

Dispersing the Gaseous Protoplanetary Disc and Halting Type II Migration

M. Lecar & D.D. Sasselov

Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, 60 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138

ABSTRACT

More than 30 extra-solar Jupiter-like planets have shorter periods than the planet Mercury. It is generally accepted that they formed further out, past the 'snow line' (~ 1 AU), and migrated inwards. In order to be driven by tidal torques from the gaseous disc, the disc exterior to the planet had to contain about a planetary mass. The fact that the planets stopped migrating means that their outer disc was removed. We suggest, following the simulation by Bate et al. (2003), that the outer disc was accreted by the planet. This not only halts migration but removes the outer disc for planets interior to about 2 AU. The disc further out could have been removed by photoevaporation (Matsumura et al. 2003). Furthermore, as also shown by Bate et al. (op cit) this process also provides an upper limit to planetary masses in agreement with the analysis of observed planetary masses by Zucker & Mazeh (2002). In this scenario, the endgame is a race. The central star is accreting the inner disc and the planet, while the planet is accreting the outer disc. The planet survives if it accretes its outer disc before being accreted by the star. The winner is determined solely by the ratio of the mass of the outer disc to the local surface density of the disc. Some planets are certainly eaten by the central star.

Subject headings: extrasolar planets, Jupiter

1. Introduction

Planets whose 'Roche Radii' are comparable to the disk scale height form a gap in the disc. This was first suggested by Lin & Papaloizou (1986) as the mechanism to limit the growth of Jupiter. It was thought that the gap acted like semi-permeable membrane preventing gas from flowing inwards. Because the close-in extra-solar planets had migrated inwards, and then stopped, they must have had an outer disc and then lost it. Previously, we suggested (Lecar & Sasselov 1999) that gas from the outer disc would stream across the

gap, when the gap width was less than the distance gas could travel in an orbital period. We thought that the gas would sneak across the gap when the planet was on the other side of the star, and join the inner disc. We speculated that 3-D disc simulations would confirm this. Bate et al. (2003) recently performed just the simulation we wished for. Gas did, indeed, stream across the gap, almost as if the gap wasn't there, but contrary to our speculation, did not reach the inner disc. Almost all of the gas was accreted onto the planet. However, this also halts migration. The accretion of the outer disc by the planet solves two problems: stopping the migration and removing the outer disc. A recent study of removal of the disc by photoevaporation showed that that process is only effective exterior to 2.4 AU (Matsuyama et al. 2003). In the minimum mass solar nebula (Hayashi 1981) there are about four Jupiter masses of gas interior to 2.4 AU. In any case, we have to account for the more than 50 extra-solar planets interior to 1 AU. Since the 'snow line' starts at 1 AU, there is a possibility that planets outside of 1 AU formed in place, or did not migrate much.

An argument in favor of the planet accreting its outer disc is that it provides a natural upper limit to the masses of planets of 10 Jupiter masses. Zucker & Mazeh (2002) found that to be the upper limit to planetary masses and the lower limit to the masses of brown dwarfs. The formation of gas giants by gravitational instability (Boss 2000) provides no natural upper limit to the masses.

We now discuss in more detail the migration process, following Lin & Papaloizou (1986). We wish to illustrate when migration switches from Type I (no gap) to Type II (gap) (Ward 1997). A planet with semimajor axis a migrates at a rate

$$\dot{a} = -a \left(\frac{M_{\text{pl}}}{M} \right) \left(\frac{a}{a_{\text{disk I}}} \right)^2 \quad (1)$$

where

$$a_{\text{disk I}}^3 = \frac{GM}{\Sigma} \quad ; \quad M_{\text{pl}} = \frac{M}{\Sigma} \quad ; \quad \Sigma = \frac{2}{M} \left(\frac{a}{a_{\text{disk I}}} \right)^2 \quad (2)$$

For a minimum mass solar nebula (Hayashi 1981), the surface mass density of the disk is $\Sigma = 1700 \text{ g cm}^{-2}$ at 1 AU, and $\Sigma \propto x^{-3/2}$, where $x = a/\text{AU}$. The dimensionless integral, I , is given by

$$I = \int_{a_{\text{out}}}^{a_{\text{in}}} dx \frac{(1+x)^{5/2}}{x^4} = \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{1}{x^3} \right)_{a_{\text{out}}}^{a_{\text{in}}} + \frac{5}{2} \left(\frac{1}{x^2} \right)_{a_{\text{out}}}^{a_{\text{in}}} \quad (3)$$

where for $a_{\text{out}} \gg a_{\text{in}}$, I is insensitive to the upper limits. If there is no gap, $a_{\text{in}} = a_{\text{out}}$ and $I = \frac{5}{2} \frac{1}{x^2}$, where $x = \frac{h}{a} = \frac{c_s}{V}$, V is the circular orbital velocity, c_s is the sound speed, and h is the scale height. Typically, $c_s/V = 0.06 x^{1/4}$.

If there is a gap, the planet moves within the gap to equalize the torques from the inner

and outer discs. This is accomplished by

$$\sigma_{\text{out}} = \left(1 + \frac{5}{4}\right); \quad \sigma_{\text{in}} = \left(1 - \frac{5}{4}\right) \quad (4)$$

Henceforth, the planet responds to the inward migration of the outer disc, which is driven by viscosity. Once a gap is opened, the further evolution is controlled by viscous accretion and is referred to as type II migration (Ward 1997).

