Correlation between planet formation rate and gas surface density: An analog of Kennicutt–Schmidt law for planet formation

Mor Rozner*

Institute of Astronomy, University of Cambridge, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0HA, UK

Gonville & Caius College, Trinity Street, Cambridge, CB2 1TA, UK

and

Institute for Advanced Study, Einstein Drive, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA

(Dated: December 24, 2024)

The efficiency of planet formation is a fundamental question in planetary science, gaining increasing significance as observational data from planet-forming disks accumulates. Here we derive from first principles a correlation between the planet formation rate (PFR) and the gas surface density, i.e. PFR $\propto \Sigma_{\rm g}^{\rm n}$. This relation serves as an analog for the well-established Kennicutt-Schmidt law for star-forming galaxies. We study the different planet formation mechanisms and the density dependence in each one of them, to finally formulate a simple relation. We find that the powerlaw ranges between $n \approx 4/3 - 2$, depending on the type of the forming planet, when we carry out different analyses for the formation rates of terrestrial planets, gas giants, and also planets formed by gravitational instability. We then compare our results with the available observational data. The relation we derive here aims to shed more light on the interpretation of observational data as well as analytical models, and give a new perspective on the properties of planet formation and its connection to gas.

I. INTRODUCTION

Planet formation is one of the most fundamental and enduring questions in astrophysics, spanning over a wide range of scales and processes – from dust grains to fullscale planets, unfolding complex interplay of gravitational, hydrodynamic, and thermodynamic phenomena [1]. From the pioneering theories in the eighteenth century to the high-resolution observations of modern telescopes like ALMA [2], our understanding of planet formation has evolved dramatically. Yet, despite significant advances, many aspects of this process are still under active research and the picture is far from being complete.

Planet formation requires significant amounts of gas. The necessity of gas for the process of planet formation is manifested by the model of minimum mass solar nebula (MMSN) [3, 4], which sets the minimal amount of material in the solar nebula to form the current Solar system. In the time when planets are born, the protoplanetary disk is strongly dominated by gas (99%), hinting at the significance of gas in the processes involved. The role played by gas during planet formation changes from one stage to another, but is essential for all of them, until the disk dispersal. At early stages, the gas determines the velocity of objects moving in it, setting the radial drift [3], and in late stages, gas drag-induced accretion determines the growth rate planetesimals [5–8], and finally the growth of cores to gas giants [9, 10].

Similar to planet formation, star formation also requires high gas densities. Kennicutt-Schmidt law [11, 12] is an empirical law that describes the relation between the star formation rate (SFR) and gas (surface) density, that now is shown to hold over a large number of starforming galaxies [13–16]. Kennicutt-Schmidt law has a local (microscopic) version, specifies the regional SFR as a function of the gas surface density, as well as a global (macroscopic) one related to disk-averaged properties. This law plays a crucial role in our understanding of the processes and conditions involved in star formation and also serves as a critical component in cosmological simulations.

In this letter, we derive from first principles a relation connecting the planetary formation rate (PFR) to the gas surface density Σ_g (or equivalently, the volumetric gas density ρ_g). We discuss a local PFR law, but relate also to a global version. Such a relation could be useful both for theoretical studies and future observations. There are some key differences between planet formation and star formation. While stars are formed directly by the collapse of gas clouds, the dependence of planet formation on the surrounding gas is more indirect and complicated. Still, the existence and density of gas in a protoplanetary disk is a necessary component to enable planet formation.

II. THE FINAL STAGES OF PLANET FORMATION

Planet formation could be roughly divided into three stages: dust growth by coagulation, the intermediate regime and gravitationally-assisted growth. While the first and last stages are fairly understood, the intermediate one is still highly uncertain, as meter-sized objects

^{*} morozner@ast.cam.ac.uk

should overcome various barriers to grow to km-sized objects, including the meter-size barrier, fragmentation, bouncing and aeolian-erosion [3, 17–21].

The final planet formation rate is determined essentially by the last stages before the gas disk dispersal, assuming a bottom-up growth of planets (see further discussion on gravitational instability in IIC). Hence, we will briefly review the growth rate of objects during these stages, and the relation to the gas density. It is important to note that we are agnostic here to the planetesimal formation mechanism, and focus only on the growth after the planetesimal formation.

