can be computed by the surface integration,

$$L(\alpha_0) = \int_C S(\alpha_0) ds \quad (7)$$

where C is the part of the surface of the cellinoid shape model, both illuminated and viewed, i.e. $\alpha_0 = 0$, and $\alpha_0 = 0$.

135 As the Hipparcos data are sparse, the χ^2 should be defined with the standard deviation σ_i of each data point as follows,

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i \frac{(L_i - \hat{L}_i)^2}{\sigma_i^2} \quad (8)$$

where L_i is the brightness of the i -th observed point, while $\hat{L}_i$ is the i -th corresponding fitted brightness. Then some optimization tools, such as the genetic algorithm, or Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm, can be employed to search for the best-fitting solutions that minimize χ^2 .
140

3. Error Propagation and Constraints

As the sparse data for constraining the physical parameters of the cellinoid shape model are inaccurate, the error propagation of the volume, centre of the cellinoid shape, and free rotational axis with respect to the six semi-axes must be considered. Besides,
145 some constraints need to be applied to make the whole algorithm more robust.

3.1. Error Propagation

The error propagation is linear for the centre of the cellinoid shape in Eq.(2) with respect to the six semi-axes a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1 and c_2 . Furthermore, the volume in Eq.(1) increases as k^3 as the semi-axes increases with k to the power of three, which will make
150 the algorithm unstable if the semi-axes substantially increase. Generally, we add the constraint of fixing a_1 to 1, and the other semi-axes will be adjusted proportionally.

The free rotational axis is complicated to derive by calculating the eigen-decomposition of the matrix C . Since the matrices A B in Eqs.(3,4) are real symmetric, the eigenvalues are real and the eigenvectors are orthogonal. For simplicity, the matrix C can be simplified to $C = (a_1 \ a_2)(b_1 \ b_2)(c_1 \ c_2)F$, with the definition of a real symmetric 3 3 matrix F as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{11} &= \frac{19}{1920}b_1^2 + \frac{19}{1920}b_2^2 + \frac{13}{960}b_1b_2 + \frac{19}{1920}c_1^2 + \frac{19}{1920}c_2^2 + \frac{13}{960}c_1c_2 \\ F_{22} &= \frac{19}{1920}a_1^2 + \frac{19}{1920}a_2^2 + \frac{13}{960}a_1a_2 + \frac{19}{1920}c_1^2 + \frac{19}{1920}c_2^2 + \frac{13}{960}c_1c_2 \\ F_{33} &= \frac{19}{1920}a_1^2 + \frac{19}{1920}a_2^2 + \frac{13}{960}a_1a_2 + \frac{19}{1920}b_1^2 + \frac{19}{1920}b_2^2 + \frac{13}{960}b_1b_2 \\ F_{12} \ F_{21} &= (\frac{3}{128} \ \frac{1}{15})(a_1 \ a_2)(b_1 \ b_2) \\ F_{13} \ F_{31} &= (\frac{3}{128} \ \frac{1}{15})(a_1 \ a_2)(c_1 \ c_2) \\ F_{23} \ F_{32} &= (\frac{3}{128} \ \frac{1}{15})(b_1 \ b_2)(c_1 \ c_2) \end{aligned}$$

The eigen-decomposition of C can be calculated simply from the eigen-decomposition of F with the same eigenvectors, where the proportional eigenvalues increase by a factor of $(a_1 \ a_2)(b_1 \ b_2)(c_1 \ c_2)$. Let the eigenvectors of matrices C and F be $[v_1 \ v_2 \ v_3]$ with respect to the three eigenvalues of the matrix F , $[\lambda_1 \ \lambda_2 \ \lambda_3]$, which are arranged from the smallest to the largest. To estimate the error propagation in the optimization process of the cellinoid shape model, we performed a numerical test. Given a random set of six semi-axes where the first one is fixed to 1, we calculated the three eigenvectors of the matrix C and a 5% error was added to each semi-axis except for the first fixed one a_1 , then the new three eigenvectors of the matrix C were calculated. Comparing the error of the norm of the deviation of two eigenvectors,

$$\|v_i - u_i\|_2 \quad i = 1, 2, 3$$

in which v_i is the i -th eigenvector of the original matrix and u_i is the i -th eigenvector of the matrix with 5% Gaussian noise added, we repeated the test 10,000 times. The three maxima and the mean of the norm for the three eigenvectors are listed in Table 1 for the five semi-axes, respectively. Intuitively, the max and mean norm of the numerical test for 10,000 simulations are under 5%, which means the eigenvectors of matrix C

converged as the six semi-axes converged. As described previously, the three orthogonal eigenvectors of the matrix C are the three new coordinate axes, and the eigenvector of the largest eigenvalue is the new z -axis, i.e. the free rotational axis of the cellinoid shape model.

Table 1: Numerical Test for Error Propagation of Five Semi-Axes

Semi-Axis	Max Norm: [v_1 v_2 v_3]	Mean Norm: [v_1 v_2 v_3]
a_2	[0.02571, 0.02533, 0.00443]	[0.00161, 0.00125, 0.00073]
b_1	[0.00740, 0.00780, 0.00416]	[0.00101, 0.00149, 0.00086]
b_2	[0.00601, 0.00701, 0.00461]	[0.00053, 0.00152, 0.00131]
c_1	[0.00247, 0.01180, 0.01188]	[0.00027, 0.00082, 0.00092]
c_2	[0.00189, 0.00541, 0.00542]	[0.00012, 0.00032, 0.00037]

3.2. Constraints

As the scattering law in Eq.(5) can adjust the relative brightness of the model, the total brightness of the modelled shape scales with the size. The total parameters used to control the cellinoid shape are reduced to five and the other five semi-axes can be adjusted proportionally. Meanwhile, the parameters a_1 and a_2 in Eq.(5) can be adjusted to balance the whole brightness integration in Eq.(7).

