

Lecture 1: Observations of planetary systems

For centuries the study of planet formation essentially amounted to trying to understand how the Solar System formed, but in the last 15–20 years the discovery of large numbers of planets around other stars have revolutionised this field. We are now able to study the Solar System in exquisite detail, but are also able to obtain large number statistics from surveys of exoplanets. In this course we aim to look at planet formation from an astrophysical perspective (rather than a planetary science one), and so will consider both Solar System and exoplanet data in turn. In practice these data are complementary, and a successful theory of planet formation should be able to explain the observed properties of both the Solar System and extra-solar planetary systems.

1 The Solar System

We reside in our own planetary system, and much of what we know about planets and their origin comes from observations of the Solar System. The Solar System comprises the Sun, eight planets, and a large number of smaller bodies (including “dwarf planets”, asteroids, comets, etc.). The eight planets can be divided into three different types:

- **Gas Giants:** Jupiter & Saturn. These planets are massive (hundreds of times more massive than Earth), and are composed primarily of hydrogen and helium. However, they have solid cores ($\sim 10M_{\oplus}$), and by comparison to the Sun are substantially enriched in heavy elements.
- **Ice Giants:** Uranus & Neptune. Composed primarily of heavier molecules, principally H_2O , NH_3 & CH_4 , along with low-mass ($\sim 1M_{\oplus}$) solid cores.
- **Terrestrial Planets:** Earth, Venus, Mars & Mercury. These are low-mass rocky planets, with molten cores.

The dynamical properties of the planets also provide useful clues as to their origin. All eight planets are nearly co-planar (with relative inclinations $< 10^\circ$), and all but Mercury have small (< 0.1) eccentricities. Six of the eight planets rotate in the prograde direction (with respect to their orbits); Venus has retrograde rotation, while Uranus’ rotation axis is inclined by 98° to that of its orbit. The near-perfect co-planarity of the Solar System planets strongly suggests formation from a single rotating disc. (This is the so-called Nebular Hypothesis, first suggested in the 18th century by Kant, Laplace and others.)

If we consider the Solar System’s rotation, we see that the planets account for the majority of the Solar System’s angular momentum. We can estimate the Sun’s angular momentum by assuming that it rotates as a solid body, so

$$J_{\odot} = k^2 M_{\odot} R_{\odot}^2 \Omega_{\odot}, \quad (1)$$

with the constant $k^2 \simeq 0.1$. For a Solar rotation period of 25 days, this gives $J_{\odot} \sim 3 \times 10^{48} \text{ g cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$. By comparison, the orbital angular momenta of Jupiter and Saturn are:

$$J_{\text{Jup}} = M_{\text{Jup}} \sqrt{GM_{\odot} a_{\text{Jup}}} \simeq 2 \times 10^{50} \text{ g cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

$$J_{\text{Sat}} = M_{\text{Sat}} \sqrt{GM_{\odot} a_{\text{Sat}}} \simeq 8 \times 10^{49} \text{ g cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}. \quad (3)$$

The planets therefore account for $> 99\%$ of the total angular momentum of the Solar System, with Jupiter dominating the overall angular momentum budget. By contrast, the planets contain only 0.13% of the total mass of the Solar System.

Radioactive dating of the Solar System is its own sub-field, and is beyond the scope of this course. However, we note in passing that radioactive dating of primitive meteorites (chondrites) measures the age of the Solar System to be 4.57 Gyr . More interesting for understanding planet

formation are the *relative* ages of the various bodies in the Solar System, but this is much more challenging (and subject to significant systematic uncertainties).

Much more detailed discussion of the Solar System is possible, but our focus here is on the astrophysical nature of planet formation. However, even from this simple discussion we can see that planet formation is a very challenging problem. In order to form the Solar System planets, solid bodies must grow from the sub- μm dust grains found in the ISM to Earth-sized objects: an increase of at least 12 orders of magnitude in size, or approximately 40 orders of magnitude in mass. In addition the process(es) of planet formation must efficiently separate mass from angular momentum, and preferentially retain heavy elements.

