

# The Dynamical Consequences of a Super-Earth in the Solar System

STEPHEN R. KANE<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521, USA*

## ABSTRACT

Placing the architecture of the Solar System within the broader context of planetary architectures is one of the primary topics of interest within planetary science. Exoplanet discoveries have revealed a large range of system architectures, many of which differ substantially from the Solar System model. One particular feature of exoplanet demographics is the relative prevalence of super-Earth planets, for which the Solar System lacks a suitable analog, presenting a challenge to modeling their interiors and atmospheres. Here we present the results of a large suite of dynamical simulations that insert a hypothetical planet in the mass range 1–10  $M_{\oplus}$  within the semi-major axis range 2–4 AU, between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter. We show that, although the system dynamics remain largely unaffected when the additional planet is placed near 3 AU, Mercury experiences substantial instability when the additional planet lies in the range 3.1–4.0 AU, and perturbations to the Martian orbit primarily result when the additional planet lies in the range 2.0–2.7 AU. We further show that, although Jupiter and Saturn experience relatively small orbital perturbations, the angular momentum transferred to the ice giants can result in their ejection from the system at key resonance locations of the additional planet. We discuss the implications of these results for the architecture of the inner and outer solar system planets, and for exoplanetary systems.

*Keywords:* astrobiology – planetary systems – planets and satellites: dynamical evolution and stability

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of numerous exoplanets over the past several decades has allowed statistical studies of planetary architectures that place the Solar System within a broader context (Limbach & Turner 2015; Ford 2014; Martin & Livio 2015; Winn & Fabrycky 2015; Horner et al. 2020b; Kane et al. 2021c). The detected multi-planet systems exhibit a remarkable diversity of architectures that differ substantially from the Solar System (Hatzes 2016; He et al. 2019). Examples include compact systems, such as the Kepler-11 (Lissauer et al. 2011; Gelino & Kane 2014) and TRAPPIST-1 (Gillon et al. 2016, 2017; Luger et al. 2017; Agol et al. 2021; Kane et al. 2021a) systems, demonstrating that planetary systems may harbor multiple planetary orbits with long-term stability close to the host star. Additionally, exoplanetary systems reveal a wide range of orbital eccentricities (Shen & Turner

2008; Kane et al. 2012; Van Eylen & Albrecht 2015), as extreme as 0.96 for the planet HD 20782b (Kane et al. 2016; Udry et al. 2019), and evidence for past significant planet-planet interactions (Jurić & Tremaine 2008; Kane & Raymond 2014; Carrera et al. 2019; Bowler et al. 2020). Studying the statistics of exoplanet demographics offers the opportunity to provide important insights into the question of how typical our Solar System architecture and evolution is compared with other planetary systems (Limbach & Turner 2015; Martin & Livio 2015).

One of the current main challenges to placing the Solar System within the broad planetary formation context are planetary sizes/masses that are not present within our system. In particular, exoplanet discoveries have included a large population of super-Earths (Valencia et al. 2007; Léger et al. 2009; Howard et al. 2010; Bonfils et al. 2013) and mini-Neptunes (Barnes et al. 2009b; Lopez & Fortney 2014; Nielsen et al. 2020), planets whose size places them within the Solar System’s notable size gap between Earth and Neptune. The local dearth of this cate-

gory of planets results in a lack of in-situ data, truncating models of their possible composition and formation differences compared with the Solar System ice giants (Owen & Wu 2017; Lee 2019). The factors that contributed to the  $\sim 1\text{--}4 R_{\oplus}$  radius gap within the Solar System are numerous, but predominantly is due to early migration of the giant planets (Gomes et al. 2005; Morbidelli et al. 2005; Walsh et al. 2011; Raymond et al. 2014; Nesvorný 2018), a process that may also have limited the growth of Mars (Bromley & Kenyon 2017; Clement et al. 2018, 2021). Even so, it is useful to investigate the dynamical consequences of additional planetary mass within the Solar System, in order to constrain current formation theories and study the implications for general planetary system architectures (Lissauer et al. 2001; Nesvorný & Morbidelli 2012).


In this paper, we provide the results of a dynamical study that places an additional terrestrial planet in the mass range  $1\text{--}10 M_{\oplus}$  and semi-major axis range  $2\text{--}4$  AU within the current Solar System architecture. Section 2 summarizes the evidence for giant planet migration and the reasons why the Solar System does not have a super-Earth between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter. The details of the executed suite of dynamical simulations are described in Section 3, together with specific examples and global results for each of the Solar System planets. Section 4 discusses the implications of these results for the inner planets, outer planets, and exoplanetary system architectures. We provide concluding remarks and suggestions for further work in Section 5.

## 2. WHY IS THERE NO SUPER-EARTH IN THE SOLAR SYSTEM?

The architecture of the Solar System planetary orbits exhibits a substantial gap between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter, populated by a vast reservoir of asteroids. These features of the Solar System architecture provide compelling evidence of past interactions, and numerous challenges remain for Solar System formation models (Morbidelli & Raymond 2016). The gravitational interactions of Jupiter with the material within the asteroid belt is well known, particularly those related to mean motion resonances (MMR) and the Kirkwood gaps (Dermott & Murray 1981; Wisdom 1983; Morbidelli & Giorgilli 1989; Gladman et al. 1997). Earlier work strongly suggested that the total mass of the asteroid belt has been significantly depleted since the formation of the planets (Bottke et al. 2005), whereas more recent work indicates that the present asteroid belt is consistent with relatively empty primordial origins (Raymond & Izidoro 2017).

However, it is generally agreed that the Solar System giant planets have undergone migration processes that have altered their locations through time relative to where they formed. Models that describe the giant planet migration range from the early “Grand Tack” model of orbital evolution for Jupiter and Saturn, in which Jupiter migrated inward to approach the current orbit of Mars before moving back outward (e.g., Walsh et al. 2011; Raymond et al. 2014; Nesvorný 2018), to the late and chaotic interactions of the “Nice Model” (Gomes et al. 2005; Morbidelli et al. 2005, e.g.). The formation of the four terrestrial planets and associated accretion models has been studied in detail (Raymond et al. 2009; Lykawka & Ito 2019), for which the migration of the giant planets played a major role in sculpting their eventual size and orbits (Kaib & Chambers 2016; Nesvorný et al. 2021). Indeed, the size of Mars and the distribution of asteroids within the main belt are essential clues to the terrestrial planet formation processes that occurred (DeMeo & Carry 2014; Izidoro et al. 2015).