Since the coordinate system of the asteroid can be selected freely, the constraint

$$a_1 \geq a_2, b_1 \geq b_2, c_1 \geq c_2$$

is added to make the cellinoid similar to the standard ellipsoid, where the three axes $a \geq b \geq c$. Additionally, we let $a_1 \geq a_2$ to make the longest axis occur at the positive direction of the x -axis.

In all, the constraints to the six semi-axes are generally set as follows,

- (1) $a_1 \geq 1$;
- (2) $a_1 \geq a_2, b_1 \geq b_2, c_1 \geq c_2$;
- (3) $a_1 \geq a_2$.

180 4. Application to Synthetic Sparse Data

In order to test the stability of the algorithm based on the cellinoid shape model, as described in Section 2.3, the inverse process of constraining the free parameters by minimizing χ^2 in Eq. (8) was first applied to synthetic sparse data. The procedure used to derive the best-fitting results is described in detail as follows.

185 4.1. Generating Synthetic Sparse Data

The method presented in this article is primarily applied to sparse datasets of asteroids, such as those obtained by Hipparcos and Gaia. In order to better simulate real observations, synthetic sparse data were generated to match the cadence and photometric uncertainties obtained by Hipparcos. Here we used the asteroid Laetitia (39) as an example to illustrate the whole inversion process. The total number of observations of Laetitia (39) is 112, which is the largest amount obtained for all asteroids recorded by Hipparcos.

First, the related parameters are preset as

$$[1 \ 0.9 \ 0.85 \ 0.7 \ 0.6 \ 0.5 \ 43 \ 70 \ 5.5 \ 100 \ 0.5 \ 1 \ 0 \ 1]$$

following the sequence of six semi-axes ($a_1 \ a_2 \ b_1 \ b_2 \ c_1$ and c_2), pole orientation (θ) in the ecliptic coordinate frame, rotational period (P) with the initial rotational phase angle (ϕ_0), and the three scattering factors ($\alpha_1 \ \alpha_2 \ \alpha_3$) in Eq. (6).

It should be noticed that the other two parameters, β_1 and β_2 in Eq. (6), are ignored here as the solar phase angles of Laetitia (39) recorded in the Hipparcos data are distributed between 13.62° and 23.62° , with a mean angle of 17.95° , for which the opposition effect is not relevant.

200 Second, the brightness of Laetitia (39) in the Hipparcos data is replaced by the synthetic brightness calculated via Eq. (7) using the preset parameters and the corresponding observed geometries of Laetitia (39).

Then, the generated synthetic sparse data were used to verify the cellinoid shape model. Furthermore, in order to better simulate real observations, we also applied the shape model to the noised synthetic sparse data. Gaussian noise with a mean value of

0 mag and a standard deviation of 0.01 mag were added to the previously generated sparse data.




Figure 2: Searching for the best-fit period(circled point) from synthetic sparse data based on Laetitia (39). Synthetic sparse data without adding Gaussian noise(Left), synthetic sparse data adding Gaussian noise(Right)

4.2. Searching for the Best-fitting Period

The generated synthetic sparse data with the given parameters were treated as real
 210 observed sparse data. The caveat here of course is that its shape is that of an ideal
 cellinoid and not the complex shape of a real asteroid. The most important thing when
 deriving the fitted parameters by the cellinoid shape model is to search for the best-fit
 period correctly. For most situations, the periods are unknown, especially for newly
 found asteroids. Fortunately, as described by Warner et al. (2009), most asteroids have
 215 rotational periods that are greater than about 2.2 hours with the majority being between
 four and 10 hours. Based on that, if we do not have any prior information of a given
 asteroid, a first-approximation search with a test period ranging from two to 10 hours
 is implemented. However, for some special asteroids if the χ^2 of the derived best-fit
 period is not enough small, the period search should be enlarged to the interval 10 to
 220 20 hours.

Fig. 2 presents the distribution of χ^2 for different test periods for both the synthetic
 sparse data and the synthetic sparse data with added Gaussian noise. It should be

noticed that χ^2 in Eq. (8) would be modified to

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i (L_i - \hat{L}_i)^2 \quad (9)$$

for the synthetic sparse data without Gaussian noise as its standard error is zero. As shown in Fig. 2, the inversion process can correctly derive the initial period of both the sparse data and the noised sparse data. The circled points in Fig. 2 are the derived best-fitting periods. The χ^2 of best-fitting period for the noised synthetic sparse data is higher than that of the non-noised sparse data, but it is good enough to distinguish from the other test values of the period.

It is a time-consuming process to search for the best-fitting period. Kaasalainen et al. (2001) presented a strategy to search for the best-fitting period for events where the obtained lightcurves span many years and apparitions because the period space is filled with densely packed local minima. The smallest separation P of the local minima when searching the period should roughly be given by

$$\frac{P}{T} \approx \frac{1}{2} \frac{P}{T} \quad (10)$$

where $T = \max(t - t_0)$ within a lightcurve set. In our test of the synthetic sparse data based on Laetitia (39), as the observed period is $T = 966.32 \text{ days}$, the corresponding separation P should be $0.000086h$ for $P = 2h$, and $0.0022h$ for $P = 10h$.

However, in the real implementations, $P = 0.01h$ was enough for the synthetic sparse data. If there was some prior information about the period of the asteroid, the search interval could be reduced to save computing time.

4.3. Searching for the Best-fitting Pole and Shape

With the derived best-fitting period, we searched for the pole orientation with a resolution of 3° on the unit sphere. There were a total of 7320 tests. For each test, the period and pole orientation were specified, while the other parameters could be chosen freely. Then, the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm was employed to search for local optimal solutions with the initially specified parameters. All of the derived locally optimal pole orientations are shown in Fig. 3, denoted by the grey points.




