

High-Precision Amplitude-Modulated Continuous-Wave Lunar Laser Ranging

Slava G. Turyshev

*Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology,
4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, CA 91109-0899, USA*

(Dated: December 3, 2025)

Lunar laser ranging (LLR) currently delivers mm-class tests of relativistic gravity and the lunar interior, but further gains are limited by photon-starved pulsed systems, array-induced pulse broadening, and atmospheric variability. Pushing into the sub-0.1 mm regime is required to probe ultra-slow tidal dissipation, long-period librations, and μHz -band gravitational waves. We develop a complete amplitude-modulated continuous-wave (AM-CW) framework for high-power LLR, including measurement models, estimators, a unified covariance description, and an observatory concept of operations. In the AM-CW architecture, LLR is treated as RF phase metrology on a bright CW optical carrier: two-way range and one-way line-of-sight range-rate are obtained from the phase and phase slope of a GHz-class modulation tone. The joint estimators are characterized by a covariance matrix $C_{ij}(T)$ decomposed into photon, atmospheric, instrumental, oscillator, and nonlinearity contributions, which we map into quantitative subsystem requirements, including a closed-form range-rate bias from modulation-frequency slew across the ~ 2.56 s round trip and synthetic-wavelength constraints on multi-tone nonlinearity. Using realistic photon budgets for a 1 kW, 1064 nm CW transmitter on a 1 m telescope ranging to 10 cm corner-cube retroreflectors, we show that the photon-statistical floor for two-way range at a GHz-class modulation frequency is at the level of a few $\times 10 \mu\text{m}$ on $T \sim 10^2$ s windows. With representative allocations to residual atmosphere and instrument, the resulting single-station two-way precision is $\sim 80 \mu\text{m}$, with range-rate sensitivities in the $0.1\text{--}1 \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$ band. Differential LLR between reflectors separated on the Moon by baselines $\sim 10^3$ km is capable of delivering $20\text{--}50 \mu\text{m}$ and $\text{few} \times (0.1\text{--}1) \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$ differential range and range-rate. These precision bands are realized across three representative operating regimes that span detected photon rates $\dot{N}_\gamma \simeq (5\text{--}7) \times 10^3\text{--}10^5 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and are translated directly into hardware and CONOPS requirements for next-generation high-power AM-CW LLR stations.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	2
II. AM phase model and observables	4
A. Science-driven metrology requirements	5
B. Unified phase-measurement model	6
C. Range and range-rate	7
D. Oscillator slew across the round trip	8
E. Differential observables	8
III. Ambiguity removal: multi-tone synthetic wavelengths	9
IV. Photon-counting lock-In SNR and link budget	10
V. Atmosphere and instrument: precision budgets	12
A. Representative error budget	13
1. Atmosphere	13
2. Instrument	14
B. Observable-specific noise budgets	14
C. Temporal correlations and multi-epoch covariance	16
VI. Implementation gates	16
VII. Performance summary and recommendations	17
VIII. Hardware and CONOPS	18
A. Common hardware stack	19
1. Frequency reference	19

2. Laser and modulation	20
3. Transmit/receive optics	21
4. Detector and back-end	22
5. Internal reference	22
B. Facility-level infrastructure for high-power operation	22
1. Thermal and electrical budget	22
2. Mechanical and vibrational environment	22
3. Telescope enclosure and site monitoring	23
4. High-power safety and beam control	23
5. Timing and frequency distribution	23
6. Geophysical co-location and ancillary sensors	23
C. Concept of operations	23
IX. Conclusions	24
Acknowledgments	25
References	25
A. Atmospheric turbulence and time averaging	26

I. INTRODUCTION

Since its inception in 1969, lunar laser ranging (LLR) has achieved millimeter-level precision in measuring the distance between Earth-based observatories and the corner-cube retroreflectors (CCRs) on the Moon [1–5]. This progress has enabled a suite of high-precision tests of relativistic gravity, including tests of the equivalence principle, constraints on a possible variation of G , geodetic precession, and detailed studies of the deep lunar interior [4, 5]. In this classical pulsed architecture, the ranging observable is the distribution of photon arrival times referenced to an internal clock, and the range estimate is obtained by fitting this distribution after applying corrections for relativistic light time, station motion, and atmospheric delay. However, further improvements are increasingly limited by photon-starved statistics, array-induced pulse broadening, and two-way atmospheric variability, specifically:

- *photon statistics*: the number of detected photons per normal point is modest, and further gains by increasing peak power are constrained by eye safety, nonlinearity, and cost;
- *array-induced pulse spreading*: large corner-cube arrays produce return pulses broadened by array geometry and librations, limiting the utility of higher single-photon timing precision;
- *atmosphere and station*: two-way atmospheric delay variations and station metrology become non-negligible once intrinsic photon noise is driven below the millimeter level.

Recently, we proposed a high-power amplitude-modulated continuous-wave (AM-CW) LLR architecture with the potential to significantly improve Earth–Moon distance measurements, even when ranging to next-generation 10 cm CCRs [6, 7]. The AM-CW approach addresses the limitations above by replacing time-of-flight estimation with RF-phase metrology on a bright CW optical carrier. The basic idea is as follows:

- an RF tone at frequency f_m modulates the optical power (or, effectively, the envelope);
- the lunar retroreflector returns a delayed, attenuated copy of this modulation;
- the station measures the RF phase $\phi(t)$ of the returned tone against the local RF reference;
- two-way range comes from the mean phase, after ambiguity removal; one-way range-rate comes from the time derivative (slope) of the phase.

The core observables for the AM-CW LLR architecture are therefore

- range \rightarrow absolute RF phase (unwrapped) of the modulation,
- range-rate \rightarrow time derivative of that phase (or, equivalently, the Doppler of the modulation).

Furthermore, by alternating measurements between lunar CCRs that are widely separated on the surface (baselines $\sim 10^3$ km) but closely spaced on the sky (angular separations $\theta \lesssim 0.1^\circ$), one realizes differential LLR (dLLR) observables that suppress common-mode station and atmospheric terms, achieving tens-of- μm precision limited primarily by residual, uncorrelated turbulence. Thus, the full set of AM-CW LLR observables includes not only the absolute two-way range and one-way range-rate (R_{2w}, v_r), but also their differential counterparts ($\Delta R_{2w}, \Delta v_r$).

To enable AM-CW LLR, the key hardware element is an RF phase-metrology chain, phase-locked to an ultra-stable frequency reference and used to modulate a kW-class, 1064 nm CW laser, with the lunar CCRs supplying a weak, delayed replica of the imposed RF modulation. Compared to pulsed LLR, this architecture supports sustained coherent integration of the RF tone(s), greatly reduced effective detection bandwidth via narrowband digital lock-in detection, and routine use of GHz-class modulation frequencies. Taken together, these features open a realistic path to sub-0.1 mm two-way range precision and robust, high-sensitivity range-rate measurements on $T \sim 10^2$ – 10^3 s windows.

From a science perspective, sub-0.1 mm absolute LLR and tens-of- μm differential LLR open several new regimes:

- measurement of ultra-slow changes in the lunar tidal dissipation and Love numbers on decadal time scales;
- detection of small shifts in libration amplitudes and precession that may indicate core-mantle coupling or exotic interior structure;
- sensitivity to very low-frequency (μHz) gravitational waves, which imprint characteristic, slowly varying signatures on the Earth-Moon separation;
- improved constraints on higher-order relativistic effects in the Earth-Moon system, including post-Newtonian parameters and possible deviations from general relativity at long range.

As a result, a highly precise AM-CW implementation of LLR, operated in both absolute and differential modes, would open a qualitatively new regime for tests of relativistic gravity, lunar interior structure, and long-term orbital and rotational dynamics [6, 8]. In particular, dLLR provides enhanced sensitivity to spatially correlated signatures—such as deep-mantle tidal response, core-mantle coupling, and possible violations of the equivalence principle—by exploiting simultaneous measurements to multiple reflectors with strongly suppressed common-mode noise [9–11]. The recent detection of a dense solid inner core and associated mantle overturn in the Moon further sharpens the need for such high-precision constraints on the deep interior [12]. At the same time, this level of ranging accuracy enables searches for stochastic and deterministic gravitational-wave signals in the μHz band [13–15].

LLR already sits near the top of the gravity-test hierarchy; the question this paper addresses is what hardware, measurement models, and operating procedures are needed to push the photon-rich AM-CW approach into a regime where ~ 0.1 mm normal points and high-precision range-rate are technically realistic.

Our goal here is to determine what station hardware, measurement models, and observing strategy are required to achieve sub-0.1 mm two-way range precision and $(0.1\text{--}1) \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$ range-rate sensitivity over $\sim 10^2$ – 10^3 s, and to translate these requirements into a quantitative error budget and concept of operations (CONOPS).

A detailed link budget and hardware feasibility study for high-power CW LLR, including realistic photon return rates to 10 cm CCRs on a 1 m class telescope, is developed in [6]. Here we adopt that architecture (1 kW at 1064 nm on a 1 m aperture interrogating 10 cm CCRs) as a baseline and focus on the metrology side: a unified AM-CW phase model, a covariance description suitable for parameter estimation, and system-level error budgets that map directly onto the observables ($R, v_r, \Delta R, \Delta v_r$) and onto hardware and CONOPS requirements.

In particular, the present work introduces: (i) a unified AM-CW phase-measurement model and joint covariance $\mathbf{C}(T)$ for the observable vector $y(T) = (R_{2w}, v_r, \Delta R_{2w}, \Delta v_r)^T$; (ii) an explicit multi-tone synthetic-wavelength ambiguity-removal scheme with quantitative nonlinearity constraints on $\mathbf{C}_{\text{nl}}(T)$; and (iii) a system-level error budget and observatory concept of operations that map the photon, atmospheric, instrumental, oscillator, and nonlinearity contributions directly into hardware and CONOPS requirements for next-generation AM-CW LLR stations.

Conceptually, the core object of this paper is the observation covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}(T)$ of the AM-CW range and range-rate estimators over an integration window T . This covariance is decomposed into photon, atmospheric, instrumental, oscillator, and nonlinearity contributions. The station hardware and operational concept can then be designed so that each subsystem keeps its contribution to $\mathbf{C}(T)$ within its allocated variance.

This paper is organized as follows: Section II develops a unified observation model for the AM envelope phase, defining the two-way range $\hat{R}_{2w}(T)$ and one-way range-rate $\hat{v}_r(T)$ together with their differential counterparts and the covariance description $\mathbf{C}(T)$. Section III discusses multi-tone ambiguity resolution via synthetic wavelengths. Section IV links photon-counting statistics and the optical link budget to the shot-noise contribution $\mathbf{C}_{\text{shot}}(T)$ of the observation covariance. Section V quantifies the atmospheric and instrumental contributions $\mathbf{C}_{\text{atm}}(T)$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\text{inst}}(T)$ as functions of integration time T and angular separation θ . Section VI formulates implementation gates that ensure each hardware and environmental contribution remains within its allocated error budget, and Section VII summarizes the resulting performance bands for absolute and differential range and range-rate. Section VIII describes a representative

high-power AM–CW LLR station, including the common hardware stack, facility-level infrastructure, and a concept of operations tailored to multi-tone phase metrology. In Section IX we summarize results obtained and conclude.

II. AM PHASE MODEL AND OBSERVABLES

The total one-way optical path length (in meters) between an Earth-based LLR station and a CCR on the moon is

$$R_{\text{tot}}(t) = R_{\text{geom}}(t; \boldsymbol{\theta}) + R_{\text{atm}}(t) + R_{\text{inst}}(t), \quad (1)$$

where R_{geom} includes relativistic light-time, station position and motion, Earth orientation, CCR position and motion with respect to the luni-centric celestial reference system (LCRS) [16, 17] and lunar ephemeris (see modeling details in [4, 5].) The atmospheric term R_{atm} represents the neutral delay mapped to path length via standard refractive index models and mapping functions¹ [18–21]. The instrumental term R_{inst} collects the internal optical and RF path contributions that are not part of the formal geometric model and are monitored by the internal reference.

For a single-tone AM–CW transmitter, the optical power at the telescope aperture may be written as

$$P_{\text{tx}}(t) = P_0 \left(1 + a_m \cos(2\pi f_m t) \right), \quad 0 < a_m \leq 1, \quad (2)$$

where P_0 is the mean optical power and a_m is the dimensionless amplitude-modulation index.

After propagation to the Moon, reflection from a CCR, and return to the receiver, the modulation is delayed by the total round-trip light time and attenuated by the link. Neglecting scintillation-induced amplitude fluctuations for the moment, the received power at the detector can be written, to first order in a_m , as

$$P_{\text{rx}}(t) = P_1 \left(1 + a_m \cos(2\pi f_m (t - \tau(t))) \right), \quad \tau(t) = \frac{2R_{\text{tot}}(t)}{c}, \quad (3)$$

where P_1 collects the geometric loss, atmospheric transmission, and reflector response, and $\tau(t)$ is the round-trip light time corresponding to the total station-to-reflector path $R_{\text{tot}}(t)$ of Eq. (1). (In the photon-counting description developed in Sec. IV, the same mean received power may be viewed as the optical power corresponding to the detected photon rate, so that $P_1 \simeq \dot{N}_\gamma E_\gamma$ with \dot{N}_γ given by the link model of Eq. (36) and E_γ defined there, also see [6].)

After direct square-law detection and narrowband filtering around f_m , the photocurrent on a given tone can be modeled as

$$i(t) = I_0 + I_1 \cos(2\pi f_m t - \phi(t)) + n(t), \quad (4)$$

where I_0 is the mean photocurrent, $I_1 \propto a_m P_1$ is the amplitude of the modulation component, $n(t)$ is dominated by shot noise and residual background, and $\phi(t)$ is the modulation-envelope phase given as

$$\phi(t) = \phi_0 + \frac{4\pi f_m(t)}{c} R_{\text{tot}}(t) + \epsilon_\phi(t), \quad (5)$$

with ϵ_ϕ the phase noise from photon statistics, electronics, and fast turbulence. In the high-SNR limit, efficient estimators satisfy $\sigma_\phi^2 \simeq 1/\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}^2$ [rad²] for the tone phase [22–24].

The two primary observables are:

- two-way range R_{2w} from the mean phase $\bar{\phi}$,
- one-way range-rate v_r from the phase slope $b = d\phi/dt$.

Differential observables, formed between two CCRs, further suppress station-level and atmospheric contributions.

¹ At typical mid-latitude observatories the mean zenith hydrostatic delay at near-IR wavelengths is ~ 2 m in the one-way optical path. Modern surface-pressure-driven mapping functions and refractivity models remove this static component at the $\lesssim 10^{-4}$ level [18–21], so that the contribution of $R_{\text{atm}}(t)$ to the covariance matrix $C_{ij}(T)$ is set by the residual, time-varying wet delay and turbulent fluctuations rather than by the absolute 2 m column delay, as quantified in Sec. VA 1 and Appendix A.

A. Science-driven metrology requirements

Building on the high-power CW link and reflector feasibility analysis of [6], the present work focuses on the metrology side of the problem: a unified AM–CW phase model, a covariance framework suitable for global parameter estimation, and quantitative station-level error budgets that map directly onto sub-mm normal-point observables and subsystem requirements. Our objective is to translate the science-driven precision goals into requirements on the station hardware, measurement model, and observing strategy.

