

Eccentricity modulation of a close-in planet by a companion: application to GJ 436 system

Xiao Tong and Ji-Lin Zhou[†]

Department of Astronomy, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China

ABSTRACT

GJ 436b is a Neptune-size planet with 23.2 Earth masses in an elliptical orbit of period 2.64 days and eccentricity 0.16. With a typical tidal dissipation factor ($Q' \sim 10^6$) as that of a giant planet with convective envelope, its orbital circularization timescale under internal tidal dissipation is around 1 Gyr, at least two times less than the stellar age (> 3 Gyr). A plausible mechanism is that the eccentricity of GJ 436b is modulated by a planetary companion due to their mutual perturbation. Here we investigate this possibility from the dynamical viewpoint. A general method is given to predict the possible locations of the dynamically coupled companions, including in nearby/distance non-resonant or mean motion resonance orbits with the first planet. Applying the method to GJ 436 system, we find it is very unlikely that the eccentricity of GJ 436b is maintained at the present location by a nearby/distance companion through secular perturbation or mean motion resonance. In fact, in all these simulated cases, GJ 436b will undergo eccentricity damp and orbital decay, leaving the present location within the stellar age. However, these results do *not* rule out the possible existence of planet companions in nearby/distance orbits, although they are not able to maintain the eccentricity of GJ 436b.

Subject headings: celestial mechanics, methods: analytical, methods: N-body simulations, stars: individual (GJ 436), planetary systems: dynamics

1. Introduction

The discovery of the first extrasolar planet around a pulsar^[1], which was quickly followed by the detection of first Jupiter-like planet around the star 51 Peg^[2], opened a new era for

[†]Corresponding author (email: zhoujl@nju.edu.cn)

⁰ Supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 10833001 and 10778603), and National Basic Research Program of China (2007CB4800).

planetary science. The planet around 51 Peg is known as a hot Jupiter: planets with masses comparable to Jupiter’s, orbits typically within 0.1 AU and surface temperatures ~ 1000 K^[3]. To date, more than 310 planets have been discovered in about 250 planetary systems¹. With the improvement of detection precision and the use of various techniques, the minimum mass of discovered planets around main sequence stars is down to 3.3 Earth masses (M_{\oplus}), which is MOA-2007-BLG-192-L b around a star with mass of $0.06M_{\odot}$ ^[4].

Among the planets discovered so far, GJ 436b is the only transiting Neptune-mass planet orbiting an M-type star. It was first detected by radial velocity techniques^[5], with its orbital elements refined later by Maness et al.^[6]. The transiting signals of GJ 436b were first discovered by Gillon et al.^[7] and followed by lots of work^[8–13]. These observations reveal GJ 436b with a mass of $23.17M_{\oplus}$ and a radius of $4.22R_{\oplus}$ (see Table 1) .

Table 1: The parameters of GJ 436 and its planet companion GJ 436b.

Parameter	Value	Ref.
M_* (M_{\odot})	$0.452^{+0.014}_{-0.012}$	1
R_* (R_{\odot})	$0.464^{+0.009}_{-0.011}$	1
stellar age (Gyr)	6^{+4}_{-5}	1
M_p (M_{\oplus})	23.17 ± 0.079	1
R_p (R_{\oplus})	$4.22^{+0.09}_{-0.10}$	1
$M_p \sin i$ (M_J)	0.0713 ± 0.006	2
a (AU)	0.0285	2
P (days)	2.64385 ± 0.00009	2
e	0.16 ± 0.019	2

Refs.: 1. Torres (2007), 2. Maness et al. (2007).

One of the most interesting characteristics about GJ 436b is its significant eccentricity (0.16) in an orbit (2.64 days) very close to the host star. Assuming a tidal dissipation factor ($Q' \sim 10^6$) as that of a gas giant planet, its orbit circularization timescale under internal tidal dissipation is around 1 Gyr. On the other hand, the fiducial age of the host star is 6^{+4}_{-5} Gyr^[11], and according to observation, GJ 436 has low rotation velocity and does not exhibit particular strong chromospheric activity nor photometric variability^[5], indicating an age > 3 Gyr. As the orbit is not circulated by planetary tide, either GJ 436b has $Q' > 6 \times 10^6$, or there is a planetary companion which induces a periodic modulation of its orbital eccentricity.

