Solar System formation and early evolution

Alessandro Morbidelli Observatoire de la Côte d'Azur CNRS Nice, France

OUTLINE

Too vast subject, so I will focus on:

- **1. Primary accretion**
- 2. Accretion chronology
- **3. Giant planet cores vs. planetary embryos**
- 4. Circum-planetary disks and satellite accretion

(again with emphasis on chronology)

5.Bonus: radial mixing of planetesimal populations

Why an emphasis on chronology of accretion?



Because it determines the internal structure of a body, due to the heat released by short lived radio-nuclei

PLANETESIMAL FORMATION



Aggregate-aggregate collisions: results

Dominik, Tielens (1997) – Wurm, Blum (2000)

Sunward dust fall

Dust particles run headwind -> fast radial drift of m-size boulders

« meter-size barrier »

A mm-size bouncing barrier for silicates For icy particles, better sticking properties. Potential formation of fluffy aggregates (Okuzumi et al., 2012)

Turbulent disk: 10cm-1m particles are captured in vortices

Disks are not thought any more to be very turbulent. Besides, to be trapped in vortices particles need to be much bigger than allowed by the bouncing barrier

Streaming instability (Youdin and Goodman, 2005) – spontaneous clumping of radially drifting particles

Johansen, Klahr, Henning, 2011 tau=1,Z=0.03,512³

Problem: chondrites are made of sub-mm particles, not 15-60 cm "pebbles" This is a problem to understand planetesimal formation in the inner disk (in the outer disk icy pebbles can be bigger and the Stokes number is bigger too)

Possibly, in high-density conditions, chondrules can collide with each other, avoid the bouncing barrier by multiple mutual collisions, stick to each other through their dust rims. This way, they could form macroscopic aggregates, which may behave as previously seen

We do see cm-size chondrule clusters in chondrites!

Radial coordinate (x/H)

Solid concentration (Z)

Carrera et al., 2016

1) Deplete the gas and keep the solids

Gas depletion due to viscous accretion onto the star is slower than particle loss due to radial drift. Thus, the solid/gas ratio decreases with time rather than increase. Lambrechts and Johansen, 2014.

1) Deplete the gas and keep the solids

Photoevaporation can remove gas faster than the timescale of particle radial drift.

1) Deplete the gas and keep the solids

Photoevaporation can remove gas faster than the timescale of particle radial drift.

1) Deplete the gas and keep the solids

Photoevaporation can remove gas faster than the timescale of particle radial drift.

However, photoevaporation is effective only in the latest stages of a disk. So, this mechanism can only allow the formation of planetesimal by the streaming instability at a late time The parent bodies of chondrites (undifferentiated asteroids) indeed formed late, at 3-4 My, i.e. near the end of the disk lifetime

Iron meteorites, however, come from planetesimals that accreted and differentiated very quickly, within 1 My at most

Kleine et al., 2009

Miles

1) Pile-up by radial drift

$$\Sigma_{pb} = \dot{M}_F / (2\pi r v_r)$$

In order to have pile-up one needs that the term $1/rv_r$ increases faster than $1/r^{\alpha}$ for r-> 0, where $1/r^{\alpha}$ is the profile of the gas surface density

$$v_r = -2\frac{\tau_f}{\tau_f^2 + 1}\eta v_K + \frac{u_r}{\tau_f^2 + 1}$$

1) Pile-up by radial drift

A first possibility is that η decreases somewhere in the disk (e.g. disk inner edge, outer edge of a cavity etc.

1) Pile-up by radial drift

Even without edge effects, there is a moderate pile-up of pebbles in the inner part of the disk

 η^{-} = constant in the inner part of the disk (where H \sim r)

$$\begin{split} \Sigma_{pb} &= M_F / (2\pi r v_r) \\ v_r &= -2 \frac{\tau_f}{\tau_f^2 + 1} \eta v_K + \frac{u_r}{\tau_f^2 + 1} \\ \tau_f &= \frac{\rho_b R}{\rho_g c_s} \Omega \, \sim \, r^{\alpha} \text{, where } 1/r^{\alpha} \text{ is the profile of the gas surface density} \end{split}$$

$$\Sigma_{pb}/\Sigma_g \sim 1/r^{1/2}$$

1) Pile-up by radial drift

Drazkowska et al., 2016

Thus, in principle one can expect a situation like this.....

Planetesimals formed big., with a preferential diameter of ~100Km

N(>D)

$$a_{\rm c} = \frac{H/R}{0.04} \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{2.7 \cdot 10^{-6}}} \sqrt{\frac{0.1}{\text{St}}} 98 \text{km.}$$

Planetesimal size formula from SI theory (Klahr et al., submitted)

Primordial `bumps

From planetesimals to proto-planets

Once the first planetesimals are formed they still reside in a disk of gas and pebbles.