The asteroid belt further provides plentiful evidence for the migration of the Solar System giant planets and their gravitational influence on the architecture of the inner Solar System (Morbidelli et al. 2010; Deienno et al. 2016; Izidoro et al. 2016; Clement et al. 2020; Kane et al. 2020b). In particular, planetary migration possibly played a major role in depletion of material between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter (Clement et al. 2019; Pirani et al. 2019), including the effect of secular resonances with the giant planets as they migrated inward and outward (Minton & Malhotra 2011). Furthermore, exoplanet discoveries have revealed an abundance of super-Earths and mini-Neptunes that are relatively close to their host stars (Winn & Fabrycky 2015). The lack of any such planets interior to the orbit of Mercury has thus become a matter of some intrigue for Solar System formation models that address the architecture of the inner Solar System (Morbidelli et al. 2012; Clement et al. 2022). Explanations for the relative dearth of inner Solar System planets include outward migration of planet forming material due to the solar wind (Spalding 2018), a narrow annulus of building material (Hansen 2009), dynamical/collisional destruction of inner planets (Volk & Gladman 2015), and the presence and orbital migration of the giant planets (Batygin & Laughlin 2015; Hansen 2017). Indeed, as dynamical models of the early Solar System continue to evolve, the evidence increasingly suggests that it was the powerful combination of multiple giant planets and their migration processes that prevented planet formation in the region of the asteroid belt, and ensured that



**Figure 1.** Top-down view of the Solar System planetary orbits (shown as solid lines) out to the orbit of Jupiter. The red shaded region indicates the locations in which a planet in the mass range  $1\text{--}10 M_{\oplus}$  was added to the Solar System architecture. The dotted lines show a grid with 1 AU resolution, and the full figure scale is 12 AU along one side.

the inner Solar System did not harbor a super-Earth planet.

### 3. AN ALTERNATE ARCHITECTURE

Here we describe the details of the dynamical simulations conducted for our study, and the overall results for each of the Solar System planets.

#### 3.1. Dynamical Simulation

The N-body integrations for the analysis reported here were performed with the Mercury Integrator Package (Chambers 1999), where the methodology was similar to that described by Kane & Raymond (2014); Kane (2016, 2019). The orbital elements for the major planets were extracted from the Horizons DE431 ephemerides (Folkner et al. 2014); minor planets were not included in the simulation. The simulations used a hybrid symplectic/Bulirsch-Stoer integrator with a Jacobi coordinate system to provide increased accuracy for multi-planet systems (Wisdom & Holman 1991; Wisdom 2006). Given the relatively large semi-major axes involved in our simulations, General Relativity was not calculated in the evolution of the planetary orbits. Dynamical simulations conducted by Lissauer et al. (2001) provided a dynamical simulation that added mass to Ceres and several other asteroids, finding dynamically stable configurations for a subset of the simula-

tions. Here, we provide a more general case by systematically exploring the parameter space of planetary mass and semi-major axis of the added body. Specifically, the simulations described here add a planet with mass range  $1\text{--}10 M_{\oplus}$ , in steps of  $1 M_{\oplus}$ . The additional planet was placed at various starting locations in a circular orbit, coplanar with Earth’s orbit, and with a semi-major axis range  $2\text{--}4$  AU, in steps of 0.01 AU, as shown in Figure 1. This resulted in several thousand simulations, where each simulation was allowed to run for  $10^7$  years, commencing at the present epoch and an orbital configuration output every 100 simulation years. We used a simulation time resolution of 1.0 day to provide adequate sampling based on the orbit of the inner planet, Mercury. An initial baseline simulation was conducted without the additional planet, to ensure that the eccentricity variations of the Solar System planets were properly reconstructed in agreement with other Solar System dynamical models, such as those by Laskar (1988). The baseline simulation provided an important point of comparison from which to evaluate the potential divergence of the main suite of simulations with the additional terrestrial planet. The divergence of the simulation results from the baseline model were primarily tracked via the eccentricity evolution of the Solar System planets, where planets are considered removed if they are either ejected from the system or lost to the potential well of the host star.

#### 3.2. Examples of Instability

As mentioned in Section 3.1, several thousand simulations were conducted, producing a vast variety of dynamical outcomes for the Solar System planets. The inner Solar System planets are particularly vulnerable to the addition of the super-Earth planet, resulting in numerous regions of substantial system instability. The broad region of  $2\text{--}4$  AU contains many locations of MMR with the inner planets that further amplify the chaotic evolution of the inner Solar System. There are also important MMR locations with the outer planets within the  $2\text{--}4$  AU region, with potential significant consequences for the ice giants. Here we provide several specific examples of simulation results to highlight the range of possible dynamical outcomes.

Shown in Figure 2 is an example of the eccentricity evolution of the inner planets for the case of an inserted planet with mass and semi-major axis of  $7.0 M_{\oplus}$  and 2.00 AU, respectively. The eccentricity evolution for the inserted planet is shown in the bottom panel. In addition, we provide the evolution of the semi-major axis for all planets in the panels of Figure 3, shown as the fractional change in the semi-major axis from the initial


value. For this example, the orbits of all four inner planets become sufficiently unstable such that they are removed from the system before the conclusion of the  $10^7$  year simulation. The semi-major axis of 2 AU places the additional planet in a 2:3 MMR with Mars, leading to a rapid deterioration of the Martian orbit, culminating with the ejection of Mars approximately halfway through the simulation. Mercury is also ejected relatively early in response to interactions with Venus and Earth, whose eccentricities gradually increase and deposit angular momentum into the Mercury orbit. Figure 2 and Figure 3 show the gradual increase in eccentricities for Venus and Earth, along with the increasing semi-major axis of Venus and decreasing semi-major axis of Earth, leading to catastrophic close encounters. Consequently, both Venus and Earth are removed from the system during the time period of 8–9 Myrs after the commencement of the simulation. For the super-Earth itself, an examination of the periastron longitude relative to those of Jupiter and Saturn reveal a weak connection of the eccentricity evolution to the  $\nu_6$  secular resonance with Saturn, and is largely affected by the presence of Jupiter.

A second example for the inner Solar System planets is shown in both Figure 4 and Figure 5, for the case of an inserted planet with mass and semi-major axis of  $8.0 M_{\oplus}$  and 3.70 AU, respectively. In this case, the orbit of Mars is relatively unaffected by the presence of the additional planet, whose eccentricity undergoes high frequency oscillations due to interactions with the outer planets. However, the  $\nu_5$  secular resonance with Jupiter plays a role in the eccentricity excitations of Venus and Earth. In particular, the initial slight increase in the eccentricities of Venus and Earth, combined with the  $\nu_5$  resonance, is sufficient to perturb the orbit of Mercury, resulting in the rapid removal of Mercury from the system. The catastrophic loss of Mercury, causes a subsequent injection of that angular momentum into the orbits of Venus and Earth. This results in a substantial periodic evolution of their orbits, with both high and low frequency variations in their eccentricities. Figure 5 shows that, although the semi-major axis of Earth and Mars are largely unaltered, the semi-major axis of Venus experiences a slight reduction.