A. Terrestrial planets

The growth of objects larger than planetesimals is governed by collisions of planetesimals/protoplanets either between themselves or with smaller objects, coupled to the gas – pebble accretion, which is an efficient mechanism for protoplanets growth [6–8]. Pebble accretion describes the accretion of aerodynamically small particles on gravitationally large objects, and involves gas drag and gravity, with a typical rate of $\dot{M}_{\rm PA} \approx 2v_{\infty}b_{\rm PA}\Sigma_{\rm peb}$ where v_{∞} is the unperturbed velocity of the particle, $b_{\rm PA}$ is the impact factor and $\Sigma_{\rm peb}$ is the surface density of the pebbles. There are two regimes of pebble accretion based on the impact parameter, the shear regime – large $b_{\rm PA}$ and headwind regime – small $b_{\rm PA}$ [22]

$$\dot{M}_{\rm PA} \approx \begin{cases} \sqrt{8GM_{\rm pl}t_{\rm stop}v_{\rm hw}}\Sigma_{\rm peb}, \text{ headwind,} \\ 2R_{\rm Hill}^2\Omega_K \tau_s^{2/3}\Sigma_{\rm peb}, \text{ shear} \end{cases}$$
(1)

1

where $M_{\rm pl}$ is the mass of the accreting object, $t_{\rm stop} = m v_{\rm rel}/F_D$ is the stopping time of a particle with mass m, radius $R_{\rm peb}$ and a velocity $v_{\rm rel}$ relative to the gas, which applies a drag force of $F_D = 0.5 C_D \pi R_{\rm peb}^2 \rho_g v_{\rm rel}^2$, C_D is a function of the Reynolds number [7], $v_{\rm hw}$ is disk headwind, Ω_K is the Keplerian frequency of the particle and $\tau_s = \Omega_K t_{\rm stop}$.

The pebble surface density Σ_{peb} is determined by the pebble flux, and is changing in time, as it depends on the drifting particles. Overall [23],

$$\Sigma_{\rm peb} = \frac{\dot{M}_{\rm peb,disk}}{2\pi r v_{\rm drift}(\tau_s)} = f \Sigma_g \frac{r_{pro,0}}{r_{\rm pro}} \frac{v_{\rm drift,0}}{v_{\rm drift}} := f_{\rm peb} \Sigma_g \quad (2)$$

where $f = \Sigma_d / \Sigma_g$ is the dust-to-gas ratio, $r_{\rm pro}$ is the pebble production line, defined by the location, which drifts with time, at the disk in which the growth and drift timescale of a pebble are comparable, $v_{\rm drift}$ is the radial drift velocity [3], and $f_{\rm peb} = \Sigma_{\rm peb} / \Sigma_g$ is the pebbles-togas fraction. Subindex zero relates to the initial reference values, that change with time. We will adopt a typical value of $f_{\rm peb} = 0.01$.

B. Gas giants

For some objects, the accretion is rapid enough, and they attain large masses before the gas disk dispersal. These objects will capture a significant gas envelope and will finally develop to become gas giants [9, 10]. In this case, their formation rate will depend on the rate of the runaway gas accretion. Here we adopt Bondi accretion rate,

$$\dot{M}_{\rm RA} \approx 4\pi R_{\rm Bondi}^2 c_s \rho_g$$
 (3)

where $R_{\text{Bondi}} = GM/c_s^2$ and c_s is the sound speed in the disk. The gas accretion rate is then stopped/modified either when the gas supply from the disk is exhausted or the planet opens a gap [24, 25]. Note that there could be corrections to the accretion rate depending on the thermal mass parameters, but they will not change steeply the overall scaling with the gas density [26]. For gap-opening planets, the mass accretion rate will become [24, 27]

$$\dot{M}_{GO} \approx 0.29 \left(\frac{h_p}{r_p}\right)^{-2} \left(\frac{M}{M_\star}\right)^{4/3} \Sigma_g r_p^2 \Omega_K$$
 (4)

where h_p and r_p are the scale height of the protoplanetary disk and the location of the planet correspondingly. M_{\star} is the mass of the host star.

C. Other planet formation models

Planet formation is not necessarily a bottom-up process. An alternative mechanism, known as gravitational instability (GI) [5, 28, 29], can lead to the formation of massive planets through instabilities in the protoplanetary disk. GI bears similarities to the star formation process, enabling us to establish an analogous relation between the planetary formation rate (PFR) and the gas surface density,

$$PFR_{GI} \propto \frac{\Sigma_g}{t_{ff}} \propto \Sigma_g^{3/2}$$
 (5)

where $t_{\rm ff} = \sqrt{2\pi/32G\rho_g}$ is the free-fall timescale which is the typical timescale for instability to develop in the disk. The proportionality factor is determined by the efficiency of converting disk material into planets.