¹<http://exoplanet.eu/>

Considering that radial velocities of GJ 436 reveal a long-term trend, Maness et al. proposed the presence of a long-period (~ 25 yr) planet companion with mass $\sim 0.27M_J$ (Jupiter mass) in an eccentric orbit ($e \sim 0.2$)^[6]. Recently, Ribas et al. suggested that the observed radial velocities of the system are consistent with an additional small, super-Earth planet in the outer 2:1 mean-motion resonance with GJ 436b^[14]. Such a possibility was also studied from the dynamical viewpoint^[15]. More recent inspection of transit data implies that GJ 436b is perturbed by another planet with mass $\leq 12M_\oplus$ in a non-resonant orbit of 12days (0.08 AU)^[16].

In this paper, we exam the possibility of a nearby or distant undiscovered planet through dynamical considerations. The key issue here is to locate the undetected companion that can both excite and maintain the eccentricity of GJ 436b. First we present the dynamical restrictions on the possible locations of the companion in section 2. Then in section 3 we show the analytical and numerical results on the eccentricity modulation by a companion in nearby or distant non-resonance orbits, followed by the investigation of the possible companion in resonant orbits in section 4. Conclusions are presented in section 5. Although the method is derived in GJ 436 system, it can be applied to any other systems in similar situations.

2. Models and restrictions for planet companion

Consider a planetary system of a star with mass M_* and two planets with masses M_1 and M_2 . For simplicity we assume the two planets are in coplanar orbits and employ a general coplanar three-body model. The orbital elements of the two planets are denoted by $a_i, e_i, \lambda_i, \varpi_i$, which are semi-major axis, eccentricity, mean longitude, longitude of periapsis of planet i ($i = 1, 2$), respectively. The index i is labelled so that M_1 is the inner planet with $a_1 < a_2$ throughout the evolution. For the present problem, as it is unlikely to have a planet inside GJ 436b to modulate its eccentricity, we suppose M_1 is GJ 436b and let M_2 denote GJ 436c. Suppose GJ 436b is located in an initially circular orbit with the present semi-major axis, we will study the mass range and the location of the planet companion that excites the eccentricity of GJ 436b to the observed value (0.16) due to either secular or resonance interaction. In this section we present three conditions that restrict the extension of mass and orbital elements for the undiscovered companion from (1) Doppler technique, (2) Hill stability consideration and (3) tidal circulation timescale.

2.1. Observational restriction from Doppler technique

Radial velocity technique detects the stellar wobbles of orbital motion in the presence of a planet M_p . In terms of the orbital elements of M_p , the stellar radial velocity is given as^[17]:

$$K = \left(\frac{2\pi G}{P} \right)^{1/3} \frac{M_p \sin i}{(M_* + M_p)^{2/3}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - e^2}} \quad (1)$$

where P is the period of the planet orbit. As $M_p \ll M_*$, the above equation can be simplified as

$$K \approx 3.0 \text{ m/s} \left(\frac{P}{10\text{days}} \right)^{-1/3} \left(\frac{M_p \sin i}{10M_\oplus} \right) \left(\frac{M_*}{M_\odot} \right)^{-2/3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - e^2}}. \quad (2)$$

Due to the perturbation of stellar photosphere, the limit precision that the Doppler technique can achieve is around 3 m/s^[17]. Assume the companion we are to locate is comparable or below this limit, an undetect planet with stellar radial velocity $K < 3 \text{ m/s}$ has maximum mass of,

$$M_p \sin i \leq 5.9M_\oplus \left(\frac{P}{10\text{days}} \right)^{1/3} (1 - e^2)^{2/3}. \quad (3)$$

Using the elements and physical parameters in Table 1, and assuming $\sin i = 0.9784$ by the comparison of GJ 436b's mass from radial velocity and transit technique, we get the possible location of companion in the period-mass (P_2 - M_2) space in Fig.1.