Figure 3: Searching for the best-fit pole orientation (big circle) and accompanying solution (big diamond) from synthetic sparse data based on Laetitia (39).

As the synthetic sparse data were generated with a specific cellinoid shape, and the brightness was also calculated via the same algorithm in Eq. (7) in the inversion process, the preset solutions could be searched by the optimization algorithm. The derived best-fitting solution with $\chi^2 = 10^{-29}$ is the same as the preset one,

$$[1 \ 0.9 \ 0.85 \ 0.7 \ 0.6 \ 0.5 \ 43 \ 70 \ 5.5 \ 100 \ 0.5 \ 1 \ 0 \ 1]$$

Furthermore, we found that all 37 of the best-fitting solutions with χ^2 less were than 10^{-25} , in which there were 32 solutions with a pole orientation of $(43 \ 70)$ denoted by a big circle in Fig. 3, and five solutions with a pole orientation of $(223 \ -70)$, denoted by a big diamond in the same figure. The solutions with the pole $(43 \ 70)$ are the same as the preset one, while the solutions with the pole $(223 \ -70)$ are different. For example, one solution is,

$$[1 \ 0.8235 \ 1.0588 \ 1.1765 \ 0.7059 \ 0.5882 \ 223 \ -70 \ 5.5 \ 100 \ 0.3613 \ 0.7226 \ 0 \ 1]$$

However, if the six semi-axes are divided by the largest semi axis, the six semi-axes

would be

$$[0.8500 \ 0.7000 \ 0.9000 \ 1.0000 \ 0.6000 \ 0.5000]$$

which is the same as the preset one, although the sequence changes. Similarly, the first two scattering factors of this solution are also proportional to the preset ones.

250 As the cellinoid shape is asymmetric, one can use the shape model to adjust the semi-axes, the initial phase angle, and scattering factors to fit the reverse direction of the pole (43° 70'). That is why we added the constraints to the six semi-axes in Sec. 3.2. Nevertheless, this is also a very good phenomenon for the whole inversion process to confirm the correct pole orientation, i.e. the pole search can derive the correct pole
255 orientation, accompanying a reverse one if we do not constrain the semi-axes.

Following the previous process, the pole search was also applied to the noised synthetic sparse data. The derived pole orientation is (42.5° 69.6°) with the χ^2 0.0383 and the six semi-axes are

$$[1.08860 \ 0.8584 \ 0.7171 \ 0.6749 \ 0.4103]$$

Although the derived semi-axes c_1 , c_2 are not very close to the preset $c_1 = 0.6$, $c_2 = 0.5$, the mean value 0.5426 of c_1 and c_2 is close to the mean value 0.55 of preset c_1 and c_2 .

Analogously, the pole search also derives another pole orientation (222.5° 69.5°).

Besides, we also performed the numerical tests in the same way based on the other asteroids. All of the best-fitting results are similar to the initial ones. For example, Fig. 4 shows that the period search for both synthetic sparse data and noised synthetic sparse data based on the asteroid Hebe (6). The initial related parameters are

$$[1.085 \ 0.75 \ 0.6 \ 0.5 \ 0.7 \ 143 \ 50 \ 6.5 \ 140 \ 0.6 \ 1.2 \ 0.4]$$

260 The circled points in Fig. 4 are the best-fitting periods, which are close to the initial one, $P = 6.5$ hr.

As shown in Fig. 5, for the synthetic sparse data with added Gaussian noise, the pole search derived the best-fitting pole orientation (141.8° 51.5°) with the six semi-axes,

$$[1.08934 \ 0.7690 \ 0.6137 \ 0.4868 \ 0.7248]$$

And the other accompanying pole orientation was (321 8 51 5).

The numerical simulations confirmed that the cellinoid shape model is self-consistent, and the period search could derive a best-fitting result whose value was close to the pre-set one. Then the pole search could subsequently derive the correct pole orientation.

265 It should be noted that the reverse pole orientation would emerge as an accompanying result, whose semi-axes and scattering factors would change proportionally. Besides, there is no need to search for the best-fitting shape again, as the pole search for the 7320 initial tests could cover enough test values of the semi-axes, and the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm could efficiently search for the locally optimal solution.




Figure 4: Searching the best-fit period (circled point) from synthetic sparse data based on Hebe (6). Synthetic sparse data without adding Gaussian noise(Left), synthetic sparse data with adding Gaussian noise(Right)

270 5. Application to Hipparcos Data

Following the successful strategy applied in the synthetic sparse data, the cellinoid shape model was employed to Hipparcos data. Again, we used the asteroid Laetitia (39) as an example to show the whole process of searching for the related physical parameters of the asteroid from the sparse data, and make a comparison with known
275 solutions obtained via other methods and authors.

As illustrated previously, the better search scheme for the period is to search the interval from 2 hours to 10 hours with a separation $P = 0.000086h$. However, this will be a very time-consuming task. In real implementations to Hipparcos data, we searched the interval [2 10] with an increment of $P = 0.005h$ for the first rough




Figure 5: Searching the best-fit pole orientation (big circle) and accompanying solution (big diamond) from synthetic sparse data based on Hebe (6).

search, as shown in Fig. 6(a). The derived best-fitting period of asteroid Laetitia (39) is $P = 5.21h$. Moreover, in Fig. 6(a) there are also some other possible period solutions derived at local minima, where the χ^2 of the period was smaller than ones of neighbouring periods. Therefore, we manually add these possible period solutions into the interval $[3.4, 3.6, 5.1, 5.3, 7.3, 7.4, 9.7, 9.8]$ to a refined search with an increment of $P = 0.001h$, as shown in Fig. 6(b). Then a best-fitting period of $P = 5.17h$ was derived. Finally, we searched the interval from 5.1 hours to 5.2 hours with an increment of $P = 0.0001h$, as shown in Fig. 6(c). The derived best-fitting period was $P = 5.138h$. The search for the period in this way could save much computational time.