For later parameter estimation it is useful to write a linearized observation model for the two-way range,²

$$\delta R_{2w}(t_k) = \sum_j \frac{\partial R_{2w}}{\partial \theta_j}(t_k) \delta \theta_j + \epsilon_R(t_k), \quad (6)$$

where θ is the set of dynamical and relativistic parameters (e.g. lunar Love numbers, tidal Q , equivalence–principle parameters, and a possible \dot{G}/G), and ϵ_R denotes the residual measurement noise with variance $\sigma_R^2(T)$ on a window of duration T . For a single parameter θ_j that is not strongly correlated with others, the formal uncertainty from N normal points is approximately

$$\sigma^2(\theta_j) \simeq \left[\sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_R^2(T_k)} \left(\frac{\partial R_{2w}}{\partial \theta_j}(t_k) \right)^2 \right]^{-1}. \quad (7)$$

Eqs. (6)–(7) make explicit the otherwise qualitative statement that reducing the single-station two-way uncertainty from the current millimeter level to the sub-0.1 mm regime improves sensitivity to the underlying physics parameters by roughly an order of magnitude, all else equal. In the unified AM–CW observation model developed in Sec. II, the window-dependent variance $\sigma_R^2(T)$ entering these expressions is simply the (1, 1) element of the joint observation covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}(T)$ of the range and range-rate estimators [see Eq. (13)]. Throughout the rest of the paper we treat $\mathbf{C}(T)$ as the central object that links hardware and environmental noise to the science parameters θ .

As we shall see below, the same scaling applies to other low-frequency signatures in the Earth–Moon system and to the full AM–CW observable set. In the scalar case of Eq. (6) the variance $\sigma_R^2(T)$ is simply the (1, 1) element $C_{11}(T)$ of the observation covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}(T)$ defined in Eq. (13). In the four-observable case the data vector for a window T_k is $\mathbf{y}(T_k)$ in Eq. (15), with covariance $\mathbf{C}(T_k)$; the Fisher matrix in Eq. (7) is then built from all four components $(R_{2w}, v_r, \Delta R_{2w}, \Delta v_r)$ and the corresponding rows of the design matrix $\mathbf{H}(T_k)$ in Eq. (16). Absolute two-way range $R_{2w}(T)$ at the ~ 0.1 mm level per normal point improves sensitivities to post-Newtonian parameters, possible violations of the weak equivalence principle, and \dot{G}/G by roughly an order of magnitude relative to present LLR, provided model correlations can be controlled. High-precision range-rate $v_r(T)$ on 10^2 – 10^3 s windows is especially sensitive to near-diurnal signatures induced by Earth rotation and tidal forcing, and therefore sharpens constraints on lunar Love numbers, tidal Q , and core–mantle coupling. Differential observables $\Delta R_{2w}(T)$ and $\Delta v_r(T)$ between nearby next-generation CCRs primarily probe spatial gradients in the lunar response and local tidal loading, making them natural diagnostics for interior structure (e.g. fluid core size, possible solid inner core) and for separating long-term tidal evolution from global orbital perturbations. Together, these observables define the science return of high-power AM–CW LLR: gravity tests at the 10^{-14} level, detailed secular evolution of the lunar interior, and sensitivity to very low-frequency (μHz) gravitational waves encoded as slowly varying signatures in $R_{2w}(t)$ and $v_r(t)$.

As a concrete example, a very low-frequency ($f \ll 1/\tau_{2w}$) gravitational wave of characteristic strain amplitude h produces a slowly varying modulation of the Earth–Moon separation L_{EM} . For an order-of-magnitude estimate, and averaging over polarization and source direction, the induced range variation is

$$\delta R_{2w}(t) \sim \mathcal{O}(1) \times \frac{1}{2} h L_{\text{EM}}, \quad (8)$$

so that the single-normal-point strain sensitivity is

$$h_{\text{min}} \sim \frac{2 \sigma_R}{L_{\text{EM}}}. \quad (9)$$

A more precise treatment would include the full antenna pattern and temporal filtering for specific waveform families, but the scaling used here is adequate for assessing the impact of sub-mm ranging precision.

² We adopt the standard LLR convention that the estimated “two-way range” $R_{2w}(T)$ is defined as the *one-way* geometric Earth–Moon distance inferred from the round-trip light time. Thus the modeled optical path entering the light-time calculation is $2R_{\text{tot}}(t)$, while the estimator $\hat{R}_{2w}(T)$ defined in Eq. (18) returns a quantity numerically equal to the time-averaged $R_{\text{tot}}(t)$ over the analysis window T .

With $L_{\text{EM}} \simeq 3.84 \times 10^8$ m, going from $\sigma_R \simeq 1$ mm to 0.1 mm pushes h_{min} from $\sim 5 \times 10^{-12}$ to $\sim 5 \times 10^{-13}$ per normal point, with further gains obtained by coherent integration in the appropriate frequency band. Similar scaling applies to slowly varying tidal and libration signatures, where the relevant derivatives $\partial R_{2w}/\partial \theta_j$ are taken with respect to Love numbers, tidal Q , and core–mantle coupling parameters.³

B. Unified phase–measurement model

After subtraction of the internal reference phase $\phi_{\text{inst}}(t)$, the phase samples entering the estimators may be written as

$$\tilde{\phi}(t_k) = \frac{4\pi f_m^*}{c} R_{\text{tot}}(t_k) + \delta\phi_{\text{slew}}(t_k) + \delta\phi_{\text{osc}}(t_k) + \delta\phi_{\text{nl}}(t_k) + n_\phi(t_k), \quad (10)$$

where f_m^* is the window–averaged modulation frequency, $\delta\phi_{\text{slew}}(t_k)$ is the deterministic contribution from modulation–frequency drift across the round trip, $\delta\phi_{\text{osc}}(t_k)$ collects residual stochastic oscillator phase noise after slew removal, $\delta\phi_{\text{nl}}(t_k)$ collects residual hardware nonlinearities (e.g. AM–to–PM conversion, frequency–dependent RF delays, small differences between the internal and lunar paths), and $n_\phi(t_k)$ is a zero–mean stochastic term dominated by photon statistics and fast turbulence. In the high–SNR regime of interest here, n_ϕ is well approximated as white with variance $\sigma_\phi^2 \simeq 1/\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}^2$ (rad²) over the analysis bandwidth, where $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(T)$ denotes the lock–in SNR accumulated over the window T as introduced in Sec. IV by Eq. (35).

Decomposition of the phase (10) into the deterministic path term, the known modulation–frequency slew, and the residual stochastic processes makes explicit that all hardware and environmental effects enter the AM–CW LLR problem only through $R_{\text{tot}}(t)$, the deterministic slew, and the residual phase fluctuations $\delta\phi_{\text{osc}}(t)$, $\delta\phi_{\text{nl}}(t)$, and $n_\phi(t)$. Because the range and range–rate estimators are linear functionals of the sequence $\{\tilde{\phi}(t_k)\}$, on a single reflector and tone, the jointly estimated observables over a window T are collected in⁴

$$\mathbf{y}(T) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \hat{R}_{2w}(T) \\ \hat{v}_r(T) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

so that

$$\mathbf{y}(T) = \mathbf{h}(R_{\text{tot}}; T) + \boldsymbol{\eta}(T), \quad (12)$$

where \mathbf{h} is the deterministic mapping implied by Eqs. (1), (18), and (19), and $\boldsymbol{\eta}(T)$ are fully characterized, at the Gaussian level, by their covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}(T)$ via a zero–mean random vector with covariance

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}(T) &\equiv \text{Cov}[\boldsymbol{\eta}(T)] \equiv \left\langle (\boldsymbol{\eta}(T) - \langle \boldsymbol{\eta}(T) \rangle) (\boldsymbol{\eta}(T) - \langle \boldsymbol{\eta}(T) \rangle)^T \right\rangle = \\ &= \mathbf{C}_{\text{shot}}(T) + \mathbf{C}_{\text{atm}}(T) + \mathbf{C}_{\text{inst}}(T) + \mathbf{C}_{\text{osc}}(T) + \mathbf{C}_{\text{nl}}(T), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{C}_{\text{shot}}(T)$ is set by photon statistics (21) and the sampling model (22), $\mathbf{C}_{\text{atm}}(T)$ captures atmospheric turbulence and mapping–function residuals, $\mathbf{C}_{\text{inst}}(T)$ collects bench, optical, RF, and internal–reference path–length residuals, $\mathbf{C}_{\text{osc}}(T)$ is determined by the Allan deviation of the frequency reference, and $\mathbf{C}_{\text{nl}}(T)$ represents coherent hardware nonlinearities, including residual conversion of amplitude modulation into phase errors (AM–to–PM conversion) and frequency–dependent path delays that differ between tones.

Subsequent sections assign quantitative allocations to each of these terms: $\mathbf{C}_{\text{shot}}(T)$ via the lock–in SNR $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(T)$ and the Cramér–Rao bounds for phase and slope estimators, $\mathbf{C}_{\text{atm}}(T)$ via Kolmogorov turbulence scalings and mapping functions, $\mathbf{C}_{\text{inst}}(T)$ via internal metrology and bench stability models, $\mathbf{C}_{\text{osc}}(T)$ via the measured Allan deviation of the maser, and $\mathbf{C}_{\text{nl}}(T)$ via multi–tone synthetic–wavelength and AM–to–PM constraints. The absolute range precision $\sigma_R^2(T)$ entering the science model is simply the (1, 1) element of $\mathbf{C}(T)$, and the quantitative error budget is expressed as allocations to the individual covariance terms.⁵ Eq. (13) provides a compact observation model that can be used

³ Baseline constants: speed of light $c = 299\,792\,458$ m s^{−1}, Earth–Moon distance $L_{\text{EM}} \simeq 3.84 \times 10^8$ m. Two–way light time near opposition is $\langle \tau \rangle \approx 2.56$ s. We assume standard relativistic light–time modeling for $R_{\text{geom}}(t; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ [4, 5] and standard models for atmospheric refractivity and mapping [18–21].

⁴ In what follows, we reserve the “hat” notation (e.g. \hat{R}_{2w}) for explicit estimator definitions such as Eqs. (18)–(19). When discussing the observables as inputs to the global parameter–estimation problem, we drop the hats and use $R_{2w}(T)$, $v_r(T)$, $\Delta R_{2w}(T)$, and $\Delta v_r(T)$ to denote the corresponding estimated quantities.

⁵ For clarity, we will often refer to the covariance elements as

$$\mathbf{C}(T) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} C_{11}(T) & C_{12}(T) \\ C_{21}(T) & C_{22}(T) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_R^2(T) & \text{cov}(R, v_r; T) \\ \text{cov}(R, v_r; T) & \sigma_{v_r}^2(T) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

with the understanding that, when differential observables are included, the same notation is promoted to the full four–observable vector $(R_{2w}, v_r, \Delta R_{2w}, \Delta v_r)$, so that the 2×2 form written above is just the upper–left block of the 4×4 covariance matrix used later in the error–budget and parameter–estimation discussions.

directly in Kalman filtering or global parameter estimation. Atmospheric and turbulence models follow standard treatments in Refs. [18–21, 25–27], while the photon and estimator statistics are based on Refs. [22–24].

More generally, when differential observables between two CCRs are formed, each analysis window T_k yields a 4-component vector of observables

$$\mathbf{y}(T_k) \equiv \left(R_{2w}(T_k), v_r(T_k), \Delta R_{2w}(T_k), \Delta v_r(T_k) \right)^\top. \quad (15)$$

Operationally, $R_{2w}(T)$ and $v_r(T)$ are the primary carriers of global signatures tied to the overall Earth–Moon orbit (EP tests, \dot{G}/G , PPN parameters, and very low-frequency gravitational waves), whereas $\Delta R_{2w}(T)$ and $\Delta v_r(T)$ are optimally matched to spatially structured and dissipative interior signals (local tidal loading, regional Love-number variations, and time-varying core–mantle coupling). In practice, global analyses will use the full four-component vector $\mathbf{y}(T_k)$ with observable weights set by the corresponding diagonal entries of $\mathbf{C}(T_k)$ in Table IV.

Linearizing about a reference solution gives

$$\delta \mathbf{y}(T_k) = \mathbf{H}(T_k) \delta \boldsymbol{\theta} + \boldsymbol{\eta}(T_k), \quad (16)$$

where the rows of $\mathbf{H}(T_k)$ are the partial derivatives of the modeled observables with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, evaluated from the same dynamical model used in current LLR analyses, and $\boldsymbol{\eta}(T_k)$ is a zero-mean noise vector with covariance matrix

$$\mathbf{C}(T_k) \equiv \text{Cov}[\boldsymbol{\eta}(T_k)], \quad (17)$$

whose decomposition into photon, atmospheric, instrumental, oscillator, and nonlinearity contributions is given by Eq. (13). The scalar range variance $\sigma_R^2(T_k)$ that appears in Eqs. (6)–(7) is simply the (1, 1) element $C_{11}(T_k)$ of this matrix.⁶ Eq. (16) can then be used directly in least-squares or Kalman-filter estimators in place of the traditional single-observable LLR model.

Below, each contribution in (13) is given a quantitative allocation and linked to specific hardware or environmental controls. The photon term $\mathbf{C}_{\text{shot}}(T)$ is set by the lock-in signal-to-noise ratio $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(T)$ and sampling model through (21) and (22). Atmospheric fluctuations enter through $\mathbf{C}_{\text{atm}}(T)$, whose (1, 1) element $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}^2(T)$ is modeled using Kolmogorov turbulence scalings in Sec. V A 1. Residual instrumental effects—including internal metrology, bench stability, and RF/optical delays—are captured in $\mathbf{C}_{\text{inst}}(T)$ and budgeted in Sec. V A 2. The oscillator term $\mathbf{C}_{\text{osc}}(T)$ is bounded using the Allan deviation of the frequency reference and the slew correction model of Sec. II D, while $\mathbf{C}_{\text{nl}}(T)$ represents coherent phase errors from AM-to-PM conversion and multi-tone nonlinearity, constrained by the synthetic wavelength requirements in Sec. III. The absolute range budget in Eq. (37) is simply the (1, 1) element of Eq. (13) with these allocations.

In parallel with these stochastic, station-level contributions, the deterministic geometric term $R_{\text{geom}}(t; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ collects global modeling ingredients such as station coordinates and velocities, Earth orientation and nutation, lunar librations and ephemerides, reflector locations and orientations, and relativistic light-time corrections [28, 29]. Uncertainties in these quantities are represented in the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and enter the global least-squares or Kalman-filter solution through the sensitivity matrix $H(T_k)$ and the associated parameter covariance, rather than through the per-window noise covariance $C_{ij}(T_k)$. The precision budgets and implementation gates developed below therefore focus on the incremental photon, atmospheric, and instrumental terms introduced by the AM-CW architecture, while assuming corner-cube designs and deployment strategies for which array-induced pulse spreading, thermoelastic deformations, and related reflector-level systematics remain below the atmospheric and bench allocations on the $T \sim 10$ –100 s windows considered here.

C. Range and range-rate

Over an integration window of duration T , the estimate for the range is given as

$$\hat{R}_{2w}(T) = \frac{c}{4\pi f_m^*} \left(\bar{\phi}(T) - \phi_0 + 2\pi N \right), \quad N \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (18)$$

with f_m^* the recorded average modulation frequency on that window and $\bar{\phi}$ the internal-reference-corrected mean phase. Here and throughout we define R_{2w} as the one-way geometric Earth–Moon distance inferred from the round-trip light time, so that $\tau(t) = 2R_{\text{tot}}(t)/c$ (as in Eq. (3)) and $R_{2w} = R_{\text{tot}}$. This convention matches the usual LLR range observable, in which $c\tau/2$ is taken as the range.

⁶ In what follows we denote the elements of this matrix by $C_{ij}(T)$, so that $C_{11}(T)$ and $C_{22}(T)$ correspond to the variances of $R_{2w}(T)$ and $v_r(T)$, respectively, and the off-diagonal terms capture their covariance.