2 Methods for detecting exoplanets

The first planets detected around a star other than the Sun were the pulsar planets (Wolszczan & Frail 1992), but despite intensive subsequent study only a handful of these unusual objects have been found. The first planet around a main sequence star, 51 Peg b, was discovered by Mayor & Queloz in 1995, using radial velocity observations¹. We now have several different techniques for detecting extra-solar planets, and here we summarize the most successful².

2.1 Direct Imaging

The most straightforward means of detecting exoplanets is via direct imaging. However, the faintness of the planets, and the extreme contrast between the star and planet(s), make it one of the most challenging methods of exoplanet detection. The first direct images of planetary-mass objects around main sequence stars were made by Marois et al. and Kalas et al. in 2008, but to date relatively few direct imaging detections have been made.

At optical wavelengths most of the emission from planets is reflected starlight. A planet of radius R_p at orbital radius a reflects a fraction

$$f = A \frac{\pi R_p^2}{4\pi a^2} = 4.6 \times 10^{-10} \left(\frac{A}{1.0} \right) \left(\frac{R_p}{R_\oplus} \right)^2 \left(\frac{a}{1\text{AU}} \right)^{-2}. \quad (4)$$

Here A is the albedo (typically $A = 0.1$ – 0.5). If we assume that $A = 0.3$ we find that Jupiter reflects $f_{\text{Jup}} \simeq 6 \times 10^{-10}$ of the Sun's luminosity, while Earth reflects $f_\oplus \simeq 1 \times 10^{-10}$. We therefore expect planets to be 22–25 mag fainter than their host stars at optical wavelengths.

This presents two problems: brightness and contrast. Planets around even nearby stars are very faint, and large telescopes are necessary simply to reach the sensitivity required to detect them³. The contrast problem is even more severe. At a distance of 10pc a physical separation of 1AU subtends an angle of $0.1''$, so direct imaging of giant planets requires > 20 mag of dynamic range at sub-arcsecond separations. This can only be achieved by using coronagraphic techniques to block the light from the central star, but even in this case the residual point-spread function (PSF) artefacts can be orders of magnitude brighter than the planetary targets. The most successful method (to date) of overcoming this problem is so-called Angular Differential Imaging, where many images are taken while the sky is allowed to rotate in the image plane. PSF artefacts therefore rotate with respect to the sky, allowing real sources to be identified. Other techniques, such as apodizing phase plates and aperture-masking interferometry, have been successful at infrared wavelengths (where the contrast problem is not so severe), but until recently even the best systems are unable to reduce the stellar emission sufficiently within $\lesssim 0.5''$. To date, therefore, direct imaging detections

¹HD114762b, discovered in 1989 by Latham et al., has a minimum mass ($M_p \sin i$) of $11M_{\text{Jup}}$ and is now sometimes considered the first exoplanet discovery. At the time, however, it was described as a brown dwarf rather than a planet.

²For reasons of space we will not discuss gravitational microlensing or timing methods in detail.

³Detecting a point source of magnitude $V = 26$ requires an integration of ~ 1 hour on an 8m-class telescope.

have largely been limited to luminous (super-Jupiter) planets around nearby ($\lesssim 40\text{pc}$) stars at large ($> 10\text{AU}$) separations. However, the last few years have seen the advent of new instruments [such as the Gemini Planet Imager (GPI), and SPHERE on the VLT] which are capable of resolving planets at separations down to $\sim 0.1''$. Over the next few years these should deliver a complete census of giant ($\gtrsim M_{\text{Jup}}$) planets around nearby stars down to separations $\sim 10\text{AU}$.

2.2 Radial Velocity Searches

Until the launch of the *Kepler* satellite, the method which accounted for the largest number of exoplanet detections uses Doppler spectroscopy to measure stellar radial velocities. In a planetary system the host star undergoes “reflex” motion about the system’s barycentre, and repeated measurements allow planets to be detected via periodic variations in the star’s radial velocity.

