

Simulating the Lunar Thermal Environment for the Surface-Deployed LEMS Artemis III TVAC Test

Ethan Burbridge*

Vertex Aerospace, LLC, Grasonville, MD 21638

Juan Rodriguez-Ruiz†

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, 20771

and

Daniel Powers‡

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, 20771

The Lunar Environment Monitoring Station (LEMS) is an autonomous, survive-the-lunar-night seismic suite to be deployed on the Lunar surface by the Artemis III crew and designed to operate continuously for two years. It will see the extremes of the Lunar south pole thermal environment where surface temperatures range from -200°C to $+20^{\circ}\text{C}$ and where nighttime duration is at least 354 hours. Given power and mass constraints, the thermal system is limited to 2.5 Watts of heat during the lunar night. Presented is the system thermal vacuum test plan and configuration to validate the thermal control system performance in a flight-like environment. The test will measure the nighttime heat leaks for the bus and seismometers to ensure lunar night survival and operability.

Acronyms and Nomenclature

BB	=	Broad Band
C&DH	=	Command and Data Handling
DSN	=	Deep Space Network
E_b	=	batter capacity of the LEMS-A3 bus at -30°C or 940.8 Wh
E_{LEMS}	=	energy measurement of the
E_{htr}	=	measured heater power of the GSE bus heater over a nominal Lunar night
E_{0Q}	=	thermal energy flow through the GSE bus harnessing
ΔE_{SP}	=	delta of energy consumed by the SP seismometer RRU compared to the flight unit
ΔE_{BB}	=	delta of energy consumed by the BB seismometer RRU compared to the flight unit
ΔE_{env}	=	additional heat loss expected due to the difference in environment from TVAC to flight
EPS	=	Electrical Power System
GN2	=	Gaseous Nitrogen
GSE	=	Ground Support Equipment
GTP	=	Ground Test Panel
HMS	=	Hibernation Management System
IMLI	=	Integrated Multi-Layer Insulation
LEMS-A3	=	Lunar Environment Monitoring Station – Artemis 3
LN2	=	Liquid Nitrogen
LPT	=	Limited Performance Test
n	=	number of measurement samples with substantially equal time periods
PI	=	Proportional, Integral

* Thermal Engineer, Vertex Aerospace, LLC, and PO BOX 192, Grasonville, MD 21638

† Thermal Principal Design Lead, Thermal Engineering Branch, and 8800 Greenbelt Rd Greenbelt, MD 20771

‡ Thermal Engineer, Thermal Engineering Branch, and 8800 Greenbelt Rd Greenbelt, MD 20771

41	PRT	=	Platinum Resistance Thermometer
42	RRU	=	Risk Reduction Unit
43	SAPP	=	Signal and Power Passthrough
44	SP	=	Short Period
45	T_1	=	temperature at the 0Q heater
46	T_2	=	temperature at the GTP
47	t_{night}	=	nominal length of lunar night per LEMS-A3 requirements at 360 hours
48	σ	=	systematic error of the measurements
49	ϵ	=	random error of the measurements
50	0Q	=	zero heat flow

I. Introduction

THE Lunar Environment Monitoring Station for Artemis 3 (LEMS-A3) is an autonomous remote seismic monitoring station to be deployed to the South Pole region of the Moon via the Artemis 3 crew. The seismic suite consists of two three-axis sondes that will be buried in the lunar regolith to detect seismic events which consist of shallow moonquakes, deep moonquakes, meteoroid impacts, and thermal cycling. LEMS-A3 will be gathering the first seismic data for the region which will inform objectives and requirements for future Lunar South Pole missions. LEMS-A3 includes all systems necessary for remote operation like direct-to-earth communications, solar power generation, battery storage, command and data handling, and thermal control. Figure 1 details the system architecture. Novel to this system is a low-power Hibernation Mode which disables all systems like communications and data processing not related to science gathering or system telemetry. LEMS-A3 will operate in this Hibernation Mode 98.6% of the mission to conserve power. The Hibernation Mode is controlled via the Hibernation Management System (HMS) which nominally operates continuously over the two-year mission. Once every 24 hours, for 20 minutes, HMS will enable the Command and Data Handling card (C&DH) which maintains the operations schedule based on timekeeping in the HMS. During this 20 minute “Awake” period, the C&DH will determine the charge state of the battery and the solar power incident on the solar arrays based on the two sun sensors and enable or disable the Electrical Power System (EPS) as appropriate. Figure 2 pictures the concept of operations which includes at least one monthly, three-hour, direct-to-Earth communications window using the Deep Space Network (DSN) for downloading science data and system telemetry. Additional short-duration, 20-minute, communication windows can be performed using smaller antenna dishes for monitoring system health and uploading mission schedules.