The effect of the additional planet on the orbital evolution of the outer planets tends to be less severe than for the inner planets, but there are still several cases of significant orbital perturbations. The example shown in Figure 6 and Figure 7 reveals the orbital evolution of the outer planets for the case where the additional planet has a mass and semi-major axis of  $7.0 M_{\oplus}$  and 3.79 AU, respectively. A significant aspect of this orbital

configuration is that the additional planet lies at the 8:5 MMR with Jupiter, creating further opportunity for orbital instability within the system. Indeed, the orbits of the planets are largely unaffected for the first several million years. After  $\sim 3.5$  Myrs, a dramatic change occurs within the system, whereby the orbit of the super-Earth planet is substantially altered, with high eccentricity (0.5–0.7) and with semi-major axis values in the range 10–30 AU, as indicated in the bottom panels of Figure 6 and Figure 7. Figure 7 also shows that this change in the super-Earth orbit corresponds with a slight increase in the semi-major axis of Saturn. This period of instability persists for the next several hundred thousand years until the super-Earth is ejected from the system after a total integration time of  $\sim 4.2$  Myrs. The loss of the super-Earth planet, and subsequent transfer of angular momentum, has a marginal effect on the orbit of Jupiter, but a substantial effect on the eccentricities of Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune. In particular, the orbit of Uranus remains in a quasi-perturbed state, and the third and fourth panels of Figure 6 show that Uranus and Neptune thereafter exchange angular momentum with a significantly higher amplitude than their previous baseline interactions.


A final example of the outer planet eccentricity evolution is shown in Figure 8 and Figure 9. In this case, the additional planet has a mass and semi-major axis of  $7.0 M_{\oplus}$  and 3.80 AU, respectively, so the overall system architecture is only slightly different to the case shown in Figure 6 and Figure 7. Indeed, the super-Earth is similarly influenced by the 8:5 MMR with Jupiter and the 4:1 MMR with Saturn, leading to significant planet-planet interactions after  $\sim 2.5$  Myrs. These interactions are especially manifest in the increased eccentricity of Jupiter and Saturn, the latter of which also increases in semi-major axis, and the ejection of the super-Earth from the system entirely. These interactions also perturb the orbit of Neptune, which moves through a period of chaotic changes in eccentricity up until  $\sim 4$  Myrs. The biggest effect of the interactions though is the loss of Uranus after  $\sim 4$  Myrs, illustrating how the presence of a super-Earth within the Solar System can greatly alter the architecture of the outer planets. The substantial difference between the cases shown in Figure 6 and Figure 8 demonstrates the sensitivity of the dynamical outcome to the initial conditions, particularly near locations of MMR. It is also worth noting that, in cases such as these that produce significant interactions in the outer Solar System, the orbits of the inner planets generally become unstable also. For example, in the case described here and represented in Figure 8 and Figure 9, Mars is ejected from the Solar System after  $\sim 6$  Myrs.




**Figure 2.** Eccentricity evolution of the Solar System terrestrial planets (top four panels) for a 10<sup>7</sup> year simulation, where the additional planet (bottom panel) has a mass and semi-major axis of 7.0  $M_{\oplus}$  and 2.00 AU, respectively.



**Figure 3.** Semi-major axis evolution, expressed as a fractional change from the initial value, of the Solar System terrestrial planets (top four panels) for a 10<sup>7</sup> year simulation, where the additional planet (bottom panel) has a mass and semi-major axis of 7.0  $M_{\oplus}$  and 2.00 AU, respectively.




**Figure 4.** Eccentricity evolution of the Solar System terrestrial planets (top four panels) for a 10<sup>7</sup> year simulation, where the additional planet (bottom panel) has a mass and semi-major axis of 8.0  $M_{\oplus}$  and 3.70 AU, respectively.




**Figure 5.** Semi-major axis evolution, expressed as a fractional change from the initial value, of the Solar System terrestrial planets (top four panels) for a  $10^7$  year simulation, where the additional planet (bottom panel) has a mass and semi-major axis of  $8.0 M_{\oplus}$  and 3.70 AU, respectively.







**Figure 6.** Eccentricity evolution of the Solar System outer planets (top four panels) for a  $10^7$  year simulation, where the additional planet (bottom panel) has a mass and semi-major axis of  $7.0 M_{\oplus}$  and 3.79 AU, respectively.



**Figure 7.** Semi-major axis evolution, expressed as a fractional change from the initial value, of the Solar System outer planets (top four panels) for a  $10^7$  year simulation, where the additional planet (bottom panel) has a mass and semi-major axis of  $7.0 M_{\oplus}$  and 3.79 AU, respectively.



**Figure 8.** Eccentricity evolution of the Solar System outer planets (top four panels) for a 10<sup>7</sup> year simulation, where the additional planet (bottom panel) has a mass and semi-major axis of 7.0  $M_{\oplus}$  and 3.80 AU, respectively.



**Figure 9.** Semi-major axis evolution, expressed as a fractional change from the initial value, of the Solar System outer planets (top four panels) for a  $10^7$  year simulation, where the additional planet (bottom panel) has a mass and semi-major axis of  $7.0 M_{\oplus}$  and 3.80 AU, respectively.

### 3.3. System-Wide Results

As described in Section 3.1, several thousand simulations with the inclusion of a super-Earth planet were executed, in addition to a baseline simulation for the unmodified Solar System architecture. The divergence from the baseline scenario was evaluated by dividing the eccentricity range throughout the simulation for each planet with the eccentricity range from the baseline case. This produced a ratio of eccentricity ranges that are generally  $\geq 1$ , where unity implies that there is relatively little change in the orbital evolution of that planet for a particular simulation. Cases where the ratio of eccentricity ranges is  $< 1$  can occur in relatively rare situations where the damping of eccentricity oscillations exceeds the perturbative effects of the other planets.

The results of the above described calculations for all of the simulations are represented as intensity plots, shown in Figures 10, 11, 12, and 13. The calculated eccentricity ranges relative to the baseline model are labeled “ $\Delta$  Eccentricity” on the color bars. Here, we note some of the major features of these figures, and discuss their implications in Section 4. Figure 10 shows the results for Mercury and Venus, and Figure 11 shows the results for Earth and Mars. These figures demonstrate the sensitivity of the inner planet orbits to the addition of the super-Earth at locations in the range 2.0–2.7 AU, particularly for Mars. The orbit of Mercury is also especially vulnerable to a super-Earth location in the range 3.1–4.0 AU, resulting in significant eccentricity excursions for Mercury. Venus and Earth appear to have very similar orbital evolution responses to the addition of the super-Earth, regardless of the planetary mass or semi-major axis location.

