

What would happen if we were about 1 pc away from a supermassive black hole?

Lorenzo Iorio¹

Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca (M.I.U.R.)-Istruzione
Permanent address for correspondence: Viale Unità di Italia 68, 70125, Bari (BA), Italy

lorenzo.iorio@libero.it

Received _____; accepted _____

Abstract

We consider a hypothetical planet with the same mass m , radius R , angular momentum S , oblateness J_2 , semimajor axis a , eccentricity e , inclination I , and obliquity ε of the Earth orbiting a main sequence star with the same mass M_\star and radius R_\star of the Sun at a distance $r_\bullet \simeq 1$ parsec (pc) from a supermassive black hole in the center of the hosting galaxy with the same mass M_\bullet of, say, M87*. We preliminarily investigate some dynamical consequences of its presence in the neighbourhood of such a stellar system on the planet’s possibility of sustaining complex life over the eons. In particular, we obtain general analytic expressions for the long-term rates of change, doubly averaged over both the planetary and the galactocentric orbital periods P_b and P_\bullet , of e , I , ε , which are the main quantities directly linked to the stellar insolation. We find that, for certain orbital configurations, the planet’s perihelion distance $q = a(1 - e)$ may greatly shrink leading, in some cases, even to an impact with the star. Also I may notably change, with variations of the order even of tens of degrees. On the other hand, ε does not seem to be particularly affected, being shifted, at most, by $\simeq 0.02$ deg over a Myr. Our results strongly depend the eccentricity e_\bullet of the galactocentric motion.

keywords gravitation – celestial mechanics – (galaxies:) quasars: supermassive black holes – planetary systems – extraterrestrial intelligence

1. Introduction

Let us consider a restricted two-body system consisting of a telluric planet orbiting a main sequence star which, in turn, revolves around a supermassive black hole (SMBH) along an orbit whose perinigricon¹ distance amounts to hundreds or thousands of Schwarzschild radii. For the sake of definiteness, in the following we will assume the same physical and orbital parameters of the Sun and the Earth, while we will adopt the mass $M_\bullet = 6.5 \times 10^9 M_\odot$ (Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration et al. 2019a) of M87* located in the center of the supergiant elliptical galaxy M87. Its shadow was recently imaged for the first time (Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration et al. 2019b). Notably, even more massive SMBHs exist like, e.g., TON 618 ($M_\bullet = 6.6 \times 10^{10} M_\odot$) (Shemmer et al. 2004), and HOLM 15A ($M_\bullet = 4.0 \times 10^{10} M_\odot$) (Mehrgan et al. 2019).

A scenario like the aforementioned one should be deemed neither entirely fictional nor unrealistic. It has been recently demonstrated that the formation of many (rogue) Earth-sized planets in the circumnuclear disks around SMBHs in low luminosity active galactic nuclei

¹It is one of the possible names attributable to the pericentre when the primary is a black hole (Schödel et al. 2002). It comes from the Latin word ‘*niger*’, meaning ‘black’.

(AGNs) is potentially possible at several parsecs (pc) from them (Wada, Tsukamoto & Kokubo 2019). Several pros and cons of the habitability of such kind of worlds have been studied by Opatrný, Richterek & Bakala (2017), Forbes & Loeb (2018), Lingam, Ginsburg & Bialy (2019), and Schnittman (2019). See also <https://exoplanets.nasa.gov/news/1602/five-reasons-you-wouldnt-want-to-live-near-a-black-hole/>, <https://planetplanet.net/2018/05/30/the-black-hole-ultimate-solar-system/>, and <https://dailygalaxy.com/2019/07/extremely-extreme-life-planets-orbiting-milky-ways-black-hole-pulsars/> on the Internet. In particular, Lingam, Ginsburg & Bialy (2019) analyzing the strong radiation environment in AGNs hosting SMBHs found that, perhaps, it may be not so extremely hazardous for life. Indeed, the zone where the negative effects due to strong ultraviolet (UV) irradiation become dominant seems to be smaller than the corresponding zones for powering prebiotic chemistry and photosynthesis, which may extend up to $\approx 40 - 340$ pc. On the other hand, close-in planets at $\lesssim 1$ pc might become uninhabitable because of complex interactions with the dusty torus as well as strong outflows and winds at relativistic speeds from the accretion disc. Stellar formation in the Galactic Center was investigated by, e.g., Morris (1993), Kauffmann (2016), and Kruijssen et al. (2019). It should be recalled that 8 out of the roughly 40 stars constituting the S-star cluster orbiting Sgr A* in the central arcsecond of the Galactic Center (GC) are old, main sequence stars of spectral classes G, K, and M whose masses are in the range $0.5 - 2 M_{\odot}$ (Habibi et al. 2019; Davari, Capuzzo-Dolcetta & Spurzem 2019). The evolution of a fictitious planetary system like our solar system around a S-type star orbiting the SMBH in Sgr A* was recently studied by Davari, Capuzzo-Dolcetta & Spurzem (2019), who recalled that the existence of planetary systems in the innermost pc of Sgr A* is still debated (Trani et al. 2016), being, perhaps, due to migration instead of *in situ* formation. Finally, we also mention *en passant* the intriguing possibility that advanced civilizations may develop inside SMBHs themselves (Dokuchaev 2011, 2012).