Unwrapping $\phi(t)$ over the window and fitting a slope gives

$$\hat{v}_r(T) = \frac{c}{4\pi f_m^*} \hat{b}(T), \quad \hat{b} = \frac{d\phi}{dt} \text{ (slope fit)}, \quad (19)$$

for the one-way line-of-sight range-rate. Because a 2π wrap in the envelope phase corresponds, via Eq. (5), to a change $\delta R_{\text{tot}} = c/(2f_m)$ in the one-way path, the estimator (18) is ambiguous modulo

$$\Delta R_{\text{amb}} = \frac{c}{2f_m}, \quad (20)$$

(for example, $\Delta R_{\text{amb}} = 0.15\text{m}$ at $f_m = 1\text{GHz}$). In terms of the underlying round-trip optical path $2R_{\text{tot}}$ this corresponds to an ambiguity interval $2\Delta R_{\text{amb}} = c/f_m$. The shot-noise limits for fixed f_m and lock-in SNR $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(T)$, where $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(T)$ is given by Eq. (35) for an integration time T , are

$$\sigma_{R,\text{shot}} = \frac{c}{4\pi f_m} \frac{1}{\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(T)}, \quad \sigma_{v_r,\text{shot}} = \frac{c}{4\pi f_m} \frac{1}{T \text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(T)}. \quad (21)$$

For $N = Tf_s$ equally spaced phase samples with per-sample variance σ_ϕ^2 , least-squares regression on the unwrapped phase yields

$$\text{Var}(\hat{b}) = \frac{12\sigma_\phi^2}{N T^2}, \quad (22)$$

which recovers the $1/T$ improvement for range-rate versus the $1/\sqrt{T}$ improvement for range.

For a single tone with lock-in SNR_{AM} , efficient estimators satisfy $\text{Var}(\hat{\phi}) \simeq 1/\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}^2$ [22–24]. For equally spaced samples $\{t_k\}$ over T , $\phi_k = a + bt_k + \eta_k$ with $\text{Var}(\eta_k) = \sigma_\phi^2$ gives $\text{Var}(b) = 12\sigma_\phi^2/(NT^2)$, consistent with Eq. (22).

D. Oscillator slew across the round trip

If the modulation frequency in (5) depends on time behaving as $f_m(t) = f_m + \dot{f}_m t$ during the two-way light time $\tau_{2w} \approx 2.56\text{s}$, then $d\phi/dt$ contains $2\pi\tau_{2w}\dot{f}_m$, producing a deterministic range-rate bias

$$\delta v_r \simeq \frac{c\tau_{2w}}{2f_m} \dot{f}_m. \quad (23)$$

At $f_m = 1\text{GHz}$, $|\dot{f}_m| \lesssim 2.6 \times 10^{-6} \text{Hz s}^{-1}$ keeps $|\delta v_r| < 10^{-6} \text{m s}^{-1}$. In practice, $f_m(t)$ is recorded and this term is subtracted explicitly; residual oscillator noise is then governed by the short-term Allan variance of the reference [30].

Operationally, we record the modulation frequency history $f_m(t)$ and subtract the deterministic contribution of Eq. (23) in post-processing. The residual stochastic component is then governed by the short-term Allan deviation $\sigma_y(\tau)$ of the maser; with $\sigma_y(1\text{--}10\text{s}) \lesssim 10^{-14}$ the corresponding range contribution is bounded by Eq. (44) at the $\sim\text{few-}\mu\text{m}$ level and is absorbed into $\mathbf{C}_{\text{osc}}(T)$.

E. Differential observables

For two corner-cube reflectors A and B at small angular separation θ , the internal-reference-corrected phases on a given tone may be written as

$$\tilde{\phi}^{(j)}(t_k) = \frac{4\pi f_m^*}{c} \left(R_{\text{geom}}^{(j)}(t_k) + R_{\text{atm}}^{(j)}(t_k) \right) + \delta\phi_{\text{nl}}^{(j)}(t_k) + n_\phi^{(j)}(t_k), \quad j \in \{A, B\}, \quad (24)$$

where common instrumental terms have been removed by the internal reference and where any residual instrument nonlinearity is included in $\delta\phi_{\text{nl}}^{(j)}$. The differential phase

$$\Delta\phi(t_k) \equiv \tilde{\phi}^{(A)}(t_k) - \tilde{\phi}^{(B)}(t_k) \quad (25)$$

then yields the differential two-way range and one-way range-rate over an integration window T via

$$\Delta\hat{R}_{2w}(T) = \frac{c}{4\pi f_m^*} \overline{\Delta\phi}(T), \quad \Delta\hat{v}_r(T) = \frac{c}{4\pi f_m^*} \widehat{\Delta b}(T), \quad (26)$$

TABLE I. Example modulation-tone set and associated one-way ambiguity intervals $\Delta R_{\text{amb}} = c/(2f_m)$ and two-way synthetic wavelengths $\Lambda_{2w,ij} = c/(2|f_i - f_j|)$, as defined in Eqs. (31) and (32). Numerical values assume $c = 299\,792\,458\text{ m s}^{-1}$ and are rounded to three significant digits. The close pair at 50/50.1 MHz provides a kilometre-scale synthetic wavelength that greatly simplifies integer ambiguity resolution.

Tone / pair	Frequency	$\Delta R_{\text{amb}} = c/(2f_m)$ [m]	$\Lambda_{2w} = c/(2 f_i - f_j)$ [m]
Low tone	$f_L = 50\text{ MHz}$	2.998	–
Intermediate tone	$f_I = 200\text{ MHz}$	0.749	–
Fine (precision) tone	$f_H = 1\,000\text{ MHz}$	0.150	–
Synthetic (L, I)	$ f_I - f_L = 150\text{ MHz}$	–	0.999
Synthetic (L, H)	$ f_H - f_L = 950\text{ MHz}$	–	0.158
Close synthetic pair	$ 50.1 - 50.0 = 0.1\text{ MHz}$	–	1.50×10^3

where the overbar denotes the mean over T and $\widehat{\Delta b}$ is the slope from a linear regression of $\Delta\phi(t)$ on time over the same window (with $\widehat{\Delta b} = d\Delta\phi/dt$ being the differential phase slope fit, similar to Eq. (19)).

The differential two-way range precision can be decomposed as

$$\sigma_{\Delta R}^2(T) = 2\sigma_{R,\text{shot}}^2(T) + \sigma_{\Delta R,\text{atm}}^2(T, \theta) + \sigma_{\Delta R,\text{inst}}^2(T, \theta), \quad (27)$$

with the corresponding expression for the differential range-rate,

$$\sigma_{\Delta v_r}^2(T) = 2\sigma_{v_r,\text{shot}}^2(T) + \sigma_{\Delta v_r,\text{atm}}^2(T, \theta) + \sigma_{\Delta v_r,\text{inst}}^2(T, \theta), \quad (28)$$

where $\sigma_{v_r,\text{shot}}(T)$ is given by Eq. (21) and the atmospheric and instrumental terms inherit their T and θ dependence from the same turbulence and metrology models used for $\sigma_{\Delta R,\text{atm}}^2$ and $\sigma_{\Delta R,\text{inst}}^2$.

For Kolmogorov turbulence and a toggling cadence short compared to the coherence time of the differential atmosphere, a useful parametrization of the atmospheric term (see Appendix A) is

$$\sigma_{\Delta R,\text{atm}}^2(T, \theta) \simeq K_R^2 \left(\frac{\theta}{\theta_0} \right)^{5/3} \frac{\tau_0}{T}, \quad (29)$$

where K_R is a site-dependent amplitude, τ_0 is the coherence time, and θ_0 is the isoplanatic angle. For $\theta \lesssim 0.1^\circ$ and $T \sim 10^2\text{ s}$, differential atmospheric residuals can be pushed into the $\sim 10\text{--}50\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ band, consistent with the differential budgets in Sec. VII.

Note that, in terms of the joint covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}(T)$ from Eq. (13), the scalar range budget in Eq. (37), for instance, can be written as

$$\sigma_R^2(T) = C_{11}(T) = C_{\text{shot},11}(T) + C_{\text{atm},11}(T) + C_{\text{inst},11}(T), \quad (30)$$

with the oscillator and nonlinearity contributions $\mathbf{C}_{\text{osc}}(T)$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\text{nl}}(T)$ either folded into $\sigma_{R,\text{inst}}^2(T)$ or treated explicitly when needed. For the differential case, the same structure applies but with the atmospheric and instrumental terms replaced by their differential counterparts $\sigma_{\Delta R,\text{atm}}^2(T, \theta)$ and $\sigma_{\Delta R,\text{inst}}^2(T, \theta)$ as in Eqs. (27)–(29).

III. AMBIGUITY REMOVAL: MULTI-TONE SYNTHETIC WAVELENGTHS

The envelope phase $\phi(t)$ in Eq. (5) is defined modulo 2π , which maps to a range ambiguity in the estimator \widehat{R}_{2w} of

$$\Delta R_{2w} = \frac{c}{2f_m}, \quad (31)$$

i.e. a change of 2π in the measured phase corresponds to a change ΔR_{2w} in the inferred one-way geometric range and to a change $2\Delta R_{2w} = c/f_m$ in the modeled round-trip optical path $2R_{\text{tot}}$.

With tones $\{f_i\}$, ambiguity is lifted using synthetic wavelengths

$$\Lambda_{2w,ij} = \frac{c}{2|f_i - f_j|}, \quad \Lambda_{1w,ij} = \frac{c}{4|f_i - f_j|}. \quad (32)$$

An illustrative tone plan and the associated ambiguity intervals and synthetic wavelengths for the tone set used in this work are summarized in Table I.

A practical implementation uses a small set of tones, for example $\{50, 50.1, 200, 1000\}$ MHz, and resolves the integer ambiguity via a constrained search over the synthetic-wavelength bins. Operationally, the procedure can be summarized as follows (it is analogous to multi-frequency ranging in SLR and RF navigation [31]):

1. Use the lowest-frequency tone to obtain a coarse estimate of the unwrapped phase and hence of the two-way range modulo the corresponding ambiguity interval. For a tone near 50 MHz this interval is of order a few metres.
2. Form a synthetic-wavelength observable from the close frequency pair at 50 and 50.1 MHz. The associated synthetic two-way wavelength Λ_{2w} is of order kilometres, and the measured phase difference between the two tones constrains the admissible set of integer ambiguities for the coarse range solution.
3. Use the intermediate-frequency tone (e.g. 200 MHz) to refine the range estimate within the remaining synthetic-wavelength bins. The shorter ambiguity interval at this frequency restricts the allowed integer combinations further, still subject to consistency with the dynamical light-time model.
4. Finally, use the highest-frequency tone (e.g. 1 GHz) as the precision carrier. The admissible integer for this tone is selected such that the corresponding range solution is simultaneously consistent with the coarse and intermediate-frequency constraints and with the predicted round-trip light time.
5. Reject any integer combination for which the implied range differs from the modelled light time by more than the allocated synthetic-wavelength tolerance or for which the multi-tone residuals indicate unmodelled frequency-dependent path delays.

In this scheme the internal metrology and calibration keep the frequency-dependent instrumental path differences well below the synthetic-wavelength scale, so that the multi-tone integer search is dominated by the photon noise and the dynamical model rather than by hardware nonlinearity.

Frequency-dependent delays in the RF and optical paths enter the multi-tone ambiguity resolution through small offsets in the effective path length seen by each tone. If the net instrumental path difference between tones i and j is $\Delta R_{\text{inst}}(f_i, f_j)$, the corresponding synthetic-wavelength bias is

$$\delta R_{2w,ij}^{(\text{inst})} \simeq \Delta R_{\text{inst}}(f_i, f_j), \quad \text{which must satisfy} \quad |\Delta R_{\text{inst}}(f_i, f_j)| \ll \frac{1}{10} \Lambda_{2w,ij} \quad (33)$$

in order not to compromise the integer search over the synthetic-wavelength bins $\Lambda_{2w,ij}$ of (32). This requirement drives the calibration and thermal stabilization of frequency-dependent delays in the RF distribution, modulator drive, and detection chains, and it is naturally folded into the nonlinearity term $\delta\phi_{\text{nl}}(t)$ and the covariance contribution $\mathbf{C}_{\text{nl}}(T)$ in Eq. (13). In practice, we choose the condition $|\Delta R_{\text{inst}}(f_i, f_j)| \ll \Lambda_{2w,ij}/10$ such that the associated scalar contribution

$$\sigma_{R,\text{nl}}(T) \equiv \sqrt{C_{\text{nl},11}(T)} \quad (34)$$

remains at or below the $\sim 20\text{--}30 \mu\text{m}$ level even when multiple tone pairs are used in the ambiguity resolution.

IV. PHOTON-COUNTING LOCK-IN SNR AND LINK BUDGET

Let post-filter signal and background be \dot{N}_γ and \dot{N}_b (both in s^{-1}), with AM depth a_m (the same amplitude-modulation index introduced in (2)). Throughout this section we follow the notation of the high-power CW link study of Ref. [6]: \dot{N}_γ and \dot{N}_b denote the detected signal and noise photon rates at the output of the receive chain, and η_{eff} is the same end-to-end efficiency parameter used there, combining telescope throughput, atmospheric transmission, CCR response, stellar-aberration loss, and detector quantum efficiency into a single scalar factor.

A sinusoidal lock-in at f_m accumulates a lock-in signal-to-noise ratio $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(T)$:

$$\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(T) \simeq \frac{1}{2} a_m \sqrt{\frac{\dot{N}_\gamma T}{1 + \dot{N}_b/\dot{N}_\gamma}} = \frac{1}{2} a_m \text{SNR}_{1s} \sqrt{\frac{T}{1s}}, \quad (35)$$

consistent with standard phasor-sum statistics for Poisson processes [22–24]. In the notation of Ref. [6], $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(T)$ plays the role of the total SNR over an integration window T , with $\text{SNR}_{1s} = [\dot{N}_\gamma/(1 + \dot{N}_b/\dot{N}_\gamma)]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ (see (29) in [6]) corresponding approximately to $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(1\text{ s})$ once the factor $\frac{1}{2} a_m$ associated with the AM depth in Eq. (35) is taken into account. At $f_m = 1\text{ GHz}$, $c/(4\pi f_m) = 2.38567 \times 10^{-2}\text{ m rad}^{-1}$; thus $\sigma_{R_{2w}} = 0.10\text{ mm}$ requires $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(100\text{ s}) \approx 2.4 \times 10^2$.

In deriving Eq. (35) we have treated the detected photon flux as stationary over T . For a 1 m aperture and 10–100 s integration, the scintillation index on the Earth–Moon path at 1064 nm is modest, so that fluctuations in \dot{N}_γ primarily modulate $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(T)$ at the tens of percent level rather than changing its fundamental $\propto \sqrt{T}$ scaling [26].

At fixed target lock-in SNR_{AM} on the precision tone, Eq. (35) implies $T \propto 1/\dot{N}_\gamma$: higher detected photon rates permit the same phase precision to be reached on proportionally shorter coherent integration windows. Because the variance of the time-averaged atmospheric path obeys $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}^2(T) \propto \tau_0/T$ for $T \gg \tau_0$ in the Kolmogorov model (Appendix A), shortening T suppresses the contribution of low-frequency wet-delay fluctuations to $\mathbf{C}_{\text{atm}}(T)$. In the operating Cases B and C (introduced below) we exploit this either as margin in T at fixed atmospheric variance, or, when conditions allow, by using slightly shorter windows at the same photon-noise level.

Combining the beam geometry, two-way transmission, and collection aperture yields an approximate flux at the detector may given as below

$$\dot{N}_\gamma \simeq \frac{P_0}{E_\gamma} \eta_{\text{eff}} \frac{A_{\text{CCR}}}{A_{\text{spot,Moon}}} \frac{A_{\text{tel}}}{A_{\text{spot,Earth}}}, \quad E_\gamma = \frac{hc}{\lambda}, \quad (36)$$

where P_0 is the transmitter power, E_γ is the photon energy, η_{eff} is the end-to-end efficiency, and $A_{\text{spot,Moon}}$ and $A_{\text{spot,Earth}}$ are the footprint areas set by diffraction and turbulence [6, 31].

Consistent with the AM-CW power model in Sec. II, the mean received optical power P_1 in (3) can be identified with the power associated with the detected photon rate in (36) via $P_1 \simeq \dot{N}_\gamma E_\gamma$, with the detector quantum efficiency and other throughput factors already absorbed into η_{eff} in the same way as in [6]. This makes explicit that the modulation envelope in (3) is driven by the same link budget that sets the photon-statistical term $\mathbf{C}_{\text{shot}}(T)$ in (13).