2.2. Hill stability condition

Dynamical stability of the planet system is the necessary condition for the presence of a second planet. One of the practical stability is Hill stability, which requires the ordering of two planets unchanged during the history of evolution. A coplanar, non-resonant, two-planet system is Hill stable if the following condition is satisfied^[18]:

$$H \equiv -\frac{2M_T}{G^2M^3}C^2h > 1 + 3^{4/3} \frac{M_1M_2}{M_*^{2/3}(M_1 + M_2)^{4/3}} + \dots \quad (4)$$

where $M_T = M_1 + M_2 + M_*$ is the total mass of the system, $M = M_1M_2 + M_2M_* + M_*M_1$, C and h are the total angular momentum and energy of the three-body system, respectively. Since $M_1, M_2 \ll M_*$, by omitting up to the second order terms in mass ratios of planets to the star in the expression of total angular momentum and energy, the left-hand side of equation (4) can be approximated as,

$$H = \frac{1}{(M_1 + M_2)^3} \left[M_1 \sqrt{a_1(1 - e_1^2)} + M_2 \sqrt{a_2(1 - e_2^2)} \right]^2 \left[\frac{M_1}{a_1} + \frac{M_2}{a_2} \right] + \dots \quad (5)$$




Fig. 1.— Permissible regions (shadow areas) of the planet companion in period-mass ($P_2 - M_2$) plane with eccentricity $e_2 = 0$ in panel (a) or $e_2 = 0.2$ in panel (b) under three restrictions: (1) radial velocity $K = 3$ m/s or 5 m/s, assuming $\sin i = 0.9784$ (blue and green dot-dash lines, below which the radial velocity is smaller); (2) Hill stability (black solid line denoted by ‘HS’, the right part is Hill stable); (3) Tidal circulation timescale $\tau_{\text{circ}} = 6\text{Gyr}$, assuming $Q'_2 = 10^6$ (red dashed lines, the right part with $\tau_{\text{circ}} > 6$ Gyr).

Denote $\mu_i = M_i/M_*$, $\gamma_i = \sqrt{a_i(1 - e_i^2)}$, the above criterion for the two planets in Hill stable regions reads^[19],

$$(\mu_1 + \mu_2)^{-3}(\mu_1\gamma_1 + \mu_2\gamma_2)^2 \left(\frac{\mu_1}{a_1} + \frac{\mu_2}{a_2} \right) > 1 + 3^{4/3}\mu_1\mu_2(\mu_1 + \mu_2)^{-4/3}. \quad (6)$$

The Hill stability region by Eq. (6) is also plotted in Fig.1.

2.3. Restriction from tidal circulation timescale

A close-in planet produces tidal bulges on the stellar surface, causing energy dissipation on the star and angular momentum exchanges between the stellar spin and planetary orbital motion. Meanwhile the star also generates tidal dissipation on the planet, resulting in an eccentricity damping and orbital decay^[20,21]. In the ideal case that both the stellar and planetary spins are aligned with the orbit, the secular evolution rate of the eccentricity can be expressed as follows ^[22–24],

$$\dot{e} = g_p + g_* \quad (7)$$

$$g_{p,*} = \left(\frac{81}{2} \frac{ne}{Q'_{p,*}} \right) \left(\frac{M_{*,p}}{M_{p,*}} \right) \left(\frac{R_{p,*}}{a} \right)^5 \left[-f_3(e) + \frac{11}{18}f_4(e) \left(\frac{\Omega_{p,*}}{n} \right) \right], \quad (8)$$

where g_p and g_* are contributions from the planet and star, respectively, n is the mean velocity of orbital motion, $M_{*,p}$, $Q'_{*,p}$, $R_{*,p}$, $\Omega_{*,P}$ are the masses, the effective tidal dissipation factors, radii and spin rates of the star and the planet, respectively. Some functions of eccentricity used here and later are:

$$\begin{aligned} f_3(e) &= (1 + \frac{15}{4}e^2 + \frac{15}{8}e^4 + \frac{5}{64}e^6)/(1 - e^2)^{13/2}, \\ f_4(e) &= (1 + \frac{3}{2}e^2 + \frac{1}{8}e^4)/(1 - e^2)^5, \\ f_6(e) &= (1 + \frac{15}{7}e^2 + \frac{67}{14}e^4 + \frac{85}{32}e^6 + \frac{255}{448}e^8 + \frac{25}{1792}e^{10})/(1 + 3e^2 + \frac{3}{8}e^4), \\ f_7(e) &= (1 + \frac{45}{14}e^2 + 8e^4 + \frac{685}{224}e^6 + \frac{255}{448}e^8 + \frac{25}{1792}e^{10})/(1 + 3e^2 + \frac{3}{8}e^4). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