We wish to preliminarily investigate some dynamical consequences that the presence of a SMBH in the relatively close neighbourhood of a planetary scenario potentially capable of evolving intelligent life forms may have on such a possibility. In particular, we will look at the long-term evolutions of the planet’s orbital eccentricity e and inclination I , and of its spin angular momentum’s axis \hat{S} . Indeed, it is known that the also the inclination I of the Earth’s orbit should affect incoming solar irradiance (Vieira et al. 2012) and, thus, its climate and habitability, not to say about the role played by the eccentricity and the obliquity ε , i.e. the inclination of the Earth’s equator to the ecliptic, in affecting the Earth’s insolation over the eons (Laskar, Joutel & Boudin 1993; Laskar, Joutel & Robutel 1993; Williams & Kasting 1997; Laskar et al. 2004; Williams & Pollard 2002; Spiegel et al. 2010; Dressing et al. 2010; Linsenmeier, Pascale & Lucarini 2015; Kilic, Raible & Stocker 2017). In order to get easily some broad insights from analytical calculations, we will adopt a simplified model which, however, under certain circumstances, may be extended also to a N -body solar system like ours. To be more specific, we will assume that possible variations of the other orbital elements of the planet and of its spin axis induced by the gravitational interaction with, say, other possible members of its planetary system like, e.g., planets and Moon-like satellite(s) and its parent star (stellar oblateness, post-Newtonian effects) are characterized by timescales much longer than the orbital period

around the SMBH. In the case of our Earth, the precession of the equinoxes occurs in 0.086 Myr, while its orbital elements changes in $\approx 0.1 - 3$ Myr (Murray & Dermott 2000, Tab. A.3). It should be kept in mind that we are not embarking in a detailed paleoclimatological or archeoastronomical investigation of a specific existing habitat like our Earth; instead, we are just interested in outlining a general picture that capture some salient aspects and that, hopefully, encourage further, more detailed studies.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we analytically work out, in a perturbative way, the doubly averaged long-term rates of change of the semimajor axis a , the eccentricity e , the inclination I to the reference $\{x, y\}$ plane, the longitude of the ascending node Ω , and the longitude of periastron ϖ of the Earth-like planet. Furthermore, we discuss the evolution of the periastron distance $q = a(1 - e)$ and I over a \approx Myr timescale or so. Section 3 deals with the long-term rates of change of the components of the planet’s spin axis S , with particular emphasis on the obliquity ε . Section 4 summarizes our findings and offers our conclusions.

2. Orbital perturbations due to a distant SMBH

Here, we will analytically calculate the long-term orbital perturbations induced by the distant SMBH on the motion of the Earth-like planet around its Sun-type parent star by doubly averaging them over both the yearlong planetary orbital period P_b and the much longer period P_\bullet of the revolution of the Sun-planet system around the SMBH itself. In performing the second average, we will assume that any possible long-term variations of the planetary orbital parameters due to, e.g., the putative N -body interactions with any other planets orbiting the same star and the classical and relativistic post-Keplerian (pK) components (stellar oblateness J_2^* , Schwarzschild, Lense-Thirring) of the gravitational field of the latter occur much more slowly than the galactic revolution itself. As an example, let us note that the periods of the overall changes experienced by the inclination I_\oplus , the longitude of the ascending node Ω_\oplus , and the longitude of perihelion ϖ_\oplus of the real Earth, inferable from their secular rates of change as released by the WEB interface HORIZONS, maintained by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) of NASA, are as long as $\approx 0.1 - 3$ Myr; see also Murray & Dermott (2000, Tab. A.3). On the other hand, a galactocentric semimajor axis as large as, say, $a_\bullet \approx 1$ pc, corresponding to a perinigricon distance of some 1500 Schwarzschild radii² (R_S) for moderate eccentricities $e_\bullet \lesssim 0.1$ and of $\approx 500 - 150 R_S$ for $e_\bullet \approx 0.7 - 0.9$, gives a revolution period $P_\bullet \approx 0.001$ Myr = 1 kyr = 10 cty. Incidentally, such distances from the SMBH assures that the planet would not be tidally locked, as per Fig. 2 of Schnittman (2019), thus avoiding the related consequences on its habitability. Moreover, if we assume values of the order of $\sigma \approx 1 - 1.5 \times 10^{-3} c$ (Murphy, Gebhardt & Cradit 2014) for the stellar velocity dispersion σ , as for M87, the orbit of our fictitious star-planet system falls well

