

General relativity effect of inclined orbits on the spins of the celestial bodies

HUAN-RONG YUAN,¹ YING WANG,¹ XIN WU,¹ JI-WEI XIE,² HUI-GEN LIU,² JI-LIN ZHOU,² AND WEI SUN¹

¹*School of Mathematics, Physics and Statistics Shanghai University of Engineering Science,
Shanghai 201620, China*

²*School of Astronomy and Space Science and Key Laboratory of Modern Astronomy and Astrophysics in Ministry of
Education,
Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China*

ABSTRACT

Through the Rossiter-McLaughlin effect, some hot Jupiters were found spin-orbit misalignment or even retrograde orbits. The formation reasons for the high obliquity of hot Jupiters can be divided into two cases summarizing the earlier literature. First, the host star's spin becomes misaligned with the planetary disk primordially due to chaotic accretion during the late stage of star formation, the magnetic interaction between the stars and the planetary disk, etc. Second, the orbital inclination of the individual planet can be excited due to dynamical mechanisms such as planet-planet scattering, the Lidov-Kozai cycle, and secular chaos within the framework of Newtonian mechanics. This article reveals the third case that with the framework of general relativity, the post-Newtonian spin-orbit coupling term causes precessions of the host star's spin around the orbital angular momentum. The orbital inclination concerning a reference plane can enlarge the deviation range of spatial orientation of the bodies' spins from the normal of the plane. The varying amplitude and period of the precession of the spin of the star and planet have been obtained theoretically, which can be applied without any restricted conditions and agrees well with the numerical results.

Keywords: Solar-planetary interactions (1472) — Hot Jupiters(753) — Exoplanet evolution(491)

1. INTRODUCTION

After centuries of researches and observations by astronomers, the theory of planet formation in the solar system appeared to have been well developed. However, a challenge came in 1995 when Mayor and Queloz announced the discovery of the first exoplanet ever orbiting a Sun-like star, 51 Peg b (Mayor & Queloz 1995). This planet has a mass of $0.46 M_J$ (M_J is the mass of Jupiter) and a very short orbital period of 4.231 days, making it the first hot Jupiter observed by humans. The planet formation theories include the core accretion model (Zahn 1977) and the gravitational

instability model (Toomre 1964). According to the core accretion model, solid cores of giants usually form several au away from the host star where sufficient raw material is available, it is difficult for hot Jupiters to obtain enough material to form in suit. So it is generally considered that gas giants form at a distance from the host star and then migrate to the vicinity of the host star due to gas disk migration (Goldreich & Tremaine 1980; Lin & Papaloizou 1986; Lin et al. 1996; Ward 1997) or high-eccentricity tidal migration (Wu & Murray 2003; Storch & Lai 2014; Dawson & Johnson 2018; Jackson et al. 2021).

6438 exoplanets have been confirmed updated to April 23, 2024.¹ There are 4861 exoplanet systems, of which 3826 are in single-star systems. Hot Jupiters are a class of gas giants with masses of $0.3 M_J \leq m(msini) \leq 13 M_J$ and orbital period $p \lesssim 10$ days. Among the exoplanets discovered, 659 hot Jupiters have been confirmed, most exist alone without close companion planets, and only 44 hot Jupiters have companion planets. All of the 99 Hot Jupiters in the binary system are S-type. The major detection method of observed hot Jupiters with companions is Transit, which has strong selection effects for close-in and large planets, as well as aligned multiplanet systems. About 129 Hot Jupiters have the observed data of projected obliquities, the most (about 90%) of which are in the range $[-149^\circ 100^\circ]$. Most of lonely hot Jupiters were found having highly inclined or even retrograde orbits to the spin of their host stars (Hébrard et al. 2008, 2010; Narita et al. 2009; Winn et al. 2009; Triaud et al. 2010; Albrecht et al. 2012; Winn & Fabrycky 2015), which usually tend to exist in the exoplanet systems with high-mass and hot stars (Wang et al. 2022), while the cool stars generally have the exoplanets with lower obliquities (Winn et al. 2010; Schlaufman 2010; Albrecht et al. 2012). Batygin (2012) once pointed out that the torque of distant giant companion stars may lead to the tilt of the gaseous disc and hot Jupiters with native obliquities can directly form in the tilted disk. In addition, the magnetic interaction between the stars and the planetary disk can lead to the tilt of the spin axis of the planetary disk or the host stars (Lai et al. 2011; Foucart & Lai 2011). The planetary disk may also tilt due to the chaotic accretion in the later stage of star formation (Bate et al. 2010). The transport of a large amount of angular momentum caused by internal gravitational waves in hot stars (Rogers et al. 2012; Rogers & Lin 2013) can also lead to the non-zero angle between the planetary disk and the host star's spin axis. After the formation of planets, the gravitational action between celestial bodies can also cause the phenomenon of high obliquity. Many mechanisms that cause high obliquity of the planets, including Kozai cycles (Wu & Murray 2003; Fabrycky & Tremaine 2007; Naoz et al. 2011; Wang et al. 2017), planet-planet scattering (Rasio & Ford 1996; Ford & Rasio 2008; Nagasawa et al. 2008; Beuge & Nesvorný 2011; Nagasawa & Ida 2011) and secular chaos (Wu & Lithwick 2011; Batygin 2012).