For close-in planets with tidal dissipation factor $Q'_p \leq 10^6$, dissipation in planets dominates^[25]. Omitting contribution from the star in Eq. (7) and assuming the planet spin has reached the synchronization equilibrium ($\Omega_p \sim n$), the timescale of orbital circularization ($\tau_{\text{circ}} = e/\dot{e}$) induced by planetary tidal dissipation is given as^[25],

$$\tau_{\text{circ}} \simeq 3.6 \frac{(1 - e^2)^{13/2}}{f_7(e)} \left(\frac{Q'_p}{10^6} \right) \left(\frac{M_p}{M_J} \right) \left(\frac{M_*}{M_\odot} \right)^{2/3} \left(\frac{P}{1 \text{ day}} \right)^{13/3} \left(\frac{R_p}{R_J} \right)^{-5} \text{ Myr}. \quad (10)$$

And the associate timescale of orbital decay ($\tau_{\text{decay}} = a/\dot{a}$) in elliptical orbits is

$$\tau_{\text{decay}} = \frac{(1 - e^2)f_7(e)}{2e^2f_6(e)} \tau_{\text{circ}}. \quad (11)$$

For GJ 436b, with the elements and physical parameters in Table 1 and assuming $Q' = 10^6$, the circularization timescale of GJ 436b is 1.0 Gyr, around five times less than the fiducial stellar age(6 Gyr), and $\tau_{\text{decay}} = 19$ Gyr for GJ 436b at the present location with $e = 0.16$. So some mechanisms are needed to maintain its eccentricity during the evolution.

3. Planet Companions in Non-Resonant Orbits

Secular perturbations between two planets in non-resonance orbits exchange their angular momentum, thus modulate their eccentricities, leaving their semi-major axes almost unchanged. When tidal dissipation is present on either of the planet, eccentricity modulation is effective only when the timescale of secular perturbation (τ_{sec}) is significantly shorter than that of the circularization (τ_{circ}). With an octopole Legendre expansion in ratio $\alpha = a_1/a_2$, Mardling derived the period of secular perturbation at the limit of $e_1 \ll 1$, including the effect of general relativity^[26],

$$\tau_{\text{sec}} = \frac{4}{3} P_1 \alpha^{-3} \left(\frac{M_2}{M_*} \right)^{-1} \varepsilon_2^3 \left[1 - \sqrt{\alpha} \varepsilon_2^{-1} \left(\frac{M_1}{M_2} \right) + \gamma \varepsilon_2^3 \right]^{-1}, \quad (12)$$

where P_1 is the mass of first planet (M_1), $\varepsilon_2 = \sqrt{1 - e_2^2}$, $\gamma = 4\alpha^{-3}(n_1 a_1/c)^2(M_*/M_2)$ is the ratio of general relativity to companion perturbation on periapsis precession of M_1 , with n_1 the mean motion of M_1 and c the speed of light. For a companion in a nearby orbit, $\tau_{\text{sec}} \ll \tau_{\text{circ}}$ is easily fulfilled, as $\gamma \ll 1$ and α is moderate. For a giant companion in a distance orbit, $\gamma \gg 1$, thus Eq. (12) can be simplified as $\tau_{\text{sec}} \approx P_1/3/(n_1 a_1/c)^2 = 1.5 \times 10^4$ yrs, which is independent of the planet companion and is much shorter than the circularization timescales of both planets.

Under secular perturbation of M_2 , the maximum eccentricity of M_1 that can be achieved from an initial circular orbit ($e_{10} = 0$) is^[26],

$$e_{1\text{max}} = \frac{5}{2}\alpha e_2 \varepsilon_2^{-2} \left| 1 - \sqrt{\alpha} \varepsilon_2^{-1} \left(\frac{M_1}{M_2} \right) + \gamma \varepsilon_2^3 \right|^{-1}. \quad (13)$$

This equation can be used to locate a global approximate region of the planet companion in either nearby or distance orbits, while general three-body simulations should be performed to give a precise location.