TABLE II. Representative link parameters used in the photon-flux estimates based on Eq. (36). Values correspond to the 1 kW, 1064 nm, 1 m-aperture, 10 cm CCR baseline adopted from Ref. [6].

Quantity	Symbol	Representative value
Transmitter power	P_0	1 kW
Optical wavelength	λ	1064 nm
Telescope aperture	D	1 m
CCR diameter	d_{CCR}	10 cm
End-to-end efficiency	η_{eff}	0.2–0.4
Round-trip light time	τ	$\simeq 2.56$ s
Signal photon rate (design range)	\dot{N}_γ	$\sim 10^3$ – 10^5 s $^{-1}$

For the 1 kW, 1064 nm, 1 m-aperture, 10 cm CCR baseline of Ref. [6], the link calculation corresponding to Eq. (36) yields a detected photon rate $\dot{N}_\gamma \simeq (5\text{--}7) \times 10^3$ s $^{-1}$ for an end-to-end efficiency $\eta_{\text{eff}} \simeq 0.2$ and good ($r_0 \simeq 0.2$ m) seeing (see Table II for the values used). Inserted into Eq. (35), this baseline gives $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(100 \text{ s}) \simeq 200$ and a photon-limited two-way precision $\sigma_{R,\text{shot}} \simeq 0.1$ mm at $f_m = 1$ GHz.

Representative photon-flux regimes. To connect the lock-in SNR scalings above to realistic operations, it is useful to group the detected photon rate \dot{N}_γ into three representative regimes that will be used throughout the remainder of the paper. Case A represents a “generic” 1 kW CW station with $\dot{N}_\gamma \simeq (5\text{--}7) \times 10^3$ s $^{-1}$, matching the link budget of the earlier CW study for a 1 m telescope ranging to a single 10 cm CCR under good seeing [6]. Case B is the dedicated AM-CW configuration adopted for the design allocations below, with modestly larger collecting area and/or higher end-to-end efficiency such that $\dot{N}_\gamma \sim (3\text{--}5) \times 10^4$ s $^{-1}$ under similar seeing. Case C denotes a photon-rich regime with $\dot{N}_\gamma \sim 10^5$ s $^{-1}$, corresponding to larger apertures and/or improved throughput at a very good site.

Inserting these fluxes into Eq. (35) gives, for $T \simeq 100$ s, lock-in SNRs of order $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}} \sim 2 \times 10^2$, $(4\text{--}8) \times 10^2$, and $\gtrsim 10^3$ for Cases A, B, and C, respectively. At $f_m = 1$ GHz this translates, via Eq. (21), into photon-limited two-way precisions of $\sigma_{R,\text{shot}} \simeq 0.1$ mm for Case A, $\sigma_{R,\text{shot}} \simeq (3\text{--}6) \times 10^{-5}$ m for Case B, and $\sigma_{R,\text{shot}} \lesssim 3 \times 10^{-5}$ m for Case C (see Fig. 1). These three flux regimes bracket the range from generic high-power CW LLR to the more ambitious AM-CW station considered here; in Secs. V A 1 and V A 2 they are paired with the atmospheric and instrumental allocations to form the combined operating Cases A–C summarized in Table VII.

In all three regimes we hold the lunar retroreflector design fixed to a next-generation 10 cm CCR geometry, consistent with the earlier high-power CW LLR study, so that reflector-induced pulse spreading, libration smearing, and thermoelastic deformations contribute at or below the atmospheric and instrumental allocations and can be absorbed into the geometric model $R_{\text{geom}}(t; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ rather than treated as additional stochastic terms in $C_{ij}(T)$.

In the design studies below we are interested in a more “photon-rich” configuration, e.g. a modestly larger receive aperture and/or improved throughput ($\eta_{\text{eff}} \simeq 0.35\text{--}0.4$), for which Eq. (36) yields $\dot{N}_\gamma \sim (3\text{--}5) \times 10^4$ s $^{-1}$ under good seeing. These higher rates are consistent with the upper end of the link-budget range in [6] when scaled to larger collecting area and improved efficiencies (Table II), and they are used here only to set the *design* shot-noise allocations (30 μm for R_{2w} in Table IV), not as a universal value for all 1 m / 10 cm implementations. With $a_m \simeq 0.5\text{--}0.7$ and negligible background ($\dot{N}_b \ll \dot{N}_\gamma$), Eq. (35) then gives $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(100 \text{ s}) \simeq (4\text{--}8) \times 10^2$, corresponding to a photon-limited




FIG. 1. Photon-limited two-way range uncertainty $\sigma_{R,\text{shot}}(T)$, from (21) and (35) with the values from Table II, as a function of integration time T for the three representative photon-flux regimes (Cases A–C) used in the link and covariance analysis. The curves assume a single GHz-class modulation tone on a bright CW carrier with negligible background, so that all three cases follow the expected $\sigma_{R,\text{shot}} \propto T^{-1/2}$ scaling; the vertical separation reflects the different detected photon rates in each regime.

two-way range precision $\sigma_{R,\text{shot}} \simeq (3\text{--}6) \times 10^{-5}$ m at $f_m = 1$ GHz. For somewhat higher return rates, $\dot{N}_\gamma \sim 10^5 \text{ s}^{-1}$, the lock-in SNR on 100s windows exceeds 10^3 and $\sigma_{R,\text{shot}}$ drops below 3×10^{-5} m.

Eq. (35) treats the detected photon stream as a stationary Poisson process with constant mean rate \dot{N}_γ ; atmospheric scintillation then enters only through slow fluctuations of \dot{N}_γ and, hence, of $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(T)$. For a 1 m aperture at 1064 nm on an Earth–Moon path the expected scintillation index is modest, so that amplitude noise at the modulation frequency is small compared to photon shot noise on the integration times $T \gtrsim 10$ s considered here. In practice we monitor $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(T)$ in real time and reject analysis windows in which deep scintillation fades or background excursions drive the SNR below the thresholds in Table VI. A more complete treatment of scintillation as multiplicative noise in the photon stream, and its propagation into $\mathbf{C}_{\text{shot}}(T)$, can be incorporated in future work but does not change the design-level allocations adopted in Sec. V.

V. ATMOSPHERE AND INSTRUMENT: PRECISION BUDGETS

Two-way precision over T is

$$\sigma_R^2(T) = \sigma_{R,\text{shot}}^2(T) + \sigma_{R,\text{atm}}^2(T) + \sigma_{R,\text{inst}}^2(T). \quad (37)$$

In terms of the covariance decomposition in Eq. (13), the scalar precision can be written as

$$\sigma_R^2(T) = C_{11}(T) = C_{\text{shot},11}(T) + C_{\text{atm},11}(T) + C_{\text{inst},11}(T),$$

with the understanding that the oscillator and nonlinearity contributions are either treated explicitly as $\mathbf{C}_{\text{osc}}(T)$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\text{nl}}(T)$ or, in the regime of interest here, safely absorbed into the instrumental term. For the integration windows $T \simeq 30\text{--}100$ s that drive most science applications, a representative allocation is

$$\sigma_{R,\text{shot}} \simeq 30 \text{ } \mu\text{m}, \quad \sigma_{R,\text{atm, res}} \simeq 60 \text{ } \mu\text{m}, \quad \sigma_{R,\text{inst, res}} \simeq 40 \text{ } \mu\text{m},$$

with oscillator and nonlinearity contributions bounded at the few- μm and tens-of- μm levels, respectively. These numbers define quantitative targets for the hardware and CONOPS and are used directly in the implementation gates in Sec. VI and in the summary budget in Table IV.

For example, the photon-limited covariance matrix of the joint estimator (R_{2w}, v_r) over a window T may be written

$$\mathbf{C}_{\text{shot}}(T) = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{R,\text{shot}}^2(T) & \text{cov}(R_{2w}, v_r; T) \\ \text{cov}(R_{2w}, v_r; T) & \sigma_{v_r, \text{shot}}^2(T) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (38)$$

TABLE III. Illustrative calibration of the Kolmogorov atmospheric model to representative observing conditions. Each regime specifies a Fried parameter r_0 at 1064 nm, coherence time τ_0 , and isoplanatic angle θ_0 together with the resulting ranges for the absolute and differential two-way range residuals on T in the tens-of-seconds regime. Regimes A, B, and C provide the atmospheric components of operating Cases A, B, and C in Table VII, respectively.

Regime	r_0 at 1064 nm	τ_0	θ_0	Typical residuals
A: Generic mid-latitude	~ 0.2 m	~ 5 ms	$\sim 1^\circ$	$\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T) \sim 300\text{--}500$ μm
B: Dedicated AM-CW site	$\gtrsim 0.2$ m	$\text{few} \times 10$ ms	$\sim 1^\circ$	$\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T) \sim 50\text{--}150$ μm
C: Excellent seeing	$\gtrsim 0.3$ m	$\gtrsim 10$ ms	$\gtrsim 1^\circ$	$\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T) \sim 30\text{--}80$ μm
				$\sigma_{\Delta R,\text{atm}}(T, \theta) \sim 10\text{--}50$ μm for $\theta \lesssim 0.1^\circ$

where $\sigma_{R,\text{shot}}(T)$ and $\sigma_{v_r,\text{shot}}(T)$ are given by (21). For equally spaced samples and a linear regression model of (22), the off-diagonal covariance can be made negligible by choosing the time origin at the center of the fit window, so that $\sum_k t_k = 0$. In that case the range and range-rate estimates are effectively uncorrelated at the photon-noise level.

A. Representative error budget

1. Atmosphere

The relevant quantity for LLR is the variation of the neutral-atmosphere delay over an integration window T , not its absolute value. Under Kolmogorov turbulence with frozen flow, the optical-path structure function obeys the usual $(\tau/\tau_0)^{5/3}$ scaling, and for $T \gg \tau_0$ the variance of the time-averaged path scales as $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}^2(T) \propto \tau_0/T$, as summarized in the atmospheric-turbulence Appendix A. Calibrating the overall amplitude of this model to existing mm-class LLR data and SLR experience (coherence time $\tau_0 \sim 5$ ms, isoplanatic angle $\theta_0 \sim 1^\circ$, and Fried parameter $r_0 \simeq 0.2$ m at 1064 nm) gives

$$\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T) \sim (3\text{--}5) \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}$$

on $T \simeq 30\text{--}100$ s for typical mid-latitude seeing without aggressive elevation cuts. This reproduces the $300\text{--}500$ μm atmospheric term that dominates the generic 1 kW CW LLR error budget in [6] and corresponds to our Case A.

These scalings are essentially independent of the AM-CW architecture itself; they are set by the site and by the choice of elevation and weather cuts. What the high-flux AM-CW link provides is the freedom to reach the required phase SNR on comparatively short coherent windows T_{coh} , so that $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T_{\text{coh}})$ is evaluated at smaller T . For Kolmogorov turbulence the RMS atmospheric contribution then falls approximately as $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}} \propto T_{\text{coh}}^{-1/2}$ at fixed site parameters, consistent with the scaling derived in Appendix A. In operational terms, the photon-flux regimes and turbulence allocations used in the three representative cases are coupled: in Cases B and C the higher detected rates permit $T_{\text{coh}} \lesssim 30\text{--}50$ s while maintaining robust lock-in SNR_{AM}, so that the residual atmospheric term can be held in the $\sim 50\text{--}80$ μm band under very good seeing and becomes comparable to, rather than dominant over, the internal metrology term.

With site selection, elevation $e \gtrsim 30^\circ$, and explicit SNR and quality cuts, the same model yields much smaller fluctuations:

$$\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T) \sim (5\text{--}15) \times 10^{-5} \text{ m},$$

i.e. $\sim 50\text{--}150$ μm on $T = 10\text{--}100$ s. These values are consistent with APOLLO and near-infrared LLR experience and underlie the ~ 60 μm atmospheric allocation adopted for the dedicated AM-CW facility (Case B, see Fig. 4).

For the most favorable conditions at a very good site (top quartile of the seeing distribution, somewhat larger r_0 than assumed above), the same scalings imply that the residual atmospheric contribution can realistically be driven into the $\sim 30\text{--}80$ μm band on $T \simeq 30\text{--}100$ s, which we associate with Case C.

Calibrating the Kolmogorov model for the range-averaged path fluctuations to existing mm-class LLR and SLR experience is most transparent when expressed in terms of a small set of seeing parameters. Table III summarizes representative combinations of Fried parameter, coherence time, and isoplanatic angle together with the corresponding ranges of absolute and differential atmospheric residuals on the analysis windows used throughout the paper.

By construction, Regimes A, B, and C in Table III are paired with the photon-flux regimes of Sec. IV to define the atmospheric contributions to operating Cases A, B, and C in Table VII.

Although the error budget in Eq. (37) and Table IV assumes single-wavelength operation at 1064 nm, the AM-CW architecture is compatible with dual-wavelength (or “two-color”) ranging as an optional refinement. In that case a

second, nearby optical wavelength—either from a separate seed or from frequency conversion of the primary source—would be transmitted through the same telescope and processed through the same RF/ADC chain, providing an additional set of envelope phases and slopes. Because the neutral atmosphere is only weakly dispersive in the near infrared, dual-wavelength operation does not eliminate the tropospheric delay, but the small, well-modeled chromatic dependence of the refractive index can be exploited to constrain residual errors in $R_{\text{atm}}(t)$ and in the mapping functions [31]. In the design presented here, the allocations for $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T)$ can be met with site selection, elevation cuts, and modern mapping functions alone; a dual-wavelength option would primarily provide redundancy and a path to tightening atmospheric systematics in a future upgrade of the facility.

In the Fourier domain, the same Kolmogorov turbulence model implies a one-sided OPD power spectral density $S_R(f) \propto f^{-8/3}$ in the inertial range. When mapped to phase via Eq. (5), this corresponds to $S_\phi(f) \propto f^{-8/3}$ for the atmospheric contribution. Likewise, an oscillator with fractional frequency noise characterized by an Allan deviation $\sigma_y(\tau)$ produces a phase PSD $S_{\phi,\text{osc}}(f)$ whose shape is determined by the dominant noise type (e.g. white FM, flicker FM); for the hydrogen maser performance assumed in Sec. VIII A, $S_{\phi,\text{osc}}(f)$ is well below the atmospheric and photon-noise PSDs over the integration times of interest. These spectral views are useful when assessing sensitivity to very low-frequency (μHz) signatures such as long-period tidal evolution or gravitational waves.

For $\theta \lesssim 0.1^\circ$ and a toggling cadence of 1–2 s, these scalings imply differential atmospheric residuals $\sigma_{\Delta R,\text{atm}}(T, \theta)$ in the $\sim 10\text{--}50\ \mu\text{m}$ band for $T \sim 10^2$ s, consistent with the differential error budget adopted in Sec. VII. In the language of the three operating regimes defined above, this means that even for the generic CW case (Case A), differential atmospheric residuals on $\theta \lesssim 0.1^\circ$ baselines are driven into the $\sim 10\text{--}50\ \mu\text{m}$ band, while the more selective elevation and SNR cuts in Cases B and C push $\sigma_{\Delta R,\text{atm}}$ toward the lower end of this range. In all three cases, the atmosphere can therefore be modeled and averaged well below the mm-level on the 10–100 s windows relevant for science, with the remaining variance explicitly carried in the covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}(T)$.

2. Instrument

A continuous internal reference through the same RF and ADC chain removes most drift. To keep instrument below $\sim 5 \times 10^{-5}$ m over 100 s at 1 GHz, residual instrument phase must remain $\ll 2 \times 10^{-3}$ rad. Bench stability near 0.1 K, co-located short fibers/RF cables, low-CTE mounts, and careful thermal design can achieve this; the overall behavior is analogous to metrology chains in high-precision SLR and LLR systems [2, 31].