Figure 1: LEMS-A3 Components




Figure 2: LEMS-A3 Concept of Operations

II. Thermal Architecture

Once LEMS is deployed for operations on Lunar South Pole, it is divided into three thermal regions:

1. The superstructure, which is in contact with the lunar surface and with elements directly exposed to the extreme hot and cold lunar environments.
2. The bus structure, which contains components that require tighter temperature control such as electronics and battery, and is thermally isolated from the superstructure and the lunar environment.
3. The seismometers, which are buried below the lunar surface. For the purposes of this paper we won't be considering these components and their environment.

Figure 3 below shows CAD images with and without the Integrated Multi-Layer Insulation (IMLI) to show the distinction between the superstructure and the bus structure. Figure 4 shows how the bus structure is thermally isolated from the superstructure and the external environment [1].




Figure 3: LEMS Bus Structure and Superstructure




Figure 4: Bus Thermal Isolation Design

III. South Pole Lunar Thermal Environment

Current candidate landing locations for Artemis 3 include lunar latitudes between -83.6° and -88.2° . At these latitudes daytime solar angles are shallow at around 10° , and surface temperatures range from $+20^\circ\text{C}$ during the warmest part of the lunar day, and -200°C during the lunar night. Figure 5 below shows thermal environment conditions for our hot lunar day and cold lunar night case. Detailed assumptions on the LEMS lunar thermal environment are detailed in E. Burbridge, J. Rodriguez-Ruiz [1].




Figure 5: Thermal Environment Boundary Conditions for Hot and Cold Balance

Figure 6 shows the temperature contour map of the lunar surface around LEMS around noon time, which varies due to localized reflection and shadowing effects. The IMLI is hidden to show the internal component temperatures. Figure 7 and Figure 8 show how the components mounted internal on the bus structure and external on the superstructure respond thermally over the course of a full lunation.




Figure 6: (left) Hot operational temperature plot at solar noon with 5° inclination.
(right) Cold operational temperature plot during lunar night.




Figure 7: Bus Structure Component Temperatures over a Lunation




Figure 8: Superstructure Component Temperatures over a Lunation

IV. TVAC Test Plan and Configuration

A. Test Setup

LEMS-A3 will undergo a system level thermal vacuum test at NASA Goddard Space Flight Center to qualify it for spaceflight. The lunar thermal environment will be simulated with a variety of high emissivity panels which are cooled with GN2/LN2 flow, and heated with a variety of heaters installed to achieved desired warm temperatures. For the radiator and solar array cryopanel, Z307 black coated open-cell honeycomb panels were used. This was done to obtain a consistently high emissivity of about 0.98 and increase the sink's heat transfer effectiveness [2]. Figure 9 shows the CAD image of our TVAC configuration, and Figure 10 the TVAC test block diagram.




Figure 9: TVAC Test Configuration

Pictures of as-built TVAC config (to be included in Final Submission)




Figure 10: TVAC Thermal Block Diagram

B. Test Profile and Objectives

With the test configuration shown the goals of the system level TVAC test can be accomplished, which includes simulating the flight-like environments for the hot and cold balance cases as well as achieving more extreme protoflight temperatures for the different plateaus. Figure 11 shows the test profile along with a list of the major plateaus and objectives accomplished.




Figure 11: TVAC Test Profile

C. Methods to Expedite the Test

LEMS is designed to keep the bus structure thermally isolated from the lunar environment. This requirement is driven by the need to survive on battery power alone for about 15 Earth days in the cold lunar night environment without any energy source such as solar or nuclear power. The system heat leak is about 1.5 W, which represents a very low heat transfer to mass ratio, and therefore an extremely slow temperature cooling rate. Based on preliminary analysis, as can be appreciated in Figure 12, this results in over a week to cool the internal bus components from a warm operating temperature of 50°C down to -30°C, which is prohibitive within the limited time constraints of a TVAC test.

