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• Fundamental processes (planetesimal formation, planet formation, migration,....)
• Origin of the most common properties of planetary systems.
THREE STEPS TO PLANET ACCRETION:
1) Dust coagulation, sedimentation and drift

Weindenschilling, 1977

Graph showing velocity vs. particle diameter.
Aggregate-aggregate collisions: results

A mm-size bouncing barrier for silicates
For icy particles, better sticking properties -> cm-dm.
Scenario supported by the analysis of undifferentiated meteorites, which show that planetesimals are aggregates of ~mm-size particles (chondrules, CAIs,....)
THREE STEPS TO PLANET ACCRETION:
2) Planetesimal formation

Particle clumping in the disk due to
1) Sedimentation on the mid-plane: Kelvin Helmholtz instability (Johansen et al., 2006)
2) Radial drift: streaming instability (Youdin and Goodman, 2005)

Example of clumping due to settling (Johansen et al., 2006)
Dust clumps generated in these instabilities can contract under their own gravity and form planetesimals of typical sizes of \(~100\) km.

All problems solved? Not really

The streaming instability can be triggered only if the average particle/gas mass ratio \(Z\) is larger than some threshold, typically a few \(x\) solar (1%).

Dust needs to pile-up somewhere in the disk before the streaming instability can operate.
Up to recently, solids pile-up has been shown to happen near the snowline (Ida and Guillot, 2016; Schoonenberg and Ormel, 2017; Drazkowska and Alibert, 2017)

This is in sharp contradiction with cosmochemical evidence, showing that early planetesimals formed at least at two distinct locations (iron meteorites CC and NC)
The silicate sublimation line can behave similarly, leading to the formation of a second ring of planetesimals, rocky and near the star. 

Morbidelli et al., 2022
• Planetesimals can collide with each other building protoplanets (Kokubo and Ida, 1996, 1998)
• The largest planetesimals keep growing by accreting individual dust particles as they drift in the gas (pebble accretion: Johansen and Lacerda, 2010; Ormel and Klahr, 2010; Murray-Clay et al., 2011; Lambrechts and Johansen, 2012; Ida et al., 2016)
The “Safronov number”: scattering vs accretion

- Ratio of escape speed from planet’s surface to escape speed from system at planet’s orbital radius

\[
\theta^2 \equiv \left( \frac{GM}{R_p} \right) \left( \frac{r}{GM_*} \right) \\
= 10 \left( \frac{m}{M_J} \right) \left( \frac{M_\odot}{M_*} \right) \left( \frac{R_J}{R_p} \right) \left( \frac{r}{5 \text{ AU}} \right)
\]
The “Safronov number”: scattering vs accretion

- $\text{Saf} > 1$: high-mass or distant planets, scattering is preferred
- $\text{Saf} < 1$: low-mass or close-in planets, accretion is preferred

\[ \theta^2 = \left( \frac{Gm}{R_p} \right) \left( \frac{r}{GM_*} \right) = 10 \left( \frac{m}{M_J} \right) \left( \frac{M_*}{M_\odot} \right) \left( \frac{R_J}{R_p} \right) \left( \frac{r}{5 \text{ AU}} \right) \]
Even with a large $\Sigma$ it is difficult to form bodies more massive than the threshold turning $S_a > 1$

At 5 AU the escape velocity from the Sun is 19 km/s. This is the escape speed from the surface of a planet of a 5 Earth-mass planet.
Two big advantages of pebble-accretion over planetesimal-planetesimal accretion:
I) No isolation
Two big advantages of pebble-accretion over planetesimal-planetesimal accretion:

II) Larger accretion cross-section

\[ r_B = \frac{GM_c}{\Delta v^2} \]

relative speed

Of course, for pebble-accretion to be effective a large enough flux of pebbles through the disk is needed.... If this is the case, then giant planet cores can form within the disk’s lifetime (Lambrechts et al., 2014)
Planet formation by planetesimal/pebble accretion can be complemented by:
I) a phase of giant impacts
Planet formation by planetesimal/pebble accretion can be complemented by:

II) accretion of a gas envelope

Growth of $M_c$ is prescribed

Gas envelope in hydrostatic equilibrium

No hydrostatic equilibrium possible: runaway gas accretion

Pollack et al. (1996)
An alternative giant planet formation mode: Disk instability

