## **A Quantitative Criterion for Defining Planets**

Jean-Luc Margot

Official Definition of "Planet" is Inadequate Applies only to solar system bodies Leaves thousands of exoplanets unclassified Is vague (e.g., "clear its orbit", "nearly round") How clear is clear? How round is round?

Desirable Features of Planet Taxonomy

Rigorous (quantitative) and general

Easy to implement

Independent of ideas about formation Follows spirit of existing IAU definition Proposed Criterion

Define orbit-clearing mass  $M_{clear}$  and compute  $\Pi = M_{planet} / M_{clear}$ 

Requires only estimates of star mass, planet mass, and orbital period

Can immediately classify 99% of known exoplanets

Can be used to extend and simplify IAU planet definition







## Results

All 8 solar system planets are confirmed as planets.

All classifiable exoplanets are confirmed as planets.

All pulsar planets are confirmed as planets.

Striking disparity between planets and non-planets.



## Proposed Definition

A planet is a celestial body that

(a) is in orbit around one or more stars or stellar remnants,

(b) has sufficient mass to clear [or dynamically dominate] the neighborhood around its orbit, i.e.,  $\Pi \geq 1$ ,

Classification based on 3 observable quantities.

Existing telescopes enable classification.

Newly discovered bodies can be easily classified.

Roundness is not observable nor easily quantifiable.

Roundness is problematic for classification.

All bodies with  $\Pi \geq 1$  are round.

Roundness criterion can be discarded.

Contact jlm@epss.ucla.edu

Reference

Margot, J. L.,

**150**, 2015.



UCLA

(c) has a mass below 13 Jupiter masses, a nominal value close to the limiting mass for thermonuclear fusion of deuterium.

## For single-star systems,



where M is mass, a is semi-major axis, and subscripts  $p, \star, \oplus$ , •, refer to the planet, star, Earth, and Sun, respectively.