Figure 12 shows the results for Jupiter and Saturn, and Figure 13 shows the results for Uranus and Neptune. The features of the eccentricity divergences for the outer planets from the baseline model primarily occur at locations of MMR. Indeed, a location of instability common to both the inner and outer planets is  $\sim 3.3$  AU which is the 2:1 MMR with Jupiter and a significant location within the Kirkwood gaps (see discussion in Section 2). As expected, the variations in eccentricity are relatively small for Jupiter and Saturn, who remain largely unaffected by the presence of the super-Earth except at resonance locations. However, as demonstrated by the several outer planet examples in Section 3.2, the locations of MMR can have a devastating effect on the orbits of Uranus and Neptune, including the loss of one or both ice giants from the system.

## 4. DYNAMICAL CONSEQUENCES


### 4.1. Implications for the Inner Planets

The results provided in Section 3.3, and Figures 10 and 11, show that there are broad regions of mass and semi-major axis for the additional planet that can have severe consequences for the inner Solar System planets. In general, the inner planets retain their orbital integrity if the additional planet is located within the range 2.7–3.1 AU, even for relatively high masses. This semi-major axis region minimizes interactions with the giant planets that would otherwise excite the orbital eccentricity of the additional planet. However, the full range of semi-major axes (2–4 AU) for the added super-Earth spans a period range of 1033–2922 days, in which there are numerous MMR locations with the inner planets. For example, the semi-major axis range of 2.0–2.1 AU encompasses the 1:3 MMR with Earth, though it is unclear that this MMR plays a major contributing role to the destabilization of the other inner planets. As shown in Figure 11, the stability of Mars is particularly sensitive to the super-Earth being located in the semi-major axis range 2.0–2.7 AU. There are various MMR locations throughout this region, including the 1:2 MMR with Mars at 2.42 AU, and the 4:1 and 3:1 MMRs with Jupiter, located at 2.07 AU and 2.50 AU, respectively.

Also of note is the evolution of the Mercury orbit into regions of high eccentricity when the additional planet lies within the semi-major axis range of 3.1–4.0 AU, occasionally resulting in the ejection of Mercury from the system prior to the conclusion of the simulation. Mercury does not lie near any significant locations of MMR with the full range of semi-major axes for the additional planet. However, there have been numerous studies regarding the chaotic nature of Mercury’s orbit (Ward et al. 1976; Correia & Laskar 2004; Lithwick & Wu 2011; Noyelles et al. 2014), including its sensitivity to the eccentricity and inclination of Venus’ orbit. Figures 10 and 11 show that the eccentricities of the Venus and Earth orbits are impacted by the 3.1–4.0 AU semi-major axis range of the super-Earth as well, although to a lesser extent than that of Mercury. Additionally, as noted in Section 3.2, the orbits of Venus and Mercury are sensitive to the  $\nu_5$  resonance with Jupiter, and the combination of such resonances may be the primary cause of the Venus orbital changes. Consequently, these alterations to the Venus and Earth orbits may be sufficient to dramatically contribute to the evolution of Mercury’s orbit, further demonstrating the complex dynamical interactions that can occur between planets that are relatively widely separated.

### 4.2. Implications for the Outer Planets

As seen from the several simulation results examples described in Section 3.2, the outer planets do not escape




**Figure 10.** Intensity plot showing the ratio of eccentricity variation amplitude to those from the baseline Solar System model, as a function of added planet mass and semi-major axis. Results are shown for Mercury (top panel) and Venus (bottom panel).

the consequences of the super-Earth presence in the Solar System. Section 3.3 mentions that Jupiter and Saturn are largely unperturbed by the presence of the super-Earth. The exceptions to this are locations of MMR, where Jupiter and Saturn experience mild increases in eccentricity. Particularly strong locations of MMR are those associated with Jupiter; specifically:  $\sim 2.06$  AU (4:1),  $\sim 2.5$  AU (3:1),  $\sim 3.3$  AU (2:1),  $\sim 3.58$  AU (7:4),  $\sim 3.7$  AU (5:3), and  $\sim 3.97$  AU (3:2). Many of these locations are represented as Kirkwood gaps in the asteroid belt, as described in Section 2. Note that  $\sim 3.79$  AU corresponds to the 4:1 MMR with Saturn, but there is little evidence that this MMR plays a significant role in

the orbital evolution of the super-Earth. Even at locations of MMR with the super-Earth, the perturbation to the Jupiter and Saturn eccentricities remain relatively small, and there are no simulation outcomes in which either planet are ejected from the Solar System.

However, the consequences of the super-Earth presence near the MMR locations are far more severe for the ice giants, with frequent excitation of their eccentricities, including rare occasions of ejection of the ice giants from the Solar System. The elevation of the ice giant eccentricities has two major sources. The first source is via the angular momentum transfer through Jupiter and Saturn, whose inflated eccentricities, though rela-




**Figure 11.** Intensity plot showing the ratio of eccentricity variation amplitude to those from the baseline Solar System model, as a function of added planet mass and semi-major axis. Results are shown for Earth (top panel) and Mars (bottom panel).

tively small, deliver substantial dynamical effects to the ice giants. The second source is the result of a dramatic alteration of the super-Earth orbit, placing it in a highly-eccentric chaotic orbit with a semi-major axis beyond the orbit of Saturn. In such cases, the ice giants gravitationally interact directly with the super-Earth, and develop their own divergent orbital states. These interactions usually lead to the super-Earth being ejected from the system, and it is unlikely that the ice giant orbits will maintain long-term stability beyond the  $10^7$  year simulation. It is worth noting that these described sources of orbital perturbation for the ice giants are layered on top of complicated interactions between the super-Earth and

the overall dynamics of the system, potentially resulting in further sources of instability, particularly related to secular frequencies with Jupiter.

#### 4.3. Implications for Exoplanets

As the known exoplanet population has grown, the study of demographics and their statistical relationship to planetary architectures has become increasingly important. The occurrence rates of terrestrial planets, including super-Earths, have been estimated from radial velocity (e.g., Howard et al. 2010; Bashi et al. 2020; Fulton et al. 2021; Rosenthal et al. 2021; Sabotta et al. 2021) and transit surveys (e.g.,




**Figure 12.** Intensity plot showing the ratio of eccentricity variation amplitude to those from the baseline Solar System model, as a function of added planet mass and semi-major axis. Results are shown for Jupiter (top panel) and Saturn (bottom panel).