²The Schwarzschild radius of M87* amounts to $R_S = 2GM_\bullet/c^2 \approx 128$ au, where G is the Newtonian constant of gravitation and c is the speed of light in vacuum.

within the SMBH’s sphere of influence defined by $r_H = GM_\bullet/\sigma^2 \simeq 100 - 300$ pc (Peebles 1972). Thus, we can neglect the effects of the whole galactic potential on the stellar trajectory which, otherwise, may turn out to be remarkably non-Keplerian (Binney & Tremaine 1987; Contopoulos & Efthymiopoulos 2011).

Our calculation, to the quadrupole order of the tidal perturbing potential (Hogg, Quinlan & Tremaine 1991) of a distant, pointlike perturber, is not restricted to any particular orbital geometries of both the planetary and the galactic motions, i.e., our resulting formulas hold for any values of the eccentricities e , e_\bullet and the inclinations I , I_\bullet of the astrocentric and galactocentric orbits, respectively. As such, our results have a general validity, and hold in any coordinate system.

By inserting the doubly averaged³ quadrupole tidal potential due to a pointlike, massive distant perturber (Hogg, Quinlan & Tremaine 1991) in the Lagrange planetary equations (Murray & Dermott 2000; Bertotti, Farinella & Vokrouhlický 2003; Kopeikin, Efroimsky & Kaplan 2011) allows to straightforwardly obtain

$$\frac{da}{dt} = 0, \tag{1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{de}{dt} = & \frac{15 GM_\bullet e \sqrt{1-e^2}}{32 a_\bullet^3 (1-e_\bullet^2)^{3/2} n_b} \left\{ \left[(1 + 3 \cos 2I_\bullet) \sin^2 I + (3 + \cos 2I) \cos 2\Delta\Omega \sin^2 I_\bullet - \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. - 2 \cos \Delta\Omega \sin 2I \sin 2I_\bullet \right] \sin 2\omega + 8 \cos 2\omega \sin I_\bullet [-\cos I_\bullet \sin I + \right. \\ & \left. + \cos I \cos \Delta\Omega \sin I_\bullet] \sin \Delta\Omega \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dI}{dt} = & \frac{3 GM_\bullet}{8 a_\bullet^3 (1-e_\bullet^2)^{3/2} \sqrt{1-e^2} n_b} (\cos I \cos I_\bullet + \cos \Delta\Omega \sin I \sin I_\bullet) \times \\ & \times \left[5 e^2 (-\cos I_\bullet \sin I + \cos I \cos \Delta\Omega \sin I_\bullet) \sin 2\omega + \right. \\ & \left. + (2 + 3 e^2 + 5 e^2 \cos 2\omega) \sin I_\bullet \sin \Delta\Omega \right], \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

$$\frac{d\Omega}{dt} = -\frac{3 GM_\bullet}{8 a_\bullet^3 (1-e_\bullet^2)^{3/2} \sqrt{1-e^2} n_b} (\cos I_\bullet \cot I + \cos \Delta\Omega \sin I_\bullet) \times$$

³For the reasons explained above, we can assume Keplerian ellipses as reference trajectories in both averages.

$$\begin{aligned} & \times \left[-(-2 - 3e^2 + 5e^2 \cos 2\omega) (\cos I_\bullet \sin I - \cos I \cos \Delta\Omega \sin I_\bullet) - \right. \\ & \left. - 5e^2 \sin I_\bullet \sin 2\omega \sin \Delta\Omega \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\omega}{dt} = & -\frac{GM_\bullet}{8a_\bullet^3 (1-e_\bullet^2)^{3/2} \sqrt{1-e^2} n_b} \{3 \cot I (\cos I \cos I_\bullet + \cos \Delta\Omega \sin I \sin I_\bullet) \times \\ & \times \left[(-2 - 3e^2 + 5e^2 \cos 2\omega) (\cos I_\bullet \sin I - \cos I \cos \Delta\Omega \sin I_\bullet) + 5e^2 \sin I_\bullet \sin 2\omega \sin \Delta\Omega \right] + \\ & + \frac{3}{8} (-1 + e^2) \left\{ 1 + \cos 2I_\bullet (3 + 30 \cos 2\omega \sin^2 I) + 6 \cos 2\Delta\Omega \sin^2 I_\bullet + \right. \\ & + \cos 2I \left[3 + 9 \cos 2I_\bullet + 2(-3 + 5 \cos 2\omega) \cos 2\Delta\Omega \sin^2 I_\bullet \right] + \\ & + 12 \cos \Delta\Omega \sin 2I \sin 2I_\bullet + 10 \left[\cos 2\omega (\sin^2 I + 3 \cos 2\Delta\Omega \sin^2 I_\bullet - \right. \\ & \left. \left. - 2 \cos \Delta\Omega \sin 2I \sin 2I_\bullet) + 4 \sin 2\omega (-\cos I \sin I_\bullet^2 \sin 2\Delta\Omega + \sin I \sin 2I_\bullet \sin \Delta\Omega) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