With the continuous expansion of the scope of celestial mechanics and the requirement of high-precision measurement, Einstein's general theory of relativity put forward in 1916, has been widely developed. Under the framework of general relativity, the motion of most celestial bodies in the weak gravitational field of the solar system is generally described by post-Newtonian approximation method, which is mainly divided into post-Newtonian Lagrange approximation method in harmonic coordinates (Kidder 1995; Andrade et al. 2001; Faye et al. 2006; Chen & Wu 2016) and post-Newtonian Hamiltonian approximation method written in ADM coordinates (Damour 2001a; Damour et al. 2001b; Faye et al. 2006; Jaranowski & Schäfer 2015). For the systems of hot Jupiters,

¹ <http://exoplanet.eu/>; <http://exoplanets.org/>; <http://exoplanetarchive.ipac.caltech.edu/>;
<http://openexoplanetcatalogue.com/>; <http://www.astro.keele.ac.uk/jkt/tepcat/rossiter.html>.

the magnitude of the first-order post-Newtonian term relative to the Newton term is 10^{-7} , so the relativistic effects should be considered for long-term dynamical evolution. [Biscani & Carloni \(2013, 2015\)](#) focused on the long-term evolution of spin and orbit of the secondary celestial body by using the modern perturbation scheme based on the Lie series in the analysis of relativistic spin-spin and spin-orbit interactions. The spin of the host star was considered as a constant of motion for the restricted case, which was dropped from Hamiltonian. However, according to our research, relativistic effects from the close planet can also accumulate over time to induce substantial changes in the spin of the host star, which can produce precession of the spin orientation of the host star, then raise the obliquity, the angle between the spin of the host star and the orbital plane of other planets or planetary disk. In this paper, we mainly focus on the relativistic first-order post-Newtonian two-body problem with spins to analyze the influence of spin-orbit coupling term on the host star's spin precession.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. We first introduce the Hamiltonian equations for the first-order post-Newtonian of the two-body problem with spins and the non-canonical spin variables are transformed to obtain the Hamilton equation with a global symplectic structure in Section 2. Then, the integrability of Hamiltonian describing the first-order post-Newtonian of the two-body problem with orbit-spin coupling term is exhibited in Section 3. We have done some numerical simulations in hot Jupiter systems, and then analyzed the influence of spin-orbit coupling post Newtonian term on the host star's spin with different initial inclinations of hot Jupiter in Section 4. Finally, the conclusion and discussion are shown in Section 5. The appendix introduces the effect of the spin-spin coupling post-Newtonian term on the precession of the spin of the host star.

2. HAMILTONIAN FORMULATION

The model chosen for this paper is the first-order post-Newtonian of the two-body problem with spins. After simplifying to a center-of-mass system, the Hamiltonian is defined by ([Barker & O'Connell 1970, 1979; Damour 2001a](#))

$$H = H_N + \epsilon H_1. \quad (1)$$

Here $\epsilon = 1/c^2$, c is the speed of light.

H_1 expands as

$$H_1 = H_{1\text{PN}} + H_{\text{SO}}. \quad (2)$$

Their detailed expressions are defined by

$$H_N = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathbf{J}_1^2}{I_1} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathbf{J}_2^2}{I_2} + \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2\mu} - \frac{GM\mu}{r}, \quad (3)$$

which is the Newtonian Hamiltonian,

$$H_{1\text{PN}} = \mu \left\{ \frac{1}{8} (3\nu - 1) \frac{\mathbf{p}^4}{\mu^4} - \frac{GM}{2r} \left[(3 + \nu) \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{\mu^2} + \nu \left(\mathbf{n} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{p}}{\mu} \right)^2 \right] + \frac{G^2 M^2}{2r^2} \right\}, \quad (4)$$

which is the 1PN orbital Hamiltonian, and

$$H_{\text{SO}} = \frac{2G}{r^3} \left[\left(1 + \frac{3m_2}{4m_1}\right) \mathbf{J}_1 + \left(1 + \frac{3m_1}{4m_2}\right) \mathbf{J}_2 \right] \cdot (\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{p}), \quad (5)$$

which is the 1.5PN spin-orbit part. G is the gravitational constant, m_1 , and m_2 are the mass of the secondary and main celestial bodies respectively. $M = m_1 + m_2$ is the total mass, $\mu = m_1 m_2 / M$ is the reduced mass, $\nu = \mu / M$. $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}_1 = -\mathbf{p}_2$, \mathbf{p}_1 and \mathbf{p}_2 are momentums of body 1 and 2 respectively in the centroid coordinate system. $\mathbf{r} = r\mathbf{n}$ is the vector connecting main celestial body 2 and secondary celestial body 1. \mathbf{n} denotes the unit diameter vector.

If the spin vectors \mathbf{J}_i in Hamiltonians of equations 3 and 5 are expressed in the general form of non-canonical spin variables, will hinder the deduction of the integrability and the further application of the symplectic algorithm in numerical simulation which is very suitable for long-term dynamical evolution. Wu & Xie (2010) proposed cylindrical-like spin coordinates to represent spin vectors. Here, we transform the spin vector \mathbf{J}_i into the form of canonical coordinates θ_i and canonical momentum ξ_i . So the canonical spin variable can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{J}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{J_i^2 - \xi_i^2} \cos \theta_i \\ \sqrt{J_i^2 - \xi_i^2} \sin \theta_i \\ \xi_i^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (i = 1, 2). \quad (6)$$

\mathbf{J}_i is regarded as the rotational angular momenta of spherical rigid bodies (Barker & O'Connell 1975, 1976, 1979; Wex 1995; Biscani & Carloni 2013, 2015), which can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{J}_i = I_i \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \quad (7)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$ is the rotational angular velocity vector of body i and I_i is the moment of inertia. The moment of inertia is related to the mass and radius of celestial bodies and is expressed as

$$I_i \approx \alpha m R^2. \quad (8)$$

When I_i is the moment of inertia of the stars, the α is about 0.031 to 0.148 for main sequence stars (Claret & Gimenez 1989). When I_i is the moment of inertia of planets, in the case of gas planets $\alpha \approx 0.2$, in the case of solid planets $\alpha \approx 0.25$ (Ward & Hamilton 2004; Millholland & Laughlin 2018).