Dressing & Charbonneau 2013; Kopparapu 2013; Kunimoto & Matthews 2020; Bryson et al. 2021). The results of these occurrence rate estimates vary enormously, depending upon observational biases, analysis techniques, and the parameter space being explored. In particular, most of these studies are heavily biased toward short-period planets around M dwarfs, since the radial velocity amplitude and transit probability/depths are maximized within that regime. However, these analyses consistently indicate that terrestrial planets are relatively common, with super-Earth planets occurring in most of the detected planetary systems. The exception to these planetary size distributions occur within

a photo-evaporation regime of close-in planets, where there is a relative dearth of super-Earths and mini-Neptunes (Lopez & Fortney 2013; Owen & Wu 2013; Fulton et al. 2017).

On the other hand, giant planets are relatively rare, particularly beyond the snow line, with occurrence rates averaging around 10% for solar-type stars, depending on the exact stellar type and semi-major axis range explored (Wittenmyer et al. 2020; Fulton et al. 2021). Giant planets are even scarcer around later-type stars (Zechmeister et al. 2013; Wittenmyer et al. 2016), lending further credence to the hypothesis that the Solar System may not be representative of planetary archi-





**Figure 13.** Intensity plot showing the ratio of eccentricity variation amplitude to those from the baseline Solar System model, as a function of added planet mass and semi-major axis. Results are shown for Uranus (top panel) and Neptune (bottom panel).

tectures. Indeed, the presence of giant planets can be disruptive to the orbits of dynamically packed systems (Kane et al. 2020a), and Mulders et al. (2021) found that the occurrence of hot super-Earths and cold giant planets are anticorrelated around M dwarfs. These findings are important for the results presented in this work, since a major reason for the regions of instability within the Solar System architecture are due to the interaction of the super-Earth with the outer giant planets.

An important feature of exoplanetary systems is their eccentricity distribution, and the important role that eccentricity plays in the evolution and stability of terrestrial planet climates (Williams & Pollard

2002; Dressing et al. 2010; Kane & Gelino 2012; Linsenmeier et al. 2015; Bolmont et al. 2016; Kane & Torres 2017; Way & Georgakarakos 2017; Kane et al. 2020b). As shown in Figure 4, the presence of the super-Earth has significant effects on the orbits for the inner terrestrial planets. These interactions result in large amplitude oscillation of Venus and Earth orbital eccentricities, creating Milankovitch cycles that may potentially influence the long-term climate of these planets (Deitrick et al. 2018a,b; Horner et al. 2020a; Kane et al. 2021b). Given the vast range of planetary system architectures and terrestrial planet climates, it is unclear how the high occurrence rate of super-Earths

may contribute to the overall evolution of terrestrial climates in exoplanetary systems (Becker & Adams 2017). The dependence of planetary climates on orbital interactions with super-Earths will require further atmospheric data and modeling to determine if the presence of such planets (or lack thereof) can preferentially lead to eccentricity-driven climate effects.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

Up until several decades ago, the architecture of the Solar System was the template for general models of planetary system formation and evolution. The discovery of exoplanets has revealed a diversity of orbital configurations that has motivated detailed dynamical analyses of the various processes that can explain the observed distribution of system properties (Fang & Margot 2012; Tremaine & Dong 2012; Tremaine 2015). The presence of giant planets, and their possible migration, can have a profound effect on the types of planets that are formed within a system and their eventual stable orbits, as has been the case for the early history of the Solar System. In particular, these giant planet migration events may have influenced the terrestrial planet formation processes in the inner Solar System and truncated the formation of the most common type of planet thus far discovered: super-Earths.

The lack of a super-Earth within the Solar System may be considered an example of a “double-edged sword” situation. The negative aspect of this lack is that we have no local analog from which to draw in-situ data that would aid enormously in constructing interior and atmospheric models for the exoplanet super-Earths, the vast majority of which were detected using indirect techniques. This work presents a positive aspect of the lack of a local super-Earth, in demonstrating the potential for orbital instability that such an additional planetary mass may induce. Locations of the super-Earth near 3 AU generally preserve system stability, but the full region explored of 2–4 AU is peppered with MMR locations with the other planets. For the inner planets, Mercury’s orbit is mostly rendered unstable when the super-Earth is located in the region 3.1–4.0 AU, and Mars’ orbit becomes unstable when the super-Earth lies within 2.0–2.7 AU. For the outer planets, significant MMR locations are mostly located beyond 3.0 AU, and can result in substantially chaotic orbits for the ice giants.

There are several factors that were not incorporated into this analysis that are worth exploring in future studies. Section 3.1 explains that the initial orbit for the additional planet was coplanar with Earth. Mutual inclinations between planetary orbits plays a role in overall system stability (Laskar 1989;

Chambers et al. 1996), particularly for large inclinations (Veras & Armitage 2004; Correia et al. 2011), and may provide solutions to otherwise unstable architectures (Kane 2016; Masuda et al. 2020). It is therefore possible that there are orbital inclinations for the super-Earth that may reveal further locations of long-term stability, or else enhance unstable scenarios. Furthermore, our simulations did not include tidal dissipation, which would serve to circularize orbits and dampen the orbital energy gained through angular momentum transfer (Barnes et al. 2009a; Laskar et al. 2012; Bolmont et al. 2014). However, inclusion of tidal dissipation would not affect the results of this work given the relatively wide spacing of the Solar System planets and the timescale of our simulations. Moreover, tidal interaction with the protoplanetary disk likely played a major role in producing the low eccentricities of the Solar System giant planets (Tsiganis et al. 2005).

As noted above, the lack of a super-Earth within the solar system is primarily a product of the giant planet formation pathway that occurred. However, as evidenced by the relatively low occurrence rate of Jupiter analogs for solar-type stars (for example), such a formation pathway is not guaranteed, and super-Earth formation can occur in the presence of giant planets. Our results reveal the dynamical fragility of our existing planetary configuration, allowing a more detailed examination of this configuration within the broader context of planetary system architectures. The primary application of this work is thus via a comparison with the plethora of known exoplanetary systems, especially given the apparent stability sensitivity of the solar system to alternative architectures, such as that described here. With numerous precision radial velocity surveys moving forward (e.g., Pepe et al. 2014; Fischer et al. 2016; Stefansson et al. 2016; Gupta et al. 2021) and the era of space-based astrometry upon us (Gaia Collaboration et al. 2021), the Keplerian orbits of nearby planetary systems will be gradually revealed and refined. The study of the orbits with these systems, both from individual and statistical points of view, will demonstrate the true consequences of sharing dynamical space with a super-Earth planet.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank Matthew Clement, Sean Raymond, and the two anonymous referees for useful feedback on the manuscript. The results reported herein benefited from collaborations and/or information exchange within NASA’s Nexus for Exoplanet System Science (NExSS) research coordination network sponsored by NASA’s Science Mission Directorate.