III. KENNICUTT-SCHMIDT LAW FOR PLANET FORMATION

Using the growth rates we introduced above, we construct the PFR based on our current knowledge of planet formation stages. We define the PFR as a quantity that measures the number of planets, of a given type, that are forming in a region of the disk with a certain gas density. We estimate the PFR by

$$PFR \approx \epsilon_{PFR} \Sigma_{p} \Gamma_{grow} \approx \epsilon_{PFR} \frac{\Sigma_{p}}{t_{grow}}$$
(6)

where $\epsilon_{\rm PFR}$ is an efficiency proportionality constant, that varies from one formation channel to another, Σ_p is the surface density of "growing seeds", i.e. protoplanets for the case of terrestrial planets and cores for gas giants formation, $\Gamma_{\text{grow}} \approx t_{\text{grow}}^{-1} \approx M^{-1} \frac{dM}{dt}$ is the typical growth rate and dM/dt is the mass accretion rate which we described above for the different regions. $t_{\rm grow}$ serves as the analog of the free-fall time, which dictates the typical timescale for star formation. The quantities M, dM/dt are evaluated at typical seed masses of the forming planets, and are used to estimate the typical growth timescale t_{grow} (see Table A for fiducial values). We set the efficiency of protoplanets/cores formation by $\epsilon_{\rm pro} = \Sigma_{\rm pro} / \Sigma_{\rm peb}$ and $\epsilon_{\rm core} = \Sigma_{\rm core} / \Sigma_p$ correspondingly, and follow [23] to quantify them. They relate mainly to core formation, but we used that for protoplanet formation efficiency as well, as a restrictive value. Overall, we find the following dependencies

$$PFR \propto \Sigma_{g}^{n}, n = \begin{cases} 3/2, \text{ terrestiral, headwind} \\ 4/3, \text{ terrestiral, shear} \\ 2, \text{ gas giants} \\ 2, \text{ gap opening gas giants} \\ 3/2, \text{ gravitational instability} \end{cases}$$
(7)

Similarly, we could derive a volumetric PFR law. It is interesting to note that while the formation processes of planets and stars are intrinsically different, we predict a dependence similar to the one initially derived for the SFR law [12], for two of the planet formation regimes.

Observations of gas densities in protoplanetary disks as well as planet formation face many non-trivial challenges. Most of the gas there is made of molecular hydrogen, which does not emit efficiently at low temperatures, such that observational data have to rely on different measurements [30, 31]. Currently, we found two protoplanetary disks that could be used to test our theory, in which the gas density and the planetary masses are known. Since the accretion rates on the planets are known in these disks, we will estimate the PFR by $PFR_{obs} \sim M/A$ where A is the surface of the disk. TW Hya is one of the most studied protoplanetary disks, with two major dust gaps, which are thought to host two super-Earths with a mass of ~ 4 M_{\oplus} each [32, 33], and the mass accretion was found to be $4 \times 10^{-7} - 10^{-5} M_J \text{yr}^{-1}$ [33], we will estimate $A \sim \pi (100 \text{AU})^2$. Overall, $PFR_{TH} \approx 1.9 \times 10^{-11} - 10^{-11}$ mate $A \sim \pi(100AO)$. Overall, 11101 $6.4 \times 10^{-10} \text{ M}_{J}\text{yr}^{-1}\text{AU}^{-2}$. The corresponding gas surface density is $\Sigma_g = 10 - 10^2 \text{ g cm}^{-2}$ [33, 34]. PDS 70 hosts two protoplanets, with masses of $2-4~M_J$ and $1-3~M_J$ and accretion rates of $3 \times 10^{-7} - 8 \times 10^{-7} ~M_J {\rm yr}^{-1}$ and



FIG. 1. The planet formation rate (PFR) as a function of the gas surface density (Σ_g) for (a) terrestrial planets (b) gas giants. We consider different planet formation mechanisms (solid lines) and observational data (black crosses).