In the centroid coordinate system, the final simplified Hamiltonian with canonical variables $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2)$ can be written as

$$H(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2) = H(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{J}_1(\theta_1, \xi_1), \mathbf{J}_2(\theta_2, \xi_2)), \quad (9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\text{SO}} = & \frac{2G}{r^3} \left\{ \left[\left(1 + \frac{3m_2}{4m_1}\right) (\sqrt{J_1^2 - \xi_1^2} \cos \theta_1) \right. \right. \\
& + \left. \left(1 + \frac{3m_1}{4m_2}\right) (\sqrt{J_2^2 - \xi_2^2} \cos \theta_2) \right] (yp_x - zp_y) \\
& \left[\left(1 + \frac{3m_2}{4m_1}\right) (\sqrt{J_1^2 - \xi_1^2} \sin \theta_1) + \left(1 + \frac{3m_1}{4m_2}\right) \right. \\
& \left. \left. (\sqrt{J_2^2 - \xi_2^2} \sin \theta_2) \right] (zp_x - xp_z) + \left[\left(1 + \frac{3m_2}{4m_1}\right) \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \xi_1 + \left(1 + \frac{3m_1}{4m_2}\right) \xi_2 \right] (xp_y - yp_x) \right\}. \tag{10}
\end{aligned}$$

3. THE INTEGRABILITY OF THE SYSTEM

For a general post-Newtonian double-spinning two-body problem, position \mathbf{r} and momentum \mathbf{p} are a set of canonical variables that satisfy the Hamiltonian equations of motion,

$$\frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dt} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{p}}, \quad \frac{d\mathbf{p}}{dt} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{r}}. \tag{11}$$

The spin-evolution equations are

$$\frac{d\mathbf{J}_i}{dt} = \frac{\partial H_{\text{SO}}}{\partial \mathbf{J}_i} \times \mathbf{J}_i. \tag{12}$$

The fact that 6 integrals of motion exist in the 12-dimensional space made of $[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2]$, including the total energy H , the constant magnitudes of spins J_1, J_2 , and the total angular momentum $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{J}_1 + \mathbf{J}_2$ ($\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{p}$ is the orbital angular momentum) can not infer that the Hamiltonian is integrable by Liouville's theorem, which illustrates that a canonical Hamiltonian with n degrees of freedom is integrable if and only if there are n independent isolating integrals (Lichtenberg 2013). So, the integrability of canonical equation 11 needs 3 independent isolating integrals, but the integrability of non-canonical equation 12 needs 6 independent isolating integrals. A total of 9 independent isolating integrals are needed to confirm the integrability of the Hamiltonian containing equation 5.

After the canonical spin variables in equation 6 are adopted, each 3-dimensional variable \mathbf{J}_i turns into 2 degrees of freedom with an implying condition that the magnitude of the vector \mathbf{J}_i is constant. The canonical spin Hamiltonian equations can be obtained

$$\frac{d\theta_i}{dt} = \frac{\partial H_{\text{SO}}}{\partial \xi_i}, \quad \frac{d\xi_i}{dt} = -\frac{\partial H_{\text{SO}}}{\partial \theta_i}. \tag{13}$$

The Hamiltonian $H(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{J}_1(\theta_1, \xi_1), \mathbf{J}_2(\theta_2, \xi_2))$ consists of 10-dimensional variables with 5 degrees of freedom. Its integrability needs 5 independent isolating integrals. Besides the total energy H and the total angular momentum \mathbf{J} , Damour (2001a) gave out that post-Newtonian Hamiltonian containing orbital PN orders and the 1.5PN spin-orbit coupling has two additional conserved quantities

$$\mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{L} = \text{const}, \quad \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}} = \text{const}, \tag{14}$$

where, $\mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}} = [2 + 3m_2/(m_1)]\mathbf{J}_1 + [2 + 3m_1/(m_2)]\mathbf{J}_2$. The six integrals can determine the integrability of the canonical Hamiltonian described by equations 1-4 and 9. Furthermore, due to the integrability

Table 1. Summary and explanation of the symbolic variables appearing in this article

Parameter	unit	Meaning
M_1	M_J	Mass of planet
M_2	M_\odot	Mass of primary
R_1	R_J	Radius of planet
R_2	R_\odot	Radius of primary
a	au	Orbital semi-major axis
e	\	Orbital eccentricity
i	deg	Orbital inclination
Ω	degree	longitude of ascending node
ω	degree	argument of pericenter
M	degree	mean anomaly
P_{2rot}	day	Rotation period of primary
P_{1rot}	day	Rotation period of planet
θ_1	degree	Nodal angle of planetary spin
θ_2	degree	Nodal angle of star spin
φ_1	degree	Angle between \mathbf{J}_1 and Z axis
φ_2	degree	Angle between \mathbf{J}_2 and Z axis
λ_1	degree	Angle between \mathbf{J}_1 and \mathbf{L}
λ_2	degree	Angle between \mathbf{J}_2 and \mathbf{L}
ϕ	degree	Angle between \mathbf{J} and \mathbf{L}

needing only five independent integrals, the additional integral means that two of the five frequencies are commensurable. The integrability of the system means that there are no chaotic orbits, only periodic and quasi-periodic orbits.

4. THE DYNAMICAL EVOLUTIONS OF THE TWO SPINNING BODIES CONSIDERING 1.5 PN TERM

As we all know, based on Newtonian dynamics, post-Newtonian terms produce some relativistic effects, which apply to the motion of celestial bodies at low speed in a weak gravitational field. That means the orbital angular momentum should remain constant approximatively when considering post-Newtonian parts, for it is strictly constant in two-body problems only considering Newtonian dynamics.

We plot the projections of the spins $\mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2$, the orbital angular momentum \mathbf{L} , and the constant \mathbf{J} on a 3-dimensional spherical surface, as shown in Figure.1. Case-0 in Table.2 lists the initial orbital parameters of the orbit with a mild eccentricity $e = 0.5$. Clearly, \mathbf{L} has a tiny variation, closing to a constant, while \mathbf{J} keeps constant strictly. Also, we can see in Figure.2, the variations of the angles between \mathbf{L} and \mathbf{J} are almost imperceptible for different eccentricities ($e = 0.006, 0.5, 0.9$).

However, the spins rotate around the \mathbf{L} with the angles changing slightly and periodically, as shown in Figure.3. That means the obliquities (the angle between the spins and the orbital angular momentum) are almost unchanged. There is one thing that needs to be noticed, the obliquity generally mentioned in kinds of literature referred to as λ_2 , the angle between the spin of the host star and the normal

Table 2. Related initial parameters of three numerical cases, the unit and explanation of which are listed in Table 1.