With the derived best-fitting period, a pole search was implemented. The derived local optimal pole orientations are shown in Fig. 7. The pole orientation with the smallest χ^2 is $(313^\circ, 4^\circ)$, denoted by the big circle in Fig. 7, while the corresponding accompanying pole solution is $(133^\circ, 4^\circ)$, denoted by the big diamond in Fig. 7. The

derived semi-axes of the shape are

$$a_1 = 1 \quad a_2 = 0.65 \quad b_1 = 0.74 \quad b_2 = 0.43 \quad c_1 = 0.62 \quad c_2 = 0.43$$

290 and the refined period is $P = 5.13830h$ with the three scattering parameters
 $3.6 \quad 5.5 \quad 0.23$.

As the observing error could affect the solutions, and the scattering law cannot accurately simulate the real situation, here we show the distribution of the possible pole results with the 300 smallest χ^2 in Fig. 8 and present a second possible pole solution for reference. The results can be classified into two groups. Generally, the deviations of both the longitude and latitude of the similar pole solutions classified in the same group are less than 3° . The first is the one with the smallest χ^2 , $(313^\circ \quad 4^\circ)$, denoted by the big circle, where its accompanying pole $(133^\circ \quad 4^\circ)$ is denoted by the big diamond. The second is $(318^\circ \quad 23^\circ)$, denoted by the upward triangle, and its accompanying pole $(138^\circ \quad 23^\circ)$, is denoted by the downward triangle in Fig. 8. The corresponding period of the second group of the pole orientation is $P = 5.13827h$, and its six semi-axes are

$$a_1 = 1 \quad a_2 = 0.61 \quad b_1 = 0.67 \quad b_2 = 0.51 \quad c_1 = 0.57 \quad c_2 = 0.45$$

Based on the cellinoid shape model, the derived rotational period of Laetitia (39) from the Hipparcos data is consistent with the known results, such as Kaasalainen's method (Kaasalainen et al., 2002; Ďurech et al., 2011; Hanuš et al., 2013) and the in-
 295 version method (Cellino et al., 2009), shown in Tab. 2. Besides, as we have derived two possible pole orientations due to the limited data source, the second pole $(318^\circ \quad 23^\circ)$ is close to the pole solution $(323^\circ \quad 32^\circ)$ determined via Kaasalainen's method with the longitude deviation 5° and the latitude deviation 9° , which is based on 56 lightcurves obtained from 1949 to 1988. The accompanying direction $(133^\circ \quad 4^\circ)$ of the first pole
 300 result is similar to the second result $(126^\circ \quad 20^\circ)$ obtained by Cellino, with a longitude deviation 7° and a latitude deviation 16° , who derived the pole solution based on the same data source. Therefore, from only 112 observed snapshots of Laetitia(39) in the Hipparcos data, the cellinoid shape model could derive the rotational period and provide a reasonable estimate of the pole orientation. Furthermore, the cellinoid shape
 305 model could present a rough profile of the asteroid from the sparse dataset; this is in

contrast to the convex shape model, which requires many lightcurves to reconstruct its surface and which has more than 50 parameters.

Generally speaking, the process of searching for the physical parameters of asteroids from sparse photometric data based on the cellinoid shape model could be split into four steps. First, a rough estimate of the period is derived by searching the period interval [2, 10] with a separation of $P = 0.005h$. Second, a refined estimate of the period is derived by searching the period interval that covers the local minima in the first rough period search with a separation of $P = 0.001h$. Third, the best-fitting period will be derived by searching the period interval covering the absolute minimum in the second period search with a separation of $P = 0.0001h$. Fourth, with the derived best-fitting period a pole search is implemented on the unit sphere with a resolution of 3° . The pole solution with the least χ^2 is taken as the best-fitting pole value. Meanwhile, the cellinoid shape model that corresponds to the best-fitting pole value is derived.

Applying the same process based on the cellinoid shape model to other asteroids recorded in Hipparcos data, the best-fitting parameters were derived and are listed in the final column of Tab. 2. The first column lists the names and numbers of asteroids with their total numbers of observations by Hipparcos. For comparison, the known results from other methods are also listed respectively in the second and third columns, including the results in DAMIT by Kaasalainen's method (Durech et al., 2010) and the inversion solutions based on the triaxial ellipsoid shape model by Cellino et al. (2009). In the following subsections, we will present the details for each individual asteroid.

5.1. *Hebe* (6)

There are a total of 91 observed snapshots in the Hipparcos data. The solar phase angles are between 14.94° and 30.59° with a mean value of 20.30° . The derived rotational period determined by the cellinoid shape model is $P = 7.27806h$, and the best-fitting pole orientation is $(342^\circ, 39^\circ)$ with a longitude deviation of 2° and a latitude deviation of 3° to the result Pole₁($340^\circ, 42^\circ$) by Kaasalainen's method (Torppa et al., 2003; Durech et al., 2011). The derived six semi-axes are

$$a_1 = 1, a_2 = 0.14, b_1 = 0.94, b_2 = 0.41, c_1 = 0.68, c_2 = 0.56$$

As Hebe (6) is a large main-belt asteroid, its shape is close to that of a sphere due to the effects of gravity. Although the derived cellinoid shape model is asymmetric, its axial ratios $a/b = 0.84$, $c/b = 0.92$ are close to that of a sphere if we set $a = a_1 = a_2$, $b = b_1 = b_2$, $c = c_1 = c_2$.