- Requires a region in the disk to be Toomre unstable

\[ Q \equiv \frac{c_s \Omega}{\pi G \Sigma} < Q_{\text{crit}} \approx 1 \]
An alternative giant planet formation mode: Disk instability

Mayer & Quinn (2016)
Planet Migration
Migration of small planets (Type-I)

The outer wake trails the planet

The inner wake leads the planet

The outer wake exerts a negative torque on the planet

The inner wake exerts a positive torque on the planet

The outer wake usually wins: inward migration
Type-I migration in brief

The migration speed is proportional to

→ The planet mass $M$

→ The surface density of the disk $\Sigma$

→ The inverse square of the disk’s aspect ratio: $(r/H)^2$

\[ \frac{dh_p}{dt} \sim M \left(\frac{r}{H}\right)^2 \Sigma r \]

(h$_p$ is the specific ang. mom. of the planet)

where all quantities are evaluated at the planet’s location

• *The migration speed is independent of the disk’s viscosity*
How a massive planet sculpts the disk: gap opening

The planet accelerates the outer disk and pushes it forward and decelerates the inner disk and pushes it inwards. If the force exerted by the planet overcomes the internal (viscous) disk forces, a gap opens.
Massive planets and gap opening

The planet accelerates the outer disk and pushes it forward and decelerates the inner disk and pushes it inwards. If the force exerted by the planet overcomes the internal (viscous) disk forces, a gap opens.
The effect of the gap on planet migration

**TYPE II MIGRATION**

The planet is repelled
→ outwards by the inner disk
→ inwards by the outer disk.

It is locked in the middle of the gap, and can not migrate with respect to the gas of the disk anymore.

But the disk falls onto the star (accretion), driving the planet inwards. Hence, the migration rate $v_{r,pl}$ should be equal to $v_{r,gas} = -3/2 \nu/r$ (independent of $\Sigma$ and $M_{pl}$)
Part II: 
Origin and evolution of extrasolar planet systems
Planet mass (Jupiter masses)
Semi major axis (\textit{ua})

- **Hot Jupiters**
- **Warm Jupiters**
- **Super-Earths/Neptune-like**
- **Distant Jupiters**
Giant planets
Gravitational instability: the direct imaged “planets” are the best candidates
Clumps formed by disk instability migrate inward rapidly

Core accretion: all other giant planets are the best candidates
Growth tracks with pebble accretion and migration

Migration remains a main issue

Bitsch et al 2015
Eccentricity distribution (giants)
Planet-planet scattering during a giant planet instability is considered to be the best explanation for the eccentricity distribution of the (surviving) planets.

Credit: S. Raymond
Planet-planet scattering during a giant planet instability is considered to be the best explanation for the eccentricity distribution of the (surviving) planets.
Planet-planet scattering during a giant planet instability is considered to be the best explanation for the eccentricity distribution of the (surviving) planets.

...and also for some distant planets.
Survivors of planet-planet scattering match the eccentricity distribution

To fit eccentricity distribution, 75-95% of giant exoplanet systems must be survivors of instability
(Juric & Tremaine 2008; Chatterjee et al 2008; Raymond et al 2010)

Raymond et al (2009)
Highest-mass planets have highest eccentricities: opposite for planet-planet scattering

Raymond et al (2010)
Solution: massive planets form in ~equal-mass systems

Raymond et al (2010)
Giant planet scattering is bad for the formation of terrestrial planets.
Origins of hot Jupiters

1. Inward migration
2. Tidal circularization of eccentric planets
3. In-situ growth

For details see Dawson & Johnson (2018; Annual Reviews of Astron. & Astrophys.)
Giant exoplanets

- Tidal circularization
- Planet-planet scattering
- Orbital migration
- Hot Jupiters (~1% of stars)

Wright et al. 2011
Reasons to prefer planet-planet scattering as the dominant mechanism:

Reasons to prefer planet-planet scattering as the dominant mechanism:

- Many hot Jupiters have high orbital inclinations relative to the stellar equatorial plane.
Scattering + tidal friction

Beaugé & Nesvorny (2012)
Pl-pl scattering and tidal circularization

Naturally produces misaligned hot Jupiters from scattering

Other source of eccentricity (e.g., secular chaos, Kozai mechanism) possible (e.g., Fabrycky & Tremaine 2007; Wu & Lithwick 2011)

Beaugé & Nesvorny (2012)
Migration

Can only produce misaligned hot Jupiters if the disk itself is tilted with respect to the stellar equator.