Parameter	Case-0	Case-1	Case-2
M_1	10	1	10
M_2	1.09	1.2	1
R_1	1	1	1
R_2	1	1	1
a	0.05	0.04	0.05
e		0.004	0.006
i	10	30	[0,20]
Ω	0	0	0
ω	0	0	0
M	0	0	0
P_{2rot}	30	25	30
P_{1rot}	4	4	4
θ_1	90	90	90
θ_2	95	95	95
φ_1	1	1	1
φ_2	5	1	5

of the planetary orbital plane. Although the 1.5PN spin-orbit coupling post-Newtonian term can't change the obliquities obviously in the system consisting of two spinning bodies, it can make the spatial orientations of spins vary by a significant degree.

To illustrate the revolutions of \mathbf{L} and the spin \mathbf{S} vividly as well as the variation range of the spins, we show their loops in the invariant plane coordinate system as well as the general coordinate system in Figure 4. \mathbf{J} is exactly conserved, while \mathbf{L} keeps constant approximately with a tiny rotation. The spins \mathbf{S} rotate around \mathbf{L} periodically.

Then, we can easily get the rules about the spin deviation amplitude from the z-axis in the general coordinate systems, which are decided by their respective obliquities λ_i and the orbital inclination i . For example, the approximate maximum value of φ_2 (the angle between the spin of the host star and z-axis) is $\lambda_2 + i$ in a prograde orbit, $2\pi - (\lambda_2 + i)$ in a retrograde orbit, and the approximate minimum value $|\lambda_2 - i|$. Interestingly, the deviation between the host star's spin and the z-axis, φ_2 , will be remarkable for highly inclined orbits, even if the host star's spin is almost parallel to the z-axis initially.

In this paper, all the celestial bodies are supposed to have spherical symmetry, because shape asymmetry can also produce precession of the rotation axis. So, the precession here is caused entirely by the spin-orbit coupling post-Newtonian term. The amplitude of the angle between the spin orientation of the host star and the z-axis can excited by an inclined planetary orbit. Without loss of generality, we set the normal direction of the planetary disk plane as the z-axis. Due to relativistic precession, the spin orientation of the host star and the normal direction of the planetary disk plane can get a large deviation, which may be important for the formation of exoplanet systems' obliquities.




Figure 1. The projection of the spins $\mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2$, the orbital angular momentum \mathbf{L} , and the constant \mathbf{J} on 3-dimensional spherical surface. The initial orbital parameters are listed in Case-0 of Table.2 with eccentricity $e = 0.5$.

In the following section, we will investigate the influence of this relativistic dynamical mechanism on the variation of the spatial orientations of spins in detail.

4.1. *The influence of inclined planetary orbits on relativistic spins precession: numerical simulations*

In this part, we aimed to find the evolutionary characteristics of the spins due to the 1.5 PN orbit-spin coupling term. We simulate the spins' evolution in a hot Jupiter system considering the first-order post-Newtonian Hamiltonian and 1.5 PN spin-orbit coupling term applying the rkf8(9) method., and supposing that the positive z-axis is aligned with the initial normal direction of the planetary disk. In the solar system, the Sun's spin deviation from the ecliptic plane's normal is about 7° , and the obliquity of the Earth's ecliptic is about 23° . Considering this, we set initial angles $\varphi_1 = 1^\circ$, $\varphi_2 = 5^\circ$, which are reasonable deviations from the normal direction of the planetary disk, both are smaller than that in the Solar system.

Figure 5 (a) and (b) show the time evolutions of the angles between the spins and the initial normal direction of the planetary disk, which are denoted as φ_1 and φ_2 respectively. We can see clearly that




Figure 2. The numerical evolutions of the angle between the total angular momentum \mathbf{J} and the orbital angular momentum \mathbf{L} with three different eccentricities $e = 0.006, 0.5, 0.9$. The other initial orbital parameters are listed in Case-0 of Table.2.

the maximum value of φ_i is $\lambda_i + i$ and the minimum value is $\|\lambda_i - i\|$, which is consistent with the theoretical analysis in the previous part.

From the numerical results above, we can obtain the evolution period of λ_1 (the angle between the spin of the planet and the normal of the planetary disk (the orientation of the z-axis)), which is 3.32×10^4 yr. The precession period of λ_2 (the angle between the host star's spin and the planetary disk's normal direction (the z-axis's orientation)) is 2.81×10^6 yr. The precession period is unrelated to the orbital inclination which can be relative to any fixed plane. In the next section, we will obtain the spin precession period theoretically.

4.2. Relativistic spins precession period: theoretical analysis in general case

We can obtain the theoretical spin precession period of the planet by some restricted models from previous literature. One is the well-known relativistic effect named geodetic or de Sitter precession describes the spin precession of the spin of a gyroscope orbiting a large (non-rotating) spherical mass m_2 in a circular orbit (De Sitter 1916; Barker & O'Connell 1970, 1979; Schiff 1960a,b).

$$\hat{T}_1 = \frac{4\pi c^2 a^{5/2}}{3G^{3/2} m_2^{3/2}} \quad (15)$$

where $\bar{\omega} = \left(\frac{Gm_2}{a^3}\right)^{1/2}$.




Figure 3. The numerical evolutions of the angles between spins \mathbf{J}_1 , \mathbf{J}_2 and the orbital angular momentum \mathbf{L} with three different eccentricities $e = 0.006, 0.5, 0.9$. (a) the angle between \mathbf{J}_1 and \mathbf{L} , (b) the angle between \mathbf{J}_2 and \mathbf{L} . The other initial orbital parameters are listed in Case-0 of Table.2.