5.2. *Iris* (7)

As *Iris* (7) was not inverted from Hipparcos data by Cellino et al. (2009), we attempted to model it using the cellinoid shape model. There are totally 69 sparse Hipparcos datapoints, and the observed solar phase angles are distributed between 16.45° and 31.64° . The best-fitting period is $P = 7.11281h$, which is close to the result obtained when using the Kaasalainen method (Kaasalainen et al., 2002; Ďurech et al., 2011; Hanuš et al., 2013). However, the Kaasalainen result is based on lightcurves observed between 1950 to 1993, which also includes Hipparcos data. It could be a mean estimate for the rotational period over this time frame and the result may be affected by the different data sources. The cellinoid shape model was also used to derive a pole orientation of (20.47°) , with a longitude deviation of 4° and a latitude deviation of 32° to the result $\text{Pole}_1(16.15^\circ)$ by Kaasalainen's method. Obtaining an accurate pole orientation requires more accurate sparse data and more data points. Nevertheless, the asymmetric shape of the cellinoid model performs better than the traditional ellipsoid model. More or less, the derived period and pole orientation only from 69 observed snapshots provides rough estimates of the physical properties of *Iris* (7).

5.3. *Flora* (8)

Flora (8) is another asteroid not inverted by Cellino et al. (2009). As such, we applied the cellinoid shape model to 56 snapshots of *Flora* (8) in the Hipparcos dataset. The solar phase angles are between 17.21° and 29.86° , with a mean value of 22.89° . The best-fitting period is $P = 12.81710h$, with a best-fitting pole orientation of (347.18°) , as shown in Tab. 2. The pole solution is close to the result Pole_2 with the longitude deviation 12° and the latitude deviation 13° obtained via Kaasalainen's method (Torppa et al., 2003; Ďurech et al., 2011; Hanuš et al., 2013).

5.4. Eunomia (15)

There are 83 snapshots of Eunomia (15) in the Hipparcos dataset, which was observed at solar phase angles between 13.62° and 25.88° . The cellinoid shape model derived a rotational period of $P = 6.08277h$ and a pole orientation of $(353^\circ, 55^\circ)$. The best-fitting period is the same as that derived via Kaasalainen's method (Kaasalainen et al., 2002; Nathues et al., 2005; Hanuš et al., 2013) and Cellino's inversion method (Cellino et al., 2009). The pole orientation is also close to the value of the pole $(3^\circ, 67^\circ)$ derived via Kaasalainen's method, with a longitude deviation of 10° a latitude deviation of 12° . Moreover, the cellinoid shape model also obtains a second pole orientation $(346^\circ, 67^\circ)$ with six semi-axes of

$$a_1 = 1, a_2 = 0.50, b_1 = 0.68, b_2 = 0.40, c_1 = 0.56, c_2 = 0.14$$

The deviations in both the longitude and latitude directions to the pole solution $(347^\circ, 64^\circ)$ derived by Cellino et al. (2009) are less than 3° . We computed similar axial ratios, $b/a = 0.72, c/a = 0.47$, which are close to the ratios $b/a = 0.70, c/a = 0.55$ of Cellino et al. Furthermore, the derived pole solution $(353^\circ, 55^\circ)$ from the cellinoid shape model is also confirmed by the pole result $(352^\circ, 58^\circ)$ obtained by Tanga et al. (2003).

5.5. Melpomene (18)

We apply the cellinoid shape model to 100 snapshots of Melpomene (18), where the observed solar phase angles are located in the interval from 15.23° to 27.26° . The best-fitting rotational period is $P = 11.57039h$ and the pole orientation is $(188^\circ, 40^\circ)$ with the six semi-axes as shown in Tab. 2. Cellino et al. (2009) could not derive the same parameters based on the traditional ellipsoid in their inversion method, and the information on this asteroid is not provided by Ďurech et al. (2010). Fortunately Warner et al. (2009) obtained a rotational period $P = 11.570h$, which is same as the result from the cellinoid shape model.

5.6. Harmonia (40)

In total there are 103 observed data points for Harmonia (40) in the Hipparcos dataset. The solar phase angles are distributed from 18.23° to 26.96° . Based on the

cellinoid shape model, we derive two possible results. The first best-fitting result is for a rotational period of $P = 8.91081h$ and a pole orientation of $(219^\circ, 38^\circ)$; while the second best-fitting result is for a rotational period of $P = 8.91083h$ and a pole orientation of $(36^\circ, 31^\circ)$. The derived rotational period is close to that determined by Cellino et al. (2009) as the data sources employed in two methods are the same, i.e. Hipparcos data. However, the cellinoid shape model derived two pole orientations. The reverse direction $(39^\circ, 38^\circ)$ of the first pole $(219^\circ, 38^\circ)$ is close to the pole $(24^\circ, 31^\circ)$ inverted by Cellino et al. (2009), while the second pole $(36^\circ, 31^\circ)$ is close to the pole $(22^\circ, 31^\circ)$ derived via Kaasalainen's method (Hanuš et al., 2011, 2013). The cellinoid shape model requires data points with higher accuracy to obtain a refined pole orientation.

5.7. *Nysa (44)*

There are a total of 53 Hipparcos data points of *Nysa (44)*, which were observed with solar phase angles between 20.61° and 28.44° . The cellinoid shape model derived a rotational period $P = 6.42140h$ that is very similar to the ones derived via Kaasalainen's method (Kaasalainen et al., 2002; Delbo' and Tanga, 2009) and Cellino's method (Cellino et al., 2009). Although the derived pole orientation $(293^\circ, 33^\circ)$ is different to the pole $(99^\circ, 58^\circ)$ determined via Kaasalainen's method, it is similar to the pole $(298^\circ, 36^\circ)$ obtained via Cellino's method with a longitude deviation of 5° and a latitude deviation of 3° . Moreover, as *Nysa (44)* likely has an irregular shape, the pole solution is different to the pole result $(102^\circ, 50^\circ)$ obtained by Tanga et al. (2003).