 $10^{-7}-5\times 10^{-7}~M_J {\rm yr}^{-1}$ correspondingly [35], we will estimate $A\sim \pi (100 {\rm AU})^2$ The gas surface density is taken to be $10^{-3}-0.1~{\rm gcm}^{-2}$ [36]. Overall the PFR could be estimated by $1.3\times 10^{-11}-4.1\times 10^{-11}~M_J {\rm yr}^{-1} {\rm AU}^{-2}$.

In Fig. 1, we present the dependence of the PFR on the gas surface density Σ_g for different types of planets and formation processes. In Fig. 1a, we consider the PFR for terrestrial planets, and in Fig. 1b we consider the PFR for gas giants. As can be seen, in all the cases, there is a correlation between the PFR and the gas density. Moreover, the PFR is a monotonically increasing function of the gas density, indicating that there is positive feedback. This trend could be seen also from the observational data we considered. It should be noted that the formation of terrestrial planets is more efficient than the formation of gas giants, as also concluded in [37]. In the near future, hopefully, we will have more observations on planet-forming disks that will enable us to test against larger statistics.

IV. DISCUSSION & SUMMARY

In this letter, we derived from first principles a relation between the planet formation rate (PFR) and the gas surface density. Such a relation is an important step towards our understanding of planet formation, and hopefully will be tested against further observations in the near future, when statistics of planet-forming disks will be available.

The law we derived here changes according to the planetary type, as different planets are formed via different physical processes. While we mostly focused on bottomup formation, we also discussed the PFR for planets forming by gravitational instability. Our model could be used also to determine the dominant formation processes of planets, given the different dependencies.

To extend the analogy to the SFR law introduced by [11, 12], one can define a threshold density for planet formation. Such a density was discussed in the context of the MMSN [3, 4]. The law derived in this letter will hold under the condition that $\Sigma_g \gtrsim \Sigma_{\text{th}}$. Disks with smaller gas densities will lack the ability to produce planets, and accordingly will not obey the law we derived. For planets formed via GI, another threshold should be applied using the Safronov-Toomre stability criterion [38, 39]. We also expect to have self-regulation of planet formation, similar to star formation. As time goes by, the gas is depleted and accordingly, fewer planets are forming, while obeying the PFR-gas relation.

Here we related mainly to a local PFR law, focusing on the local relation between PFR and gas surface density. Future studies can include spatially averaged planet formation rates over the disk, as well as a more accurate calculation of $t_{\rm grow}$, based on full integration. Moreover, Similar relations could also be derived for earlier stages of planet formation, i.e. pebble and planetesimal formation, using similar lines of thought. While pebble formation processes are well understood, the production of planetesimals is still an open question. Hence, the uncertainty of the derived powerlaws in this case will be higher, as well as the current observational data. Formation of in-situ moons should present similar dependencies on the gas surface density.

Given more observations, we would be able to determine which formation mechanism is more favorable, given the different dependencies for different mechanisms. We could also gauge the overall efficiency factors that encapsulate the efficiencies of planet formation rates. Another trace for the relation of planet formation rate to the gas density could be found in discussions on the dependence of planet formation and distribution on metallicities, as higher gas densities correlate with lower metallicities [37, 40, 41].

Planet formation in distorted disks relies on different properties of the disks, and could give rise to different formation rates. Since a decent fraction of protoplanetary disks are thought to be distorted, a more detailed analysis of the planet formation rate in these disks should be carried out in the future.

- [1] P. J. Armitage, Astrophysics of planet formation, Second Edition (2020).
- [2] ALMA Partnership, E. B. Fomalont, C. Vlahakis, S. Corder, A. Remijan, D. Barkats, R. Lucas, T. R. Hunter, C. L. Brogan, Y. Asaki, S. Matsushita, W. R. F. Dent, R. E. Hills, N. Phillips, A. M. S. Richards, P. Cox, R. Amestica, D. Broguiere, W. Cotton, A. S. Hales, R. Hiriart, A. Hirota, J. A. Hodge, C. M. V. Impellizzeri, J. Kern, R. Kneissl, E. Liuzzo, N. Marcelino, R. Marson, A. Mignano, K. Nakanishi, B. Nikolic, J. E. Perez, L. M. Pérez, I. Toledo, R. Aladro, B. Butler, J. Cortes, P. Cortes, V. Dhawan, J. Di Francesco, D. Espada, F. Galarza, D. Garcia-Appadoo, L. Guzman-Ramirez, E. M. Humphreys, T. Jung, S. Kameno, R. A. Laing, S. Leon, J. Mangum, G. Marconi, H. Nagai, L. A. Nyman, M. Radiszcz, J. A. Rodón, T. Sawada, S. Takahashi, R. P. J. Tilanus, T. van Kempen, B. Vila Vilaro, L. C. Watson, T. Wiklind, F. Gueth, K. Tatematsu, A. Wootten, A. Castro-Carrizo, E. Chapillon, G. Dumas, I. de Gregorio-Monsalvo, H. Francke, J. Gallardo, J. Garcia, S. Gonzalez, J. E. Hibbard, T. Hill, T. Kaminski, A. Karim, M. Krips, Y. Kurono, C. Lopez, S. Martin, L. Maud, F. Morales, V. Pietu, K. Plarre, G. Schieven, L. Testi, L. Videla, E. Villard, N. Whyborn, M. A. Zwaan, F. Alves, P. Andreani, A. Avison, M. Barta, F. Bedosti, G. J. Bendo, F. Bertoldi, M. Bethermin, A. Biggs, J. Boissier, J. Brand, S. Burkutean, V. Casasola, J. Conway, L. Cortese, B. Dabrowski, T. A.