Figure 4. $\widehat{x}\widehat{y}\widehat{z}$ coordinate system is the invariable plane coordinate system. $\widehat{x}'\widehat{y}'\widehat{z}'$ is the general coordinate system. \widehat{z} axis can be set parallel to the normal of the planetary disk without generality. \mathbf{J} keeps constant strictly. \mathbf{L} keeps constant approximately. The spins S rotate around L periodically.





Figure 5. The spin precession of the planet and host star in the system of inclined planetary orbits induced by 1.5 orbital-spin coupling post-Newtonian term. $i = 0^\circ, 5^\circ, 10^\circ$ and 20° , and the corresponding initial obliquities can be calculated, λ_1 , are $1^\circ, 6^\circ, 11^\circ$ and 21° respectively, and λ_2 , are about $5^\circ, 10^\circ, 15^\circ$ and 25° respectively. The other initial parameters of the system are listed in Case-2 of Table 2.

The other model considers that the order of the ratio J_1/J_2 is small enough (about $10^{-3} \sim 10^{-4}$ for the Jupiter-like planets). The spin precession of the planets can be obtained through the restricted condition ($m_2 \gg m_1$ and $|\mathbf{J}_2| \gg |\mathbf{J}_1|$, \mathbf{J}_2 is considered as a constant). General theoretical analysis for the post-Newtonian two-body problem with spins in restricted condition $\mathbf{J}_2 = cont$ has been well resolved in (Biscani & Carloni 2013, 2015).

The precession period of spin \mathbf{J}_1 can be derived from (Biscani & Carloni 2013)

$$\tilde{T}_1 = \frac{4\pi c^2 \tilde{L}^3 \tilde{G}^3}{3m_2^4 G^4 M}, \quad (16)$$

where, $\tilde{L} = \sqrt{Gm_2 a}$, $\tilde{G} = \tilde{L} \sqrt{1 - e^2}$. M is the magnitude of the total mean angular momentum vector in the scaled restricted post-Newtonian Hamiltonian, which can be obtained by

$$M^2 = \tilde{G}^2 - 2\tilde{H}_0^2 + 2\tilde{H}_0 \tilde{J}_* + \tilde{J}_1^2 + 2\tilde{G}_{xy,0} \tilde{J}_{1xy,0} \cosh_{*,0}, \quad (17)$$

where $\tilde{H} = \tilde{G} \cos i$, $\tilde{J}_* = \tilde{H} + \tilde{J}_{1z}$, $\tilde{J}_1 = |\mathbf{J}_1|/m_1$, $h_* = \Omega - \theta_1$. The subscript 0 , xy , z represent the value of the initial time, the component of the xy plane, the z component of the value respectively.

When $e = 0$ and $\mathbf{J}_2 = 0$ the Equation.16 will be consistent with Equation.15 of geodetic or de sitter precession.

The values calculated by Equation.15 and Equation.16 with the parameters in Case-2 are 3.34×10^4 yrs and 3.80×10^4 yrs, which approximate the numerical period 3.32×10^4 . It is worth noting that these results are approximate only in the circular orbits of restricted models. Moreover, the theoretical spin precession period of the host star hasn't been given out yet. Next, we will provide the theoretical formula on the periods of spins' precession in general two spinning bodies system considering 1.5 post-Newtonian terms.

According to the content in Section 3, the system composed of two spinning celestial bodies at 1.5 post-Newtonian order is integrable. An integrable system may not have explicit analytical solutions. However, we can get more information by theoretical analysis than un-integrable systems.

Equation 11 and 13 is the Hamiltonian vector field of the Hamiltonian H of Equation 9 by calculating Poisson brackets $\{\sim, H\}$. Similarly, following the flow of the generators J^2, J_z , and L^2 , we can work out the equations of $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2$, as well as their evolutionary characters by calculating Poisson brackets $\{\sim, J^2\}, \{\sim, J_z\}, \{\sim, L^2\}$.

For \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p} , they satisfy

$$\frac{d\mathbf{V}}{d\lambda_1} = \{\mathbf{V}, J^2\} = 2\mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{V}, \quad (18)$$

$$\frac{d\mathbf{V}}{d\lambda_2} = \{\mathbf{V}, J_z\} = \hat{z} \times \mathbf{V}, \quad (19)$$

and

$$\frac{d\mathbf{V}}{d\lambda_3} = \{\mathbf{V}, L^2\} = 2\mathbf{L} \times \mathbf{V}, \quad (20)$$

with \mathbf{V} representing any of \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{p} . The three equations make \mathbf{r} , and \mathbf{p} rigidly rotate about the constant \mathbf{J} , the \hat{z} axis, and the orbital angular momentum \mathbf{L} in the loops generated by the flow J^2, J_z , and L^2 . According to the definition of $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{p}$, \mathbf{L} also rotate about the constant \mathbf{J} , the \hat{z} axis, and itself in the loops respectively.

For \mathbf{J}_1 and \mathbf{J}_2 , they satisfy

$$\frac{d\mathbf{S}}{d\lambda_1} = \{\mathbf{S}, J^2\} = 2\mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{S}, \quad (21)$$

$$\frac{d\mathbf{S}}{d\lambda_2} = \{\mathbf{S}, J_z\} = \hat{z} \times \mathbf{S}, \quad (22)$$

and

$$\frac{d\mathbf{S}}{d\lambda_3} = \{\mathbf{V}, L^2\} = 0, \quad (23)$$

with \mathbf{S} representing any of \mathbf{J}_1 and \mathbf{J}_2 . The three equations make spin \mathbf{S} rigidly rotate about the constant \mathbf{J} and the \hat{z} axis in the loops generated by the flow J^2 and J_z , but fixed (not rotating about \mathbf{L} in the loops generated by the flow L^2).