In the scalar budget of Eq. (37), these design choices correspond to a residual instrumental allocation

$$\sigma_{R,\text{inst}}^2(T \simeq 100\text{ s}) \equiv C_{\text{inst},11}(T) \approx (40\ \mu\text{m})^2, \quad (39)$$

which includes bench, cabling, and residual calibration terms in addition to the internal-reference residuals. In other words, for representative windows $T \simeq 100$ s the instrumental variance entering Eq. (37) is dominated by this residual term, with oscillator and nonlinearity contributions already folded into $C_{\text{inst},11}(T)$ at the few $\times 10\ \mu\text{m}$ level.

This is the absolute two-way range allocation quoted in the $R_{2\text{w}}$ row of Table IV, and it is realized in practice by the bench, internal reference, and facility parameters summarized in Table VIII.

The allocations above correspond to the absolute two-way range bands summarized in Sec. VII.

B. Observable-specific noise budgets

For later science analysis it is useful to summarize how the covariance decomposition in Eq. (13) maps onto the individual AM–CW observables. Over an integration window T we consider four estimators,

$$R_{2\text{w}}(T), \quad v_r(T), \quad \Delta R_{2\text{w}}(T), \quad \Delta v_r(T),$$

corresponding to absolute two-way range, one-way line-of-sight range-rate, and their differential counterparts between nearby CCRs. The corresponding 4×4 covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}(T)$ is defined in Eq. (17); its diagonal entries give the per-observable variances, while the off-diagonal entries encode correlations that can be retained in global fits.

For the design studies in this paper we choose estimators and time origins such that the photon-noise cross covariance between range and range-rate is negligible [cf. Eq. (38)], and we treat the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{C}(T)$ as the primary performance metrics. The representative 1σ allocations that we adopt for these diagonal elements are collected in Table IV. Each row in that table corresponds to one of the four observables and gives the decomposition of the relevant variance into the photon, atmospheric, instrumental, oscillator, and nonlinearity contributions appearing in Eq. (13). The scalar budgets in Eqs. (27), (28), and (37) are just the range and differential-range rows of Table IV.

TABLE IV. Representative 1σ error budget for the four AM–CW observables on typical analysis windows T . Entries give design-level allocations (i.e., Case B) to the diagonal elements of the covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}(T)$ in Eq. (13); off-diagonal covariances are kept negligible by choice of estimator and time origin.

Contribution	Symbol	$R_{2w}(30\text{--}100\text{ s})$	$v_r(10^2\text{--}10^3\text{ s})$	$\Delta R_{2w}(T \sim 10^2\text{ s})$	$\Delta v_r(10^2\text{--}10^3\text{ s})$
Photon statistics	$\sigma_{R,\text{shot}}$	$30\text{ }\mu\text{m}$	$0.2\text{--}0.5\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$	$40\text{ }\mu\text{m}$	$\text{few} \times 0.1\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$
Atmosphere (residual)	$\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}$	$60\text{ }\mu\text{m}$	$\lesssim 0.5\text{--}1\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$	$10\text{--}30\text{ }\mu\text{m}$	$\lesssim \text{few} \times 0.1\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$
Instrument (bench, cabling, metrology)	$\sigma_{R,\text{inst}}$	$40\text{ }\mu\text{m}$	$\lesssim 0.5\text{--}1\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$	$10\text{--}20\text{ }\mu\text{m}$	$\lesssim \text{few} \times 0.1\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$
Oscillator noise	$\sigma_{R,\text{osc}}$	$\lesssim 5\text{ }\mu\text{m}$	$\ll 0.1\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$	$\ll 10\text{ }\mu\text{m}$	$\ll 0.1\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$
Nonlinearity (AM–to–PM, multi-tone)	$\sigma_{R,\text{nl}}$	$\lesssim 25\text{ }\mu\text{m}$	$\ll 0.1\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$	$\ll 10\text{ }\mu\text{m}$	$\ll 0.1\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$
Total (RSS)	σ_R	$\simeq 80\text{ }\mu\text{m}$	$\text{few} \times (0.1\text{--}1)\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$	$20\text{--}50\text{ }\mu\text{m}$	$\text{few} \times (0.1\text{--}1)\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$




FIG. 2. Expected one-way line-of-sight range-rate uncertainties as a function of integration time T for the absolute observable $\sigma_{v_r}(T)$ and the differential observable $\sigma_{\Delta v_r}(T)$ (from (28)) between nearby reflectors. Both curves correspond to the Case B range allocations and use the slope-estimator relation $\sigma_{v_r}(T) \simeq \sigma_R(T)/T$ (using (37)) applied to the underlying range budgets. Differential range-rate benefits from common-mode cancellation of atmospheric and instrumental terms between lines of sight, leading to systematically lower $\sigma_{\Delta v_r}(T)$ at fixed T in the $10^2\text{--}10^3\text{ s}$ regime.

The first row of Table IV reproduces the absolute two-way range budget discussed in Sec. V: on $T = 30\text{--}100\text{ s}$ windows the photon term is kept at $\sigma_{R,\text{shot}} \simeq 30\text{ }\mu\text{m}$, the residual atmosphere at $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}} \simeq 60\text{ }\mu\text{m}$, and the residual instrument at $\sigma_{R,\text{inst}} \simeq 40\text{ }\mu\text{m}$, with oscillator and nonlinearity contributions safely sub-dominant; the corresponding RSS total $\sigma_R \simeq 0.08\text{ mm}$ is the single-station design goal. The second row gives the analogous allocation for the absolute range-rate $v_r(T)$ on $10^2\text{--}10^3\text{ s}$ windows, where the photon term $\sigma_{v_r,\text{shot}} \sim 0.2\text{--}0.5\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$ follows from Eqs. (21) and (22), and atmospheric and instrumental drifts are controlled to the $\sim 10^{-7}\text{--}10^{-6}\text{ ms}^{-1}$ level.

The last two columns of Table IV describe the differential observables $\Delta R_{2w}(T)$ and $\Delta v_r(T)$ between CCRs separated by $\theta \lesssim 0.1^\circ$. Here the photon terms gain a factor of $\sqrt{2}$ relative to the absolute case, while the differential atmospheric and instrumental terms are suppressed by the angular, temporal, and internal-referencing lever arms encapsulated in Eqs. (27)–(29) and Appendix A. The allocations $\sigma_{\Delta R} \sim 20\text{--}50\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ and $\sigma_{\Delta v_r} \sim \text{few} \times (0.1\text{--}1)\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$ are consistent both with the turbulence model and with the performance bands summarized in Sec. VII, see Fig. 2. Numerically, for the allocations in Table IV, this means that even though the differential photon term is larger by a factor $\sqrt{2}$, the strong suppression of atmospheric and instrumental contributions allows the total ΔR_{2w} uncertainty to be smaller than the absolute R_{2w} uncertainty by a factor of $\sim 1.5\text{--}2$ on representative windows. These differential allocations assume separations $\theta \lesssim 0.1^\circ$ and a 1–2 s toggling cadence, as well as a well-behaved internal reference; violating these conditions degrades the atmospheric and instrumental suppression and pushes $\sigma_{\Delta R}$ and $\sigma_{\Delta v_r}$ back toward the absolute bands.

For the science analyses it is also helpful to summarize, at a qualitative level, which observables are most directly tied to which classes of physical signals. A compact mapping is shown in Table V.

From the standpoint of station systematics, the differential observables are the cleanest: common-mode atmosphere, internal metrology, calibration offsets, and oscillator noise cancel to first order, leaving residuals dominated by photon statistics and the well-understood $\theta^{5/3}$ scaling of the differential atmosphere. Between the two, the differential two-way range $\Delta R_{2w}(T)$ is especially robust: it depends only on the mean phase difference between nearby CCRs, is

TABLE V. The science value of different AM-CW LLR observables.

Observable	Dominant science drivers
$R_{2w}(T)$	EP tests, \dot{G}/G , PPN parameters, long-period GW, secular orbit/libration
$v_r(T)$	Near-diurnal tidal signatures, Love numbers, tidal Q , short-period core-mantle coupling
$\Delta R_{2w}(T), \Delta v_r(T)$	Interior gradients, local tides and loading, regional Love-number variations, core-mantle coupling, differential control of station and atmospheric systematics

insensitive to static path-length offsets, and is limited mainly by well-understood photon noise and the residual differential atmosphere on $\theta \lesssim 0.1^\circ$ separations. Differential range-rate $\Delta v_r(T)$ inherits the same common-mode rejection but is more sensitive to very low-frequency phase noise and any residual modeling error in the modulation-frequency history. In contrast, the absolute observables $R_{2w}(T)$ and $v_r(T)$ remain indispensable for global parameter estimation, since they carry the full atmospheric and station covariance needed to constrain the long-baseline Earth-Moon dynamics and relativistic parameters.

C. Temporal correlations and multi-epoch covariance

Throughout this section we have treated $\mathbf{C}(T)$ as the covariance for a single analysis window, implicitly assuming that different windows are statistically independent once separated by $\gtrsim T$. This approximation is adequate for defining per-window error budgets and implementation gates, but the dominant low-frequency noise sources (Kolmogorov turbulence, bench motion, oscillator flicker) are in reality strongly time-correlated.

Let $R_{2w}(T_k)$ denote the range estimator formed on a window T_k with weighting function $w_k(t)$ (for a rectangular window, w_k is simply a top-hat of width T_k). If the underlying one-way path fluctuation $\delta R_{\text{tot}}(t)$ has one-sided power spectral density $S_R(f)$, the multi-epoch covariance between two normal points centred at times t_k and $t_{k'}$ can be written, to good approximation, as

$$\text{Cov}[R_{2w}(T_k), R_{2w}(T_{k'})] \simeq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty df S_R(f) W_k(f) W_{k'}^*(f), \quad (40)$$

where $W_k(f)$ is the Fourier transform of $w_k(t)$ and $S_R(f)$ includes contributions from the atmosphere, instrument, oscillator, and any additional colored noise processes. For the Kolmogorov atmosphere model of Appendix A, $S_R(f) \propto f^{-8/3}$ in the inertial range, so that Eq. (40) predicts significant correlations between adjacent windows when their centers are separated by $\lesssim T$.

As a concrete example, using the same Kolmogorov model calibrated to $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}} \simeq 60 \mu\text{m}$ on $T = 100$ s windows, a numerical evaluation of the covariance integral shows that two adjacent 100 s windows whose centers are 50 s apart have a correlation coefficient of order $\rho \simeq 0.5$, i.e., such normal points are far from statistically independent.

In global parameter-estimation or Kalman-filter analyses, these correlations can be included by evaluating Eq. (40) (or suitable approximations to it) and assembling the full multi-epoch covariance matrix, with the diagonal blocks given by the per-window $\mathbf{C}(T_k)$ defined in Eq. (13). At the design stage considered here we use the diagonal elements alone to set hardware and CONOPS requirements, but the formalism above provides a straightforward path to incorporating temporal correlations in science analyses.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION GATES

The gates in Table VI provide a concrete mapping between subsystem performance and the overall range error budget in Eq. (37) and the covariance decomposition in Eq. (13). The SNR requirement on the fine (GHz) tone ensures that the photon-statistical term $\sigma_{R,\text{shot}}(T)$ remains at or below 0.10 mm on $T = 30$ –100 s windows, i.e. comfortably below the atmospheric and instrumental allocations. The bound on the rms internal-reference phase directly limits the residual instrumental contribution $\sigma_{R,\text{inst}}(T)$, while the constraint on $|\dot{f}_m|$ —or explicit correction via Eq. (23)—keeps oscillator-induced range-rate biases far below the target band for σ_{v_r} . Elevation and seeing cuts control the atmospheric term $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T)$, and the differential toggling cadence is chosen so that the differential atmospheric variance in Eq. (29) remains in the tens-of-micrometers regime for $\theta \lesssim 0.1^\circ$. Together, these gates realize the representative allocations $\sigma_{R,\text{shot}}, \sigma_{R,\text{atm}}, \sigma_{R,\text{inst}}$ quoted in Eq. (37).

In practice, these implementation gates can be organized into a simple run-book: (i) a commissioning phase in which each gate is tested and demonstrated independently (e.g. tone SNR on a bright terrestrial retroreflector, internal-reference stability in closed-loop operation, oscillator characterization); (ii) an initial operations phase targeting

TABLE VI. Quantitative gates for sub-0.1 mm two-way precision on $T = 30\text{--}100$ s windows at $f_m = 1$ GHz.

Parameter	Performance requirement
Tone SNR	$\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}}(100\text{ s}) \geq 250$ on the fine tone ($\Rightarrow \sigma_{R,\text{shot}} \lesssim 0.10$ mm)
Instrument residual	$\text{rms}\{\phi_{\text{inst}}\} \leq 2 \times 10^{-3}$ rad over 100 s
Oscillator drift	$ \dot{f}_m \leq 3 \times 10^{-6}$ Hz s $^{-1}$ or corrected via (23)
Elevation	$e \geq 30^\circ$; reject poor seeing
Differential toggling	1–2 s cadence for $\theta \leq 0.1^\circ$

TABLE VII. Representative operating cases for a 1 kW, 1064 nm, 1 m AM–CW LLR station ranging to 10 cm CCRs. Each case combines a detected photon flux \dot{N}_γ (Sec. IV) with an atmospheric regime from Table III. Quoted values are 1σ two-way precisions on $T \simeq 30\text{--}100$ s windows for absolute range R_{2w} and on $T \sim 10^2$ s windows for absolute range–rate v_r and the differential observables ΔR_{2w} and Δv_r . Case A (generic mid-latitude) reproduces the generic CW concept of the earlier high-power CW LLR study [6] with $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T) = 300\text{--}500$ μm ; Case B (dedicated AM–CW site) corresponds to the baseline AM–CW design in this work, $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T) = 50\text{--}150$ μm ; Case C (excellent seeing) represents a photon-rich, excellent-seeing scenario, $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T) = 30\text{--}80$ μm .

Case	Detected flux \dot{N}_γ [s $^{-1}$]	σ_R (absolute)	σ_{v_r} (absolute)	$\sigma_{\Delta R}$ (differential)	$\sigma_{\Delta v_r}$ (differential)
A: generic CW station	$\simeq (5\text{--}7) \times 10^3$	0.32–0.55 mm	$\sim 1\text{--}3$ $\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$	$\sim 30\text{--}40$ μm	$\sim 0.3\text{--}1$ $\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$
B: dedicated AM–CW facility	$\sim (3\text{--}5) \times 10^4$	$\simeq 80$ μm	$\sim 0.3\text{--}1$ $\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$	$\sim 20\text{--}50$ μm	$\sim 0.2\text{--}0.5$ $\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$
C: photon-rich, excellent seeing	$\sim 10^5$	$\sim 50\text{--}100$ μm	$\sim 0.2\text{--}0.5$ $\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$	$\sim 20\text{--}40$ μm	$\sim 0.1\text{--}0.3$ $\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$

$\sigma_R \simeq 0.2\text{--}0.5$ mm on 10–100 s windows; and (iii) a mature phase in which site, hardware, and CONOPS are tuned to approach the 0.05–0.10 mm design goal and the differential performance bands in Sec. VII.

VII. PERFORMANCE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The analysis above supports the following bands as realistic targets for high-power AM–CW LLR:

- single-station absolute two-way range (10–100 s windows): initial 0.2–0.5 mm, design goal 0.05–0.10 mm,
- single-station range–rate ($10^2\text{--}10^3$ s windows): $\sigma_{v_r} \sim \text{few} \times (0.1\text{--}1)$ $\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$,
- differential two-way range between nearby CCRs: $\sigma_{\Delta R} \sim 20\text{--}50$ μm for $\theta \lesssim 0.1^\circ$,
- differential range–rate: $\sigma_{\Delta v_r} \sim (0.1\text{--}1)$ $\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$.