To accelerate the hot to cold transitions, a technique is used where the TVAC chamber is partially backfilled with enough cold GN2 to short the MLI [2] and introduce a significant component of free convection to cool down the test article. For this accelerated transitioned the flight hardware is powered off to accelerate the cooling effect and to avoid the risk of any electronic damage due to arcing when crossing the corona pressure region. A test Kapton film heater was installed on the bus structure to keep the flight hardware from going below cold temperature limits during




Figure 12: Temperature transition estimates in high-vacuum environment

these transitions. This bus GSE heater also facilitates over-driving the transitions during the unpowered cool downs and shortens the long thermal balance asymptote by catching the hardware at a lower temperature with this heater, and then powering up LEMS and raising the heater setpoint using PI controls.

This technique was tested on January 2026 during our TVAC checkout test. The TVAC checkout test included all of the TVAC GSE hardware showing in the previous section plus the LEMS TRL-6 development unit, which had a similarly built IMLI covering the bus structure. The effectiveness of the partial GN₂ backfill was assessed by measuring both the heater power to hold temperature and the cooldown rate of the mass within the IMLI at various chamber pressure levels. Figure 13 plots the heater power vs. pressure to hold the test article at -20°C with diminishing returns in improvements above 0.1 torr. Figure 14 shows the cool down rate over the course of 1 hr and shows dramatic improvements when using this technique to accelerate hot to cold transitions during TVAC. Based on the results from this test a pressure range between 0.3 and 0.5 torr was chosen for the system level TVAC test.




Figure 13: Heater Power vs. GN2 backfill pressure




Figure 14: Temperature drop vs. time for high-vacuum and 0.5 torr pressure

D. Test GSE for Thermal Stability

Figure 15 lays out the test GSE used to measure heat flows during thermal balance. The test is configured to minimize or measure non-flight heat losses to ensure accurate measurements of heat flows for nighttime energy consumption predictions. The elements of this GSE are the LEMS-A3 flight hardware, bus GSE heater, and the Ground Test Panel (GTP) 0Q heater.




Figure 15: Thermal Balance Ground Support Equipment (to be updated for Final Submission)

The flight hardware, including the Short Period (SP) and Broad Band (BB) seismometers is powered via an external power supply during thermal balances. The Keysight N6761A power supply was selected for its accurate supply and measurement capabilities. The LEMS-A3 bus will be configured into hibernation mode for the cold balance. The seismometer environment will be set so that the internal heater will not cycle and the only power consumption in the SP and BB seismometers are the electronics in standby.

The bus GSE heater is installed onto the bus structure to replace the bang-bang-controlled flight heater in TVAC testing in order to reduce signal noise during the balance measurements. The GSE heater is PI controlled by a Lakeshore 336. A Keithley DMM7510 monitors the power supplied to the GSE heater.

The OQ heater is wrapped around the electrical GSE harnessing used to power and control the LEMS-A3 flight hardware during testing. Because the GSE harnessing is not present in flight, the OQ heater adjusts the temperature of T2 until it matches T1. With zero temperature gradient, little non-flightlike heat loss should leave via the GTP. Four-wire positive resistance thermistors were chose for T1 and T2 to reduce uncertainty in the temperature measurements and gradient.

V. TVAC Analysis Predictions

A. Thermal Balance Stability Criteria Methodology

Given the long lunar night (>360 hours) and TVAC schedule limitations for cold balance (48 hours), a thermal stability methodology was developed to validate Lunar night survivability. Cold operational thermal balance is completed when the predicted nighttime thermal energy loss is less than the LEMS battery capacity at -30°C. The sources of energy loss are detailed in Eq. (1):

$$E_b \geq E_{LEMS} + E_{htr} + E_{0Q} + \Delta E_{SP} + \Delta E_{BB} + \Delta E_{env} + \sum 3\sqrt{\sigma^2 + \epsilon^2} \quad (1)$$

The measured data for each source of energy consumption is power so predictor tools are made to extrapolate the measured power to total nighttime energy. For E_{LEMS} and E_{0Q} , a simple linear regression is sufficient given that those terms reach stability quickly. E_{LEMS} , as the power supply for LEMS during TVAC, is independent of small temperature changes and should be constant during cold balance. E_{0Q} should be zero during the test but uncertainty in the readings of the temperature sensors can result in a small temperature gradient that is calculated from the conductance of the harnessing attached to the GTP. The goodness-of-fit of each regression will be evaluated with the r^2 statistic, an F-test, and residual plots.