Although the evolutions of \mathbf{r} , \mathbf{p} , \mathbf{J}_1 and \mathbf{J}_2 in the Hamiltonian flow generated by $\{\sim, H\}$ will be different with their loops generated by the flow $\{\sim, L^2\}$. But we can calculate the periods of loops around \hat{z} , \mathbf{J} and \mathbf{L} more simply by theoretical analysis. For example the period T_2 of \mathbf{J}_2 around \hat{z} can be obtained by

$$T_i = \frac{2\pi}{\tilde{\omega}_i}, \quad (24)$$

$$\tilde{\omega}_i = \left\langle \frac{d\lambda_2}{dt} \right\rangle = \left\langle \frac{d\mathbf{J}_i}{dt} \middle/ \frac{d\mathbf{J}_i}{d\lambda_2} \right\rangle.$$

for an entier loop by the flow generator J_z of the spin need λ_2 changing 2π .

$$\frac{d\mathbf{J}_1}{dt} = \frac{2G}{c^2 r^3} \left(1 + \frac{3m_2}{4m_1} \right) \mathbf{L} \times \mathbf{J}_1. \quad (25)$$

$$\frac{d\mathbf{J}_2}{dt} = \frac{2G}{c^2 r^3} \left(1 + \frac{3m_1}{4m_2} \right) \mathbf{L} \times \mathbf{J}_2. \quad (26)$$

The angle bracket represents averaging over a period of the spin precession. It is worth noting that the division of vectors requires they are parallel. So when calculating equations.4.2, we should transform the general coordinate system to the coordinate system with the direction of \mathbf{L} as the z-axis. Moreover, considering the conservation of L , J_1 and J_2 , the angle between the spin and the orbital angular momentum varying slightly, the average of $\frac{1}{r^3}$ over a period of mean motion,

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{r^3} \right\rangle = \frac{1}{a^3(1-e^2)^{3/2}}, \quad (27)$$

the varying period of \mathbf{J}_1 and \mathbf{J}_2 around \hat{z} can be obtained approximatively by

$$T_1 \approx \frac{2\pi c^2 a^{5/2} (1-e^2) \sqrt{m_1+m_2}}{G^{3/2} (2m_1 m_2 + 1.5m_2^2)} \quad (28)$$

$$T_2 \approx \frac{2\pi c^2 a^{5/2} (1-e^2) \sqrt{m_1+m_2}}{G^{3/2} (2m_1 m_2 + 1.5m_1^2)} \quad (29)$$

From the above equations, we can obtain the periods $T_1 = 3.31 \times 10^4$ yr, $T_2 = 2.84 \times 10^6$ yr which perfectly agree with the numerical results. We compared the periods of spin precession of the planet and host star simulated numerically with the corresponding theoretical results obtained by equation 28 and 29 for varying planetary mass, orbital semi-major axis, and eccentricity in Figure 6, 7 and 8, which show good agreements.




Figure 6. The periods of spin precession of the planet and host star are simulated numerically as well as the corresponding theoretical results obtained by equation 28 and 29 with $m_2 = 1.09M_\odot$, $a = 0.05au$, and $e = 0$. Other compared theoretical results of the planetary spin precession period were obtained by (Biscani & Carloni 2013) and (De Sitter 1916).




Figure 7. The periods of spin precession of the planet and host star are simulated numerically as well as the corresponding theoretical results obtained by equation 28 and 29 with $m_1 = 10M_J, m_2 = 1.09M_\odot$, and $e = 0$. Other compared theoretical results of the planetary spin precession period were obtained by (Biscani & Carloni 2013) and (De Sitter 1916).




Figure 8. The periods of spin precession of the planet and host star are simulated numerically as well as the corresponding theoretical results obtained by equation 28 and 29 with $m_1 = 10M_J, m_2 = 1.09M_\odot$, and $a = 0.05au$. Other compared theoretical results of the planetary spin precession period were obtained by (Biscani & Carloni 2013) and (De Sitter 1916).

5. CONCLUSIONS

Considering the post-Newtonian spin-orbit coupling term, the Hamiltonian of two spinning bodies becomes integrable by adopting canonical spin variables. Based on this, we analyze the characteristics of the spins' precession of the planet and the host star such as their trajectory on a three-dimensional sphere, the amplitude of variation, and their periods by numerical simulations and theoretical study. The theoretical results agree very well with the numerical results. This dynamical mechanism shows that orbital inclination to a reference plane can enlarge the varying amplitude of the precession of the spins concerning the same reference plane.

REFERENCES

- Lichtenberg, A.J., and Michael A. Lieberman. Regular and chaotic dynamics. Vol. 38. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- Albrecht, S., Winn, J. N., Johnson, J. A., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 757, 18. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/757/1/18
- de Andrade, V. C., Blanchet, L., & Faye, G. 2001, *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 18, 753. doi:10.1088/0264-9381/18/5/301
- Barker, B. M. & O'Connell, R. F. 1970, *PhRvD*, 2, 1428. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.2.1428
- Barker, B. M. & O'Connell, R. F. 1975, *PhRvD*, 12, 329. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.12.329
- Barker, B. M. & O'Connell, R. F. 1976, *PhRvD*, 14, 861. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.14.861
- Barker B. M., O'Connell R. F., 1979, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.*, 11, 149
- Batygin, K. 2012, *Nature*, 491, 418. doi:10.1038/nature11560
- Batygin, K. & Adams, F. C. 2013, *ApJ*, 778, 169. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/778/2/169
- Batalha, N. M., Rowe, J. F., Bryson, S. T., et al. 2013, *ApJS*, 204, 24. doi:10.1088/0067-0049/204/2/24
- Beauge C., Nesvorny D., 2011, *ApJ*, 751, 1633
- Biscani, F. & Carloni, S. 2013, *MNRAS*, 428, 2295. doi:10.1093/mnras/sts198
- Biscani, F. & Carloni, S. 2015, *MNRAS*, 446, 3062. doi:10.1093/mnras/stu2258
- Buonanno, A., Chen, Y., & Damour, T. 2006, *PhRvD*, 74, 104005. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.104005
- Bate M. R., Lodato G., Pringle J. E., 2010, *MNRAS*, 401, 1505
- Claret, A. & Gimenez, A. 1989, *A&AS*, 81, 37
- Chen, R.-C. & Wu, X. 2016, *Communications in Theoretical Physics*, 65, 321. doi:10.1088/0253-6102/65/3/321
- Damour, T. 2001a, *PhRvD*, 64, 124013. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.64.124013
- Damour T., Jaranowski P., Schafer G., 2001b, *Phys. Rev. D.*, 63, 044021
- Dawson, R. I. & Johnson, J. A. 2018, *ARA&A*, 56, 175. doi:10.1146/annurev-astro-081817-051853
- De Sitter W. 1916, *MNRAS*, 76: 699-728.
- Feng K., 1985, in Feng K., ed., *Proceedings of the 1984 Beijing Symposium on Differential Geometry and Differential Equations*. Science Press, Beijing, China, p. 42
- Feng K., 1986, *J. Comput. Math.*, 44, 279
- Fabrycky, D. & Tremaine, S. 2007, *ApJ*, 669, 1298. doi:10.1086/521702
- Ford, E. B. & Rasio, F. A. 2008, *ApJ*, 686, 621. doi:10.1086/590926
- Foucart, F. & Lai, D. 2011, *MNRAS*, 412, 2799. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.18176.x
- Fernández J. A., Ip W. H., 1984, *Icarus*, 58, 109
- Faye G., Blanchet L., Buonanno A., 2006, *Phys. Rev. D*, 74, 104005
- Goldreich, P. & Tremaine, S. 1980, *ApJ*, 241, 425. doi:10.1086/158356
- Holt J., 1893, *A & A*, 646
- Huang, C., Wu, Y., & Triaud, A. H. M. J. 2016, *ApJ*, 825, 98. doi:10.3847/0004-637X/825/2/98
- Haghighipour, N. 2009, arXiv:0908.3328
- Hébrard, G., Bouchy, F., Pont, F., et al. 2008, *A&A*, 488, 763. doi:10.1051/0004-6361:200810056
- Hébrard, G., Désert, J.-M., Díaz, R. F., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 516, A95. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201014327