The mass accretion rate is

$$\dot{M}_{\text{acc}} = 2\pi a \Sigma a^2 \frac{a}{a^3} = 2\pi \Sigma \frac{1}{a^2}; \quad (5)$$

which by continuity is independent of x . If $\Sigma \propto x^{-3/2}$, then $\dot{M}_{\text{acc}} \propto x^{1/2}$. The time to accrete a Jupiter mass is

$$t_{M_J} = \frac{M_J}{\dot{M}_{\text{acc}}} = \frac{M_J}{2\pi \Sigma a^2} t_{\text{acc}}; \quad (6)$$

If the outer disc has, say, a Jupiter mass, in order for a planet to accrete the outer disc before being swept into the star, we require that

$$t_{M_J} < t_{\text{acc}} \quad (7)$$

or

$$\frac{M_J}{2\pi \Sigma a^2} = \frac{M_J}{2\pi \Sigma_0 a_0^2 x^{1/2}} < 1 \quad (8)$$

The migration halts when

$$x^{1/2} > \frac{M_J}{2\pi \Sigma_0 a_0^2}; \quad (9)$$

For the minimum mass solar nebula, migration would halt at $x = 0.63$ or the orbital period $P = 183$ days. For denser discs our estimates (with $\Sigma_{\text{min}} = 1700 \text{ g cm}^{-2}$ at 1 AU) are given in Table 1. For surface densities larger than $4 \Sigma_{\text{min}}$, the planet is accreted by the star.

More quantitatively, if the planet is at a_0 , the ratio $\frac{M_J}{2\pi \Sigma_0 a_0^2}$ can be written:

$$\int_1^x dx (x)^{1-n} = \frac{(x)^{2-n}}{2-n}; \quad (10)$$

if $\Sigma(x) = (1/x)^n$ and $x = \frac{a}{a_0}$. For the planet to accrete its outer disc before the star accretes the planet, that quantity has to be less than 1.0, or $x < x_m$. This is illustrated in Table 2. For comparison, if $a_0 = 5.203 \text{ AU}$ (Jupiter), Saturn is at $x = 1.83$. If $a_0 = 1 \text{ AU}$, photoevaporation is effective at $x > 2.4$.

So far, we have avoided a discussion of the physical source of the viscosity and the value of α (Shakura & Sunyaev 1973), because our result is independent of this physics. But, to make contact with the literature, we note that with our prescription (also used by Bate et al., op cit), $\dot{M} \propto \Sigma_0 x^{1=2}$, we require $\Sigma_0 \approx 3 \times 10^4$ in order that the mass accretion be less than $10^{-8} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. This is to limit the accretion luminosity to yield the so called 'passive disc' (Chiang & Goldreich 1997; Sasselov & Lecar 2000). With this value of Σ_0 , we have $t_{\text{acc}} \approx 10^5 x^{1=2}$ years, which is short, suggesting that Σ_0 is smaller.

We conclude with some speculations about our Jupiter. In the minimum mass solar nebula, with $\dot{M} \propto x^{-3=2}$, there is about 2.7 Jupiter masses of gas between Jupiter and Saturn. Clearly, Jupiter (and Saturn) did not accrete it all. However the investigation of photoevaporation of the outer disc was motivated by the fact that Saturn has only $\frac{1}{3}$ rd the mass of Jupiter, and in any case, $x^{-3=2}$ yields a divergent mass ($\propto x^{1=2}$). The surface density profile must steepen. If we keep the minimum mass surface density at Jupiter (143 g/cm^2), but allow the surface density to decrease outwards at a steeper rate, say $x^{-7=2}$, then there is less than a Jupiter mass between Jupiter and Saturn. If we allow Jupiter to start accreting when its mass was $\approx 0.1 M_J$, as suggested by Bate et al. (2003), then the outer disc is in Jupiter.

REFERENCES

- Bate, M. R., Lubow, S. H., Ogilvie, G. I., & Miller, K. A., 2003, MNRAS 341, 213.
- Boss, A. P., 2000, Astrophys. J. 536, L101.
- Chiang, E. I., & Goldreich, P., 1997, Astrophys. J. 490, 368.
- Hayashi, C., 1981, Prog. Theoretical Phys. Suppl., 70, 35.
- Lecar, M. & Sasselov, D., 1999, Halting Planetary Migration, astro-ph/9911384.
- Lin, D. N. C. & Papalizou, J. C. B., 1986, Astrophys. J. 309, 846.
- Matsuyama, I., Johnstone, D., & Murray, N., 2003, Astrophys. J. 585, L143.
- Sasselov, D. D., & Lecar, M., 2000, Astrophys. J. 528, 995.
- Shakura, N. I., & Sunyaev, R. A., 1973, A & A, 24, 337.
- Zucker, S. & Mazeh, T., 2002, Astrophys. J. 568, L113.

{ 5 {

	x (a/AU)	P (days)
x_{min}	0.630	183
$2 x_{\text{min}}$	0.157	23
$3 x_{\text{min}}$	0.070	7
$4 x_{\text{min}}$	0.039	3

Table 1: Orbital distances x and periods P at which a planet accreting its outer disc would stop migrating, as a function of disc surface density Σ .

n	$\frac{(x)^{2-n}}{2-n}$	x_m
$3/2$	$2(x^{1=2} - 1)$	2.25
2	$\ln x$	2.72
$5/2$	$2(1 - x^{1=2})$	4.0
3	$(1 - x^{-1})$	1

Table 2: The minimum orbital distance, x_m , where migration halts, for different types of discs.