Davis, M. Diaz Trigo, F. Fontani, R. Franco-Hernandez, G. Fuller, R. Galvan Madrid, A. Giannetti, A. Ginsburg, S. F. Graves, E. Hatziminaoglou, M. Hogerheijde, P. Jachym, I. Jimenez Serra, M. Karlicky, P. Klaasen, M. Kraus, D. Kunneriath, C. Lagos, S. Longmore, S. Leurini, M. Maercker, B. Magnelli, I. Marti Vidal, M. Massardi, A. Maury, S. Muehle, S. Muller, T. Muxlow, E. O'Gorman, R. Paladino, D. Petry, J. E. Pineda, S. Randall, J. S. Richer, A. Rossetti, A. Rushton, K. Rygl, A. Sanchez Monge, R. Schaaf, P. Schilke, T. Stanke, M. Schmalzl, F. Stoehr, S. Urban, E. van Kampen, W. Vlemmings, K. Wang, W. Wild, Y. Yang, S. Iguchi, T. Hasegawa, M. Saito, J. Inatani, N. Mizuno, S. Asayama, G. Kosugi, K. I. Morita, K. Chiba, S. Kawashima, S. K. Okumura, N. Ohashi, R. Ogasawara, S. Sakamoto, T. Noguchi, Y. D. Huang, S. Y. Liu, F. Kemper, P. M. Koch, M. T. Chen, Y. Chikada, M. Hiramatsu, D. Iono, M. Shimojo, S. Komugi, J. Kim, A. R. Lyo, E. Muller, C. Herrera, R. E. Miura, J. Ueda, J. Chibueze, Y. N. Su, A. Trejo-Cruz, K. S. Wang, H. Kiuchi, N. Ukita, M. Sugimoto, R. Kawabe, M. Hayashi, S. Miyama, P. T. P. Ho, N. Kaifu, M. Ishiguro, A. J. Beasley, S. Bhatnagar, I. Braatz, J. A., D. G. Brisbin, N. Brunetti, C. Carilli, J. H. Crossley, L. D'Addario, J. L. Donovan Meyer, D. T. Emerson, A. S. Evans, P. Fisher, K. Golap, D. M. Griffith, A. E. Hale, D. Halstead, E. J. Hardy, M. C. Hatz, M. Holdaway, R. Indebetouw, P. R. Jewell, A. A. Kepley, D. C. Kim, M. D. Lacy, A. K. Leroy, H. S. Liszt, C. J. Lonsdale, B. Matthews, M. McKinnon, B. S. Mason, G. Moellenbrock, A. Moullet, S. T. Myers, J. Ott, A. B. Peck, J. Pisano, S. J. E. Radford, W. T. Randolph, U. Rao Venkata, M. G. Rawlings, R. Rosen, S. L. Schnee, K. S. Scott, N. K. Sharp, K. Sheth, R. S. Simon, T. Tsutsumi, and S. J. Wood, The 2014 ALMA Long Baseline Campaign: An Overview, ApJ 808, L1 (2015), arXiv:1504.04877 [astro-ph.IM].