Figure 9. Retrograde planets, $i = 100^\circ$, with different eccentricities $e = 0.006, 0.5, 0.9$ can lead to reversed spins of the planets and the host star. The other orbital parameters are listed in Case-0 of Table 2

- Han, E., Wang, S. X., Wright, J. T., et al. 2014, *PASP*, 126, 827. doi:10.1086/678447
- Jaranowski, P. & Schäfer, G. 2015, *PhRvD*, 92, 124043. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.124043
- Jackson J.M., Dawson R.I., Shannon A., Petrovich C., 2021, *Astron. J.*, 161, 4
- Kidder, L. E. 1995, *PhRvD*, 52, 821. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.52.821
- Lai, D. 2014, *MNRAS*, 440, 3532. doi:10.1093/mnras/stu485
- Lai, D., Foucart, F., & Lin, D. N. C. 2011, *MNRAS*, 412, 2790. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.18127.x
- Liao, X. 1997, *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy*, 66, 243
- Lin, D. N. C. & Papaloizou, J. 1986, *ApJ*, 309, 846. doi:10.1086/164653
- Lin, D. N. C., Bodenheimer, P., & Richardson, D. C. 1996, *Nature*, 380, 606. doi:10.1038/380606a0
- Lissauer, J. J., Ragozzine, D., Fabrycky, D. C., et al. 2011, *ApJS*, 197, 8. doi:10.1088/0067-0049/197/1/8
- Liu, L., Wu, X., Huang, G., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 459, 1968. doi:10.1093/mnras/stw807
- Liu, L., Wu, X., & Huang, G. 2017, *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 49, 28. doi:10.1007/s10714-017-2193-z
- Li, D. & Wu, X. 2017, *MNRAS*, 469, 3031. doi:10.1093/mnras/stx1059
- Luo, J., Wu, X., Huang, G., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 834, 64. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/834/1/64
- Luo, J. & Wu, X. 2017, *European Physical Journal Plus*, 132, 485. doi:10.1140/epjp/i2017-11765-4
- McLaughlin, D. B. 1924, *ApJ*, 60, 22. doi:10.1086/142826
- Malhotra, R. 1993, *Nature*, 365, 819. doi:10.1038/365819a0
- Mayor, M. & Queloz, D. 1995, *Nature*, 378, 355. doi:10.1038/378355a0
- Murray C., Dermott S., 1999, *Solar System Dynamics*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge
- Nagasawa, M. & Ida, S. 2011, *ApJ*, 742, 72. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/742/2/72
- Mordasini, C., Alibert, Y., Georgy, C., et al. 2012, *A&A*, 547, A112. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201118464
- Millholland, S. & Laughlin, G. 2018, *ApJL*, 869, L15. doi:10.3847/2041-8213/aaedb1
- Nagasawa M., Ida S., Bessho T., 2008, *ApJ*, 678, 498
- Naoz, S., Farr, W. M., Lithwick, Y., et al. 2011, *Nature*, 473, 187. doi:10.1038/nature10076
- Narita, N., Sato, B., Hirano, T., et al. 2009, *PASJ*, 61, L35. doi:10.1093/pasj/61.5.L35
- Preto, M. & Saha, P. 2009, *ApJ*, 703, 1743. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/703/2/1743
- Pihajoki, P. 2015, *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy*, 121, 211. doi:10.1007/s10569-014-9597-9
- Petrovich C., Tremaine S., 2016, *ApJ*, 829
- Rossiter, R. A. 1924, *ApJ*, 60, 15. doi:10.1086/142825
- Ruth, R. D. 1983, *IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science*, 30, 2669. doi:10.1109/TNS.1983.4332919
- Rasio F. A., Ford E. B., 1996, *Science*, 274, 954
- Rogers, T. M., Lin, D. N. C., & Lau, H. H. B. 2012, *ApJL*, 758, L6. doi:10.1088/2041-8205/758/1/L6
- Rogers, T. M. & Lin, D. N. C. 2013, *ApJL*, 769, L10. doi:10.1088/2041-8205/769/1/L10
- Schiff, L. I. 1960, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, 46, 871. doi:10.1073/pnas.46.6.871
- Schiff, L. I. 1960, *PhRvL*, 4, 215. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.4.215
- Schlaufman, K. C. 2010, *ApJ*, 719, 602. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/719/1/602
- Spalding, C. & Batygin, K. 2014, *ApJ*, 790, 42. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/790/1/42
- Storch, N. I. & Lai, D. 2014, *MNRAS*, 438, 1526. doi:10.1093/mnras/stt2292
- Sun, W., Wang, Y., Liu, F., et al. 2021, *arXiv:2109.02295*
- Szebehely, V. 1984, *Celestial Mechanics*, 34, 49. doi:10.1007/BF01235791
- Toomre, A. 1964, *ApJ*, 139, 1217. doi:10.1086/147861
- Triaud, A. H. M. J., Collier Cameron, A., Queloz, D., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 524, A25. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201014525
- Ward, W. R. 1997, *Icarus*, 126, 261
- Ward, W. R. & Hamilton, D. P. 2004, *AJ*, 128, 2501. doi:10.1086/424533
- Wang, X.-Y., Rice, M., Wang, S., et al. 2022, *ApJL*, 926, L8
- Wang, Y., Zhou, J.-. lin ., hui-gen, L., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 848, 20. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aa8868