If we consider a planet of mass M_p orbiting a star of mass M_* at radius (semi-major axis) a , we can calculate the magnitude of the RV signal. For simplicity, we consider the case of a circular orbit. In the limit $M_p \ll M_*$ the planet’s orbital speed is simply the Keplerian velocity

$$v_K = \sqrt{\frac{GM_*}{a}}, \quad (5)$$

and conservation of momentum requires that $M_*v_* = M_pv_K$. If the orbital angular momentum is inclined at an angle i to the line-of-sight then the stellar radial velocity varies sinusoidally with (half-)amplitude

$$K = v_* \sin i = \frac{M_p \sin i}{M_*} \sqrt{\frac{GM_*}{a}}. \quad (6)$$

The orbital period P is also Keplerian

$$P = 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{a^3}{GM_*}}, \quad (7)$$

and both P and K are therefore directly observable quantities⁴. The required observational precision is straightforward to estimate, and for a $1M_\odot$ host star we find

$$K = 28.4 \text{ m s}^{-1} \left(\frac{M_p \sin i}{1M_{\text{Jup}}} \right) \left(\frac{a}{1\text{AU}} \right)^{-1/2}. \quad (8)$$

Detecting a Jupiter-like planet therefore requires $< 10\text{m s}^{-1}$ precision, while $< 10\text{cm s}^{-1}$ precision is required to detect Earth-like planets. Moreover, we must observe for roughly the orbital period in order to obtain a detection. RV searches are therefore biased towards massive planets in short-period orbits, with high line-of-sight inclination angles (i.e., viewed close to edge-on). In practice we usually cannot determine the inclination angle i , so we instead measure $M_p \sin i$ (a lower limit to the planet’s true mass).

Most of the early RV detections were massive ($\gtrsim M_{\text{Jup}}$) planets in short-period (< 5 day) orbits, and these are usually referred to as “hot Jupiters”. Their existence presented an immediate challenge to our understanding of planet formation (as they exist well inside the radius at which solids would sublime), and sparked a great deal of interest in the theory of planet migration. Subsequent RV observations have conducted detailed surveys of essentially all of the F-, G- and K-type stars in the solar neighbourhood (out to $\sim 20\text{pc}$), with $10\text{--}20\text{m s}^{-1}$ precision over a period of approximately 20 years. These surveys are therefore complete for giant planets ($\gtrsim M_{\text{Jup}}$) with periods $\lesssim 5\text{--}10\text{yr}$. Newer spectrographs (such as HARPS & HIRES) have attained precisions of

⁴It is possible to generalise this analysis to the case of eccentric orbits. In this case the velocity amplitude K is multiplied by a pre-factor $1/\sqrt{1-e^2}$, and the RV curve is no longer sinusoidal.

$\lesssim 1 \text{ m s}^{-1}$, and are sensitive to Earth-mass planets in short-period orbits, but surveys with these instruments have a shorter time baseline (and limited sampling) and therefore only offer good statistics for periods $\lesssim 3\text{--}5 \text{ yr}$. It is not clear, however, how much further RV methods can be pushed. Stellar variability and activity ultimately limits the precision with which Doppler measurements can be made, and although this floor has not yet been reached, with current technology it seems unlikely that precisions $\ll 1 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ are possible for large numbers of stars. Nevertheless, almost 500 planets have now been discovered using RV methods, and this sample remains the major source of our statistical knowledge of exoplanets for periods $\gtrsim 100 \text{ days}$. “Follow-up” RV measurements are also our primary means of measuring the masses of planets discovered via other methods.

2.3 Transit Methods

A transit occurs when a planet passes between its host star and the Earth. It is straightforward to compute the dimming fraction f , which to first-order (neglecting limb-darkening and grazing transits) depends only the relative radii of the star and planet:

$$f = \frac{R_p^2}{R_*^2}. \quad (9)$$

For Jupiter this gives $f_{\text{Jup}} \simeq 0.01$, while for Earth we find $f_{\oplus} \simeq 10^{-4}$. We therefore see that detecting transits requires a high degree of photometric precision: for bright host stars these correspond to $\sim 10 \text{ mmag}$ for gas giants, and $\lesssim 0.1 \text{ mmag}$ for rocky planets. Giant planet transits are therefore detectable with ground-based telescopes, but the variability induced by our atmosphere means that transits of Earth-like planets can only be detected from space.