In the notation of Eq. (15), these four bands are simply the square roots of the diagonal entries of the 4×4 covariance matrix $C_{ij}(T)$ in Eq. (17): the absolute two-way range band corresponds to $C_{11}^{1/2}(T)$, the absolute range–rate band to $C_{22}^{1/2}(T)$, and the differential bands to the analogous diagonal elements for ΔR_{2w} and Δv_r . The allocations in Table IV decompose each of these diagonal terms into photon, atmospheric, instrumental, oscillator, and nonlinearity contributions, so that a single set of link, turbulence, and metrology assumptions (Secs. IV–V) consistently supports the full observable vector $\mathbf{y}(T) = (R_{2w}, v_r, \Delta R_{2w}, \Delta v_r)^\top$. In particular, the differential allocations for ΔR_{2w} and Δv_r in Table IV reproduce the $\sim 20\text{--}50$ μm and $\sim (0.1\text{--}1)$ $\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$ bands found in the CW LLR error analysis of [6], so that the main difference between the two studies lies in the more ambitious absolute R_{2w} and v_r targets adopted here.

Representative operating cases. It is useful to bundle these assumptions into three representative operating cases that combine photon return, atmospheric residuals, and instrumental stability into a small set of scalar performance targets. Specifically, we take: (i) the three photon-flux regimes of Sec. IV, characterized by detected rates $\dot{N}_\gamma \simeq (5\text{--}7) \times 10^3$, $(3\text{--}5) \times 10^4$, and $\sim 10^5$ s $^{-1}$; (ii) the three turbulence regimes of Table III, with $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T)$ in the 300–500, 50–150, and 30–80 μm bands on $T \simeq 30\text{--}100$ s windows; and (iii) a common instrumental allocation $\sigma_{R,\text{inst}} \simeq 40$ μm from Sec. VA2. Case A couples the lowest-flux regime to the generic mid-latitude atmosphere (Regime A) and therefore reproduces the generic CW concept and error budget of Ref. [6]. Case B combines the intermediate flux with the dedicated AM–CW turbulence allocation (Regime B) and defines the baseline design of this work. Case C couples the photon-rich regime to the excellent-seeing model (Regime C) and illustrates the performance reachable when both flux and atmosphere are favorable. In Sec. VIII we therefore focus the detailed hardware and facility design on Case B, treating Cases A and C primarily as lower and upper performance brackets that are realized by operating the same hardware stack at different photon-flux and turbulence regimes.

From a hardware perspective, Table VII shows how the AM–CW concept spans from a generic 1 kW CW implementation (Case A) to a dedicated high-throughput facility (Case B) and a photon-rich, excellent-seeing regime (Case C).

Case A reproduces the earlier 1 kW CW LLR concept on a conventional observatory platform: a 1 m telescope, 10 cm CCR, and good but generic seeing yield $\dot{N}_\gamma \simeq (5\text{--}7) \times 10^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and total two-way RMS errors of 0.32–0.55 mm dominated by atmospheric turbulence. Case B corresponds to a purpose-built AM–CW facility at a very good site, with higher throughput, explicit elevation and SNR cuts, continuous internal referencing, and turbulence-averaging and CONOPS gates; under these more aggressive assumptions, the photon term is kept at the $\sim 30 \mu\text{m}$ level and the residual atmosphere and instrument at $\sim 60 \mu\text{m}$ and $\sim 40 \mu\text{m}$, respectively, giving the $\sim 80 \mu\text{m}$ single-station design goal already quoted. Case C illustrates that, once these atmospheric and instrumental allocations are achieved, increasing the photon rate to $\dot{N}_\gamma \sim 10^5 \text{ s}^{-1}$ mainly provides margin: the photon term drops below $\sim 30 \mu\text{m}$ and the total absolute precision becomes limited by the remaining $\sim 30\text{--}80 \mu\text{m}$ atmospheric and $\sim 40 \mu\text{m}$ bench contributions, while the differential two-way range remains in the $\sim 20\text{--}40 \mu\text{m}$ band for $\theta \lesssim 0.1^\circ$ and 1–2 s toggling.

At $f_m = 1 \text{ GHz}$, $c/(4\pi f_m) \approx 2.39 \times 10^{-2} \text{ m rad}^{-1}$. Reaching $\sigma_R = 0.10 \text{ mm}$ requires $\sigma_\phi \approx 4.2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ rad}$ and thus $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}} \approx 240$. With kW-class CW power and a 10 cm CCR, link budgets put $\text{SNR}_{\text{AM}} \gtrsim 10^3$ on 10–100 s windows, corresponding to $\sigma_{R,\text{shot}} \sim 2\text{--}5 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}$. Photon statistics alone are therefore not the limit.

Using (37), a representative decomposition of the absolute two-way range variance (R_{2w} column of Table IV) is

$$\sigma_{R,\text{shot}} \sim 30 \mu\text{m}, \quad \sigma_{R,\text{atm}} \sim 60 \mu\text{m}, \quad \sigma_{R,\text{inst}} \sim 40 \mu\text{m}, \quad (41)$$

which yields

$$\sigma_R \sim \sqrt{30^2 + 60^2 + 40^2} \mu\text{m} \approx 80 \mu\text{m}. \quad (42)$$

This illustrates that sub-0.1 mm two-way precision is realistic as a design goal, provided atmospheric variation and instrument residuals are systematically held below the $\sim 50\text{--}100 \mu\text{m}$ level.

The oscillator and nonlinearity terms $\mathbf{C}_{\text{osc}}(T)$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\text{nl}}(T)$ from Eq. (13) are implicitly included in this allocation. As discussed in Sec. VIII A, the assumed maser performance implies $\sigma_{R,\text{osc}} \lesssim 5 \mu\text{m}$ [Eq. (44)], and the AM-to-PM and multi-tone nonlinearity constraints keep $\sigma_{R,\text{nl}} \lesssim 25 \mu\text{m}$ [Eq. (34)]. Both are therefore comfortably absorbed within the $\sim 40 \mu\text{m}$ instrumental term in Eq. (37), confirming that the dominant residuals are atmospheric and bench-related.

For range-rate, starting from Eq. (19) and using the regression variance in Eq. (22), with $f_m = 1 \text{ GHz}$, per-sample $\sigma_\phi \simeq 3 \times 10^{-3} \text{ rad}$, 1 Hz sampling, and $T = 100 \text{ s}$ ($N = 100$), one finds

$$\sigma_{v_r} \approx \frac{c}{4\pi f_m} \sqrt{\frac{12}{N}} \frac{\sigma_\phi}{T} \simeq 2.5 \times 10^{-7} \text{ m s}^{-1}, \quad (43)$$

before atmospheric and instrumental drifts, which are typically well below the cm s^{-1} scale. Extending T to several hundred seconds and/or improving σ_ϕ keeps σ_{v_r} comfortably in the $\text{few} \times 10^{-7} \text{ m s}^{-1}$ band.

In differential mode, for $\theta \lesssim 0.1^\circ$ and 1–2 s toggling, most station and atmosphere terms cancel; the remaining contributions are shot noise and residual differential turbulence at the tens of μm level, leading to $\sigma_{\Delta R} \sim (2\text{--}5) \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}$ over $T \sim 10^2 \text{ s}$. Applying the same slope-fit logic to $\Delta\phi(t)$ produces $\sigma_{\Delta v_r} \sim \text{few} \times (0.1\text{--}1) \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$ for $T = 100\text{--}1000 \text{ s}$. These bands cleanly separate physics-limited terms (photon statistics, turbulence) from implementation limits (internal metrology, site, CONOPS) and are consistent with the earlier link and error budgets. They provide a set of quantitative, defensible performance goals for high-power AM–CW LLR.

These differential bands correspond to Eqs. (27) and the analogous expression for $\sigma_{\Delta v_r}^2(T)$ in (28) with $\sigma_{\Delta R,\text{atm}}(T, \theta)$ and $\sigma_{\Delta v_r,\text{atm}}(T, \theta)$ in the $\sim 10\text{--}50 \mu\text{m}$ and $\text{few} \times 10^{-7}\text{--}10^{-6} \text{ m s}^{-1}$ ranges, respectively, consistent with the turbulence scalings in Sec. V A 1 and the implementation gates in Sec. VI.

VIII. HARDWARE AND CONOPS

The AM–CW LLR station behaves as an RF interferometer coupled to a high-power optical transmitter/receiver, as summarized in Fig. 3. The hydrogen maser defines the frequency reference for the modulation tones $\{f_{m,i}\}$, the LiNbO₃ modulator and MOPA chain realize a kW-class 1064 nm CW beam with amplitude index a_m , and the lunar CCRs return a delayed, attenuated replica of the imposed modulation. The internal reference path, measured through the same RF and ADC chain, provides the phase $\phi_{\text{inst}}(t)$ used to remove common-mode instrument drift before forming the range and range-rate estimators defined in Sec. II.

In the notation of Eq. (13), the blocks in Fig. 3 map most directly onto the oscillator, photon, and instrumental contributions $\mathbf{C}_{\text{osc}}(T)$, $\mathbf{C}_{\text{shot}}(T)$, and $\mathbf{C}_{\text{inst}}(T)$ that set the precision of the AM–CW observables. In this section we describe the subsystems and the operational concept at a level that supports concrete requirements.

In the remainder of this section we specialize to the dedicated AM–CW facility (Case B in Table VII), characterized by the baseline link parameters in Table II and the hardware summary in Table VIII. In Cases A and C the same




FIG. 3. Simplified schematic of the RF-coherent high-power AM-CW LLR station. A hydrogen maser and RF synthesis stage generate the modulation tones $\{f_{m,i}\}$, which drive a LiNbO₃ MZM and MOPA chain to impose amplitude modulation with index a_m on a 1064 nm CW beam at power $P_0 \sim 1$ kW. The transmit/receive telescope launches the beam to the lunar 10 cm CCRs and collects the weak, delayed return, which is filtered, detected, and digitized by the receive chain. Digital lock-in processing and estimators on the precision tone, aided by a short internal reference path that supplies $\phi_{\text{inst}}(t)$, produce the observables $R_{2w}(T)$, $v_r(T)$, $\Delta R_{2w}(T)$, and $\Delta v_r(T)$.

hardware stack is operated at different photon-flux and turbulence regimes (Table VII), so a separate hardware table is not required; the performance deltas are driven by site quality, throughput, and observing strategy rather than qualitatively different subsystems.

A. Common hardware stack

1. Frequency reference

A hydrogen maser (or equivalent ultra-stable oscillator) [30]. It synthesizes the modulation tones $\{f_m\}$ in the 50 MHz–1 GHz range and provides timing for the ADCs. Short-term fractional frequency instability (Allan deviation) at the level of 10^{-14} on 1–10 s and better than 10^{-15} on 10^2 s ensures that stochastic oscillator noise is negligible in the range and range-rate error budgets. A simple bound on the two-way range contribution over the round-trip light time $\tau_{2w} \simeq 2.56$ s is

$$\sigma_{R,\text{osc}} \simeq \frac{c \tau_{2w}}{2} \sigma_y(\tau_{2w}), \quad (44)$$

where $\sigma_y(\tau)$ is the Allan deviation of the maser. For $\sigma_y(1\text{--}10\text{ s}) \lesssim 10^{-14}$ one finds $\sigma_{R,\text{osc}} \lesssim 4\text{ }\mu\text{m}$, so that $C_{\text{osc}}(T)$ in Eq. (13) is safely subdominant to the atmospheric and instrumental contributions. The corresponding range-rate contribution on a window T scales as

$$\sigma_{v_r,\text{osc}}(T) \sim \frac{\sigma_{R,\text{osc}}}{T} \ll 1\text{ }\mu\text{m s}^{-1} \quad (45)$$

for $T \gtrsim 10$ s, consistent with the target band for σ_{v_r} in Sec. VII.




FIG. 4. Representative absolute two-way range error budget $\sigma_R(T)$ for the dedicated AM–CW facility (Case B), from (37) and the values from Table II. The photon, atmosphere, and instrument contributions are shown separately together with their root-sum-square total. Photon and atmospheric terms follow the $T^{-1/2}$ scaling implied by the shot-noise and Kolmogorov models, while the instrumental term is approximately constant over the 30–100 s band. The total curve illustrates the transition from a photon/atmosphere-dominated regime at short T to an instrumental floor at longer integrations, consistent with the scalar allocations used in the range covariance.

In the notation of Eq. (13), these bounds imply a scalar oscillator contribution

$$\sigma_{R,\text{osc}}(T) \equiv \sqrt{C_{\text{osc},11}(T)} \lesssim 5 \mu\text{m} \quad (46)$$

on $T \sim 10\text{--}10^2$ s windows. This is more than an order of magnitude below the atmospheric and instrumental allocations adopted in Sec. V, and it justifies treating $\mathbf{C}_{\text{osc}}(T)$ as a sub-dominant term in the total covariance decomposition of Eq. (13).

2. Laser and modulation

A single-frequency 1064nm master oscillator feeding a master-oscillator power-amplifier (MOPA) chain. The modulation is imposed at the seed using a LiNbO₃ Mach–Zehnder modulator with tone set $\{f_{m,i}\}$; typical amplitude-modulation indices $a_m \sim 0.3\text{--}0.7$ are feasible. The MOPA is operated well below saturation to preserve AM index and linear phase transfer. High-power optical isolators protect the seed. The amplifier chain is designed for near-diffraction-limited beam quality ($M^2 \lesssim 1.3$), minimal pointing jitter, and stable polarization into the telescope aperture [6, 31].

Characterization of the LiNbO₃ modulator response at the operating tones is essential to control AM-to-PM conversion and harmonic distortion. Residual AM-to-PM conversion on the precision tone⁷ can be parameterized as an equivalent phase perturbation $\delta\phi_{\text{AM}\rightarrow\text{PM}}(t)$ entering $\delta\phi_{\text{nl}}(t)$ in Eq. (10). For a given modulation index, the corresponding nonlinearity-induced range error on a window T is

$$\sigma_{R,\text{nl}}(T) \simeq \frac{c}{4\pi f_m} \text{rms}\{\delta\phi_{\text{AM}\rightarrow\text{PM}}\}, \quad (47)$$

so that enforcing

$$\text{rms}\{\delta\phi_{\text{AM}\rightarrow\text{PM}}\} \lesssim 10^{-3} \text{ rad} \quad (48)$$

at $f_m = 1$ GHz limits $\sigma_{R,\text{nl}}$ to $\lesssim 25 \mu\text{m}$. This contribution is collected in $\mathbf{C}_{\text{nl}}(T)$ in Eq. (13) and is therefore comfortably below the atmospheric and instrumental allocations in Eq. (37).

⁷ In practice we designate one of the modulation tones, typically at $f_m = 1$ GHz, as the “precision tone” whose phase is used to form the primary range and range-rate estimators, while lower-frequency tones serve primarily for ambiguity resolution and diagnostics.

TABLE VIII. Baseline AM–CW LLR station hardware and facility parameters for the dedicated facility (Case B). Values are design targets consistent with the link budget in Table II, the error allocations in Table IV, and the covariance decomposition $\mathbf{C}(T) = \mathbf{C}_{\text{shot}} + \mathbf{C}_{\text{atm}} + \mathbf{C}_{\text{inst}} + \mathbf{C}_{\text{osc}} + \mathbf{C}_{\text{nl}}$ in Eq. (13).