Batygin (2012)
In-situ growth of hot Jupiters?

If disks are primordially tilted, why not?

(E.g., early growth of large cores by collisions of fast-growing super-Earths near inner edge of disk)

Batygin (2012); Batygin et al (2016)
Super-Earths: formation models
Because Icy-pebbles should be bigger than silicate pebbles, p.a. should produce SE predominantly beyond the SL

Formation by pebble accretion

Morbidelli et al., 2015
Ida et al., 2016

The diagram shows the relationship between eccentricity and semi-major axis (AU) with mass (Earth Mass) as a color gradient. The inner edge of the disk and the snowline are indicated by vertical dashed lines.

- **Eccentricity**
  - Y-axis ranging from 0.00 to 1.00
- **Semi-major Axis (AU)**
  - X-axis ranging from 0.5 to 30
- **Mass (Earth Mass)**
  - Color gradient from blue to red indicating mass variations.
Problem: pebble accretion implies that all super-Earths should be icy.

Because icy pebbles are bigger, seeds beyond the SL grow much faster and migrate inwards.
This contrasts with the observation that many Super-Earths are rocky.
Back to the classic growth model
Two rings of planetesimals and planetesimal-planetesimal collisions

Morbidelli et al., 2022

(a) Planetesimals @ snowline (~30 M_E)
Planetesimals @ silicate line (~2 M_E)

mass in icy planetesimals (M_{Earth})

Heliocentric distance (au)

mass in rocky planetesimals (M_{Earth})

$\alpha_{min}$

- $1 \times 10^{-3}$
- $5 \times 10^{-4}$
- $2.5 \times 10^{-4}$
- $1 \times 10^{-4}$

lower viscosity
metallicity = 2 x solar
metallicity = solar
metallicity = 1/2 solar
Back to the classic growth model
Two rings of planetesimals and planetesimal-planetesimal collisions

Batygin and Morbidelli, 2022
Back to the classic growth model
Two rings of planetesimals and planetesimal-planetesimal collisions

The advantage is that we reproduce naturally the peas-in-the-pot pattern

Notice the mass-period correlation. Systems with small masses in the rocky ring don’t produce planets massive enough to migrate substantially

Batygin and Morbidelli, 2022
Take-away points

• Hydrodynamical instabilities in the gas-dust disk lead to self gravitating dust clumps which then contract forming planetesimals
• Planetesimal-planetesimal collisions (in the inner part of the disk) and pebble accretion (in the outer part) promote some planetesimals to become solid proto-planets
• Giant impacts among proto-planets and gas accretion may complement the planet formation process
• Planet migration is a pain in the neck for all theorists.....
• Giant planets usually form multi-planet systems of roughly equal mass, don’t migrate much, become unstable after gas removal, so that only few (~1) remain detectable per system
• Scattering and tidal damping should be the main (but not unique!) mechanism to form Hot Jupiters.
• Low-density super-Earths are likely to be failed giant planets which formed at the snowline and migrated to the inner edge of the disk (mini-Neptunes)
• Rocky super-Earths should have formed from mutual collisions in a massive ring of rocky planetesimals. The competition between the accretion and migration timescale leads to the typical peas-in-the-pot pattern
• Both giant planets and super-Earths form within the lifetime of the disk of gas. The terrestrial planets of the solar system don’t fall in this category. Their analog has not been found yet.
Because of migration, all systems form resonant chains at the end of the disk’s lifetime. But after gas-removal ~ 50% of the systems become unstable.
Before the instability, stable and unstable systems have statistically the same period-ratio distribution, very different from the one observed.
After the instability, systems that went unstable reproduce the observed period-ratio distribution very well.
When we pass our system through a Kepler-survey simulator, reproducing the observed multiplicity distribution requires that 90% of the system became unstable (instead of ~50% as in our simulations – open problem)

NO EVIDENCE FOR SINGLE-PLANET SYSTEMS