Eq.(13) provides a *mechanism* that can excite e_1 to a moderate value at $M_1 > M_2$. In fact, from the expression of $e_{1\text{max}}$, there exists a singularity at α_{crit} when the denominator of Eq. (13) is zero so that $e_{1\text{max}}$ tends to infinity when $M_1 > M_2$. In reality, as $e_{1\text{max}}$ becomes large enough, the above approximation $e_1 \ll 1$ is no more valid and we should resort to numerical simulations. Fig.2a shows the maximum eccentricity ($e_{1\text{max}}$) as a function of companion's period and mass (P_2 - M_2) derived from Eq.(13) with $e_{20} = 0.2$. To verify this, we perform some three-body simulations with M_1 in initial circular orbits, and obtain $e_{1\text{max}}$ under the modulation of M_2 at different locations. Fig.2b shows the results by three-body simulations. The critical locations (α_{crit}) when the singularity occurs in Eq.(13) are also plotted in the curves with the asterisks, showing a roughly good agreement between the analytical and numerical results. According to Fig.2, it is possible to excite $e_{1\text{max}} = 0.16$ in close orbits with $M_2 \geq 10M_{\oplus}$ and $e_2 = 0.2$. For gas giant companion, only nearby orbit is possible. We investigate these situations in detail as follows.

Nearby Orbits. We perform extensive three-body simulations, including general relativity effect, on the initial $P_2 - e_2$ plane, with a nearby companion mass of $5M_{\oplus}$ or $10M_{\oplus}$. The results are shown in Fig.3a,b. The shadow regions in Fig.3a,b are the most possible locations of the companion that can maintain $e_1 = 0.16$ by secular perturbation, combined with the three restrictions present in section 2. As two examples, we present the evolution of two orbits from the permissible regions under tidal dissipation (with illustrative $Q'_1 = Q'_2 = 100$) in Fig.3c,d. The eccentricity of GJ 436b can be excited and maintained (with a periodic modulation) to 0.16 only within 10^5 years. Considering the linear dependence of tidal force on Q'_i , ($i=1,2$), these simulations indicate that $e_{1\text{max}} \sim 0.16$ can be maintained *only* for 1




Fig. 2.— Maximum eccentricity of M_1 that can be excited at the present location by a planet companion with initial eccentricity $e_2 = 0.2$. Panel (a): 3-D plot of $e_{1\max}$ in the plane of $P_2 - M_2$ from theoretical Eq. (13). Panel (b): $e_{1\max}$ obtained from numerical simulations of a general three-body model. The asterisks denote the singularities from Eq. (13).

Gyr provide $Q'_i = 10^6$.

Distant Orbits. According to equation (13) and numerical simulation (Fig.2b), $e_{1\max}$ is small unless M_2 is in a highly eccentric orbit. Fig. 4a plots the region in $P_2 - e_2$ plane that a companion can generate a maximum eccentricity $e_{1\max} = 0.16$. They are calculated from equation (13) and confirmed by full 3-body simulations. Thus it is almost impossible for a companion in orbit of $P_2 \sim 1$ yr to produce $e_{1\max} = 0.16$. The two possible locations of M_2 suggested by Maness et al.^[6] are also investigated and plotted in Fig.4d, which shows they can only excite negligible eccentricities of M_1 .

4. Planet Companion in Resonant Orbits

For a conservative coplanar two-planet system, the motion of two planets can be described by a Hamiltonian system with four degrees of freedom, which is non-integrable. However, near a generic $(p + q)/p$ ($q \neq 0$) mean-motion resonance, the degrees of freedom of the system are reduced from four to two by averaging technique^[27]. Below we will show that, the minimum initial eccentricity of unseen planet M_2 can be deduced approximately




Fig. 3.— Permissible regions and orbital evolution for the companion M_2 in nearby orbits that can excite $e_1 = 0.16$ at the present location. Panels (a) and (b) are permissible regions (shadow areas) in $P_2 - e_2$ plane obtained from general three-body simulations for companion mass $5M_\oplus$ and $10M_\oplus$, respectively. The boundary lines of the three restrictions ($K = 3$ m/s or 5 m/s; Hill stability denoted by HS, and $\tau_{\text{circ}} = 6\text{Gyr}$ with $Q'_2 = 10^6$) are also plotted. Evolution of P_1, e_1 for two orbits (denoted by filled circles) in panels (a) and (b) are shown in panels (c) and (d), respectively, with initial parameters shown in the labels. Tidal dissipation factors of two planets are taken $Q'_2 = 100$ in panels (c) and (d), with density of M_2 taken as $\rho_2 = 3 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$.




Fig. 4.— Permissible region and orbital evolution for distance giant companion M_2 that can excite $e_1 = 0.16$ at the present location. Panel (a): Minimum eccentricities of companion with different mass $M_2 = 0.1M_J, 0.3M_J, 1M_J$ from Eq. (13) and are confirmed by general three-body simulations. Panels (b-d): Evolution of e_1 of six orbits notated in panel (a) by three-body simulations, with mass and initial elements shown in the labels. Orbits in panel (d) are proposed by Maness et al.^[6].

from the conservation of total orbital energy and angular momentum, with the help of the averaged Hamiltonian function.