Subsystem	Quantity	Design value / requirement
Frequency reference	Oscillator type	Hydrogen maser or equivalent ultra-stable reference
	Allan deviation $\sigma_y(\tau)$	$\lesssim 10^{-14}$ for $\tau = 1\text{--}10$ s, $\lesssim 10^{-15}$ at $\tau \sim 10^2$ s
	Range contribution $\sigma_{R,\text{osc}}$	$\lesssim 5\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ on $T \sim 10\text{--}10^2$ s [Eqs. (44)–(46)]
Laser and modulation	Optical wavelength λ	1064 nm (single-frequency seed)
	Mean optical power P_0	1 kW CW at the telescope aperture
	AM index a_m on precision tone	0.3–0.7
	Tone set $\{f_{m,i}\}$	{50, 50.1, 200, 1000} MHz (illustrative)
	Beam quality M^2	$\lesssim 1.3$ at full power
	AM→PM residual $ \delta\phi_{\text{AM} \rightarrow \text{PM}} $	$\ll 10^{-3}$ rad on $T \simeq 10\text{--}100$ s
	Nonlinearity range term $\sigma_{R,\text{nl}}$	$\lesssim 25\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ at $f_m = 1$ GHz [Eqs. (47)–(48)]
Tx/Rx optics	Telescope aperture D	1–2 m (monostatic or near-monostatic)
	Optical bandpass	$\sim 1\text{--}3$ nm at 1064 nm
	Lunar CCRs	$d_{\text{CCR}} = 10$ cm next-generation arrays
Hardware regime	1 m, $\eta_{\text{eff}} \approx 0.2$,	Generic seeing
	1–2 m, $\eta_{\text{eff}} \approx 0.35\text{--}0.4$,	Good site
	1–2 m, $\eta_{\text{eff}} \gtrsim 0.4$,	Excellent site
Detector and back-end	Detector option 1	SNSPD at 1064 nm, system efficiency $\gtrsim 0.2$, dark counts $\lesssim 10\text{ s}^{-1}$
	Detector option 2	Low-noise InGaAs photodiode at higher flux
	ADC timing jitter	$\lesssim 0.5$ ps rms (two-way range $\ll 0.1$ mm)
	Dynamic range / resolution	Sufficient that amplitude fluctuations do not bias phase estimates at the 10^{-3} rad level
Internal reference	Reference geometry	Short, co-routed optical/RF loop through same RF+ADC chain
	Residual phase rms $\{\phi_{\text{inst}}\}$	$\lesssim 2 \times 10^{-3}$ rad over $T \simeq 100$ s ($\Rightarrow \sigma_{R,\text{inst}} \lesssim 40\text{ }\mu\text{m}$)
Facility / environment	Laser wall-plug efficiency	$\sim 20\text{--}30\%$ (electrical draw $\sim 3\text{--}5$ kW for laser)
	Temperature stability δT	$\lesssim 0.1$ K over $T \simeq 100$ s in laser and RF rooms
	Bench thermal path term $\sigma_{R,\text{inst,th}}$	$\lesssim 10\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ on $T \simeq 100$ s [Eq. (51)]
	Vibrational path term $\sigma_{R,\text{inst,mech}}$	$\lesssim 20\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ on $T \sim 10\text{--}100$ s [Eq. (52)]
	Total instrumental allocation $\sigma_{R,\text{inst}}$	$\simeq 40\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ (design value in Table IV)

In practice we require residual phase modulation at f_m induced by nominal AM to satisfy

$$|\delta\phi_{\text{AM} \rightarrow \text{PM}}| \ll 10^{-3} \text{ rad} \quad (49)$$

over $T \simeq 10\text{--}100$ s, corresponding to a two-way range bias $\ll 25\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ at $f_m = 1$ GHz. Harmonic content of the AM envelope at $2f_m$ and higher is kept below ~ -40 dBc, so that the digital lock-in—which assumes a single dominant tone—does not acquire systematic phase shifts from higher harmonics. Residual effects are included in the nonlinearity term $\delta\phi_{\text{nl}}(t)$ in Eq. (10) and contribute to \mathbf{C}_{nl} in Eq. (13).

3. Transmit/receive optics

A 1–2 m telescope, used in a monostatic or near-monostatic configuration. A fast steering mirror provides milli-arcsecond pointing control. A narrow optical passband (on the order of 1–3 nm) and spatial filtering in the focal plane suppress lunar background, especially during bright phases. Aperture shape and central obscuration are chosen to minimize far-field sidelobes and to maintain good encircled energy at the reflector arrays; coating design minimizes ghost reflections that could contaminate the lock-in.

The assumed 10 cm CCRs are consistent with proposed next-generation lunar retroreflectors [6, 7, 32], which motivate the use of kW-class CW transmitters and GHz-class modulation frequencies.

4. Detector and back-end

A photon-counting superconducting nanowire single-photon detector (SNSPD) at 1064 nm, with system detection efficiency of a few tenths and dark count below $\sim 10 \text{ s}^{-1}$, or a low-noise InGaAs photodiode at higher flux. The back end performs digital I/Q demodulation at each tone, producing $z(t) = A(t) \exp[i\phi(t)]$ at Hz–kHz rates. Phase and slope estimators are based on phasor sums and linear regression on $\phi(t)$, with performance characterized by the usual Cramér–Rao bounds for single-tone estimation [22–24]. ADC resolution and dynamic range are chosen so that amplitude fluctuations do not significantly bias phase estimates.

5. Internal reference

A short, stable reference path is measured continuously through the same RF and ADC chain. Its phase $\phi_{\text{inst}}(t)$ monitors instrument drift: laser/mixer phase noise, RF path length, ADC timing, and residual AM-to-PM conversion. Subtracting $\phi_{\text{inst}}(t)$ from the lunar phase per tone removes the bulk of instrument path and electronics drift. Residual instrument phase noise on the precision tone is required to remain below a $\text{few} \times 10^{-3}$ rad over 100 s; bench design and cable routing are optimized to satisfy this constraint.

B. Facility-level infrastructure for high-power operation

Realizing a 1 kW-class AM-CW station requires facility infrastructure that preserves the path-length stability implicit in the precision goals while handling kilowatt-level optical and several-kilowatt electrical loads.

1. Thermal and electrical budget

A 1 kW optical transmitter with overall wall-plug efficiency of order 20–30% implies an electrical draw of $\sim 3\text{--}5$ kW for the laser system alone, plus additional load for chillers, RF electronics, and cryogenics. The laser room and RF bench are therefore designed with several kilowatts of heat rejection and active temperature control that keeps bulk temperature excursions within ~ 0.1 K over 100 s. Using an effective optical path length $L \simeq 1$ m and an effective coefficient of thermal expansion α_{eff} for the metrology bench, the residual instrument path fluctuation

$$\delta R_{\text{inst}} \simeq \alpha_{\text{eff}} L \delta T \quad (50)$$

must satisfy $\delta R_{\text{inst}} \ll 10 \text{ } \mu\text{m}$ over $T \simeq 100$ s in order to respect the phase constraint stated above, implying $\alpha_{\text{eff}} \delta T \lesssim 10^{-5}$. In terms of the scalar error budget in Eq. (37) and the covariance decomposition in Eq. (13), this condition corresponds to an allocation

$$\sigma_{R,\text{inst,th}}(T \simeq 100 \text{ s}) \lesssim 10 \text{ } \mu\text{m}, \quad (51)$$

for the bench and thermal contributions to $R_{\text{inst}}(t)$, i.e. a contribution $C_{\text{inst,11}}(T \simeq 100 \text{ s}) \lesssim (10 \text{ } \mu\text{m})^2$, leaving additional margin within $\mathbf{C}_{\text{inst}}(T)$ for residual electronic, alignment, and calibration terms.

2. Mechanical and vibrational environment

The RF/optical bench and beam transport to the telescope are mounted on a low-vibration pier, with the amplifier chain, modulator, and internal reference arranged to minimize differential path motion between the lunar and reference channels. Vibration from cryocoolers and HVAC systems is isolated to keep induced path-length noise below the atmospheric floor on the relevant time scales. Expressed in the notation of Eq. (37), the goal is to keep the vibrational contribution to the instrumental variance at the level

$$\sigma_{R,\text{inst,mech}}(T) \lesssim 20 \text{ } \mu\text{m}, \quad T \sim 10\text{--}100 \text{ s}, \quad (52)$$

so that, combined with the thermal allocation above, the total $\sigma_{R,\text{inst,res}}(T)$ remains within the $\sim 40 \text{ } \mu\text{m}$ budget adopted in Sec. VII.

The $\sim 10 \text{ } \mu\text{m}$ target in Eq. (51) applies specifically to bench and thermal contributions to $R_{\text{inst}}(t)$. Together with the $\sim 20 \text{ } \mu\text{m}$ vibrational allocation in Eq. (52), and allowing $\sim 10\text{--}20 \text{ } \mu\text{m}$ of headroom for residual electronic, alignment, and calibration terms, this is compatible with the overall $\sigma_{R,\text{inst}} \simeq 40 \text{ } \mu\text{m}$ budget in Table IV.

3. Telescope enclosure and site monitoring

The telescope sits in a dome or roll-off enclosure designed to minimize local seeing and thermal gradients across the primary. Environmental sensors (temperature, pressure, humidity, wind) and a seeing monitor (e.g. MASS/DIMM) provide per-night estimates of Fried parameter r_0 , coherence time τ_0 , and isoplanatic angle θ_0 . These feed into the atmospheric term $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T)$ and into the quality cuts applied in the observing sequence.

Quantitatively, for the Kolmogorov structure function adopted later for the atmospheric contribution to the covariance, the combination of site selection, elevation cuts, and turbulence monitoring is designed to enforce $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T) \lesssim (5\text{--}10) \times 10^{-5}$ m on $T = 30\text{--}100$ s, consistent with the allocations in the precision budget.

4. High-power safety and beam control

Operation of a 1 kW, 1064 nm CW beam requires a safety system with hardwired shutters, interlocked doors, and software limits on telescope pointing. The control system enforces night-time operation only, checks for aircraft and satellite exclusion zones, and closes shutters in the event of any interlock violation. Nominal ocular-hazard distances are tens of kilometers, so these engineered controls are essential for safe routine operation and to limit illumination of the lunar surface outside the intended reflector fields.

5. Timing and frequency distribution

The hydrogen maser reference is distributed to the modulation source, local oscillators, and ADC clocks over phase-stable RF or optical links. Residual timing jitter at the ADC is required to be $\lesssim 0.5$ psrms, corresponding to $\ll 0.1$ mm in two-way range, and any differential delays between the lunar and internal-reference channels are calibrated and monitored at the ~ 10 ps level or better.

6. Geophysical co-location and ancillary sensors

For long-term interpretation of sub-mm normal points it is advantageous to embed the AM-CW LLR station in a broader geodetic and gravimetric environment. Co-located continuous Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS), a superconducting gravimeter, tiltmeters or strainmeters beneath the telescope pier, and nearby borehole or groundwater monitoring can all provide independent constraints on local vertical motion, hydrological loading, and small-scale mass redistribution at the site. In the observation model these data inform priors on the station coordinates and local gravity field and help disentangle truly global signatures in $R_{2w}(t)$ and $v_r(t)$ from slowly varying, site-specific effects. A superconducting gravimeter in particular can track local gravity changes at the 10^{-11} g level on timescales from minutes to years, which is directly relevant for separating long-period tidal signals and hydrological loading from the relativistic and interior-physics parameters entering $R_{\text{geom}}(t; \theta)$ in Eq. (1). While such ancillary sensors are not required to meet the single-window precision targets in Table IV, they would substantially strengthen the robustness of global fits that combine multi-decade AM-CW LLR with other geophysical data sets and tie the station cleanly into the broader International Terrestrial Reference Frame (ITRF) and Earth-rotation frameworks.

Taken together with the thermal, vibrational, atmospheric, and timing controls described above, this geodetic context ensures that observatory- and reference-frame systematics enter the analysis primarily through well-characterized priors on $R_{\text{geom}}(t; \theta)$, rather than as unmodeled contributions to the per-window covariance $C_{ij}(T)$, keeping the station-level error budget consistent with the allocations adopted in Secs. V–VII.

C. Concept of operations

The following concept of operations (CONOPS) is envisioned:

- *Point and acquire:* slew the telescope to the nominal reflector position; acquire at low power; close pointing by maximizing the return amplitude in a short integration (sub-second).
- *Internal calibration:* run the internal reference continuously; time-align and subtract its phase per tone from the lunar phases; monitor the residual as a function of time and temperature. Operationally, the internal reference

defines the zero of $R_{\text{inst}}(t)$ and transfers most of the internal optical and RF path fluctuations into a common-mode phase that is removed before forming the estimators in Sec. II. The residual instrumental contribution entering $\mathbf{C}_{\text{inst}}(T)$ and (37) is therefore dominated by imperfect tracking of this common mode (finite loop bandwidth, thermal gradients, and calibration offsets); these terms are explicitly allocated at the $\sim 40 \mu\text{m}$ level in Sec. V A 2.

- *Science windows*: transmit the full multi-tone AM pattern; unwrap $\phi(t)$ for each tone. For windows $T = 10, 30, 100$ s, compute the mean phase on the precision tone \rightarrow two-way range and the linear phase slope \rightarrow one-way range-rate; integrate across multiple windows to form normal points suitable for LLR analysis. In parallel, record $f_m(t)$ with sufficient resolution to reconstruct the deterministic component of the modulation-frequency history across the ~ 2.56 s round trip, so that the range-rate bias associated with frequency slew [Eq. (23)] can be removed in post-processing.
- *Differential mode*: toggle CCRs A/B every 1–2s when the angular separation θ is $\lesssim 0.1^\circ$; form ΔR and $\Delta \dot{R}$ on the same analysis grid; log θ , elevation, and seeing; use differential observables to constrain interior and tidal models and to suppress atmosphere and station systematics.
- *Quality gates*: enforce elevation $e \geq 30^\circ$; require minimum tone SNR on the precision tone; constrain $|\dot{f}_m|$ via direct measurement; monitor internal-reference residuals; reject windows exhibiting obvious cycle slips, dropouts, or strong background excursions. These gates enforce the per-window bounds on SNR, oscillator drift, internal-reference stability, and elevation that underlie the scalar error budget in Eq. (37) and are made explicit as implementation targets in Sec. VI and Table VI.

Each observing block thus produces a well-defined set of data products: (i) raw phase time series $\phi^{(j)}(t)$ per tone and CCR; (ii) internal reference phase $\phi_{\text{inst}}(t)$; (iii) the recorded modulation-frequency history $f_m(t)$; (iv) environmental telemetry (temperature, pressure, r_0 , τ_0 , θ_0 , wind); and (v) quality flags identifying windows with low SNR, suspected cycle slips, or abnormal instrument behavior. From these, the reduction pipeline constructs calibrated observables $\hat{R}_{2w}(T)$, $\hat{v}_r(T)$, $\Delta \hat{R}_{2w}(T)$, and $\Delta \hat{v}_r(T)$ with associated covariance estimates derived from the equations in Secs. II and V. The implementation gates in Sec. VI are chosen such that each hardware or environmental parameter operates with at least a factor of two margin relative to these allocations. Taken together, these operational steps enforce the variance allocations for $\mathbf{C}_{\text{shot}}(T)$, $\mathbf{C}_{\text{atm}}(T)$, $\mathbf{C}_{\text{inst}}(T)$, $\mathbf{C}_{\text{osc}}(T)$, and $\mathbf{C}_{\text{nl}}(T)$ of Sec. II on each integration window T .

IX. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we developed a complete amplitude-modulated continuous-wave (AM-CW) metrology framework for high-power lunar laser ranging (LLR) built around RF phase measurements on a bright optical carrier [6]. Starting from an explicit model for the modulated transmitted and received signals, we defined two-way range $R_{2w}(T)$ and one-way line-of-sight range-rate $v_r(T)$ as joint estimators on the RF envelope phase and its slope over an integration window T . The observables and their differential counterparts are represented by a covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}(T)$ that is decomposed into photon, atmospheric, instrumental, oscillator, and nonlinearity contributions. This structure connects the AM-CW measurement model directly to global parameter estimation for the Earth-Moon system.