In Eqs. (1) to (5), $n_b = \sqrt{GM_\star/a^3} = 2\pi/P_b$ is the Keplerian mean motion of the planet's orbit around its star of mass $M_\star = 1 M_\odot$, while $\Delta\Omega \doteq \Omega - \Omega_\bullet$ is the difference of the nodes of the planetary and SMBH orbital planes; ω is the planet's argument of periastron.

In analogy with the Sun-Earth case, let us assume that the planetary orbital motion occurs just in the reference $\{x, y\}$ plane adopted, i.e., we put $I = 0$, and focus on Equation (2). It turns out that its trigonometric part enclosed in the curly brackets, which is characterized by the orientations of the orbital planes of the planet and of the SMBH determining, among other things, the sign of the rate of change of the eccentricity, assumes its maximum positive value, corresponding to 4, for $\Delta\Omega = 254$ deg, $I_\bullet = 90$ deg, $\omega = 151$ deg. In the following, we will adopt such values in order to maximize the effects we are interested in. Figure 1 deals with a system revolving around the SMBH within a time span of $P_\bullet = 1$ kyr by depicting the temporal evolutions of the perihelion distance $q = a(1 - e)$ to its parent star over $\Delta t = 7$ Myr for different values of the eccentricity e_\bullet of the galactocentric orbit.




Fig. 1.— Upper panel: Plot of the perihelion distance $q(t) = a_0(1 - e_0 - \Delta e(t))$, in units of solar radii R_{\odot} , as a function of time t , in Myr, over a time span $\Delta t = 7$ Myr for different values of the eccentricity e_{\bullet} of the orbital motion of the star-planet system about a SMBH with $M_{\bullet} = 6.5 \times 10^9 M_{\odot}$ occurring in $P_{\bullet} = 1$ kyr ($a_{\bullet} = 1$ pc). In order to obtain $\Delta e(t)$, we straightforwardly integrated Equation (2) by keeping the astrocentric and galactocentric orbital parameters entering it fixed to $a_0 = 1$ au, $e_0 = 0.0167$, $I_0 = 0$, $\omega_0 = 151$ deg, $I_{\bullet} = 90$ deg, $\Delta\Omega_0 = 254$ deg. The assumed values of the Euler-type angular variables maximize the right-hand-side of Equation (2) which turns out to be positive. The intersection of the curves with the horizontal axis, marked by $q = 1 R_{\odot}$, corresponds to the impact of the planet with its parent star. Lower panel: same as in the upper panel, apart from the fact that $\Delta e(t)$ was integrated by assuming the same N -body rates of change for the planet’s orbital elements as of the Earth. They were retrieved from the HORIZONS Web interface maintained by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL), NASA; see also Murray & Dermott (2000, Tab. A.3).

In the upper panel, it was assumed that the no other pK variations of the planetary orbital elements occur or, equivalently, that their timescales are much longer than P_{\bullet} and Δt . It can be noticed that, for the adopted orbital geometry, an Earth-type orbit starting at the same distance of our planet from the Sun becomes soon hardly able to sustain life because of the steady increase of the insolation due to the decrease of q , even ending on the star after few Myr. The larger the eccentricity of the galactocentric orbit, the sooner the planet impacts its parent star. In the lower panel, any N -body secular rates of change of the planet’s orbital elements were taken into account by assuming the same values of the Earth for them. The picture is, now, quite different, showing wild harmonic variations, especially pronounced for large galactocentric eccentricities, which may even lead the planet to impacting its star after a few Myr. Anyway, the excursions turn out to be so huge that the long-term habitability on such a world seems hard to be preserved. Suffices it to say that an inspection of Fig. 4 of Vieira et al. (2012) shows that the the maximum annually integrated change of the Earth’s Total Solar Irradiance (TSI) related to the orbital eccentricity variation of just $\Delta e \simeq 0.045$ over the last 0.6 Myr is as little as $\simeq 1.5 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ (Laskar et al. 2004), i.e. roughly $\simeq 0.1\%$ of the TSI’s baseline value of approximately $1.361 \times 10^3 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ during minima in solar activity (Kopp & Lean 2011).

Figure 2 displays the temporal evolutions of the planet’s orbital inclination I over $\Delta t = 0.1 \text{ Myr}$ for different values of the eccentricity e_{\bullet} of the galactocentric orbit. The upper panel is based on the straightforward integration of Equation (3) by keeping the planet’s perihelion fixed to the value $\omega = 180 \text{ deg}$ which, along with $I_{\bullet} = 135 \text{ deg}$, $\Delta\Omega = 270 \text{ deg}$, yield the maximum of the trigonometric factor in the right-hand-side of Equation (3). The resulting change of the inclination can be quite remarkable, especially for very eccentric motion around the SMBH.




Fig. 2.— Upper panel: Plot of the inclination I , in deg, as a function of time t , in Myr, over a time span $\Delta t = 0.1$ Myr for different values of the eccentricity e_{\bullet} of the orbital motion of the star-planet system about a SMBH with $M_{\bullet} = 6.5 \times 10^9 M_{\odot}$ occurring in $P_{\bullet} = 1$ kyr ($a_{\bullet} = 1$ pc). In order to obtain $\Delta I(t)$, we straightforwardly integrated Equation (3) by keeping the astrocentric and galactocentric orbital parameters entering it fixed to $a_0 = 1$ au, $e_0 = 0.0167$, $I_0 = 0$, $\omega_0 = 180$ deg, $I_{\bullet} = 135$ deg, $\Delta\Omega_0 = 270$ deg. The assumed values of the Euler-type angular variables maximize the right-hand-side of Equation (3) which turns out to be positive. Lower panel: same as in the upper panel, apart from the fact that $\Delta I(t)$ was integrated by assuming the same N -body rates of change for the planet’s orbital elements as of the Earth. They were retrieved from the HORIZONS Web interface maintained by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL), NASA; see also Murray & Dermott (2000, Tab. A.3).

The lower panel of Figure 2 takes into account putative N -body interactions with any other

planets of the stellar system assuming them equal to the Earth’s ones, as in Figure 1. Also in this case, the amplitudes of the resulting harmonic shifts can reach tens of degrees for $e_{\bullet} = 0.7 - 0.9$, at least over the time span adopted. For the sake of a comparison, according to Fig. 4 of Vieira et al. (2012), for rather modest variations of I_{\oplus} , the Earth’s TSI changes by up to 0.14 W m^{-2} . However, variations of the Earth’s orbital inclination during the last 0.6 Myr amounted to $\Delta I_{\oplus} \lesssim 2.5 \text{ deg}$ (Varadi, Runnegar & Ghil 2003). In this scenario, the maximum terrestrial TSI modulation due to orbital inclination is $\simeq 3 \times 10^{-3} \text{ W m}^{-2}$. Thus, it is arguable that the distant SMBH, if located at certain positions in the sky, may have a serious impact on the habitability of the considered Earth-like planet also through the perturbations on its inclination.

Finally, let us mention that, although not directly related to the stellar insolation, also the precessions of the node and the periastron may potentially have a somewhat indirect impact on the long-term habitability of the planet. Indeed, investigations on the so-called Galactic Habitability Zone (GHZ) (Prantzos 2008) revealed that the central regions may be potentially harmful for life because an enhanced rate of explosions of supernovæ which are expected to be more numerous in the galactic inner regions. Thus, we believe that a rapidly varying position of the orbit in its orbital plane and of the latter itself, caused by fast precessing periastron and node, respectively, might somewhat augment the potential exposure of the planet to sterilising supernova events (Sloan, Alves Batista & Loeb 2017) over the eons.

3. The precession of the spin angular momentum of the planet

Here, we look at possible long-term variations of the obliquity ε of the planet’s spin axis \hat{S} with respect to the plane of its orbital motion around its parent star due to the gravitational pull of the SMBH. In order to describe the external torque acting on the planetary angular momentum, we will assume a simplified model, adequate for our illustrative scopes. Indeed, it should be recalled once again that we are not carrying out any detailed paleoclimatological study of the real Earth, being instead our aim to outline a general picture capable of capturing some key features of the investigated scenario.

By assuming that the Earth-like planet under consideration has mass m , equatorial radius R , spin angular momentum S , and dimensionless quadrupole mass moment J_2 , the rate of change of S induced by the SMBH located in the direction \hat{r}_{\bullet} at distance r_{\bullet} can be expressed as (Poisson & Will 2014)

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\frac{3 G m J_2 R^2 M_{\bullet}}{r_{\bullet}^3} (\hat{S} \cdot \hat{r}_{\bullet}) (\hat{S} \times \hat{r}_{\bullet}). \quad (6)$$

Thus, the long-term precessions of the components \hat{S}_x , \hat{S}_y , \hat{S}_z of the planet’s spin axis \hat{S} , averaged over one full galactocentric orbital period P_{\bullet} , turn out to be

$$\frac{d\hat{S}_x}{dt} = \frac{3 G m J_2 R^2 M_{\bullet}}{2 S a_{\bullet}^3 (1 - e_{\bullet}^2)^{3/2}} (\hat{S}_y \cos I_{\bullet} + \hat{S}_z \sin I_{\bullet} \cos \Omega_{\bullet}) [\hat{S}_z \cos I_{\bullet} +$$

$$+ \sin I_{\bullet} \left(\hat{S}_x \sin \Omega_{\bullet} - \hat{S}_y \cos \Omega_{\bullet} \right)], \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\hat{S}_y}{dt} = & -\frac{3 G m J_2 R^2 M_{\bullet}}{2 S a_{\bullet}^3 (1 - e_{\bullet}^2)^{3/2}} \left(\hat{S}_x \cos I_{\bullet} - \hat{S}_z \sin I_{\bullet} \sin \Omega_{\bullet} \right) \left[\hat{S}_z \cos I_{\bullet} + \right. \\ & \left. + \sin I_{\bullet} \left(\hat{S}_x \sin \Omega_{\bullet} - \hat{S}_y \cos \Omega_{\bullet} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\hat{S}_z}{dt} = & -\frac{3 G m J_2 R^2 M_{\bullet} \sin I_{\bullet}}{2 S a_{\bullet}^3 (1 - e_{\bullet}^2)^{3/2}} \left(\hat{S}_x \cos \Omega_{\bullet} + \hat{S}_y \sin \Omega_{\bullet} \right) \left[\hat{S}_z \cos I_{\bullet} + \right. \\ & \left. + \sin I_{\bullet} \left(\hat{S}_x \sin \Omega_{\bullet} - \hat{S}_y \cos \Omega_{\bullet} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

It should be noted that Eqs. (7) to (9), which are valid for an arbitrary SMBH's orbital configuration in any coordinate system, hold if \hat{S}_x , \hat{S}_y , \hat{S}_z , which were kept fixed in the integration over P_{\bullet} , can be considered as approximately constant during an orbital period of the galactocentric motion. Such a condition would be fulfilled in the case of our Earth since the lunisolar precession of the equinoxes occurs in $\simeq 26$ kyr, while $P_{\bullet} = 1$ kyr. By posing

$$\hat{S}_x = \sin \varepsilon \cos \beta, \quad (10)$$

$$\hat{S}_y = \sin \varepsilon \sin \beta, \quad (11)$$

$$\hat{S}_z = \cos \varepsilon, \quad (12)$$

and defining

$$\Gamma \doteq \beta - \Omega_{\bullet}, \quad (13)$$

Equation (9) yields for the spin's obliquity ε

$$\frac{d\varepsilon}{dt} = \frac{3 G m J_2 R^2 M_{\bullet} \sin I_{\bullet} \cos \Gamma}{2 S a_{\bullet}^3 (1 - e_{\bullet}^2)^{3/2}} (\cos I_{\bullet} \cos \varepsilon - \sin I_{\bullet} \sin \varepsilon \sin \Gamma). \quad (14)$$

We remark that Eqs. (7) to (9), and, in particular, Equation (14), in view of their generality, can be used, e.g., also in the search for the hypothesized Telisto/Planet Nine (Batygin et al. 2019), putatively residing in the outskirts of our solar system, by looking, among other things, at its impact on the spin axis of the Sun (Bailey, Batygin & Brown 2016), and of the other known planets as well.

If we assume for the planet's obliquity the Earth's value $\varepsilon \simeq 23.5$ deg, it turns out that the secular change induced by the SMBH is negligible, as shown by Figure 3.




Fig. 3.— Upper panel: Plot of the obliquity ε , in deg, as a function of time t , in Myr, over a time span $\Delta t = 1$ Myr for different values of the eccentricity e_{\bullet} of the orbital motion of the star-planet system about a SMBH with $M_{\bullet} = 6.5 \times 10^9 M_{\odot}$ occurring in $P_{\bullet} = 1$ kyr ($a_{\bullet} = 1$ pc). In order to obtain $\Delta\varepsilon(t)$, we straightforwardly integrated Equation (14) by keeping the planetary spin and galactocentric orbital parameters entering it fixed to $I_{\bullet} = 45$ deg, $\Gamma = 0$ deg. They maximize the right-hand-side of Equation (14), which turns out to be positive. Lower panel: same as in the upper panel, apart from the fact that $\Delta\varepsilon(t)$ was integrated by assuming the same precession of the equinoxes of the Earth for the spin’s azimuth angle β . For the telluric planet we adopted the terrestrial values $J_2 = 1.08 \times 10^{-3}$, $R = 6378$ km, $S = 5.86 \times 10^{33}$ Js, $\varepsilon = 23.5$ deg.

Indeed, even by maximizing the trigonometric factor of Equation (14) for $I_{\bullet} = 45$, deg, $\Gamma = 0$ and assuming no precession of the equinoxes, the resulting change experienced by ε amounts just to $\Delta\varepsilon \lesssim 0.02$ deg over 1 Myr even for large galactocentric eccentricities. Allowing the spin’s

azimuthal angle β to precess in 26 kyr does not essentially alter the situation. In the case of the real Earth, Eqs. (31) to (32) of Laskar et al. (2004) show that ε exhibits an average rate as little as $\simeq 0.002 \text{ deg Myr}^{-1}$, with jumps of the order of $\simeq 0.4 \text{ deg}$, over 500 Myr.

4. Summary and conclusions

We, first, analytically worked out, in a perturbative way, the long-term orbital perturbations experienced by a fictitious Earth-like planet orbiting its Sun-type parent star because of the gravitational pull of a SMBH no less than hundreds-thousands of its Schwarzschild radii away, depending on the eccentricity e_\bullet of the two-body system's galactocentric motion. We doubly averaged them over both the yearly planet's orbital period P_b and the time P_\bullet required to describe a galactocentric orbital revolution. The resulting expressions are valid in an arbitrary coordinate system, and are not restricted to any specific orbital geometries of both the planet and the SMBH. For the sake of definiteness, we assumed the mass of M87* for the SMBH, whose apparent motion around the restricted two-body system, characterized by any value of the eccentricity e_\bullet , has a period $P_\bullet = 1 \text{ kyr}$. In order to tentatively look at the ability of the planet to sustain complex life over time spans millions of years long, we focussed on its perihelion distance q and orbital inclination I , which are recognized as the fundamental quantities characterizing the insolation of the Earth. We preliminarily investigated their temporal evolutions over a $\simeq \text{Myr}$ timescale by considering the planet both isolated in such a way that its orbital elements stay fixed, and impacted by possible N -body gravitational interactions with any other planets which we modeled as for the Earth. It turned out that, by assuming the specific orbital configurations which maximize their amplitudes, both q and I may undergo notable variations over a few Myr which would seriously affect the habitability of the hypothesized world, especially for large values of e_\bullet . Suffices it to say that, for $e_\bullet \simeq 0.7 - 0.9$, the planet, starting from the current heliocentric distance of the Earth, may even impact its star in $\simeq 2 - 3 \text{ Myr}$ also when possible N -body harmonic modulations of the otherwise purely linear trends of q are taken into account. For the same values of e_\bullet , I may be shifted by $\simeq 5 - 30 \text{ deg}$ or so.

Then, we looked also at the long-term changes of the planet's spin axis \hat{S} due to the SMBH, with particular emphasis on the obliquity ε to the ecliptic-like plane, which is another key parameter for the habitability of an Earth-like world. We obtained perturbatively general analytical expressions for the rates of change of the three components of \hat{S} averaged over P_\bullet by keeping them constant in the integration. The rate of change of \hat{S}_z allowed us to infer the long-term precession of the obliquity. It turned out that, contrary to q and I , ε is not notably affected by the SMBH. Indeed, by using the same physical parameters of the Earth and the spin-orbital configuration which maximizes $\dot{\varepsilon}$, we obtained a shift as little as $\simeq 0.02 \text{ deg}$ over 1 Myr. Also the modulations induced by a possible Earth-like, slow precession of the equinoxes did not alter essentially such a conclusion.

We stress that the scope of our paper is not a detailed paleoclimatological study of the real

Earth or of any other existing alien ecosystem over the eons; thus, our necessarily simplified approach, which, for example, assumed a purely Keplerian trajectory of the star-planet system around the galactic SMBH, is adequate for our illustrative goals.

Our results, although necessarily preliminary and just indicative of the overall picture, have, nonetheless, a broader validity in a specific sense. Indeed, they can be applied not only to any orbital configurations of both the planet and the SMBH, but also to quite different astronomical and astrophysical systems like, e.g., extrasolar planets and, say, triple systems made of compact stellar corpses like neutron stars and white dwarfs usually described in a coordinate system whose fundamental reference plane coincides with the plane of the sky. Moreover, they can be applied also to the hunt for Telisto/Planet Nine in our solar system by looking at its effects not only on the orbits of the other known planets, but also on their spin axes and of the Sun itself.

REFERENCES

- Bailey E., Batygin K., Brown M. E., 2016, *AJ*, 152, 126
- Batygin K., Adams F. C., Brown M. E., Becker J. C., 2019, *Phys. Rep.*, 805, 1
- Bertotti B., Farinella P., Vokrouhlický D., 2003, *Physics of the Solar System*. Kluwer Academic Press, Dordrecht
- Binney J., Tremaine S., 1987, *Galactic dynamics*. Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Contopoulos G., Efthymiopoulos C., 2011, *Scholarpedia*, 6, 10670, revision #91294
- Davari N., Capuzzo-Dolcetta R., Spurzem R., 2019, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1908.06298
- Dokuchaev V. I., 2011, *Classical Quant. Grav.*, 28, 235015
- Dokuchaev V. I., 2012, *Gravit. Cosmol.*, 18, 65
- Dressing C. D., Spiegel D. S., Scharf C. A., Menou K., Raymond S. N., 2010, *ApJ*, 721, 1295
- Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration et al., 2019a, *ApJ*, 875, L6
- Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration et al., 2019b, *ApJ*, 875, L1
- Forbes J. C., Loeb A., 2018, *MNRAS*, 479, 171
- Habibi M. et al., 2019, *ApJL*, 872, L15
- Hogg D. W., Quinlan G. D., Tremaine S., 1991, *AJ*, 101, 2274
- Kauffmann J., 2016, *Proceedings of the International Astronomical Union*, 11, 75
- Kilic C., Raible C. C., Stocker T. F., 2017, *ApJ*, 844, 147
- Kopeikin S., Efroimsky M., Kaplan G., 2011, *Relativistic Celestial Mechanics of the Solar System*. Wiley-VCH, Weinheim
- Kopp G., Lean J. L., 2011, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 38, L01706
- Kruijssen J. M. D. et al., 2019, *MNRAS*, 484, 5734
- Laskar J., Joutel F., Boudin F., 1993, *A&A*, 270, 522
- Laskar J., Joutel F., Robutel P., 1993, *Nature*, 361, 615
- Laskar J., Robutel P., Joutel F., Gastineau M., Correia A. C. M., Levrard B., 2004, *A&A*, 428, 261
- Lingam M., Ginsburg I., Bialy S., 2019, *ApJ*, 877, 62

- Linsenmeier M., Pascale S., Lucarini V., 2015, *Planet. Space Sci.*, 105, 43
- Mehrgan K., Thomas J., Saglia R., Mazzalay X., Erwin P., Bender R., Kluge M., Fabricius M., 2019, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1907.10608
- Morris M., 1993, *ApJ*, 408, 496
- Murphy J. D., Gebhardt K., Cradit M., 2014, *ApJ*, 785, 143
- Murray C. D., Dermott S. F., 2000, *Solar System Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press
- Opatrný T., Richterek L., Bakala P., 2017, *Am. J. Phys.*, 85, 14
- Peebles P. J. E., 1972, *ApJ*, 178, 371
- Poisson E., Will C. M., 2014, *Gravity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Prantzos N., 2008, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 135, 313
- Schnittman J. D., 2019, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1910.00940
- Schödel R. et al., 2002, *Nature*, 419, 694
- Shemmer O., Netzer H., Maiolino R., Oliva E., Croom S., Corbett E., di Fabrizio L., 2004, *ApJ*, 614, 547
- Sloan D., Alves Batista R., Loeb A., 2017, *Sci. Rep.*, 7, 5419
- Spiegel D. S., Raymond S. N., Dressing C. D., Scharf C. A., Mitchell J. L., 2010, *ApJ*, 721, 1308
- Trani A. A., Mapelli M., Spera M., Bressan A., 2016, *ApJ*, 831, 61
- Varadi F., Runnegar B., Ghil M., 2003, *ApJ*, 592, 620
- Vieira L. E. A., Norton A., Dudok de Wit T., Kretzschmar M., Schmidt G. A., Cheung M. C. M., 2012, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 39
- Wada K., Tsukamoto Y., Kokubo E., 2019, *ApJ*, arXiv:1909.06748, at press
- Williams D. M., Kasting J. F., 1997, *Icarus*, 129, 254
- Williams D. M., Pollard D., 2002, *Int. J. Astrobiol.*, 1, 61