## Planet Traps & Super-Earths

: Origins of the Planet-Metallicity Relation

& Implications for the Mass-Radius Diagram

Yasuhiro Hasegawa (EACOA fellow @ ASIAA / NAOJ)

Ralph Pudritz (McMaster Univ.)

## Planet Traps & Super-Earths

: Origins of the Planet-Metallicity Relation => see arXiv:1408.1841 (accepted by ApJ) & Implications for the Mass-Radius Diagram

Yasuhiro Hasegawa (EACOA fellow @ ASIAA / NAOJ)

### Mass-Semimajor Axis Diagram



### **Distinct** Populations

Chiang & Laughlin 2013, Hasegawa & Pudritz 2013, 2014



### Mass-Radius Diagram

e.g.,Weiss & Marcy 2014, Marcy et al 2014, Rogers 2014,Wolfgang & Lopez 2014



Sub-set of samples from Weiss & Marcy 2014 (mass measurements better than 2-sigma)





#### Derived invaluable constraints on the formation and evolution of planetary systems





#### Derived invaluable constraints on the formation and evolution of planetary systems

Provide a physical explanation, using theoretical models

### In reality, it is still difficult...

e.g., Mordasini et al 2012, Ida et al 2013, Hansen & Murray 2013, Chiang & Laughlin 2013

### I) many processes are involved: formation, migration, disk evolution, dynamics, photoevaporative mass loss, & etc... I) unclear formation mechanisms: a scaled-up version of rocky planet formation VS a scaled-down version of gas giant formation

Planet traps + core accretion can simplify a picture of planet formation in gas disks

Step 1: planet traps - direct connection with disk evolution

Step 2: evolutionary tracks of forming planets at planet traps

Step 3: planet formation frequencies (PFFs) our version of population synthesis calculations

### Failed Core Scenario: Planet traps + Core accretion



What is the minimum mass of planets formed at planet trap by core accretion??



Masset 2002

### Rapid type I migration

e.g. Goldreich & Tremaine 1980, Ward 1986, 1997, Masset 2001, 2002, Tanaka et al 2002, Baruteau & Masset 2008, Paardekooper et al 2010, 2011, Hasegawa & Pudritz 2011a

#### Angular momentum transfer : Lindblad & corotation resonances

#### The direct of migration

: depends sensitively on disk properties such as the surface density, disk temperature, & opacity



### Rapid type I migration

e.g. Goldreich & Tremaine 1980, Ward 1986, 1997, Masset 2001, 2002, Tanaka et al 2002, Baruteau & Masset 2008, Paardekooper et al 2010, 2011, Hasegawa & Pudritz 2011a

#### Angular momentum transfer : Lindblad & corotation resonances

#### The direct of migration

: depends sensitively on disk properties such as the surface density, disk temperature, & opacity

Masset 2002

Planet traps = disk structures at which the net tidal torque is zero

Masset et al 2006 Matsumura, Pudritz, & Thommes 2007, 2009 Ida & Lin 2008, Morbidelli et al 2008 Hasegawa & Pudritz 2010b, Lyra et al 2010 Hasegawa & Pudritz 2011b, Bitsch & Kley 2011 Hellary & Nelson 2012, Kretke & Lin 2012, Mordasini et al 2012 Pierens et al 2013, Bitsch et al 2013, etc...

 $\bullet$ 

Masset et al 2006 Matsumura, Pudritz, & Thommes 2007, 2009

Acceptable conclusion may be...

some kinds of traps are very likely to be present in protoplanetary disks

Hasegawa & Pudritz 2011b

#### 3 types of traps in single disks

: the outer edge of dead zones, ice lines, heat transitions

Hasegawa & Pudritz 2011b

#### 3 types of traps in single disks

: the outer edge of dead zones, ice lines, heat transitions



D'Alessio et al 1998

Hasegawa & Pudritz 2011b

#### 3 types of traps in single disks

: the outer edge of dead zones, ice lines, heat transitions

3 types of traps in single disks

: the outer edge of dead zones, ice lines, heat transitions

#### Hasegawa & Pudritz 201 Ib 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 Hasegawa & Pudritz 201 Ib 10.0 Heat Transition Ice Line Dead Zone 0.1 10<sup>-6</sup> 10<sup>-7</sup> 10<sup>-8</sup> 10<sup>-9</sup> 10<sup>-10</sup> accretion rate (M<sub>sun</sub>/ year)