5.8. *Dembowska (349)*

We applied the cellinoid shape model to 92 sparse Hipparcos data points of *Dembowska (349)*, which has a solar phase angle distributed between 13.88° and 21.23° . The derived best-fitting rotational period is $P = 4.69055h$. However, there are two possible pole orientations. The first one is a pole $(335^\circ, 24^\circ)$ with six semi-axes of

$$a_1 = 1, a_2 = 0.20, b_1 = 0.59, b_2 = 0.50, c_1 = 1.00, c_2 = 0.01$$

With a longitude deviation of 13° and a latitude deviation of 6° , the pole result is similar to the result $(322^\circ, 18^\circ)$ derived via Kaasalainen's method (Torppa et al., 2003;

Hanuš et al., 2013). The second pole orientation is $(342^\circ \ 37^\circ)$ with six semi-axes of

$$a_1 = 1 \ a_2 = 0.21 \ b_1 = 0.59 \ b_2 = 0.51 \ c_1 = 0.98 \ c_2 = 0.01$$

5.9. Eleonora (354)

There are a total of 98 snapshots of Eleonora (354) in the Hipparcos dataset, where the observed solar phase angle is distributed between 13.89° and 23.20° . The cellinoid shape model was applied to search for the best-fitting parameters to Eleonora (354).
 400 The best-fitting period is about $P = 4.28797h$, which is close to the period obtained by Cellino et al. (2009). As previously mentioned, Cellino et al. exploited the same data source as considered here. However, the cellinoid shape model derived two possible pole orientations, $(309^\circ \ 66^\circ)$ and $(325^\circ \ 44^\circ)$. The reverse direction $(145^\circ \ 44^\circ)$ of the second pole solution $(325^\circ \ 44^\circ)$ is similar to the pole solution $(144^\circ \ 54^\circ)$ derived
 405 via Kaasalainen's method (Hanuš et al., 2011, 2013), with a longitude deviation of 1° and a latitude deviation of 10° .

5.10. Papagena (471)

There are a total of 112 snapshots of Papagena (471) in the Hipparcos dataset. The cellinoid shape model derived a rotational period of $P = 7.11534h$ and a pole
 410 orientation of $(217^\circ \ 40^\circ)$. The period is almost same as the result $P = 7.115394h$ derived via Kaasalainen's method (Durech et al., 2011). The longitude deviation of the two pole results derived by the two different methods is 6° , with a latitude deviation of 27° .

Table 2 shows all the best-fitting solutions derived by the cellinoid shape model
 415 for the 11 asteroids recorded by Hipparcos. Generally the cellinoid shape model can derive reasonable estimates from the sparse photometric data due to its asymmetric and easily representative shape. Encouragingly, it derives rotational periods that are close to those determined by other authors. The cellinoid shape model is able to search for the best-fitting value of the pole and provide best estimates of pole orientations better
 420 than the ellipsoid shape model. Moreover, the cellinoid shape model can also derive reasonable solutions to the asteroids, such as Iris (7), Flora (8), and Melpomene (18),

which were not modelled by the inversion methods that were based on the ellipsoid shape model.

As the Hipparcos data are not accurate, in which there are many observed points
 425 with photometric errors greater than 0.05 mag, the derived solutions obtained via
 the cellinoid shape model may differ from the results derived from the modelling
 of lightcurves performed in Kaasalainen's method. Nevertheless, the cellinoid shape
 model can be employed to derive the rough estimates for a given asteroid from sparse
 photometric data instead of via the traditional triaxial ellipsoid approach. Our exam-
 430 ples confirm that the cellinoid shape model can not only derive the rotational period,
 but also derive better estimates of pole orientations compared with the ellipsoid model.

6. Conclusions and Future Work

In this article, we presented the cellinoid shape model that is used for deriving
 physical parameters of some asteroids from the sparse Hipparcos dataset. Following
 435 the error analysis and the technique, which makes the algorithm more stable and ef-
 ficient, the effectiveness of cellinoid shape model is confirmed from modelling of the
 simulated sparse data. Finally the cellinoid shape model was employed to search for
 the best-fitting parameters for specific asteroids in the Hipparcos dataset, and the com-
 puted parameters were compared with the known results via Kaasalainen's method and
 440 Cellino's inversion solutions in Table 2. According to the preliminary results shown in
 this paper, we can say that the cellinoid shape model can fit the asteroids better than
 the ellipsoid model, and the derived parameters from sparse data are close to the ones
 derived from Kaasalainen's approach. In the future, as Gaia sparse data for asteroids
 become available, the cellinoid shape model will be applied to estimate the physical
 445 parameters in an efficient way for the likely huge number of observed asteroids.

In conclusion, the cellinoid shape model seems to be, not unexpectedly, better than
 the traditional triaxial ellipsoid model, which was confirmed both theoretically and
 numerically. As far as limited datasets are concerned, the cellinoid shape model can be
 applied to efficiently determine estimates of the physical parameters of a given asteroid.
 450 If the data sources are multiple or the collected lightcurves are sampled well enough,

Kaasalainen's method can be applied to refine the shapes and the parameters of the modelled asteroid.

As the cellinoid shape model consists of eight octants of ellipsoids, in future work we want to find a theoretical formula to directly calculate the brightness since this would reduce enormously the necessary CPU time, and would make the cellinoid shape model more suited to be systematically adopted for the inversion of big sets of photometric data. Moreover, if a feasible formula could provide an initial estimate of the period and pole, it would save a considerable amount of time when deriving the best-fitting parameters via the cellinoid shape model presented in this article. This is valuable in the case of estimating the parameters for large numbers of asteroids with limited sparse photometric dataset, such as those observed by space satellites.