ΔE_{SP} and ΔE_{BB} are the difference in energy consumption between the seismometer Risk Reduction Units (RRUs) used in the System TVAC and the flight units being tested separately due to schedule constraints. In System TVAC the seismometers are powered by the power supply referenced by E_{LEMS} . The deltas correct for the differences.

E_{htr} is expected to require a non-linear regression due to the long thermal constant of the LEMS-A3 bus and potential errors in the PI gains for the bus heater. Several regression types will be tried like power or logarithmic to

determine the best fit. Fitness will be evaluated using similar methods to the linear regressions. Additionally, test results will be compared to predictions made by the Thermal Desktop model of the bus.

Because the test results will be used to extrapolate several times longer than the sample period, an accounting of the measurement errors was done to ensure the test would validate lunar night survivability with a confidence of at least three standard deviations. For each energy loss measurement, the error sources are categorized as systematic or random. The systematic errors are derived from errors in measuring equipment often reported by the manufacturer as a three standard deviation value. Systematic error bounds are applied to each measurement and are summed over time, rather than a root sum of the squares, for conservatism. Random errors are signal noise inherent to the measurement and are propagated via the regression statistics. The systematic and random errors are combined via quadrature for the final error bounds. Figure 16 shows the flow of a measurement to prediction.




Figure 16: Measurement Prediction and Error Propagation for One Term of Eq. (3)

There are two types of systematic errors: power and geometric. Power errors are the result of errors in the power supplies and monitors controlling those circuits. Table 1 details the power supplies used in the test and their errors. Eq. (2) is the method for calculating nighttime energy consumption for power supplies that are expected to be stable. Eq. (3) is the method for propagating the systematic error for the 0Q heater.

$$E_{LEMS} = t_{night}IV \quad (2)$$

$$\sigma_{LEMS}, \sigma_{htr} = \frac{t_{night}}{n} \sum^n I * V * \sqrt{\left(\frac{\sigma_I}{I}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\sigma_V}{V}\right)^2} \quad (3)$$

Table 1: Sources of Error in Power Measurements

Energy Sink	Symbol	P/N	Voltage [V]		Current [A]	
			±	%	±	%
LEMS Power Supply	E_{LEMS}	Keysight N6761A	6.00E-03	0.0160%	6.00E-03	0.0160%
GSE Heater	E_{HTR}	Keithley DMM7510	7.00E-06	0.0002%	1.80E-06	0.0050%
SP RRU	ΔE_{SP}	To be updated for final submission				
BB RRU						
SP Flight	ΔE_{BB}					
BB Flight						

The only geometric error is the 0Q heater which is a consequence of the error in the temperature measurements of the Platinum Resistance Thermometers (PRTs). The 0Q is intended to match the temperatures of two PRTs so that no heat will flow along the EGSE harnessing. While the sensors may read zero temperature gradient, each temperature sensor has an error of 0.71°C that can result in an unmeasured temperature gradient and heat flow. There are also errors in the expected harness conductivity, diameter, and length of the GSE harnessing as captured in Table 2. The typical formula for error propagation of multiplicative terms for a 0Q heater results in the ΔT term being a division by

0. Instead, ΔT in the error calculation is assumed to be the range covered by three standard deviations for calculating E_{0Q} . The associated systematic error, σ_{0Q} , is then just the error in the harness thermal conductance.

$$E_{0Q} = t_{night} \frac{kA}{L} (\bar{T}_1 - \bar{T}_2) \quad (4)$$

$$\sigma_{0Q} = t_{night} \frac{kA}{L} \sqrt{\left(\frac{\epsilon_k}{k}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\epsilon_A}{A}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\epsilon_L}{L}\right)^2} \quad (5)$$

Table 2: 0Q Harness Conductance Expected Value and Systematic Error Propagation

AWG	# Wires	Total Area (SAE AS29606B) [3] [mm2]		Material	Conductivity [W/m/K]		Length [m]		Conductance [mW/K]		% Total G
		A	±		k	±	L	±	G	±	
28	12	1.06	0.09	Copper	400	8	0.152	0.013	2.57	0.31	7.9
28	18	1.60	0.13	Copper	400	8	0.152	0.013	3.85	0.47	11.8
28	3	0.27	0.02	Copper	400	8	0.152	0.013	0.64	0.08	2.0
26	9	1.39	0.13	Copper	400	8	0.152	0.013	3.29	0.45	10.1
26	6	0.92	0.09	Copper	400	8	0.152	0.013	2.19	0.30	6.7
24	24	5.78	0.50	Copper	400	8	0.152	0.013	13.85	1.77	42.5
26	12	1.85	0.18	Copper	400	8	0.152	0.013	4.39	0.60	13.5
26	12	1.85	0.18	Constanan	20	0.2	0.152	0.013	0.22	0.03	0.7
32	16	0.51	0.05	Phosphour Bronze	40	0.4	0.152	0.013	0.12	0.02	0.4
26	4	0.62	0.06	Copper	400	8	0.152	0.013	1.46	0.20	4.5
Total Conductance									32.60	4.22	