Adopt the following planar canonical variables^[27,28],

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1, & & J_1 &= L_1 + s(I_1 + I_2), \\ \lambda_2, & & J_2 &= L_2 - (1 + s)(I_1 + I_2), \\ \sigma_1 = (1 + s)\lambda_2 - s\lambda_1 - \varpi_1, & & I_1 &= L_1(1 - \sqrt{1 - e_1^2}), \\ \sigma_2 = (1 + s)\lambda_2 - s\lambda_1 - \varpi_2, & & I_2 &= L_2(1 - \sqrt{1 - e_2^2}). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where λ_i, ϖ_i are the longitude of mean motion, longitude of periaapsis of M_i ($i = 1, 2$), respectively, and

$$\begin{aligned} s &= p/q, & L_i &= M'_i \sqrt{\mu_i a_i}, \quad (i = 1, 2) \\ \mu_i &= G(M_* + M_i), & M'_i &= \frac{M_i M_*}{M_i + M_*}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

with G the gravitational constant. The Hamiltonian H of the system can be expressed as:

$$H = H_0 + H_1, \quad (16)$$

where the first term corresponds to the two-body contribution given by:

$$H_0 = - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\mu_i^2 M_i^3}{2L_i^2}. \quad (17)$$

The second term, H_1 , is the disturbing function. Up to the first order in the masses, it has the following expression^[28]:

$$H_1 = -G \frac{M_1 M_2}{\Delta} + \frac{M_1 M_2}{M_*} (\dot{x}_1 \dot{x}_2 + \dot{y}_1 \dot{y}_2 + \dot{z}_1 \dot{z}_2) \quad (18)$$

where $\Delta = (r_1^2 + r_2^2 - 2r_1 r_2 \cos S)^{1/2}$, and for the coplanar three-body system, $S = f_1 - f_2 + \varpi_1 - \varpi_2$ with f_i the true anomaly of the orbits m_i ($i = 1, 2$). In terms of the elements on (14), all periodic terms in the Hamiltonian (16) contain only three independent angular variables $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$, thus the system is three degrees of freedom^[27]. The canonical moment conjugate $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ is an integral of motion, namely $J_1 + J_2 = \text{const}$. By averaging the synodic angle $Q = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)/q$, we obtain an averaged system with Hamiltonian function,

$$\bar{H} = H_0 + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} H_1 dQ \quad (19)$$

In practice, the above averaged Hamiltonian can be obtained only numerically.

The averaged system with Hamiltonian (19) is of two degrees of freedom, with the energy being the only integral. To show all possible solutions in (e_1, e_2) space for all possible phase

angles σ_1, σ_2 is impossible. So we fix only the symmetric resonance period orbits with initial σ_1, σ_2 being set at either 0 or π . Fig.5a shows the energy level curves of Hamiltonian at $10M_\oplus$ from equation (19) on the (e_1, e_2) plane. Based on the contour lines (or the averaged Hamiltonian function, equivalently) and fixed on symmetric period orbits, we derive the minimum initial eccentricity of the companion, $e_{2\min}$, with which M_1 can evolve to $e_1 = 0.16$, as a function of companion mass (Fig.5b). Interestingly, $e_{2\min}$ has a power-law dependence on the mass ratio M_1/M_2 , with an approximation relation:

$$e_{2\min} \approx 0.14 \left(\frac{M_1}{M_2} \right)^{1/2} \quad (20)$$

The relation holds for the three major resonances 2:1,3:1 and 5:2, and is independent of the location of M_1 .




Fig. 5.— Panel (a): Constant-energy contour of the average Hamiltonian (19) with $M_2 = 10M_\oplus$. Panel (b): Minimum eccentricity of M_2 that can excite $e_1 = 0.16$ according to the energy level curves at 2:1,3:1 and 5:2 resonances. The red dashed curve is calculated by three-body simulations for the 2:1 resonance.