Using realistic photon budgets for a 1 kW, 1064 nm CW transmitter on a 1 m class telescope interrogating 10 cm next-generation CCRs, we showed that the photon-statistical floor for two-way range at $f_m = 1$ GHz is at the level of a few $\times 10 \mu\text{m}$ on $T \sim 10^2$ s windows. In practice, the dominant residuals are atmospheric and instrumental: a representative allocation

$$\sigma_{R,\text{shot}} \simeq 30 \mu\text{m}, \quad \sigma_{R,\text{atm}} \simeq 60 \mu\text{m}, \quad \sigma_{R,\text{inst}} \simeq 40 \mu\text{m},$$

implies a total two-way range precision $\sigma_R \simeq 0.08$ mm in root-sum-square. For range-rate, the same framework yields single-station sensitivities $\sigma_{v_r} \sim 0.1\text{--}1 \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$ on $10^2\text{--}10^3$ s windows when photon noise, atmospheric fluctuations, and residual bench motion are all controlled within their allocations.

To connect these formal error budgets to realistic stations, we grouped the link, turbulence, and metrology assumptions into three representative operating regimes. Case A reproduces a generic 1 kW CW implementation on a conventional 1 m observatory platform, with detected photon rates $\dot{N}_\gamma \simeq (5\text{--}7) \times 10^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and total two-way precision in the 0.32–0.55 mm band, consistent with earlier high-power CW LLR error budgets. Case B represents the dedicated AM-CW facility developed in this work, with $\dot{N}_\gamma \sim (3\text{--}5) \times 10^4 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and an absolute two-way precision $\sigma_R \simeq 80 \mu\text{m}$ when atmospheric and instrumental residuals are held near $60 \mu\text{m}$ and $40 \mu\text{m}$, respectively. Case C is a photon-rich, excellent-seeing regime with $\dot{N}_\gamma \sim 10^5 \text{ s}^{-1}$: once these atmospheric and bench allocations are achieved, increasing the flux mainly provides margin, driving the photon term below $\sim 30 \mu\text{m}$ while leaving the absolute error budget

dominated by the remaining $\sim 30\text{--}80\ \mu\text{m}$ atmospheric and $\sim 40\ \mu\text{m}$ instrumental contributions. In all three regimes the residual neutral atmosphere is modeled with Kolmogorov statistics and modern mapping functions, yielding $\sim 50\text{--}150\ \mu\text{m}$ absolute and $10\text{--}50\ \mu\text{m}$ differential path fluctuations on $T \sim 10\text{--}100\ \text{s}$ windows that are explicitly carried in $C_{ij}(T)$ rather than treated as ad hoc margins.

We also quantified the benefits of differential AM–CW LLR between nearby CCRs. For separations $\theta \lesssim 0.1^\circ$ and a 1–2 s toggling cadence, common-mode station and atmospheric terms cancel strongly in both range and range-rate. With the same photon budgets, the remaining contributions from shot noise and differential turbulence can be held at the tens-of-micrometers level, leading to $\sigma_{\Delta R_{2w}} \sim 20\text{--}50\ \mu\text{m}$ and $\sigma_{\Delta v_r} \sim \text{few} \times (0.1\text{--}1)\ \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$ on $T \sim 10^2\text{--}10^3\ \text{s}$ windows. These differential observables are the cleanest from the standpoint of station systematics and provide powerful constraints on the spatial structure of the lunar tidal response and local interior properties.

The covariance decomposition $C_{ij}(T)$ is translated into concrete implementation gates on the station hardware and concept of operations. A hydrogen maser (or equivalent ultra-stable reference) keeps the oscillator contribution at the few-micrometer level in range and well below $1\ \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$ in range-rate. Internal referencing through a short metrology path removes most optical and RF bench drift, with the residual instrumental variance allocated at the $\sim 40\ \mu\text{m}$ level. Site selection, elevation cuts, and turbulence monitoring bound the atmospheric term in the scalar budget, while multi-tone synthetic wavelengths and strict AM-to-PM constraints limit coherent nonlinear biases to $\lesssim 25\ \mu\text{m}$. Together, these implementation gates define a realistic path from an initial $\sim 0.2\text{--}0.5\ \text{mm}$ regime to a mature $\sim 0.05\text{--}0.10\ \text{mm}$ regime in single-station two-way range.

From a science perspective, sub-0.1 mm absolute range and tens-of- μm differential range substantially extend the reach of LLR. For very low-frequency gravitational waves, the simple estimate $h_{\min} \sim 2\sigma_R/L_{\text{EM}}$ implies a per-normal-point strain sensitivity $h_{\min} \sim 5 \times 10^{-13}$ at $\sigma_R \simeq 0.1\ \text{mm}$, with further gains from coherent integration in the μHz band. Comparable improvements apply to tests of the weak equivalence principle, possible variations of G , and post-Newtonian parameters, as well as to constraints on lunar Love numbers, tidal Q , and the size and state of the lunar core. Differential AM–CW LLR between multiple next-gen CCRs is particularly well-matched to detecting small shifts in libration amplitudes, precession, and local tidal deformation that encode the deep lunar interior.

In summary, high-power AM–CW LLR with kW-class transmitters, GHz-class modulation, and continuous internal metrology provides a technically credible path to $\sim 0.1\ \text{mm}$ absolute ranging, $\sim 0.1\text{--}1\ \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$ range-rate, and tens-of- μm differential performance. The framework presented here links these performance bands to explicit subsystem requirements and a concrete observatory concept of operations, and it provides observation-level covariances suitable for global parameter estimation. Implementing such a station would move LLR into a new regime of precision tests of relativistic gravitation, deep lunar interior science, and low-frequency gravitational-wave searches in the μHz band, with direct relevance to future lunar exploration and navigation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work described here was carried out at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, under a contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

-
- [1] J. O. Dickey, P. L. Bender, J. E. Faller, X. X. Newhall, R. L. Ricklefs, J. G. Ries, P. J. Shelus, C. Veillet, A. L. Whipple, J. R. Wiant, J. G. Williams, and C. F. Yoder, Lunar Laser Ranging: A Continuing Legacy of the Apollo Program, *Science* **265**, 482 (1994).
 - [2] T. W. Murphy Jr., E. G. Adelberger, J. B. R. Battat, L. N. Carey, C. D. Hoyle, P. LeBlanc, E. L. Michelsen, K. Nordtvedt, A. E. Orin, J. D. Strasburg, C. W. Stubbs, H. E. Swanson, and E. Williams, The Apache Point Observatory Lunar Laser-ranging Operation: Instrument Description and First Detections, *PASP* **120**, 20 (2008).
 - [3] T. W. Murphy, Lunar laser ranging: the millimeter challenge, *Rep. Progr. Phys.* **76**, 076901 (2013).
 - [4] J. G. Williams, S. G. Turyshev, and D. H. Boggs, Progress in Lunar Laser Ranging Tests of Relativistic Gravity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 261101 (2004).
 - [5] J. G. Williams, S. G. Turyshev, and D. H. Boggs, Lunar laser ranging tests of the equivalence principle with the Earth and Moon, *CQG* **29**, 184004 (2012).
 - [6] S. G. Turyshev, Lunar laser ranging with high-power continuous-wave lasers, *Phys. Rev. Applied* **23**, 064066 (2025), [arXiv:2502.02796 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#).
 - [7] S. G. Turyshev, High-Precision Lunar Corner-Cube Retroreflectors: A Wave-Optics Perspective (2025), [arXiv:2504.06409 \[physics.optics\]](#).
 - [8] S. G. Turyshev, M. Shao, and I. Hahn, [Fundamental physics and lunar science investigations with advanced lunar laser ranging](#) (2021), NAS Decadal Survey on Biological and Physical Sciences (BPS) Research in Space 2023-2032.

- [9] M. Zhang, J. Müller, L. Biskupek, and V. V. Singh, Characteristics of differential lunar laser ranging, *Astron. Astrophys.* **659**, A148 (2022).
- [10] M. Zhang, J. Müller, and L. Biskupek, Advantages of combining Lunar Laser Ranging and Differential Lunar Laser Ranging, *Astron. Astrophys.* **681**, A5 (2024).
- [11] M. Zhang, *Characteristics and Benefits of Differential Lunar Laser Ranging*, *Ph.D. thesis*, Leibniz University, Hannover (2023).
- [12] A. Briaud, C. Ganino, A. Fienga, A. Mémin, and N. Rambaux, The lunar solid inner core and the mantle overturn, *Nature* **617**, 743 (2023).
- [13] D. Blas and A. C. Jenkins, Bridging the μHz Gap in the Gravitational-Wave Landscape with Binary Resonances, *PRL* **128**, 101103 (2022).
- [14] D. Blas and A. C. Jenkins, Detecting stochastic gravitational waves with binary resonance, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 064021 (2022).
- [15] D. Blas, A. C. Jenkins, and S. G. Turyshev, *Gravitational-wave discovery with lunar and satellite laser ranging*, White paper (NASA Fundamental Physics and Gravitation (FunPAG), 2024) dated 4 March 2024.
- [16] S. G. Turyshev, J. G. Williams, D. H. Boggs, and R. S. Park, Relativistic Time Transformations Between the Solar System Barycenter, Earth, and Moon, *Astrophys. J.* **985**, 140 (2025), [arXiv:2406.16147 \[astro-ph.EP\]](#).
- [17] S. G. Turyshev, High-Precision Relativistic Time Scales for Cislunar Navigation (2025), [arXiv:2507.22145 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [18] P. E. Ciddor, Refractive index of air: new equations for the visible and near infrared, *Applied Optics* **35**, 1566 (1996).
- [19] V. B. Mendes and E. C. Pavlis, High-accuracy zenith delay prediction at optical wavelengths, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **31**, L14602 (2004).
- [20] A. E. Niell, Global mapping functions for the atmosphere delay at radio wavelengths, *JGR: Solid Earth* **101**, 3227 (1996).
- [21] J. Böhm, A. E. Niell, P. Tregoning, and H. Schuh, Global Mapping Function (GMF): A new empirical mapping function based on numerical weather model data, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **33**, L07304 (2006).
- [22] J. W. Goodman, *Statistical Optics* (Wiley, New York, 1985).
- [23] S. M. Kay, *Fundamentals of Statistical Signal Processing, Volume I: Estimation Theory* (Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1993).
- [24] D. C. Rife and R. R. Boorstyn, Single-tone parameter estimation from discrete-time observations, *IEEE Transact. Inform. Theory* **20**, 591 (1974).
- [25] V. I. Tatarskii, *Wave Propagation in a Turbulent Medium* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1961).
- [26] L. C. Andrews and R. L. Phillips, *Laser Beam Propagation through Random Media*, 2nd ed. (SPIE Press, Bellingham, WA, 2005).
- [27] F. Roddier, The effects of atmospheric turbulence in optical astronomy, in *Progr. in Optics, Volume 19*, edited by E. Wolf (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981) pp. 281–376.
- [28] J. G. Williams, S. G. Turyshev, and T. W. Murphy, Improving LLR Tests of Gravitational Theory, *IJMPD* **13**, 567 (2004).
- [29] J. G. Williams, S. G. Turyshev, and D. H. Boggs, Lunar Laser Ranging Tests of the Equivalence Principle with the Earth and Moon, *IJMPD* **18**, 1129 (2009).
- [30] D. W. Allan, Statistics of Atomic Frequency Standards, *Proc. of the IEEE* **54**, 221 (1966).
- [31] J. J. Degnan, Millimeter accuracy laser ranging: a review, *Proc. of the IEEE* **81**, 1833 (1993).
- [32] D. Currie, S. Dell’Agnello, and G. O. D. Monache, A Lunar Laser Ranging Retroreflector Array for the 21st Century, *Acta Astronautica* **68**, 667 (2011).

Appendix A: Atmospheric turbulence and time averaging

We model residual atmospheric path fluctuations as a zero-mean random process $\delta R_{\text{atm}}(t)$ with a Kolmogorov optical-path structure function

$$D_R(\tau) \equiv \langle [\delta R_{\text{atm}}(t + \tau) - \delta R_{\text{atm}}(t)]^2 \rangle \simeq D_0 \left(\frac{\tau}{\tau_0} \right)^{5/3}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where τ_0 is a characteristic coherence time and D_0 sets the short-time amplitude. For an estimator that averages over an interval $T \gg \tau_0$, the relevant quantity for the range covariance $\mathbf{C}_{\text{atm}}(T)$ is the variance of the time-averaged path

$$\bar{R}_{\text{atm}}(T) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta R_{\text{atm}}(t) dt. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Expressing $\text{Var}[\bar{R}_{\text{atm}}(T)]$ in terms of the covariance $B_R(\tau)$ or $D_R(\tau)$ and using the power-law behaviour (A1) yields the familiar scaling

$$\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}^2(T) \equiv \text{Var}[\bar{R}_{\text{atm}}(T)] \simeq K_R^2 \frac{\tau_0}{T}, \quad T \gg \tau_0, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where K_R is an effective amplitude that absorbs the details of D_0 , elevation, and site-dependent turbulence parameters. In our covariance description we represent this contribution as

$$\mathbf{C}_{\text{atm}}(T) = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{R,\text{atm}}^2(T) & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_{v_r,\text{atm}}^2(T) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_{v_r,\text{atm}}(T) \simeq \frac{\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T)}{T}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

where the range-rate variance scaling follows from interpreting v_r as a slope estimated over the same interval T .

For differential LLR we require the statistics of the path difference between two closely separated lines of sight, with zenith-angle separation $\theta \ll 1$ rad. Let $\delta R_{\text{atm}}^{(1)}$ and $\delta R_{\text{atm}}^{(2)}$ denote the two paths, and define the differential quantity $\Delta R_{\text{atm}} = \delta R_{\text{atm}}^{(1)} - \delta R_{\text{atm}}^{(2)}$. For small separations the spatial correlation can be written in terms of an isoplanatic angle θ_0 , so that the differential variance of the time-averaged path obeys

$$\sigma_{\Delta R,\text{atm}}^2(T, \theta) \equiv \text{Var}[\overline{\Delta R}_{\text{atm}}(T)] \simeq K_{\Delta R}^2 \left(\frac{\theta}{\theta_0} \right)^{5/3} \frac{\tau_0}{T}, \quad \theta \ll \theta_0, \quad T \gg \tau_0, \quad (\text{A5})$$

with $K_{\Delta R}$ an effective amplitude that may differ slightly from K_R . This scaling captures the key behavior: differential atmospheric noise is suppressed both by time averaging ($\propto T^{-1}$) and by keeping reflector separations within the atmospheric isoplanatic path ($\propto \theta^{5/3}$). In the differential covariance matrix for the 4-component estimator $y_{\Delta} = (\Delta R_{2w}, \Delta v_r, R_{2w}^{\text{ref}}, v_r^{\text{ref}})^{\text{T}}$, Eq. (A5) determines the ΔR_{2w} entry and, through an analogous $\sigma_{\Delta v_r,\text{atm}}(T) \simeq \sigma_{\Delta R,\text{atm}}(T, \theta)/T$, the corresponding differential range-rate term.

For illustration, at a site with $r_0 \simeq 10$ cm at 500 nm ($r_0 \simeq 25$ cm at 1064 nm), $\tau_0 \simeq 5$ ms, and isoplanatic angle $\theta_0 \simeq 1^\circ$, Eq. (A3) with K_R chosen to match existing mm-class LLR experience yields $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T) \sim (5\text{--}10) \times 10^{-5}$ m for $T = 30\text{--}100$ s. For $\theta \simeq 0.05^\circ$ and 1–2 s toggling, Eq. (A5) then gives $\sigma_{\Delta R,\text{atm}}(T, \theta) \sim 10\text{--}30$ μm , consistent with the atmospheric and differential allocations in Table IV.

As a cross-check, we have verified the consistency of the analytic scalings with a simple Monte Carlo experiment in which synthetic time series of path fluctuations are generated with a Kolmogorov power spectrum, sampled on representative integration windows, and processed through the same averaging and slope estimators used in the main text. The recovered distributions of range and range-rate uncertainties reproduce the predicted $\sigma_{R,\text{atm}}(T) \propto T^{-1/2}$ and $\sigma_{v_r,\text{atm}}(T) \propto T^{-3/2}$ behaviour and fall within the target bands for the adopted site parameters, confirming that the atmospheric contribution to the covariance matrix can be modelled reliably at the design level.