*Software:* Mercury (Chambers 1999)

## REFERENCES

- Agol, E., Dorn, C., Grimm, S. L., et al. 2021, PSJ, 2, 1, doi: [10.3847/PSJ/abd022](https://doi.org/10.3847/PSJ/abd022)
- Barnes, R., Jackson, B., Greenberg, R., & Raymond, S. N. 2009a, ApJL, 700, L30, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/700/1/L30](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/700/1/L30)
- Barnes, R., Jackson, B., Raymond, S. N., West, A. A., & Greenberg, R. 2009b, ApJ, 695, 1006, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/695/2/1006](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/695/2/1006)
- Bashi, D., Zucker, S., Adibekyan, V., et al. 2020, A&A, 643, A106, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202038881](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202038881)
- Batygin, K., & Laughlin, G. 2015, Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, 112, 4214, doi: [10.1073/pnas.1423252112](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1423252112)
- Becker, J. C., & Adams, F. C. 2017, MNRAS, 468, 549, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stx461](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx461)
- Bolmont, E., Libert, A.-S., Leconte, J., & Selsis, F. 2016, A&A, 591, A106, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201628073](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201628073)
- Bolmont, E., Raymond, S. N., von Paris, P., et al. 2014, ApJ, 793, 3, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/793/1/3](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/793/1/3)
- Bonfils, X., Delfosse, X., Udry, S., et al. 2013, A&A, 549, A109, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201014704](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201014704)
- Bottke, W. F., Durda, D. D., Nesvorný, D., et al. 2005, Icarus, 175, 111, doi: [10.1016/j.icarus.2004.10.026](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2004.10.026)
- Bowler, B. P., Blunt, S. C., & Nielsen, E. L. 2020, AJ, 159, 63, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ab5b11](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ab5b11)
- Bromley, B. C., & Kenyon, S. J. 2017, AJ, 153, 216, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aa6aaa](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aa6aaa)
- Bryson, S., Kunimoto, M., Kopparapu, R. K., et al. 2021, AJ, 161, 36, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/abc418](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/abc418)
- Carrera, D., Raymond, S. N., & Davies, M. B. 2019, A&A, 629, L7, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201935744](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201935744)
- Chambers, J. E. 1999, MNRAS, 304, 793, doi: [10.1046/j.1365-8711.1999.02379.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-8711.1999.02379.x)
- Chambers, J. E., Wetherill, G. W., & Boss, A. P. 1996, Icarus, 119, 261, doi: [10.1006/icar.1996.0019](https://doi.org/10.1006/icar.1996.0019)
- Clement, M. S., Kaib, N. A., Raymond, S. N., & Chambers, J. E. 2021, Icarus, 367, 114585, doi: [10.1016/j.icarus.2021.114585](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2021.114585)
- Clement, M. S., Kaib, N. A., Raymond, S. N., & Walsh, K. J. 2018, Icarus, 311, 340, doi: [10.1016/j.icarus.2018.04.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2018.04.008)
- Clement, M. S., Morbidelli, A., Raymond, S. N., & Kaib, N. A. 2020, MNRAS, 492, L56, doi: [10.1093/mnrasl/slz184](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnrasl/slz184)
- Clement, M. S., Quintana, E. V., & Quarles, B. L. 2022, ApJ, 928, 91, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac549e](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac549e)
- Clement, M. S., Raymond, S. N., & Kaib, N. A. 2019, AJ, 157, 38, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aaf21e](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aaf21e)
- Correia, A. C. M., & Laskar, J. 2004, Nature, 429, 848, doi: [10.1038/nature02609](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02609)
- Correia, A. C. M., Laskar, J., Farago, F., & Boué, G. 2011, Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy, 111, 105, doi: [10.1007/s10569-011-9368-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10569-011-9368-9)
- Deienno, R., Gomes, R. S., Walsh, K. J., Morbidelli, A., & Nesvorný, D. 2016, Icarus, 272, 114, doi: [10.1016/j.icarus.2016.02.043](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2016.02.043)
- Deitrick, R., Barnes, R., Quinn, T. R., et al. 2018a, AJ, 155, 60, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aaa301](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aaa301)
- Deitrick, R., Barnes, R., Bitz, C., et al. 2018b, AJ, 155, 266, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aac214](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aac214)
- DeMeo, F. E., & Carry, B. 2014, Nature, 505, 629, doi: [10.1038/nature12908](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12908)
- Dermott, S. F., & Murray, C. D. 1981, Nature, 290, 664, doi: [10.1038/290664a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/290664a0)
- Dressing, C. D., & Charbonneau, D. 2013, ApJ, 767, 95, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/767/1/95](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/767/1/95)
- Dressing, C. D., Spiegel, D. S., Scharf, C. A., Menou, K., & Raymond, S. N. 2010, ApJ, 721, 1295, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/721/2/1295](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/721/2/1295)
- Fang, J., & Margot, J.-L. 2012, ApJ, 761, 92, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/761/2/92](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/761/2/92)
- Fischer, D. A., Anglada-Escude, G., Arriagada, P., et al. 2016, PASP, 128, 066001, doi: [10.1088/1538-3873/128/964/066001](https://doi.org/10.1088/1538-3873/128/964/066001)
- Folkner, W. M., Williams, J. G., Boggs, D. H., Park, R. S., & Kuchynka, P. 2014, Interplanetary Network Progress Report, 42-196, 1
- Ford, E. B. 2014, Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, 111, 12616, doi: [10.1073/pnas.1304219111](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1304219111)
- Fulton, B. J., Petigura, E. A., Howard, A. W., et al. 2017, AJ, 154, 109, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aa80eb](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aa80eb)
- Fulton, B. J., Rosenthal, L. J., Hirsch, L. A., et al. 2021, ApJS, 255, 14, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/abfcc1](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/abfcc1)
- Gaia Collaboration, Brown, A. G. A., Vallenari, A., et al. 2021, A&A, 649, A1, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202039657](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202039657)
- Gelino, D. M., & Kane, S. R. 2014, ApJ, 787, 105, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/787/2/105](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/787/2/105)
- Gillon, M., Jehin, E., Lederer, S. M., et al. 2016, Nature, 533, 221, doi: [10.1038/nature17448](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature17448)
- Gillon, M., Triaud, A. H. M. J., Demory, B.-O., et al. 2017, Nature, 542, 456, doi: [10.1038/nature21360](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature21360)