Acknowledgements

This work is funded under the grant NO. 095 2013 A3 and 039 2013 A2 from the Science and Technology Development Fund, MSAR. W.-H. Ip is supported by MSAR Science and Technology Fund (Project No. 019 2010 A2) and NSC 101-2111-M-008-016. And we sincerely thank the anonymous reviewers for their professional and constructive comments.

References

References

- Cellino, A., Dell'Oro, A., 2012. The derivation of asteroid physical properties from Gaia observations. *Planetary and Space Science* 73, 52 – 55. Solar System science before and after Gaia.
- Cellino, A., Hestroter, D., Tanga, P., Mottola, S., Dell'Oro, A., 2009. Genetic inversion of sparse disk-integrated photometric data of asteroids: application to Hipparcos data. *A&A* 506, 935–954.
- Cellino, A., Zappalà, V., Farinella, P., 1989. Asteroid shapes and lightcurve morphology. *Icarus* 78, 298–310.

- Delbo', M., Tanga, P., 2009. Thermal inertia of main belt asteroids smaller than 100 km from IRAS data. *Planetary and Space Science* 57, 259–265.
- 480 Drummond, J.D., Conrad, A., Merline, W.J., Carry, B., Chapman, C.R., Weaver, H.a., Tamblyn, P.M., Christou, J.C., Dumas, C., 2010. Physical Properties of the ESA Rosetta target asteroid (21) Lutetia I. The triaxial ellipsoid dimensions, rotational pole, and bulk density. *A&A* 523, A93.
- Hanuš, J., Marchis, F., Ďurech, J., 2013. Sizes of main-belt asteroids by combining
485 shape models and Keck adaptive optics observations. *Icarus* 226, 1045–1057.
- Hanuš, J., Ďurech, J., Brož, M., Warner, B.D., Pilcher, F., Stephens, R., Oey, J., Bernasconi, L., Casulli, S., Behrend, R., Polishook, D., Henych, T., Lehký, M., Yoshida, F., Ito, T., 2011. A study of asteroid pole-latitude distribution based on an extended set of shape models derived by the lightcurve inversion method. *A&A* 530,
490 A134.
- Hestroter, D., Morando, B., Hog, E. and Kovalevsky, J., Lindegren, L., Mignard, F., 1998. The HIPPARCOS solar system objects catalogues. *A&A* 334.
- Jordi, C., Gebran, M., Carrasco, J.M., de Bruijne, J., Voss, H., Fabricius, C., Knude, J., Vallenari, A., Kohley, R., Mora, A., 2010. Gaia broad band photometry. *A&A* 523,
495 1–16.
- Kaasalainen, M., Lamberg, L., 1992a. Interpretation of lightcurves of atmosphereless bodies. I-General theory and new inversion schemes. *A&A* 259, 318–332.
- Kaasalainen, M., Lamberg, L., 1992b. Interpretation of lightcurves of atmosphereless bodies. II-Practical aspects of inversion. *A&A* 259, 333–340.
- 500 Kaasalainen, M., Lu, X.P., Vänttinen, A., 2012. Optimal computation of brightness integrals parametrized on the unit sphere. *A&A* 539.
- Kaasalainen, M., Torppa, J., 2001. Optimization Methods for Asteroid Lightcurve Inversion I. Shape Determination. *Icarus* 153, 24–36.

- Kaasalainen, M., Torppa, J., Muinonen, K., 2001. Optimization Methods for Asteroid
505 Lightcurve Inversion II. The Complete Inverse Problem. *Icarus* 153, 37–51.
- Kaasalainen, M., Torppa, J., Piironen, J., 2002. Models of twenty asteroids from photometric data. *Icarus* 159, 369 – 395.
- Kaasalainen, S., Kaasalainen, M., Piironen, J., 2005. Ground reference for space remote sensing Laboratory photometry of an asteroid model. *A&A* 440, 1177–1182.
- 510 Karttunen, H., 1989. Modelling asteroid brightness variations. I-Numerical methods. *A&A* 208, 314–319.
- Karttunen, H., Bowell, E., 1989. Modelling asteroid brightness variations. II-The interpretability of light curves and phase curves. *A&A* 208, 320–326.
- Lu, X.P., Ip, W.H., 2015. Cellinoid shape model for multiple light curves. *Planetary and Space Science* 108, 31–40.
515
- Lu, X.P., Zhao, H., You, Z., 2013. A Fast Ellipsoid Model for Asteroids Inverted From Lightcurves. *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics* 13, 465–472.
- Lu, X.P., Zhao, H., You, Z., 2014. Cellinoid Shape Model for Asteroids. *Earth, Moon and Planets* 112, 73–87.
- 520 Muinonen, K., Piironen, J., Kaasalainen, S., Cellino, A., 2002. Asteroid photometric and polarimetric phase curves: Empirical modeling. *Memorie Della Società Astronomica Italiana* 73, 716–719.
- Nathues, A., Mottola, S., Kaasalainen, M., Neukum, G., 2005. Spectral study of the eunomia asteroid family: I. eunomia. *Icarus* 175, 452 – 463.
- 525 Ohba, Y., Abe, M., Hasegawa, S., Ishiguro, M., Kwiatkowski, T., Colas, F., Dermawan, B., Fujiwara, A., 2003. Pole orientation and triaxial ellipsoid shape of (25143) 1998 SF36, a target asteroid of the MUSES-C mission. *Earth, Planets and Space* 55, 341–347.