## Locations of traps are specified by disk evolution

3 types of traps in single disks : the outer edge of dead zones, ice lines, heat transitions



# Locations of traps are specified by disk evolution

#### Mass dependence of traps

: planet traps are effective until protoplanets obtain the gap-opening mass & undergo type II migration

3 types of traps in single disks : the outer edge of dead zones, ice lines, heat transitions



#### Mass dependence of traps

: planet traps are effective until protoplanets obtain the gap-opening mass & undergo type II migration

Planets form locally at traps before type II migration



### Step 2: Evolutionary Tracks

#### Planet traps

#### Core accretion



### Step 2: Evolutionary Tracks

A disk around a classical TTauri star is considered

#### $M_{disk} \sim 0.03 M_{\odot}$ $au_{disk} \sim 8.8 \times 10^6 years$



Hasegawa & Pudritz 2012







Hasegawa & Pudritz 2013

Statistical

quantities



A disk around a classical T Tauri star is considered  $M_{disk} \sim 0.03 M_{\odot}$  $\tau_{disk} \sim 8.8 \times 10^6 years$ 

Hasegawa & Pudritz 2013

#### Compute lots of tracks





A disk around a classical Tauri star is considered  $M_{disk} \sim 0.03 M_{\odot}$  $\tau_{disk} \sim 8.8 \times 10^6 years$ 

Hasegawa & Pudritz 2013

Compute lots of tracks

Dead zone

Heat transition

1

r (AU)

10

lce line

RV data

0.1

#### Partition the diagram

 $10^{4}$ 

 $10^{2}$ 

 $10^{0}$ 

10<sup>-2</sup>

 $10^{-4}$ 

0.01

Mp (MEarth)



A disk around a classical Tauri star is considered  $M_{disk} \sim 0.03 M_{\odot}$  $\tau_{disk} \sim 8.8 \times 10^6 years$ 

Hasegawa & Pudritz 2013

Compute lots of tracks

#### Partition the diagram





$1 M_{\odot}$	Hot Jupiters	Exo-Jupiters	Super-Earths	Total
PFF				

$1 M_{\odot}$	Hot Jupiters	Exo-Jupiters	Super-Earths	Total
PFF	~ 7.6 %	~ 25.3 %	~ 10.2 %	43.1%

A considerable fraction of observed super-Earths may be formed as failed cores of gas giants (mini-gas giants)

$1 M_{\odot}$	Hot Jupiters	Exo-Jupiters	Super-Earths	Total
PFF	~ 7.6 %	~ 25.3 %	~ 10.2 %	43.1%

#### A considerable fraction of observed super-Earths may be formed as failed cores of gas giants (mini-gas giants)



$1 M_{\odot}$	Hot Jupiters	Exo-Jupiters	Super-Earths	Total
PFF	~ 7.6 %	~ 25.3 %	~ 10.2 %	43.1%

A considerable fraction of observed super-Earths may be formed as failed cores of gas giants (mini-gas giants)

The minimum mass of planets formed by core accretion at planet traps:

$$M_{min}^{CA} \simeq 4 - 5M_{\oplus}$$



Why  $M_{min}^{CA} \simeq 4 - 5 M_{\oplus}$  ??