- [3] S. J. Weidenschilling, Aerodynamics of solid bodies in the solar nebula., MNRAS 180, 57 (1977).
- [4] C. Hayashi, Structure of the Solar Nebula, Growth and Decay of Magnetic Fields and Effects of Magnetic and Turbulent Viscosities on the Nebula, Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement 70, 35 (1981).
- [5] V. S. Safronov, Evolution of the protoplanetary cloud and formation of the earth and planets. (1972).
- [6] C. W. Ormel and H. H. Klahr, The effect of gas drag on the growth of protoplanets. Analytical expressions for the accretion of small bodies in laminar disks, A&A 520, A43 (2010), arXiv:1007.0916 [astro-ph.EP].
- [7] H. B. Perets and R. A. Murray-Clay, Wind-shearing in Gaseous Protoplanetary Disks and the Evolution of Binary Planetesimals, ApJ **733**, 56 (2011), arXiv:1103.1629 [astro-ph.EP].
- [8] M. Lambrechts and A. Johansen, Rapid growth of gasgiant cores by pebble accretion, A&A 544, A32 (2012), arXiv:1205.3030 [astro-ph.EP].
- [9] F. Perri and A. G. W. Cameron, Hydrodynamic Instability of the Solar Nebula in the Presence of a Planetary Core, Icarus 22, 416 (1974).
- [10] H. Mizuno, Formation of the Giant Planets, Progress of Theoretical Physics 64, 544 (1980).
- [11] J. Kennicutt, Robert C., The Star Formation Law in Galactic Disks, ApJ 344, 685 (1989).
- [12] M. Schmidt, The Rate of Star Formation., ApJ **129**, 243 (1959).
- [13] F. Bigiel, A. Leroy, F. Walter, E. Brinks, W. J. G. de Blok, B. Madore, and M. D. Thornley, The Star Formation Law in Nearby Galaxies on Sub-Kpc Scales, AJ 136, 2846 (2008), arXiv:0810.2541 [astro-ph].
- [14] A. K. Leroy, F. Walter, K. Sandstrom, A. Schruba, J.-C. Munoz-Mateos, F. Bigiel, A. Bolatto, E. Brinks, W. J. G. de Blok, S. Meidt, H.-W. Rix, E. Rosolowsky, E. Schinnerer, K.-F. Schuster, and A. Usero, Molecular Gas and Star Formation in nearby Disk Galaxies, AJ 146, 19 (2013), arXiv:1301.2328 [astro-ph.CO].
- [15] I. Pessa, E. Schinnerer, F. Belfiore, E. Emsellem, A. K. Leroy, A. Schruba, J. M. D. Kruijssen, H. A. Pan, G. A. Blanc, P. Sanchez-Blazquez, F. Bigiel, M. Chevance, E. Congiu, D. Dale, C. M. Faesi, S. C. O. Glover, K. Grasha, B. Groves, I. Ho, M. Jiménez-Donaire, R. Klessen, K. Kreckel, E. W. Koch, D. Liu, S. Meidt, J. Pety, M. Querejeta, E. Rosolowsky, T. Saito, F. Santoro, J. Sun, A. Usero, E. J. Watkins, and T. G. Williams, Star formation scaling relations at ~100 pc from PHANGS: Impact of completeness and spatial scale, A&A 650, A134 (2021), arXiv:2104.09536 [astro-ph.GA].
- [16] J. Sun, A. K. Leroy, E. C. Ostriker, S. Meidt, E. Rosolowsky, E. Schinnerer, C. D. Wilson, D. Utomo, F. Belfiore, G. A. Blanc, E. Emsellem, C. Faesi, B. Groves, A. Hughes, E. W. Koch, K. Kreckel, D. Liu, H.-A. Pan, J. Pety, M. Querejeta, A. Razza, T. Saito, A. Sardone, A. Usero, T. G. Williams, F. Bigiel, A. D. Bolatto, M. Chevance, D. A. Dale, J. Gensior, S. C. O.

Glover, K. Grasha, J. D. Henshaw, M. J. Jiménez-Donaire, R. S. Klessen, J. M. D. Kruijssen, E. J. Murphy, L. Neumann, Y.-H. Teng, and D. A. Thilker, Star Formation Laws and Efficiencies across 80 Nearby Galaxies, ApJ **945**, L19 (2023), arXiv:2302.12267 [astro-ph.GA].