- Wang, Y., Zhou, J.-lin ., Liu, F.-. yao ., et al. 2019, MNRAS, 490, 359.
doi:10.1093/mnras/stz2375
- Wang, Y., Sun, W., Liu, F., et al. 2021, ApJ, 907, 66. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/abcb8d
- Wang, Y., Sun, W., Liu, F., et al. 2021, ApJ, 909, 22. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/abd701
- Wang, Y., Sun, W., Liu, F., et al. 2021, ApJS, 254, 8. doi:10.3847/1538-4365/abf116
- Wex, N. 1995, Classical and Quantum Gravity, 12, 983. doi:10.1088/0264-9381/12/4/009
- Ward W. R., 1997, Icarus, 126, 261
- Wu, Y. & Murray, N. 2003, ApJ, 589, 605.
doi:10.1086/374598
- Wu Y., Lithwick Y., 2011, ApJ, 735, 395
- Weiss, L. M. & Marcy, G. W. 2014, ApJL, 783, L6. doi:10.1088/2041-8205/783/1/L6
- Wu, X. & Xie, Y. 2010, PhRvD, 81, 084045.
doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.084045
- Wu, X., Wang, Y., Sun, W., et al. 2021, ApJ, 914, 63. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/abfc45
- Winn, J. N. & Fabrycky, D. C. 2015, ARA&A, 53, 409. doi:10.1146/annurev-astro-082214-122246
- Winn, J. N., Fabrycky, D., Albrecht, S., et al. 2010, ApJL, 718, L145.
doi:10.1088/2041-8205/718/2/L145
- Winn, J. N., Johnson, J. A., Albrecht, S., et al. 2009, ApJL, 703, L99.
doi:10.1088/0004-637X/703/2/L99
- Xu, J. & Wu, X. 2010, Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 10, 173.
doi:10.1088/1674-4527/10/2/009
- Yoshida, H. 1990, Physics Letters A, 150, 262.
doi:10.1016/0375-9601(90)90092-3
- Zahn, J.-P. 1977, A&A, 500, 121
- Zhong, S.-Y., Wu, X., Liu, S.-Q., et al. 2010, PhRvD, 82, 124040.
doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.124040
- Zhou, J. L., Lin, D. N. C., & Sun, Y. S. 2007, ApJ, 666, 423

APPENDIX

A. INFLUENCE OF 2PN SPIN-SPIN COUPLING TERM ON CELESTIAL SPIN.

In this appendix, we consider whether the 2PN spin-spin coupling term affects the formation of high obliquity of hot Jupiters. We add the 2PN spin-spin coupling term to formula (3), and now H_1 is expressed as:

$$H_1 = H_{1\text{PN}} + H_{\text{SO}} + H_{\text{SS}} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Where

$$H_{\text{SS}} = \frac{G}{r^3} [3(\mathbf{J}_1 \cdot \mathbf{n})(\mathbf{J}_2 \cdot \mathbf{n}) - \mathbf{J}_1 \cdot \mathbf{J}_2] \quad (\text{A2})$$

According to the method of Wu & Xie (2010), the final simplified H_{SS} with canonical variables is expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\text{SS}} = \frac{G}{r^3} [& \frac{3}{r^2} ((\sqrt{J_1^2 - \xi_1^2} \cos \theta_1)x + (\sqrt{J_1^2 - \xi_1^2} \sin \theta_1) \\ & y + \xi_1 z)((\sqrt{J_2^2 - \xi_2^2} \cos \theta_2)x + (\sqrt{J_2^2 - \xi_2^2} \sin \theta_2) \\ & y + \xi_2 z) - ((\sqrt{J_1^2 - \xi_1^2} \cos \theta_1)(\sqrt{J_2^2 - \xi_2^2} \cos \theta_2) \\ & + (\sqrt{J_1^2 - \xi_1^2} \sin \theta_1)(\sqrt{J_2^2 - \xi_2^2} \sin \theta_2) \\ & + \xi_1 \xi_2)] \quad (\text{A3}) \end{aligned}$$

We compare the present Hamiltonian with the original Hamiltonian under the same orbital conditions, and calculate the time evolution of the angle between the spin of the planet and the z-axis. The result is shown in the Figure 10.

Figure 10 show that the curves of adding 2PN spin-spin part almost overlap with the original results. It can be seen that the spin-spin coupling post Newtonian term is negligible, and only the 1.5PN spin-orbit part causes the periodic oscillation of the angle between the celestial spin and the z-axis.




Figure 10. The time evolution of the angle between the spin of hot Jupiter 51 Peg b and the z-axis. The quantity on the y-axis is the angle between the spins of the hot Jupiter 51 Peg b and the z-axis. Time is measured in 10^6 yr. Blue represents the case without the 2PN spin-spin part and red represents the case with the 2PN spin-spin part.