Hasegawa 2014 in prep

Hasegawa 2014 in prep

#### I) photoevaporative mass loss of planets

## Why $M_{min}^{CA} \simeq 4 - 5M_{\oplus}$ ? Hasegawa 2014 in prep I) photoevaporative mass loss of planets

=> No, for our model, since it is NOT included yet

# Why $M_{min}^{CA} \simeq 4-5 M_\oplus$ ?? Hasegawa 2014 in prep

I) photoevaporative mass loss of planets

2) the critical core mass to start gas accretion

### Why $M_{min}^{CA} \simeq 4 - 5 M_{\oplus}$ ?? Hasegawa 2014 in prep I) photoevaporative mass loss of planets 2) the critical core mass to start gas accretion Super-Earths Gas giants **Phase III** $(< 10^5 years)$ Cores + low-mass atmospheres Phase II $(\sim 2 \times 10^6 years)$ Cores of gas giants $\frown Phase I (< 10^6 years)$ Dust/Planetesimals

Why  $M_{min}^{CA} \simeq 4 - 5 M_{\oplus}$  ?? Hasegawa 2014 in prep I) photoevaporative mass loss of planets 2) the critical core mass to start gas accretion Super-Earths Gas giants **Phase III**  $(< 10^5 years)$  $M_{c} > M_{c,crit} \left(\frac{\dot{M}_{c}}{10^{-6}M_{\oplus}yr^{-1}}\right)^{1/2}$ Cores + low-mass atmospheres Phase II  $M_{c,crit}$ : Parameter  $(\sim 2 \times 10^6 years)$  $\sim 10 M_{\oplus}$  for the canonical case Cores of gas giants **Phase I**  $(< 10^6 years)$  $< 10 M_{\oplus}$  when dust grains grow in atmospheres Dust/Planetesimals

Hasegawa 2014 in prep

I) photoevaporative mass loss of planets

2) the critical core mass to start gas accretion

$M_{c,crit}$	$3 M_{\oplus}$	$5 M_{\oplus}$	$10 M_{\oplus}$
$M_{min}^{CA}$			

Hasegawa 2014 in prep

I) photoevaporative mass loss of planets

#### 2) the critical core mass to start gas accretion

$M_{c,crit}$	$3 M_{\oplus}$	$5 M_{\oplus}$	$10 M_{\oplus}$
$M_{min}^{CA}$	$3.9 M_{\oplus}$	$5 M_{\oplus}$	$4.6 M_{\oplus}$

=> No,  $M_{min}^{CA}$  is very insensitive to the critical core mass

Hasegawa 2014 in prep

I) photoevaporative mass loss of planets

2) the critical core mass to start gas accretion

3) planetary migration in gas disks

Hasegawa 2014 in prep

I) photoevaporative mass loss of planets

2) the critical core mass to start gas accretion



3) planetary migration in gas disks

Two kinds of migration in our model

Planet traps : transport forming cores from large radii to > I AU

**Type II migration** : transport cores with atmospheres from > I AU to < I AU

Hasegawa 2014 in prep

I) photoevaporative mass loss of planets

2) the critical core mass to start gas accretion

3) planetary migration in gas disks



Two kinds of migration in our model

Planet traps : transport forming cores from large radii to > I AU

#### **Type II migration**

: transport cores with atmospheres from > I AU to < I AU

Hasegawa 2014 in prep

I) photoevaporative mass loss of planets

2) the critical core mass to start gas accretion

3) planetary migration in gas disks

 $< M_{Gap} >$ 

= the mean value of the gap-opening mass of planets which end up in the low-mass regime



Hasegawa 2014 in prep



Hasegawa 2014 in prep



Hasegawa 2014 in prep



Embryo assembly scenario (in situ formation) can form planets with < 10 M\_Earth <sup>e.g., Ogihara & Ida 2009,</sup> Hansen & Murray 2013

Hasegawa 2014 in prep



Inclusion of photoevaporative mass loss from planets Lopez & Fortney 2013

#### Exoplanet "Phase" Diagram

Hasegawa 2014 in prep



### Summary

- Super-Earths are very interesting populations
- The composition of super-Earths may change significantly around R\_p = 1.5 R\_Earth (M\_p = 4-5 M\_Earth)
- Discussed a new statistical approach PFF by combining planet traps with core accretion
- Our model suggests that the minimum mass of planets formed by our model is M\_p > 4-5 M\_Earth
- The results do not change very much for a certain range of parameters involved with planet formation
- Our results can be understood by intimate coupling of planet formation and migration (especially by type II)