- [17] F. L. Whipple, On certain aerodynamic processes for asteroids and comets, in *From Plasma to Planet*, edited by A. Elvius (1972) p. 211.
- [18] I. Adachi, C. Hayashi, and K. Nakazawa, The gas drag effect on the elliptical motion of a solid body in the primordial solar nebula., Progress of Theoretical Physics 56, 1756 (1976).
- [19] J. Blum and G. Wurm, The growth mechanisms of macroscopic bodies in protoplanetary disks., ARA&A 46, 21 (2008).
- [20] A. Zsom, C. W. Ormel, C. Güttler, J. Blum, and C. P. Dullemond, The outcome of protoplanetary dust growth: pebbles, boulders, or planetesimals? II. Introducing the bouncing barrier, A&A 513, A57 (2010), arXiv:1001.0488 [astro-ph.EP].
- [21] M. Rozner, E. Grishin, and H. B. Perets, The aeolianerosion barrier for the growth of metre-size objects in protoplanetary discs, MNRAS **496**, 4827 (2020), arXiv:1910.02941 [astro-ph.EP].
- [22] C. W. Ormel, The emerging paradigm of pebble accretion, in Formation, Evolution, and Dynamics of Young Solar Systems, edited by M. Pessah and O. Gressel (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017) pp. 197–228.
- [23] M. Lambrechts and A. Johansen, Forming the cores of giant planets from the radial pebble flux in protoplanetary discs, A&A 572, A107 (2014), arXiv:1408.6094 [astroph.EP].
- [24] T. Tanigawa and H. Tanaka, Final Masses of Giant Planets. II. Jupiter Formation in a Gas-depleted Disk, ApJ 823, 48 (2016), arXiv:1510.06848 [astro-ph.EP].
- [25] S. Ginzburg and E. Chiang, The end of runaway: how gap opening limits the final masses of gas giants, MNRAS 487, 681 (2019), arXiv:1905.03887 [astro-ph.EP].
- [26] N. Choksi, E. Chiang, J. Fung, and Z. Zhu, The maximum accretion rate of a protoplanet: how fast can runaway be?, MNRAS 525, 2806 (2023), arXiv:2305.01684 [astro-ph.EP].
- [27] T. Tanigawa and S.-i. Watanabe, Gas Accretion Flows onto Giant Protoplanets: High-Resolution Twodimensional Simulations, ApJ 580, 506 (2002).
- [28] G. P. Kuiper, On the Origin of the Solar System, Proceedings of the National Academy of Science 37, 1 (1951).
- [29] P. Goldreich and W. R. Ward, The Formation of Planetesimals, ApJ 183, 1051 (1973).
- [30] W. F. Thi, E. F. van Dishoeck, G. A. Blake, G. J. van Zadelhoff, J. Horn, E. E. Becklin, V. Mannings, A. I. Sargent, M. E. van den Ancker, A. Natta, and J. Kessler, H₂ and CO Emission from Disks around T Tauri and Herbig Ae Pre-Main-Sequence Stars and from Debris Disks around Young Stars: Warm and Cold Circumstellar Gas, ApJ 561, 1074 (2001), arXiv:astro-ph/0107006 [astroph].
- [31] T. C. Yoshida, H. Nomura, K. Furuya, T. Tsukagoshi, and S. Lee, A New Method for Direct Measurement of Isotopologue Ratios in Protoplanetary Disks: A Case Study of the ¹²CO/¹³CO Ratio in the TW Hya Disk, ApJ **932**, 126 (2022), arXiv:2204.08330 [astro-ph.EP].
- [32] D. Mentiplay, D. J. Price, and C. Pinte, Super-Earths

6

in the TW Hya disc, MNRAS **484**, L130 (2019), arXiv:1811.03636 [astro-ph.EP].