B. Achieving Thermal Balance

For final submission: a section showing thermal desktop model predictions of the timeline to enter balance using the bus GSE heater. The thermal model is being used to set initial PI gains and estimate the time to enter balance. The heater power regression predictor for Section A is fit to the model data with noise to back test the performance predictor. The model is also used to determine reduction in uncertainty in the bus GSE heater the longer thermal balance goes on.

C. Test Predictions and Deviations from Flight Predictions

1. Thermal Plateau Test Predictions

Figure 17 shows the expected temperatures that will be achieved during cold and hot plateaus. Where possible components are taken to their qualification limits. In some cases like the radio, other components limit the temperatures exercised during the test. In these cases, it is acceptable that the components have achieved the predicted flight temperature $\pm 15^\circ\text{C}$. Other external components like the solar array, course sun sensors, and antennae are unable to achieve their minimum predicted flight temperature because the liquid-nitrogen-cooled radiation sinks cannot get cold enough. These components were taken below flight predicts in a subsystem TVAC test with a cryocooler.




Figure 17: System TVAC Plateau Predictions Compared to Flight Predictions

2. Cold Balance Predictions and Estimated Systematic Error

Subsystem test results and model predictions were compiled to estimate the predicted nighttime energy requirement and the systematic error. Table 3 details the three standard deviation error for the 0Q heater. The differences between the flight model predictions and the TVAC model predictions are presented in Table 4 for the determination of the ΔE_{env} parameter in Eq. (1). The difference in environment between the TVAC chamber and lunar surface is predicted to result in 0.103 W less heat loss in the TVAC test compared to flight. Table 5 compiles all potential error sources for a prediction of the nighttime energy consumption.

Table 3: Expected 0Q Geometric Systematic Error

Description	Symbol	P/N	P/N	Temp. Error	Cond. Error	Total Error
Temperature Gradient [°C]	ΔT	RTX 0118MM	Modicon BMXAMO0410	1.00	-	-
Conductance [W/mmK]	$\frac{kA}{L}$	Table 2		32.60	4.22	-
0Q [W]		-		0.03	0.004	0.037
Nighttime Energy [Wh]	E_{0Q}			11.73	1.52	13.24

Table 4: Difference in Environment between System TVAC Model and Flight Model

Description	Heat Loss Predicts [W]		Delta
	Flight Model	TVAC Model	(TVAC - Flight)
Launch Lock	-0.483	-0.453	0.030
IMLI ($\epsilon^*=0.0028$)	-0.252	-0.229	0.023
Signal and Power Passthrough (SAPP) + Coax	-0.461	-0.414	0.047
Heat Switch (JPL)	-0.458	-0.456	0.002
Bus Heat Loss	-1.654	-1.551	0.103
Bus Internal Electronics CBE Heat	1.082	1.082	0.000
Bus Heater (GSE Heater) Power	0.578	0.475	-0.103
Total Internal Electronics Power	1.660	1.557	-0.103
SEIS-SP As-Measured Power	0.330	0.330	0.000
SEIS-BB As-Measured Power	0.330	0.330	0.000
Total LEMS Power Consumption	2.320	2.217	-0.103

Table 5: Predicted LEMS-A3 System Energy Consumption during Lunar Nighttime with Systematic Error

Energy Sink	Power [W]			Predicted Energy [Wh]	
	Source	P	σ	E	σ
LEMS Power Supply	Test	1.380	2.1E-02	496.8	7.4E+00
GSE Heater	Predict	0.475	3.1E-09	171.0	1.1E-06
SP Flight - RRU	Test	0.180		64.8	
BB Flight - RRU	Test	0.180		64.8	
Change in Env.	Predict	0.103	0.0E+00	37.1	0.0E+00
OQ Heater	Predict	0.000	3.7E-02	0.0	1.3E+01
Totals		2.318	4.2E-02	834.5	1.5E+01

Testing of the flight battery has measured the energy capacity at -30°C is 940.8 Wh. Including systematic errors, the maximum predicted energy consumption for a nominal lunar night including systematic errors set at three standard deviations is 849.5 Wh. This leaves 121.3 Wh to account for random errors from sensor noise. The level of random error from sensor noise will not be known until the test is conducted but this margin should be sufficient. Thermal balance will be concluded when the measured power plus systematic and random errors is less than the battery capacity.