The probability of observing a transit in any given planetary system is small, as the stellar orbit must be observed almost perfectly edge-on for a transit to occur. We see a transit if

$$\cos i \leq \frac{R_p + R_*}{a}, \quad (10)$$

so if an ensemble of planetary systems has a random distribution of inclination angles the probability of observing a transit is

$$p = \frac{R_p + R_*}{a}. \quad (11)$$

In almost all cases $R_p \ll R_*$, so for planets at $\sim \text{AU}$ radii the transit probability is $p \sim 10^{-3}\text{--}10^{-2}$. Transit searches must therefore observe large numbers of stars in order to detect planets, and are very strongly biased towards short-period orbits⁵. Note also that transits provide only orbital periods and planet radii; follow-up observations (usually RV, but sometimes transit-timing or other dynamical methods) are required to validate these detections and determine planet masses⁶.

Ground-based transit surveys (primarily SuperWASP and HAT) have discovered hundreds of new planets, but are generally limited to $>0.1\%$ precision and have therefore primarily detected (\sim Jupiter-size) planets in relatively short-period orbits. However, NASA’s *Kepler* satellite, which originally operated from May 2009 until May 2013⁷, revolutionised this field. To date *Kepler* has been responsible for over 2000 confirmed exoplanet detections, and identified more than 2300

⁵By comparing Equations 8 and 11 we see that transit searches are more strongly biased towards small orbital separations than RV surveys, by a factor $a^{1/2}$.

⁶Note also that both RV and transit observations only measure the planet’s properties relative to those of the host star. In many cases the absolute uncertainties in planetary masses and radii are dominated by the corresponding uncertainties in the properties of the host star.

⁷*Kepler*’s “prime mission” ended with the failure of a second reaction wheel in May 2013. Since 2014 the satellite has operated in a new mode, dubbed *K2*, which has slightly lower photometric precision than the original mission, but surveys a much larger area of the sky.

additional candidate planets⁸. *Kepler* reached a precision of ~ 10 ppm, and its survey of over 100,000 stars is complete down to planets of approximately Earth radius for periods $\lesssim 1$ yr.

3 Summary of exoplanet observations

In the last few years we have started to move from an era of simply detecting exoplanets, to one of characterising and studying them in detail. There is still a great deal to learn, but certain observational results and trends are now clear. The most important results (for our purposes) are as follows:

- Most, and perhaps all, stars host planets. Formally, RV surveys find that $>50\%$ of solar-type stars host at least one detectable planet with $P < 100$ days. If one cuts the data differently, we find that around F-, G- & K-type stars the frequency of gas-giant planets with $M_p > 1M_{\text{Jup}}$ and $a \leq 3\text{AU}$ is 5–10%. Statistical studies from *Kepler* are limited to periods of $\lesssim 1$ yr, but suggest that the frequency of smaller planets (\gtrsim Earth-size) is $>85\%$. All of these are lower limits to the total frequency, and will increase as we extend our knowledge to lower planet masses and larger orbital separations.
- Multiple planet systems are common. The selection biases here are subtle, but in the latest data release from *Kepler* almost a quarter of detected systems have multiple planet candidates, with roughly half the total number of planet candidates found in multiple systems. (These numbers are again effectively lower limits, and seem certain to increase.)
- Unlike the Solar System planets, most exoplanets are in eccentric orbits. Giant planets at AU radii have a median eccentricity $\langle e \rangle \simeq 0.3$; some exoplanets have eccentricities > 0.9 .
- The frequency of “hot Jupiters” (gas giant planets with $a \leq 0.1\text{AU}$) is approximately 1%.
- Giant planets at large separations are rare. Direct imaging surveys of nearby stars find that the frequency of 1–20 M_{Jup} planets with separations 20–200AU is $< 5\%$.
- The mass/size distribution of planets is relatively well-fit by a smooth power-law for giant planets (approximately $dN/dM_p \propto M_p^{-1}$), but turns over at lower masses/sizes and is approximately flat below 2–3 R_{\oplus} .
- The radial distribution of giant planet orbits is fairly smooth for $a \lesssim 5\text{--}10\text{AU}$: it resembles a power-law, increasing to larger a , and has few strong features at any particular values of a . The only statistically significant features in the distribution are a strong excess of giant planets in 3–5 day orbits, and a weaker “pile-up” of \sim Jupiter-mass planets at 1–2AU.
- The frequency of giant planets increases very strongly with the metallicity of the host star: stars with $Z = 2Z_{\odot}$ are 5–10 times more likely to host giant planets than stars with $Z = 0.5Z_{\odot}$ ⁹.
- This metallicity correlation does not hold for lower planet masses: the frequency of super-Earths and Neptunes is largely independent of Z .
- Compact systems, with multiple super-Earth- or Neptune-size planets in short-period (< 50 day) orbits are very common.