Thus they can still accrete pebbles flowing by them in the disk

"Pebble accretion process" (Johansen and lacerda, 2010; Ormel and Klahr, 2010; Murray-Clay et al., 2011; Lambrechts and Johansen, 2012)

Pebble accretion

This could be due to different planetesimla sizes on different sides of the snowline, or to different efficiencies of PA

Assume:

- A mass-flux that decreases by a factor ~2 at the snowline
- An order of magnitude change in particle size (this could be due to the disintegration of dirty-icy pebbles into a collection of silicate grains due to ice sublimation (Morbidelli et al., 2015) or to a change of collisional regime (Banzatti et al., 2016)

IDEA

Morbidelli, Lambrechts, Bitsch and Jacobson, Icarus (2015)

This should be the generic initial structure of a planetary system....

Consistent with the structure of the Solar System, but not with the existence of hot super-Earth systems around most of the stars

MIGRATION is the key!!

We may conceive the following scenario:

If the outer disk produces only super-Earth mass objects, they migrate into the inner disk

We may conceive the following scenario:

If the innermost SE manages to grow to a giant planet, its migration is slowed down and it retains the other super-Earth(s) behind it

Thus, the SE migrates only as far as the giant planet does

How far in can a giant planet migrate?

Indeed, most giant planets are located > 1 AU

Observed radial distribution of giant planets (more massive than Saturn)

The explanation being that they don't' reach 1 AU before that photo-evaporation has dented the disk Alexander and Pascucci, 2012)

Type II migration isslowed down/reversed if there are 2 planets with a Jupiter/Saturn mass ratio

ORIGIN OF URANUS AND NEPTUNE

The large obliquities of <u>Uranus and Neptune</u> indicate that these planets <u>should</u> <u>have experienced giant</u> <u>collisions</u> and this suggests they assembled from several merging embryos.

The dynamical barrier offered by Jupiter and Saturn offers a framework for this to happen

Izidoro et al., MNRAS 2015 Jakubik et al., 2012

ORIGIN OF URANUS AND NEPTUNE

The large obliquities of <u>Uranus and Neptune</u> indicate that these planets <u>should</u> <u>have experienced giant</u> <u>collisions</u> and this suggests they assembled from several merging embryos.

The dynamical barrier offered by Jupiter and Saturn offers a framework for this to happen

Izidoro et al., MNRAS 2015 Jakubik et al., 2012 In absence of Jupiter and Saturn, the embryos formed beyond them would have migrated into the inner Solar System forming a system of hot super-Earths

CIRCUM-PLANETARY DISKS

Ayliffe and Bate, 2009

100 M_E

166 M_E

Hot temperatures in the CPD

Why are all satellites icy?

Disks can cool at a later stage, once the influx of gas from the circum-stellar disk becomes weak. The fact that some satellites (Callisto, Titan) are not fully differentiated also argues for a late formation of satellites.

Why don't we see a first generation of rocky satellites?

Did early satellites fell into the planet (Ward and Canup, 2010)?

Satellite formation by SI and PA has never been studied and could bring interesting results. The CPD is very sub-keplerian.

The parameter η is ~0.2 whereas in the circum-stellar disk it is ~2.5x10⁻³

When the only solids available are small silicate grains, the large value of η may prevent the SI to occur -> no rocky satellites

Bonus: Radial dynamical mixing of planetesimals

r

Bottke et al. (2006) showed that planetesimals can be implanted in the asteroid belt from the terrestrial planet region and proposed that the implanted bodies are the parent bodies of differentiated meteorites.

The implantation efficiency can vary from model to model, but the concept remains true

Bodies can be implanted into the asteroid belt from the giant planet region during the planet growth, via scattering and gas drag (Izidoro et al., 2016)

...or during Jupiter outward migration (Walsh et al., 2011)

Are they C-type asteroids? Main belt comets? Parent bodies of (some) carbonaceous chondrites?

Finally, trans-Neptunian objects can be captured in the asteroid belt during the giant planet instability that brought the giant planets onto their current orbits

0.0 My T =40 20 y (AU) 0 20 40 -40-200 20 40 x (AU)

The Nice model:

Tsiganis et al., 2005; Gomes et al., 2005; Morbidelli et al., 2007; Levison et al., 2011; Nesvorny and Morbidelli, 2012 Finally, trans-Neptunian objects can be captured in the asteroid belt during the giant planet instability that brought the giant planets onto their current orbits

0.0 My T =40 20 y (AU) 0 20 40 -40-200 20 40 x (AU)

The Nice model:

Tsiganis et al., 2005; Gomes et al., 2005; Morbidelli et al., 2007; Levison et al., 2011; Nesvorny and Morbidelli, 2012 Because Trojans are Dtype, it is expected that trans-Neptunian objects implanted in the main belt are D-type too.

Levison et al., 2009; Vokrouhlicky et al., 2016

CONCLUSIONS

- Our understanding of how planetesimals formed is still not consolidated
- The streaming Instability is a promising model
- It opens the possibility that planetesimals form early in some regions and at the end of the disk's lifetime in other regions
- Pebble accretion explains well the formation of the giant planets and the dichotomy of the Solar System
- Circum-planetary disks are extremely hot, so icy satellites could form only at very late stages
- Unveiling the internal structure of bodies is a powerful tool to deduce whether they formed early or late and therefore can help mapping accretion timescales as a function of location
- However, beware of radial mixing: not all bodies are born where they are.