VI. Conclusion

The TVAC test profile to qualify the LEMS-A3 lunar surface deployed instrument for spaceflight was discussed. The TVAC test setup is designed to simulate environments representative of a hot solar noon case and a cold lunar night case. Externally mounted components on the superstructure won't be achieving the cold extreme temperatures of around -200°C due to the coldest test environment temperature limited by LN2 at around -180°C . Transitions to cold temperatures are exceptionally challenging given how well isolated the bus structure components are from the external environment. A technique was demonstrated to perform a partial cold GN2 backfill to 0.5 torr in order to accelerate hot to cold transitions and facilitate achievement of cold balance. This technique is expected to reduce cooldown transition from about one week to about one day. The cold lunar night case is critical for qualifying that LEMS is able to survive the lunar night for at least 15 Earth days. The methodology to achieve adequate stability criteria was developed and is expected to have adequate margin to account for random error in the signal noise. The additional margin is also available to shorten the time it takes to enter thermal balance.

Acknowledgments

The authors of this paper would like to acknowledge the LEMS-A3 project for financial support and the technicians for their efforts in building LEMS and preparing for thermal testing.

References

- [1] E. Burbridge and J. Rodriguez-Ruiz, "Artemis 3 Lunar Environment Monitoring Station (LEMS-A3) Thermal Control Subsystem Architecture," in *International Conference on Environmental Systems*, 383, Prague, Czech Republic, 2025.
- [2] D. Gilmore, *Spacecraft Thermal Control Handbook Vol I: Fundamental Technologies*, El Segundo, CA: AIAA The Aerospace Press, 2000.
- [3] SAE International Technical Standard, *Wire, Electrical, Stranded, Uninsulated Copper, Copper Alloy, or Aluminum, or Thermocouple Extension, General Specification for*, SAE Standard AS29606B, SAE, 2021.
- [4] J. & C. E. Tuttle, "Recent NASA/GSFC cryogenic measurements of the total hemispheric emissivity of black surface preparations.," in *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*. 102. 012015., 2015.

Manuscript Submission Checklists

[Note: this page should be deleted before final manuscript submission]

1. First Draft Manuscript checklist

- ☐ File is .docx format
- ☐ Line numbers are visible along the left hand margin
- ☐ Paper number is located in the upper right corner of the headers
- ☐ Conference details are located in the upper left corner of the headers
- ☐ Abstract matches easychair content (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
- ☐ Authors and affiliations match easychair authors (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
- ☐ Title matches easychair title (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
- ☐ Paper length (including references and appendices, but excluding this page) is 15 pages or fewer.
- ☐ All content is included (paper will be rejected if only partially complete)

2. Second Draft Manuscript

Note that Second drafts are only required if your first draft manuscript received one or more scores of 0 or lower. If all scores from reviewers were 1, 2, or 3, please proceed to the final manuscript

- ☐ File is .docx format
- ☐ Line numbers are visible along the left hand margin
- ☐ Paper number is located in the upper right corner of the headers
- ☐ Conference details are located in the upper left corner of the headers
- ☐ Abstract matches easychair content (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
- ☐ Authors and affiliations match easychair authors (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
- ☐ Title matches easychair title (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
- ☐ Paper length (including references and appendices, but excluding this page) is 15 pages or fewer.
- ☐ Changes from the first draft are tracked so reviewers can see where their comments have been addressed.

3. Final Manuscript

- ☐ File is .pdf format
- ☐ Line numbers are removed
- ☐ Paper number is located in the upper right corner of the headers
- ☐ Conference details are located in the upper left corner of the headers
- ☐ Abstract matches easychair content (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
- ☐ Authors and affiliations match easychair authors (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
- ☐ Title matches easychair title (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
- ☐ Paper length (including references and appendices, but excluding this page) is 15 pages or fewer.
- ☐ This page is removed after confirming all content above is included and accurate.