- Perryman, M.A.C., Lindegren, L., Kovalevsky, J., Hoeg, E., Bastian, U., Bernacca, P.,
530 et al., 1997. The HIPPARCOS Catalogue. *A&A* 323.
- Santana-Ros, T., Bartczak, P., Michałowski, T., Tanga, P., Cellino, A., 2015. Testing the
inversion of asteroids' gaia photometry combined with ground-based observations.
Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 450, 333–341.
- Surdej, A., Surdej, J., 1978. Asteroid lightcurves simulated by the rotation of a three-
535 axes ellipsoid model. *A&A* 66, 31–36.
- Tanga, P., Hestroter, D., Cellino, A., Lattanzi, M., Martino, M., Zappalà, V., 2003.
Asteroid Observations with the Hubble Space Telescope FGS II. Duplicity search
and size measurements for 6 asteroids. *A&A* 401, 733–741.
- Torppa, J., Kaasalainen, M., Michałowski, T., Kwiatkowski, T., Kryszczyńska, A.,
540 Denchev, P., Kowalski, R., 2003. Shapes and rotational properties of thirty asteroids
from photometric data. *Icarus* 164, 346 – 383.
- Đurech, J., Kaasalainen, M., Herald, D., Dunham, D., Timerson, B., Hanuš, J., Frappa,
E., Talbot, J., Hayamizu, T., Warner, B.D., Pilcher, F., Galád, A., 2011. Combining
asteroid models derived by lightcurve inversion with asteroidal occultation silhou-
545 ettes. *Icarus* 214, 652 – 670.
- Đurech, J., Sidorin, V., Kaasalainen, M., 2010. DAMIT: a database of asteroid models.
A&A 513, 46.
- Warner, B.D., Harris, A.W., Pravec, P., 2009. The asteroid lightcurve database. *Icarus*
202, 134 – 146.




Figure 6: Searching for the best-fitting period (circled point) from Hipparcos data of Laetitia (39). (a) searching the interval [2,10] with $P = 0.005h$; (b) searching the interval [3.4 - 3.6, 5.1 - 5.3, 7.3 - 7.4, 9.7 - 9.8] with $P = 0.001h$; (c) searching the interval [5.1, 5.2] with $P = 0.0001h$




Figure 7: Searching for the best-fitting pole orientation (big circle) and accompanying solution (big diamond) from Hipparcos data of Laetitia (39).




Figure 8: Two groups of the best-fitting pole orientation of Laetitia (39).

Table 2: Comparison of known parameters of 11 asteroids derived from different methods

NO.	DAMIT	Cellino et al.(2009)	Cellinoid Models
Hebe(6) <i>N</i> 91	P_1 7 274471 h, P_2 7 274470 h, Pole ₁ (340 42), Pole ₂ (345 42)	P_1 7 27290 h, P_2 7 27275 h, Pole ₁ (45 75), Pole ₂ (93 37), (295 29)	P 7 27806 h, Pole (342 39), [1 0 14 0 94 0 41 0 68 0 56]
Iris(7) <i>N</i> 69	P 7 138843 h, Pole ₁ (16 15), Pole ₂ (196 2)	Not Inverted	P 7 11281 h, Pole (20 47), [1 0 08 0 46 0 33 0 22 0 21]
Flora(8) <i>N</i> 56	P 12 86667 h, Pole ₁ (155 6), Pole ₂ (335 5)	Not Inverted	P 12 81710 h, Pole (347 18), [1 0 10 0 80 0 25 0 75 0 30]
Eunomia(15) <i>N</i> 83	P 6 082753 h, Pole (3 67)	P 6 08273 h, Pole (347 64)	P 6 08277 h, Pole ₁ (353 55), [1 0 46 0 66 0 30 0 70 0 25] Pole ₂ (346 67), [1 0 50 0 68 0 40 0 56 0 14]
Melpomene(18) <i>N</i> 100	Not Provided	Not Inverted	P 11 57039 h, Pole (188 40), [1 0 23 0 85 0 55 0 64 0 63]
Laetitia(39) <i>N</i> 112	P 5 138238 h, Pole (323 32)	P 5 13830 h, Pole ₁ (335 47), Pole ₂ (126 20)	P_1 5 13830 h, Pole ₁ (313 4), [1 0 65 0 74 0 43 0 62 0 43] P_2 5 13827 h, Pole ₂ (318 23), [1 0 61 0 67 0 51 0 57 0 45]
Harmonia(40) <i>N</i> 103	P 8 908483 h, Pole (22 31)	P 8 91069 h, Pole (24 31)	P_1 8 91081 h, Pole ₁ (219 38), [1 0 01 0 81 0 13 0 47 0 47] P_2 8 91083 h, Pole ₂ (36 31), [1 0 02 0 81 0 12 0 47 0 46]
Nysa(44) <i>N</i> 53	P 6 421417 h, Pole (99 58)	P 6 42160 h, Pole (298 36)	P 6 42140 h, Pole (293 33), [1 0 70 0 81 0 25 0 72 0 29]
Dembowska(349) <i>N</i> 92	P 4 701204 h, Pole (322 18),	P_1 4 69120h, P_2 4 70153 h, Pole ₁ (201 71), Pole ₂ (137 11)	P 4 69055 h, Pole ₁ (335 24), [1 0 20 0 59 0 50 1 00 0 01] Pole ₂ (342 37), [1 0 21 0 59 0 51 0 98 0 01]
Eleonora(354) <i>N</i> 98	P 4 277186 h, Pole (144 54)	P 4 28972 h, Pole (335 15)	P_1 4.28797 h, Pole ₁ (309 66), [1 0 30 0 61 0 40 0 38 0 09] P_2 4.28798 h, Pole ₂ (325 44), [1 0 01 0 96 0 02 0 97 0 63]
Papagena(471) <i>N</i> 112	P 7 115394 h, Pole (223 67)	P 7 10540 h, Pole (246 74)	P 7 11534 h, Pole (217 40), [1 0 44 0 72 0 48 0 84 0 06]

- * Cellinoid Shape Model Consisting of Eight Octants From Eight Ellipsoids
- * Search Physical Parameters of Asteroids from Sparse Photometric Data
- * Error Propagation, Simulated Numerical Test and Hipparcos Data

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT