

A candidate location for Planet 9 from an interstellar meteoroid: The messenger hypothesis

HECTOR SOCAS-NAVARRO^{1,2}

¹*Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, Vía Láctea S/N, La Laguna 38205, Tenerife, Spain*

²*Departamento de Astrofísica, Universidad de La Laguna, 38205, Tenerife, Spain*

ABSTRACT

The existence of a hypothetical Planet 9 lurking in the outer solar system has been invoked as a plausible explanation for the anomalous clustering in the orbits of trans-Neptunian objects. Here we propose that some meteoroids arriving at Earth could serve as messengers with the potential of revealing the presence of a hitherto undiscovered massive object. The peculiar meteor CNEOS 2014-01-08, recently put forward as the first interstellar meteor, might be one such messenger. The meteor radiant is in the maximum probability region calculated for the Planet 9 location in previous works. The odds of this coincidence being due to chance are $\sim 1\%$. Furthermore, some statistical anomalies about CNEOS 2014-01-08 are resolved under the hypothesis that it was flung at Earth by a gravitational encounter. Integrating its trajectory backwards in time would then lead to the region of the sky where Planet 9 is more likely to reside. Based on the available data, we propose the region at coordinates R.A. $53.0 \pm 4.3^\circ$, declination $9.2 \pm 1.3^\circ$ as a plausible candidate location for Planet 9.

Keywords: planets and satellites: detection – Kuiper belt: general – minor planets, asteroids: general – meteorites, meteors, meteoroids

1. INTRODUCTION

The peculiar clustering of orbital parameters observed in very eccentric extreme trans-Neptunian objects (ETNOs) has prompted the suggestion that there might be a large planetary mass object still undiscovered in the outer solar system (Trujillo & Sheppard 2014; de la Fuente Marcos & de la Fuente Marcos 2014; Batygin & Brown 2016; Brown & Batygin 2016; Millholland & Laughlin 2017). These ETNOs are too far away from Neptune to feel its gravitational influence. However, most of them reach their perihelion in the ecliptic and have their elliptical orbits aligned, with an ascending node (Ω) and orbital plane inclination (i) that are tightly clustered. This coincidence could be explained by the presence of a large, very distant planet with a mass between 4 and 8.4 times that of the Earth and a semi-major axis between 300 and 520 AU (Brown & Batygin 2021, hereafter BB21, see also de la Fuente Marcos & de la Fuente Marcos 2016). It has even been suggested that the unseen perturber might not be a planet at all but a primordial black hole (Scholtz & Unwin 2020), a hypothetical class of black holes formed in the early Universe.

It should be noted that the evidence for ETNO clustering is not undisputed. Some controversy exists on

whether it is a real effect or a statistical artifact caused by observational biases (see Shankman et al. 2017; Bernardinelli et al. 2020; Napier et al. 2021; Brown & Batygin 2021). An independent clue supporting the existence of a putative Planet 9 comes from the ETNO pair 2004 VN₁₁₂ and 2013 RF₉₈. de León et al. (2017) present spectroscopic and dynamic evidence indicating that these two objects were probably a binary asteroid that became detached near their aphelion by a gravitational encounter with an unknown trans-Neptunian planetary body.

The reader can find a review on our current knowledge of the outer solar system in Gladman & Volk (2021). If Planet 9 indeed exists, it would be extremely difficult to detect and identify. First, it would be a very faint object (probably around magnitude 20 ± 2 in the R band). Furthermore, its orbital velocity would be extremely slow, completing an orbit every 7,000 to 15,000 years (see BB21).

Multi-messenger astronomy has been gaining importance very rapidly during the last decade and is often recognized as a high priority for funding agencies (see, e.g., Astro2020, National Academies 2021). The term messenger here means particles or waves, other than photons, sent in our direction by celestial bodies. Normally, this refers to neutrinos, gravitational waves

and cosmic rays. We note that small asteroids or meteoroids, accelerated by massive bodies and eventually hitting Earth as meteors, behave as particles that bring us information from distant astrophysical objects. Thus, they may be considered as cosmic messengers, as well. In this paper we argue that the first detection of such meteoroid messenger could be CNEOS 2014-01-08 (hereafter CNEOS14), perhaps unveiling to us the location of Planet 9.

2. THE METEOROID

In a search to discover new interstellar objects, [Siraj & Loeb \(2022\)](#) (hereafter SL22) parsed the [CNEOS fireball database](#) for meteors with a hyperbolic trajectory. Amongst all recorded events, SL22 found one meteor with a clearly hyperbolic trajectory, CNEOS14, which impacted at 17:05:34 (UT) near Papua New Guinea (impact coordinates 1.3°S , 147.6°E). Its heliocentric velocity at that moment was $\simeq 60 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, according to SL22, or $61 \pm 5.8 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, according to [Peña-Asensio et al. \(2022\)](#).

By means of numerical simulations (detailed below), we traced back the trajectory of CNEOS14 to the outer solar system and determined the meteoroid position in the sky (distant radiant) as it traversed the Planet 9 possible orbits, at distances between 300 and 600 AU from the Sun. The distant radiant obtained was R.A. $51.6 \pm 4.3^{\circ}$, dec $8.6 \pm 1.2^{\circ}$. Strikingly, this location is within the band of possible Planet 9 locations published in BB21, as shown in Figure 1. In fact it lies well within the red area of higher probability to find the planet. This is a very remarkable coincidence since, as we discuss below, it is rather unlikely to occur by chance.

Other radiant coordinates given in previous works have slightly different meanings, which might account for the small discrepancies amongst them (in addition, of course, to possible differences in the simulation details). [Peña-Asensio et al. \(2022\)](#) obtained R.A. $62.8 \pm 1.1^{\circ}$, dec $14.0 \pm 2.8^{\circ}$ for the geocentric radiant. This refers to the incoming directorion of the meteoroid before the impact if its trajectory had not been curved by Earth's gravity. SL22 obtained R.A. $49.4 \pm 4.1^{\circ}$, dec $11.2 \pm 1.8^{\circ}$ for the asymptotic radiant, which is the direction of the meteoroid at infinity.

We explored the trajectory of CNEOS14 by integrating its motion backwards from the impact location throughout the solar system, out to 1000 AU. A newtonian N-body simulation code was employed, accounting for the gravitation of the Sun, the planets and the Moon. This code is publicly available and has been described elsewhere ([Socas-Navarro 2019](#)).

The simulation is initialized with the meteoroid at the impact site and observed velocity. The location and ini-

tial velocities for the planets and the Moon are obtained from the JPL Horizons system ([Giorgini 2015](#)). A total of 1,000 clones are generated with random perturbations applied to the initial velocity in order to account for the observational uncertainties. In the first 500 clones, the initial velocity perturbation follows a Gaussian distribution with central value 0 and standard deviation equal to 10% of the observed value.

The remaining 500 clones have their initial velocity modulus multiplied by a random factor uniformly distributed between 1.0 and 1.1 to account for the possibility that the meteoroid might have experienced some deceleration (up to 10%) upon contact with the atmosphere.

The simulation is divided into two stages. In the first stage, the meteoroid is very close to Earth and the Moon, and we need a higher temporal resolution to obtain an accurate trajectory reconstruction. For this phase we use a time resolution of 1 s and compute one million time-steps. The simulation time spanned in this phase is 11.57 days and ends with the meteoroid in interplanetary space at 0.3 AU from Earth. The second phase starts at the end of phase 1, has a coarser time resolution and a much longer span of simulation time to cover the meteoroid trip into the outer solar system. For this phase we used a time resolution of 1 hour and again one million time-steps, spanning a total of 110 years of simulation time.

According to the simulations, the meteoroid crossed the 300 and 600 AU heliocentric distances 32 and 65 years before the impact. Its celestial coordinates (radiant) did not vary significantly between 300 and 600 AU but they do vary among clones. They are plotted in Figure 2, with orange dots representing the first 500 clones and blue dots representing the clones with the atmospheric deceleration of up to 10%. The median coordinates are R.A. $50.7 \pm 4.1^{\circ}$, declination $8.3 \pm 1.2^{\circ}$ for the first 500 clones and R.A. $51.6 \pm 4.3^{\circ}$, declination $8.6 \pm 1.2^{\circ}$ when the entire sample is considered. Note that the errors on these coordinates are not uncorrelated. On average, clones with higher values of R.A. have slightly higher declinations, as well.

3. STATISTICAL ANOMALIES

There are some intriguing statistical anomalies about CNEOS14 if we consider it as an interstellar object with an unperturbed inbound trajectory from the interstellar medium.

1. Its approach trajectory was very close to the plane of the ecliptic, with only a 7° inclination. An interstellar object would be expected to come in from any random direction. Assuming an isotropic




Figure 1. Map of the entire sky in a Mollweide projection. The colored band marks the range of possible Planet 9 orbits, as obtained by BB21 (greater probability in red colors). Horizontal blue ellipse: CNEOS14 coordinates when it was at a distance between 300 and 600 AU from the Sun (the predicted range of distances for the Planet 9 orbit). Horizontal green ellipse: Asymptotic radiant (i.e., at infinity) obtained by SL22. Vertical yellow ellipse: Geocentric radiant (i.e., immediately before impact) obtained by Peña-Asensio et al. (2022). The green dot marks the solar apex, i.e. the direction of motion of the solar system.




Figure 2. Distribution of simulation clones at 300 AU. Orange dots: First 500 clones, no atmospheric slowdown effect considered. Blue dots: Remaining 500 clones with initial velocities augmented by a random factor between 1 and 1.1 (uniform distribution).

distribution of inbound velocities, the inclination angles (i) with respect to the plane of the ecliptic would follow a uniform distribution in $\sin(i)$ and the cumulative probability for a single object to have an inclination lower than i_0 would be given by $P(i < i_0) = \sin(i_0)$. In our case, $P(i < 7^\circ)$ is only 12%. We can compare this value to the other known interstellar interlopers.

1I/'Oumuamua had an inclination of 122° (i.e., 58° from the ecliptic plane but moving in a retrograde motion), resulting in a cumulative probability $P=85\%$. 2I/Borisov had a 44° inclination, yielding a probability $P=69\%$. Of course, the current sample of interstellar interlopers is too limited for a meaningful comparison. They are mentioned here simply as illustrative examples exhibiting the expected statistical behavior.

2. Its velocity with respect to the *local standard of rest* (LSR, the mean motion of matter around the galactic center) was oddly large at $v_{LSR}=58 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (SL22). The $1\text{-}\sigma$ velocity dispersion in the solar neighborhood is $\sim 38 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (Dehnen & Binney 1998), which means that only 6% of stars move at 58 km s^{-1} or faster (as a reference, the Sun moves with respect to the LSR at 18 km s^{-1} , Schönrich et al. 2010; Zbinden & Saha 2019). The LSR speed of CNEOS14 is then peculiarly high. For comparison with the other two known interstellar interlopers, the speeds of 1I/'Oumuamua and 2I/Borisov with respect to the LSR were 11 and 35 km s^{-1} , respectively (Mama-jek 2017; Bailer-Jones et al. 2020). If we consider that CNEOS14 was ejected from a “normal” star moving slower than 38 km s^{-1} , it must have received a kick strong enough to eject it with a relative velocity at infinity v_∞ of at least 20 km s^{-1} with respect to its parent star. To put this into

context, the Voyager spacecraft, after two gravity assist maneuvers with Jupiter and Saturn, are leaving the solar system at $v_\infty = 17 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. Not only the kick would need to be extremely strong but also aligned with the direction of the star motion in order to eject CNEOS14 into the interstellar medium at a speed of 58 km s^{-1} with respect to the LSR. Such alignment would be extremely unlikely. SL22 suggest that perhaps the parent star is from the Milky Way thick disk, which have a larger velocity dispersion of $\sim 50 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. This is possible but again unlikely since the thick disk population constitutes only about $\sim 10\%$ of the stars. In summary, CNEOS14 had a peculiarly high velocity with respect to the LSR, compatible with only 6% to 10% of stars.

3. SL22 claim that, in order to detect one interstellar object in a period of ~ 10 years, the number density of such objects in our environment should be $n = 10^{6+0.75}_{-1.5} \text{ AU}^{-3}$ (at 95% confidence, assuming Poisson statistics) and such amount of objects would be at tension with the mass of available planetesimal material inside the 60 km s^{-1} orbit expected in a solar nebula. This means that, with our current knowledge, it is unlikely that we would have an interstellar object like CNEOS14 in the database. The identification of interstellar meteors is a very challenging task with a long history of investigations (see e.g., [Opik 1950](#); [Wiegert 2014](#); [Hajdukova et al. 2020](#)). Given these difficulties it is likely that some events might have gone unnoticed, implying that the actual number (and the tension) would be even greater.

When considered together, the probability that these three anomalies are due to chance is less than 1%. In the remainder of this paper, we discuss a hypothetical scenario that resolves these anomalies by postulating that the trajectory of CNEOS14 was deflected by a gravitational encounter with a massive body in the outer solar system.

4. DIRECT IMPACTOR OR MESSENGER

There are two possibilities regarding the origin of CNEOS14. The first one is that it was an interstellar asteroid that entered the solar system in a direct collision course with Earth and hit us without the mediation of any other intervention (the direct impactor hypothesis). The other possibility, that we put forward in this paper, is that it experienced a gravitational encounter with a massive body and was slingshotted in our direction (the messenger hypothesis).

The direct impactor hypothesis does not explain the remarkable coincidence between the Planet 9 high-probability region and the meteoroid radiant, highlighted in Figure 1. Such coincidence is rather unlikely to occur by chance. If the meteoroid entered the solar system from any random incoming direction, it would have equal probability of originating anywhere in the figure (the Mollweide projection preserves areas). The probability of coincidence by chance with the high-probability (red) contour is 1% (the ratio of solid angles subtended by the contour and the entire sky). If we consider instead the entire Planet 9 band around the sky calculated by BB21, then the probability of a chance coincidence would increase to 9%.

The probabilities quoted above are upper bounds because they assume, for simplicity, an isotropic distribution of velocities for interstellar objects in the heliocentric frame. The solar system is moving at 18 km s^{-1} with respect to the LSR ([Schönrich et al. 2010](#); [Zbinden & Saha 2019](#)) in the direction of the solar apex, marked by a green dot in the figure. This means that the probability of interstellar asteroids entering from that side of the sky will be relatively higher and, conversely, lower from the other side. The solar apex and the CNEOS14 radiant are separated in R.A. by 133° and therefore the number of objects entering the solar system from that direction should be lower, thus lowering the probability of chance coincidence quoted in the previous paragraph.

The messenger hypothesis, on the other hand, explains the coincidence of the CNEOS14 radiant with the Planet 9 high probability contour and also resolves the CNEOS14 anomalies discussed in Section 3 above. There would be nothing particularly peculiar about CNEOS14. A significant part of its large impact velocity of 60 km s^{-1} in the heliocentric frame is provided by the solar gravitational acceleration (up to 42 km s^{-1}). The remaining kinetic energy, corresponding to another 42 km s^{-1} , would be the combination of its inbound velocity from the interstellar medium in the heliocentric frame plus the delta- v supplied by the Planet 9 slingshot. In the limiting case of zero delta- v (i.e., the slingshot would have only caused a deflection but no velocity increase), the required 42 km s^{-1} is very close to the typical rms velocity of objects with respect to the LSR (38 km s^{-1}). For other delta- v values, the meteoroid velocity in the LSR would be even lower.

Thus far we have discussed CNEOS14 in the context of previous Planet 9 clues. One might also consider what this meteor tells us independently of all previous work. CNEOS14 was found in a search for a meteor with high heliocentric speed, returning a match with $\sim 60 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. At such a high speed, CNEOS14 was not bound to the

Table 1. Coordinates of outer planets on the date when CNEOS14 crossed their orbits. None of them was close in the sky to the meteoroid (approx. R.A.: 51.6° , dec: 8.6°)

Planet	Orbit crossing	R.A.	dec
Mars	2013-12-21	187.24°	0.88°
Jupiter	2013-08-12	101.33°	22.88°
Saturn	2013-03-01	219.80°	-11.19°
Uranus	2012-02-19	2.71°	0.41°
Neptune	2010-12-13	328.70°	-12.79°

solar gravity and therefore it must be either an interstellar direct impactor or a messenger accelerated into our direction by a gravitational encounter.

In the first case (direct impactor), the meteor would be expected to arrive from any direction in space with a random inclination (uniform in $\sin(i)$) with respect to the plane of the ecliptic. However, the trajectory followed by CNEOS14 was very close to the ecliptic, with only a 7° inclination. There is only a 12% probability for a chance alignment, which disfavors this first scenario.

Furthermore, if CNEOS14 were an undeflected meteoroid, its speed with respect to the LSR would be of 58 km s^{-1} which, as discussed in Section 3, is peculiarly high. Only about 6% of stars move that fast.

Combining these two probabilities as independent (uncorrelated) properties, the odds that CNEOS14 had a gravitational encounter during its passage through the solar system before hitting Earth may be estimated conservatively to be higher than 99%. However, it did not come close to any of the known planets. Table 1 lists the approximate dates at which the projected trajectory of CNEOS14 crossed each one of the outer planet orbits and the coordinates of the planets at that time.

Therefore, even if one disregards all previous evidence for Planet 9 based on the ETNO clustering, this meteor is most likely a messenger slingshotted in our direction by some unknown massive body in the outer solar system or beyond. This is additional evidence in favor of the existence of Planet 9 other than the one provided by the peculiar orbital parameter space of the ETNOs.

The current position of Planet 9 has changed in the 32 to 65 years elapsed since the hypothetical encounter with the meteoroid because of the planet's proper motion. Given the orbital parameters estimated for Planet 9 (e.g. BB21), the proper motion must be between 1.3° and 1.7° . Taking this into account, we end up with coordinates R.A. $53.0 \pm 4.3^\circ$, declination $9.2 \pm 1.3^\circ$ as the predicted current position for Planet 9.

5. CONCLUSIONS

We propose a plausible current candidate location for Planet 9 at coordinates R.A. $53.0 \pm 4.3^\circ$, declination $9.2 \pm 1.3^\circ$, in the trijunction of Aries, Taurus and Cetus. Moreover, we argue that CNEOS14 provides additional supporting evidence in favor of Planet 9 that is completely independent of the distant ETNOs orbital clustering. It should be emphasized that the proposed location is only a candidate, there is no certainty about this prediction, which could be just a curious coincidence. However, it is a plausible, easily testable and well motivated proposal. The odds of a chance coincidence between Planet 9's orbit and the CNEOS14 origin is lower than 9% or 1% (depending on whether one considers the full orbital band or the higher probability region). Figure 1 shows these locations, as well as the direction of the solar system motion (the solar apex), which is on the opposite side of the sky. The statistical significance of this coincidence is not very high but it increases considerably when combined with the statistical anomalies of CNEOS14 for an overall $\sim 0.1\%$ probability of chance.

There are two possibilities: Either CNEOS14 was a direct impactor or it was redirected into our direction by a gravitational encounter (messenger hypothesis).

The messenger scenario explains the coincidence of the CNEOS14 radiant with the Planet 9 orbital band and resolves the CNEOS14 anomalies in Section 3. The meteoroid would not need to be moving initially at 58 km s^{-1} with respect to the LSR. It could have been moving at typical speeds of stars in the LSR.

We consider the messenger hypothesis as the most parsimonious with all existing evidence. There are, however, a number of caveats that should be kept in mind:

1. Planet 9 might not exist. The current evidence is indirect and controversial. The ETNO clustering has been attributed by some authors to observational bias (Shankman et al. 2017; Bernardinelli et al. 2020; Napier et al. 2021). For counterarguments, see Brown & Batygin (2021). Nevertheless, there is additional support for the Planet 9 hypothesis beyond the ETNO clustering. de León et al. (2017) argue that the pair of ETNOs 2004 VN₁₁₂ and 2013 RF₉₈ originated as a binary asteroid and were detached by a trans-Neptunian planetary encounter. Furthermore, in this paper we find a remarkable coincidence between the CNEOS14 radiant and the region where Planet 9 is expected to reside that would be rather unlikely to occur by chance.
2. Most of the argumentation presented in this paper is based on the determination that the CNEOS14

trajectory is hyperbolic, given its high heliocentric speed at 1 AU. If such determination were deemed incorrect (as suggested by [Vaubailon 2022](#)), then the meteoroid could be a solar system object and, in that case, the statistical significance of its anomalies would decrease enormously. However, the observational evidence for the hyperbolic trajectory is very robust. As pointed out by SL22, in order to make it a bound orbit the measured velocity would need to be in error by about 20 km s^{-1} , or nearly 50%. Independent studies of the accuracy of events in the CNEOS database have not observed such large errors ([Devillepoix et al. 2019](#); [Borovička et al. 2017](#); [Peña-Asensio et al. 2022](#)).

3. Even if the messenger hypothesis is correct, the massive perturber could be something other than Planet 9. One possibility is that the meteoroid originated in the Oort cloud during a close encounter with a passing star (perhaps even in that star's Oort cloud). We explored this hypothesis by comparing the timing of the meteoroid origin to the list of recent stellar encounters. Extending the simulation out to distances beyond $\sim 1 \text{ lyr}$, we find that such distance would have been reached 7 kyr ago (24 kyr for 1 pc). However, no such encounters closer than 1 pc have occurred more recently than 80 kyr ago ([Bailer-Jones 2022](#); [Majek et al. 2015](#)). Another possibility could be an encounter with a passing brown dwarf or a rogue planet (meaning a free-floating planet in the interstellar medium) thousands of years ago, again destabilizing objects in the Oort cloud. This scenario is certainly a possibility but it would not explain the coincidence of the meteoroid with the predicted location for Planet 9 or the low ecliptic inclination.
4. [Huang et al. \(2022\)](#) propose an alternative explanation in which the ETNO population was created by a distant planet that is not there any more. In their scenario, Planet 9 would have been a temporary inhabitant of the solar system (a rogue planet in their terminology, not to be confused with the meaning of rogue in the previous paragraph) and our efforts to understand the trans-Neptunian peculiarities would be planetary archaeology. This scenario is consistent with all the available evidence except for the clues presented in this paper, which require the presence of a solar system Planet 9 between 32 and 65 years ago.
5. An open question in the messenger hypothesis is why would the first interstellar meteor be a mes-

senger and not a direct impactor. The answer might be related to the search bias. This object was identified by searching for the highest heliocentric speed in a database of meteor events. Perhaps the fastest objects are those resulting from a gravitational slingshot and that introduces a bias in the search by making them more easily recognizable amongst all background events. This issue may be explored with detailed simulations of the solar system motion through the interstellar medium. A natural follow up question could be why this messenger comes from Planet 9 and not Jupiter or the other giant planets, which are considerably more massive. However, the sphere of gravitational influence, given by the Hill radius, depends much more strongly on the distance to the Sun than the planetary mass. While Jupiter has a Hill radius of 0.35 AU, Planet 9 has it between 5 and 12 AU. Thus, the Planet 9 volume of gravitational dominance is between 2,400 and 38,600 times larger than Jupiter's.

6. Perhaps the most important caveat is that the Planet 9 location proposed here is sensitive to the accuracy of the CNEOS14 observed velocity. Previous studies comparing events in the CNEOS database with ground-based observations found that, while a good agreement is obtained in most cases, significant discrepancies are found in a few events ([Devillepoix et al. 2019](#); [Borovička et al. 2017](#); [Peña-Asensio et al. 2022](#)). Unfortunately, no other observations exist of CNEOS14, so we need to rely on this single measurement.

With all of these considerations in mind, the evidence in favor of the Planet 9 messenger hypothesis for the origin of CNEOS14 seems sufficiently compelling to warrant a search effort. The slow proper motion makes the identification of Planet 9 extremely challenging in observations. It takes a very long time to detect a significant motion with respect to the background stars. However, parallax observations might prove helpful. At the predicted distances, a parallax between $12'$ and $23'$ is expected. Unfortunately, the BB21 calculations suggest that Planet 9 is just beyond the magnitude limit for GAIA. However, given the exploratory nature of their calculation and the marginal difference with the limit, it is probably worth some search efforts.

This research has made use of NASA’s Astrophysics Data System Bibliographic Services, as well as the Jet Propulsion Laboratory’s CNEOS and Horizons databases. Python Matplotlib (Hunter 2007), Numpy (Van Der Walt et al. 2011) and iPython (Pérez & Granger 2007) modules have been employed to generate the figures and analyze the calculations in this paper. Thanks are also due to Eloy Peña-Asensio for many fruitful discussions.

REFERENCES

- Bailer-Jones, C. A. L. 2022, *ApJL*, 935, L9
- Bailer-Jones, C. A. L., Farnocchia, D., Ye, Q., Meech, K. J., & Micheli, M. 2020, *A&A*, 634, A14
- Batygin, K. & Brown, M. E. 2016, *AJ*, 151, 22
- Bernardinelli, P. H., Bernstein, G. M., Sako, M., et al. 2020, *The Planetary Science Journal*, 1, 28
- Borovička, J., Spurný, P., Grigore, V. I., & Svoreň, J. 2017, *Planetary and Space Science*, 143, 147, sI:Meteoroids 2016
- Brown, M. E. & Batygin, K. 2016, *ApJL*, 824, L23
- Brown, M. E. & Batygin, K. 2021, *AJ*, 162, 219
- CNEOS fireball database. 2022, CNEOS fireball database, <https://cneos.jpl.nasa.gov/fireballs/>, accessed: 2022-05-12
- de la Fuente Marcos, C. & de la Fuente Marcos, R. 2014, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters*, 443, L59
- de León, J., de la Fuente Marcos, C., & de la Fuente Marcos, R. 2017, *MNRAS*, 467, L66
- Dehnen, W. & Binney, J. J. 1998, *MNRAS*, 298, 387
- Dévillepoix, H. A. R., Bland, P. A., Sansom, E. K., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 483, 5166
- de la Fuente Marcos, C. & de la Fuente Marcos, R. 2016, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters*, 459, L66
- Giorgini, J. D. 2015, in *IAU General Assembly*, Vol. 29, 2256293
- Gladman, B. & Volk, K. 2021, *ARA&A*, 59, 203
- Hajdukova, M., Sterken, V., Wiegert, P., & Kornoš, L. 2020, *Planet. Space Sci.*, 192, 105060
- Huang, Y., Gladman, B., Beaudoin, M., & Zhang, K. 2022, *ApJL*, 938, L23
- Hunter, J. D. 2007, *Computing In Science & Engineering*, 9, 90
- Mamajek, E. 2017, *Research Notes of the American Astronomical Society*, 1, 21
- Mamajek, E. E., Barenfeld, S. A., Ivanov, V. D., et al. 2015, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 800, L17
- Millholland, S. & Laughlin, G. 2017, *The Astronomical Journal*, 153, 91
- Napier, K., Gerdes, D., & Dark Energy Survey Collaboration. 2021, in *AAS/Division of Dynamical Astronomy Meeting*, Vol. 53, AAS/Division of Dynamical Astronomy Meeting, 502.03
- National Academies. 2021, *Pathways to Discovery in Astronomy and Astrophysics for the 2020s* (2021), <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/26141/pathways-to-discovery-in-astronomy-and-astrophysics-for-the-2020s>, accessed: 2022-05-12
- Opik, E. J. 1950, *Irish Astronomical Journal*, 1, 80
- Peña-Asensio, E., Trigo-Rodríguez, J. M., & Rimola, A. 2022, *AJ*, 164, 76
- Pérez, F. & Granger, B. E. 2007, *Computing in Science and Engineering*, 9, 21
- Scholtz, J. & Unwin, J. 2020, *PhRvL*, 125, 051103
- Schönrich, R., Binney, J., & Dehnen, W. 2010, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 403, 1829
- Shankman, C., Kavelaars, J. J., Bannister, M. T., et al. 2017, *The Astronomical Journal*, 154, 50
- Siraj, A. & Loeb, A. 2022, *ApJ*, 939, 53
- Socas-Navarro, H. 2019, *A&A*, 626, A5
- Trujillo, C. A. & Sheppard, S. S. 2014, *Nature*, 507, 471
- Van Der Walt, S., Colbert, S. C., & Varoquaux, G. 2011, *Computing in Science & Engineering*, 13, 22
- Vaubailon, J. 2022, *WGN, Journal of the International Meteor Organization*, 50, 140
- Wiegert, P. A. 2014, *Icarus*, 242, 112
- Zbinden, O. & Saha, P. 2019, *Research Notes of the AAS*, 3, 73