- [33] T. C. Yoshida, H. Nomura, C. J. Law, R. Teague, Y. Shibaike, K. Furuya, and T. Tsukagoshi, Outflow Driven by a Protoplanet Embedded in the TW Hya Disk, ApJ 971, L15 (2024), arXiv:2407.14395 [astro-ph.EP].
- [34] J. K. Calahan, E. Bergin, K. Zhang, R. Teague, I. Cleeves, J. Bergner, G. A. Blake, P. Cazzoletti, V. Guzmán, M. R. Hogerheijde, J. Huang, M. Kama, R. Loomis, K. Öberg, C. Qi, E. F. van Dishoeck, J. Terwisscha van Scheltinga, C. Walsh, and D. Wilner, The TW Hya Rosetta Stone Project. III. Resolving the Gaseous Thermal Profile of the Disk, ApJ 908, 8 (2021), arXiv:2012.05927 [astro-ph.EP].
- [35] J. J. Wang, S. Ginzburg, B. Ren, N. Wallack, P. Gao, D. Mawet, C. Z. Bond, S. Cetre, P. Wizinowich, R. J. De Rosa, G. Ruane, M. C. Liu, O. Absil, C. Alvarez, C. Baranec, É. Choquet, M. Chun, D. Defrère, J.-R. Delorme, G. Duchêne, P. Forsberg, A. Ghez, O. Guyon, D. N. B. Hall, E. Huby, A. Jolivet, R. Jensen-Clem, N. Jovanovic, M. Karlsson, S. Lilley, K. Matthews, F. Ménard, T. Meshkat, M. Millar-Blanchaer, H. Ngo, G. Orban de Xivry, C. Pinte, S. Ragland, E. Serabyn, E. V. Catalán, J. Wang, E. Wetherell, J. P. Williams, M. Ygouf, and B. Zuckerman, Keck/NIRC2 L'-band Imaging of Jovian-mass Accreting Protoplanets around PDS 70, AJ 159, 263 (2020), arXiv:2004.09597 [astroph.EP].
- [36] B. Portilla-Revelo, I. Kamp, S. Facchini, E. F. van Dishoeck, C. Law, C. Rab, J. Bae, M. Benisty, K. Öberg, and R. Teague, Constraining the gas distribution in the

PDS 70 disc as a method to assess the effect of planet-disc interactions, A&A **677**, A76 (2023), arXiv:2306.16850 [astro-ph.EP].

- [37] L. A. Buchhave, D. W. Latham, A. Johansen, M. Bizzarro, G. Torres, J. F. Rowe, N. M. Batalha, W. J. Borucki, E. Brugamyer, C. Caldwell, S. T. Bryson, D. R. Ciardi, W. D. Cochran, M. Endl, G. A. Esquerdo, E. B. Ford, J. C. Geary, R. L. Gilliland, T. Hansen, H. Isaacson, J. B. Laird, P. W. Lucas, G. W. Marcy, J. A. Morse, P. Robertson, A. Shporer, R. P. Stefanik, M. Still, and S. N. Quinn, An abundance of small exoplanets around stars with a wide range of metallicities, Nature **486**, 375 (2012).
- [38] V. S. Safronov, On the gravitational instability in flattened systems with axial symmetry and non-uniform rotation, Annales d'Astrophysique 23, 979 (1960).
- [39] A. Toomre, On the gravitational stability of a disk of stars., ApJ 139, 1217 (1964).
- [40] S. Ida and D. N. C. Lin, Toward a Deterministic Model of Planetary Formation. II. The Formation and Retention of Gas Giant Planets around Stars with a Range of Metallicities, ApJ 616, 567 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0408019 [astro-ph].
- [41] M. C. Wyatt, C. J. Clarke, and J. S. Greaves, Origin of the metallicity dependence of exoplanet host stars in the protoplanetary disc mass distribution, MNRAS 380, 1737 (2007), arXiv:0707.2733 [astro-ph].

Appendix A: Fiducial values

Fiducial values		
Symbol	Meaning	Fiducial value
$ ho_{ m peb}$	pebble internal density	$3 \mathrm{~g~cm^{-3}}$
$R_{ m peb}$	pebble radius	$1 \mathrm{~cm}$
C_D	drag constant (for pebbles)	1
$v_{\rm hw}$	typical headwind for pebbles	$50 \mathrm{~m~sec^{-1}}$
h	disk scale-height (at $\sim 1~{\rm AU})$	0.1 AU
M_{\star}	host star mass	$1~M_{\odot}$
c_s	speed of sound	$200 \mathrm{~m~sec^{-1}}$
f	Σ_d/Σ_g , dust-to-gas ratio	0.01
$f_{ m peb}$	$\Sigma_{\rm peb}/\Sigma_g$, pebble-to-gas ratio	0.01
$\epsilon_{ m PFR}$	planet formation efficiency	1
$\epsilon_{ m pro}$	protoplanet formation efficiency	0.2
$\epsilon_{\rm core}$	core formation efficiency	0.2
$M_{\rm pro}$	typical $M_{\rm pl}$ for a protoplanet	$10^{-3}~M_\oplus$
$M_{\rm core}$	typical $M_{\rm pl}$ for a core	$10 M_\oplus$
$M_{ m gap}$	typical $M_{\rm pl}$ for a gap-opening planet	$1 M_J$