⁸The majority of the *Kepler* target stars are too faint for spectroscopic follow-up, so most of these candidates will not be confirmed in the foreseeable future (if ever). However, the criteria adopted to define candidates are strict, and the false positive rate is estimated to be low ($\simeq 10\%$).

⁹There is some evidence that the pile-up of hot Jupiters in 3–5 day periods is only seen in high-metallicity stars; there also appears to be a correlation between host star metallicity and planet eccentricity.

- The observed mass-radius relation is relatively tight for gas-giant ($\gtrsim 0.1M_{\text{Jup}}$) and rocky ($\lesssim 2M_{\oplus}$) planets, but shows very large scatter at intermediate masses¹⁰.
- Some planets have orbits which are significantly inclined to the stellar rotation axis, and a few have even been found on retrograde orbits. (Only a small number of exoplanets have measured obliquities, however, so the statistical significance of these results is not yet clear.)
- Planets form readily in binary systems, in both S-type (circumstellar) and P-type (circumbinary) orbits.

In addition, we are now beginning to move beyond detecting planets into an era where we can characterise exoplanet properties in detail. We have taken spectra of exoplanetary atmospheres for a small number of transiting systems, and this is starting to become possible for directly imaged planets also. We are also detecting younger and younger planets, some of which are still embedded in debris or even protoplanetary discs. Future study of exoplanets in this manner will give us a much clearer idea of their structure and composition, and will provide many important clues as to how planets form.

4 Further Reading

In addition to the main list of references given on the course home-page, the following papers are particularly relevant to this lecture:

Wolszczan & Frail, *A planetary system around the millisecond pulsar PSR1257 + 12*, 1992, *Nature*, 355, 145.

Latham et al., *The unseen companion of HD114762 - A probable brown dwarf*, 1989, *Nature*, 339, 38.

Mayor & Queloz, *A Jupiter-mass companion to a solar-type star*, 1995, *Nature*, 378, 355.

Charbonneau et al., *Detection of Planetary Transits Across a Sun-like Star*, 2000, *ApJ (Letters)*, 529, L45.

Kalas et al., *Optical Images of an Exosolar Planet 25 Light-Years from Earth*, 2008, *Science*, 322, 1345.

Marois et al., *Direct Imaging of Multiple Planets Orbiting the Star HR 8799*, 2008, *Science*, 322, 1348.

Udry & Santos, *Statistical Properties of Exoplanets*, 2007, *ARA&A*, 45, 397.

Batalha et al., *Planetary Candidates Observed by Kepler III: Analysis of the First 16 Months of Data*, 2013, *ApJS*, 204, 22.

Mullally et al., *Planetary Candidates Observed by Kepler VI: Planet Sample from Q1–Q16 (47 Months)*, 2015, *ApJS*, 217, 31.

Howard et al., *The Occurrence and Mass Distribution of Close-in Super-Earths, Neptunes, and Jupiters*, 2010, *Science*, 330, 653.

Mayor et al., *The HARPS search for southern extra-solar planets XXXIV: Occurrence, mass distribution and orbital properties of super-Earths and Neptune-mass planets*, [arXiv:1109.2497](https://arxiv.org/abs/1109.2497).

Fischer & Valenti, *The Planet-Metallicity Correlation*, 2005, *ApJ*, 622, 1102.

Dawson & Murray-Clay, *Giant Planets Orbiting Metal-rich Stars Show Signatures of Planet-Planet Interactions*, 2013, *ApJ (Letters)*, 767, L24.

Petigura et al., *A Plateau in the Planet Population below Twice the Size of Earth*, 2013, *ApJ*, 770, 69.

¹⁰Note, however, that measurement errors on both M_p and R_p are typically $\gtrsim 10\text{--}20\%$, and this translates to typical uncertainties of $\gtrsim 50\%$ in the mean density of transiting planets. As mentioned above, the uncertainties in the mass and radius of the host star are usually the limiting factor when we measure planetary properties at high precision.