- Gladman, B. J., Migliorini, F., Morbidelli, A., et al. 1997, *Science*, 277, 197, doi: [10.1126/science.277.5323.197](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.277.5323.197)
- Gomes, R., Levison, H. F., Tsiganis, K., & Morbidelli, A. 2005, *Nature*, 435, 466, doi: [10.1038/nature03676](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03676)
- Gupta, A. F., Wright, J. T., Robertson, P., et al. 2021, *AJ*, 161, 130, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/abd79e](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/abd79e)
- Hansen, B. M. S. 2009, *ApJ*, 703, 1131, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/703/1/1131](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/703/1/1131)
- . 2017, *MNRAS*, 467, 1531, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stx182](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx182)
- Hatzes, A. P. 2016, *SSRv*, 205, 267, doi: [10.1007/s11214-016-0246-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-016-0246-3)
- He, M. Y., Ford, E. B., & Ragozzine, D. 2019, *MNRAS*, 490, 4575, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stz2869](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz2869)
- Horner, J., Vervoort, P., Kane, S. R., et al. 2020a, *AJ*, 159, 10, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ab5365](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ab5365)
- Horner, J., Kane, S. R., Marshall, J. P., et al. 2020b, *PASP*, 132, 102001, doi: [10.1088/1538-3873/ab8eb9](https://doi.org/10.1088/1538-3873/ab8eb9)
- Howard, A. W., Marcy, G. W., Johnson, J. A., et al. 2010, *Science*, 330, 653, doi: [10.1126/science.1194854](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1194854)
- Izidoro, A., Raymond, S. N., Morbidelli, A., & Winter, O. C. 2015, *MNRAS*, 453, 3619, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stv1835](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv1835)
- Izidoro, A., Raymond, S. N., Pierens, A., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 833, 40, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/833/1/40](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/833/1/40)
- Jurić, M., & Tremaine, S. 2008, *ApJ*, 686, 603, doi: [10.1086/590047](https://doi.org/10.1086/590047)
- Kaib, N. A., & Chambers, J. E. 2016, *MNRAS*, 455, 3561, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stv2554](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv2554)
- Kane, S. R. 2016, *ApJ*, 830, 105, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/830/2/105](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/830/2/105)
- . 2019, *AJ*, 158, 72, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ab2a09](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ab2a09)
- Kane, S. R., Ciardi, D. R., Gelino, D. M., & von Braun, K. 2012, *MNRAS*, 425, 757, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2012.21627.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2012.21627.x)
- Kane, S. R., & Gelino, D. M. 2012, *Astrobiology*, 12, 940, doi: [10.1089/ast.2011.0798](https://doi.org/10.1089/ast.2011.0798)
- Kane, S. R., Jansen, T., Fauchez, T., Selsis, F., & Ceja, A. Y. 2021a, *AJ*, 161, 53, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/abcfbe](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/abcfbe)
- Kane, S. R., Li, Z., Wolf, E. T., Ostberg, C., & Hill, M. L. 2021b, *AJ*, 161, 31, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/abcbfd](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/abcbfd)
- Kane, S. R., & Raymond, S. N. 2014, *ApJ*, 784, 104, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/784/2/104](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/784/2/104)
- Kane, S. R., & Torres, S. M. 2017, *AJ*, 154, 204, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aa8fce](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aa8fce)
- Kane, S. R., Turnbull, M. C., Fulton, B. J., et al. 2020a, *AJ*, 160, 81, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ab9ffe](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ab9ffe)
- Kane, S. R., Vervoort, P., Horner, J., & Pozuelos, F. J. 2020b, *PSJ*, 1, 42, doi: [10.3847/PSJ/abae63](https://doi.org/10.3847/PSJ/abae63)
- Kane, S. R., Wittenmyer, R. A., Hinkel, N. R., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 821, 65, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/821/1/65](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/821/1/65)
- Kane, S. R., Arney, G. N., Byrne, P. K., et al. 2021c, *Journal of Geophysical Research (Planets)*, 126, e06643, doi: [10.1002/jgre.v126.2](https://doi.org/10.1002/jgre.v126.2)
- Kopparapu, R. K. 2013, *ApJ*, 767, L8, doi: [10.1088/2041-8205/767/1/L8](https://doi.org/10.1088/2041-8205/767/1/L8)
- Kunimoto, M., & Matthews, J. M. 2020, *AJ*, 159, 248, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ab88b0](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ab88b0)
- Laskar, J. 1988, *A&A*, 198, 341
- . 1989, *Nature*, 338, 237, doi: [10.1038/338237a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/338237a0)
- Laskar, J., Boué, G., & Correia, A. C. M. 2012, *A&A*, 538, A105, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201116643](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201116643)
- Lee, E. J. 2019, *ApJ*, 878, 36, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab1b40](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab1b40)
- Léger, A., Rouan, D., Schneider, J., et al. 2009, *A&A*, 506, 287, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/200911933](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/200911933)
- Limbach, M. A., & Turner, E. L. 2015, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, 112, 20, doi: [10.1073/pnas.1406545111](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1406545111)
- Linsenmeier, M., Pascale, S., & Lucarini, V. 2015, *Planet. Space Sci.*, 105, 43, doi: [10.1016/j.pss.2014.11.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pss.2014.11.003)
- Lissauer, J. J., Quintana, E. V., Rivera, E. J., & Duncan, M. J. 2001, *Icarus*, 154, 449, doi: [10.1006/icar.2001.6692](https://doi.org/10.1006/icar.2001.6692)
- Lissauer, J. J., Fabrycky, D. C., Ford, E. B., et al. 2011, *Nature*, 470, 53, doi: [10.1038/nature09760](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09760)
- Lithwick, Y., & Wu, Y. 2011, *ApJ*, 739, 31, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/739/1/31](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/739/1/31)
- Lopez, E. D., & Fortney, J. J. 2013, *ApJ*, 776, 2, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/776/1/2](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/776/1/2)
- . 2014, *ApJ*, 792, 1, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/792/1/1](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/792/1/1)
- Luger, R., Sestovic, M., Kruse, E., et al. 2017, *Nature Astronomy*, 1, 0129, doi: [10.1038/s41550-017-0129](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41550-017-0129)
- Lykawka, P. S., & Ito, T. 2019, *ApJ*, 883, 130, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab3b0a](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab3b0a)
- Martin, R. G., & Livio, M. 2015, *ApJ*, 810, 105, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/810/2/105](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/810/2/105)
- Masuda, K., Winn, J. N., & Kawahara, H. 2020, *AJ*, 159, 38, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ab5c1d](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ab5c1d)
- Minton, D. A., & Malhotra, R. 2011, *ApJ*, 732, 53, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/732/1/53](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/732/1/53)
- Morbidelli, A., Brasser, R., Gomes, R., Levison, H. F., & Tsiganis, K. 2010, *AJ*, 140, 1391, doi: [10.1088/0004-6256/140/5/1391](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-6256/140/5/1391)
- Morbidelli, A., & Giorgilli, A. 1989, *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy*, 47, 173, doi: [10.1007/BF00051204](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00051204)
- Morbidelli, A., Levison, H. F., Tsiganis, K., & Gomes, R. 2005, *Nature*, 435, 462, doi: [10.1038/nature03540](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03540)
- Morbidelli, A., Lunine, J. I., O'Brien, D. P., Raymond, S. N., & Walsh, K. J. 2012, *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*, 40, 251, doi: [10.1146/annurev-earth-042711-105319](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-earth-042711-105319)

- Morbidelli, A., & Raymond, S. N. 2016, *Journal of Geophysical Research (Planets)*, 121, 1962, doi: [10.1002/2016JE005088](https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JE005088)
- Mulders, G. D., Drażkowska, J., van der Marel, N., Ciesla, F. J., & Pascucci, I. 2021, *ApJL*, 920, L1, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ac2947](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ac2947)
- Nesvorný, D. 2018, *ARA&A*, 56, 137, doi: [10.1146/annurev-astro-081817-052028](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-astro-081817-052028)
- Nesvorný, D., & Morbidelli, A. 2012, *AJ*, 144, 117, doi: [10.1088/0004-6256/144/4/117](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-6256/144/4/117)
- Nesvorný, D., Roig, F. V., & Deienno, R. 2021, *AJ*, 161, 50, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/abc8ef](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/abc8ef)
- Nielsen, L. D., Gandolfi, D., Armstrong, D. J., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 492, 5399, doi: [10.1093/mnras/staa197](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa197)
- Noyelles, B., Frouard, J., Makarov, V. V., & Efroimsky, M. 2014, *Icarus*, 241, 26, doi: [10.1016/j.icarus.2014.05.045](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2014.05.045)
- Owen, J. E., & Wu, Y. 2013, *ApJ*, 775, 105, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/775/2/105](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/775/2/105)
- . 2017, *ApJ*, 847, 29, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa890a](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa890a)
- Pepe, F., Molaro, P., Cristiani, S., et al. 2014, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, 335, 8, doi: [12.1002/asna.201312004](https://doi.org/10.1002/asna.201312004)
- Pirani, S., Johansen, A., Bitsch, B., Mustill, A. J., & Turrini, D. 2019, *A&A*, 623, A169, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201833713](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833713)
- Raymond, S. N., & Izidoro, A. 2017, *Science Advances*, 3, e1701138, doi: [10.1126/sciadv.1701138](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1701138)
- Raymond, S. N., Kokubo, E., Morbidelli, A., Morishima, R., & Walsh, K. J. 2014, in *Protostars and Planets VI*, ed. H. Beuther, R. S. Klessen, C. P. Dullemond, & T. Henning, 595, doi: [10.2458/azu\\_uapress\\_9780816531240-ch026](https://doi.org/10.2458/azu_uapress_9780816531240-ch026)
- Raymond, S. N., O'Brien, D. P., Morbidelli, A., & Kaib, N. A. 2009, *Icarus*, 203, 644, doi: [10.1016/j.icarus.2009.05.016](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2009.05.016)
- Rosenthal, L. J., Fulton, B. J., Hirsch, L. A., et al. 2021, *ApJS*, 255, 8, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/abe23c](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/abe23c)
- Sabotta, S., Schlecker, M., Chaturvedi, P., et al. 2021, *A&A*, 653, A114, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202140968](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202140968)
- Shen, Y., & Turner, E. L. 2008, *ApJ*, 685, 553, doi: [10.1086/590548](https://doi.org/10.1086/590548)
- Spalding, C. 2018, *ApJL*, 869, L17, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/aaf478](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/aaf478)
- Stefansson, G., Hearty, F., Robertson, P., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 833, 175, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/833/2/175](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/833/2/175)
- Tremaine, S. 2015, *ApJ*, 807, 157, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/807/2/157](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/807/2/157)
- Tremaine, S., & Dong, S. 2012, *AJ*, 143, 94, doi: [10.1088/0004-6256/143/4/94](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-6256/143/4/94)
- Tsiganis, K., Gomes, R., Morbidelli, A., & Levison, H. F. 2005, *Nature*, 435, 459, doi: [10.1038/nature03539](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03539)
- Udry, S., Dumusque, X., Lovis, C., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 622, A37, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201731173](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201731173)
- Valencia, D., Sasselov, D. D., & O'Connell, R. J. 2007, *ApJ*, 665, 1413, doi: [10.1086/519554](https://doi.org/10.1086/519554)
- Van Eylen, V., & Albrecht, S. 2015, *ApJ*, 808, 126, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/808/2/126](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/808/2/126)
- Veras, D., & Armitage, P. J. 2004, *Icarus*, 172, 349, doi: [10.1016/j.icarus.2004.06.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2004.06.012)
- Volk, K., & Gladman, B. 2015, *ApJL*, 806, L26, doi: [10.1088/2041-8205/806/2/L26](https://doi.org/10.1088/2041-8205/806/2/L26)
- Walsh, K. J., Morbidelli, A., Raymond, S. N., O'Brien, D. P., & Mandell, A. M. 2011, *Nature*, 475, 206, doi: [10.1038/nature10201](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10201)
- Ward, W. R., Colombo, G., & Franklin, F. A. 1976, *Icarus*, 28, 441, doi: [10.1016/0019-1035\(76\)90117-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0019-1035(76)90117-2)
- Way, M. J., & Georgakarakos, N. 2017, *ApJ*, 835, L1, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/835/1/L1](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/835/1/L1)
- Williams, D. M., & Pollard, D. 2002, *International Journal of Astrobiology*, 1, 61, doi: [10.1017/S1473550402001064](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1473550402001064)
- Winn, J. N., & Fabrycky, D. C. 2015, *ARA&A*, 53, 409, doi: [10.1146/annurev-astro-082214-122246](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-astro-082214-122246)
- Wisdom, J. 1983, *Icarus*, 56, 51, doi: [10.1016/0019-1035\(83\)90127-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0019-1035(83)90127-6)
- . 2006, *AJ*, 131, 2294, doi: [10.1086/500829](https://doi.org/10.1086/500829)
- Wisdom, J., & Holman, M. 1991, *AJ*, 102, 1528, doi: [10.1086/115978](https://doi.org/10.1086/115978)
- Wittenmyer, R. A., Butler, R. P., Tinney, C. G., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 819, 28, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/819/1/28](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/819/1/28)
- Wittenmyer, R. A., Butler, R. P., Horner, J., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 491, 5248, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stz3378](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz3378)
- Zechmeister, M., Kürster, M., Endl, M., et al. 2013, *A&A*, 552, A78, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201116551](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201116551)