The above relation can be deduced from the conservation of total angular momentum, $J_1 + J_2 = L_1\sqrt{1-e_1^2} + L_2\sqrt{1-e_2^2} = \text{const}(\text{independent of } s)$. In fact, in an ideal situation such that $e_{1\max}$ ($e_{2\min}$) occurs at $e_2 = 0$ ($e_1 = 0$, respectively), the conservation of total angular momentum requires, $L_{10}\sqrt{1-e_{1\max}^2} + L_{20} = L_{10} + L_{20}\sqrt{1-e_{2\min}^2}$, which gives approximately, $e_{2\min} = \sqrt{L_{10}/L_{20}}e_{1\max} \approx (M_1/M_2)^{1/2}(n_2/n_1)^{1/6}e_{1\max}$, where L_{10}, L_{20} are the corresponding elements evaluated at the resonance center. It shows that $e_{2\min}$ depends

weakly on the mean motion ratio. At the 2:1 resonance, let $e_{1\max} = 0.16$, we derive the approximate formula (20).

From the above derivation of equation (20), we can see that, the specific resonance structure, which would be very complicated in a general three-body model, is not considered. So the relation (20) holds approximately only, and for a real $e_{2\min}$, we shall resort to numerical simulations. Fig.5b plots also the results from the three-body simulations including the general relativity effect. The discrepancy between the relation and the simulation is large especially when M_2 is small.

Fig.6 shows the evolution of two typical orbits in 2:1 mean motion resonance with M_1 for a companion $M_2 = 5M_\oplus$, as proposed by Ribas et al.^[14]. The eccentricity they proposed is 0.2, below the value of $e_{2\min}$ plotted in Fig.5b. As we can see, e_1 can not be excited to 0.16(Fig.6b). For the higher $e_{20} = 0.40$ case, it can excite to $e_1 = 0.16$ initially, but the eccentricity is damped soon. In both cases the orbit of GJ 436 decays to inner orbits. Other mean motion resonances show similar results, indicating that it is *impossible* to maintain $e_1 = 0.16$ by a resonant companion.




Fig. 6.— Evolution of P_1, e_1 of two orbits initially in 2:1 resonance with M_1 by three-body simulations. Companion mass $M_2 = 5M_\oplus$ and density $\rho_2 = 3 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, initial eccentricities of M_2 are 0.2 and 0.4. The orbit with $e_{20} = 0.2$ was proposed by Ribas et al.^[14]. Tidal dissipation factors of two planets are taken as $Q' = 100$.

5. Conclusions

Perturbation from a companion M_2 seems to be the most plausible approach to maintain the moderate eccentricity of GJ 436b in a close-in orbit. In this paper, we study extensively all different locations of the planet companion in the following three situations:

(i) *In nearby orbits.* The eccentricity of GJ 436b can be excited to 0.16 with a broad range of planet mass (above few Earth-masses). An interesting case is the second planet can have a mass much smaller than M_1 . However, since the orbital decay time is short ($\sim 20\text{Gyr}$) for GJ 436b at the present location with the observed eccentricity, significant orbital decay ($\sim 25\%$) is expect so that GJ 436b would be in a much closer orbit, and the eccentricity of GJ 436b would be damped within the stellar age. Thus the eccentricity of GJ 436b can *not* be maintained by a nearby companion. On the other hand, one can *not* rule out the possibility that companions exist in nearby orbits of GJ 436b as long as they are in stable orbits, e.g., the possible existence of a planet with $\leq 12M_\oplus$ in an orbit of 12days from transit data^[6]. However, the companion, if exists, does not account for the eccentricity of GJ 436b.

(ii) *Distance Orbits.* Distance companions on moderate eccentric orbits can *not* excite and maintain the significant eccentricity of GJ 436b. However, the presence of giant planets in extended orbits (\sim few AU) is also possible, although they can *not* modulate the eccentricity of close-in planets. For example, there may exist a long-period (~ 25 yr) planet companion with mass $\sim 0.27M_J$ inferred from radial velocities of GJ 436 ^[6].

(iii) *Resonance Orbits.* Although a border range of companion mass can excite the eccentricity of M_1 to a moderate value, similar to situation (i), significant orbital decay would occur so that the two planets will leave 2:1 resonance soon, if GJ 436b has a normal dissipation factor ($Q' \sim 10^6$). In this case, the presence of a companion in the outer 2:1 resonance with GJ 436b is unlikely. However, if we have to confess that GJ 436b has a extremely high dissipation factor ($Q' > 6 \times 10^6$), the existence of companions in resonance orbits can *not* be ruled out in this extreme case, e.g., the planet ($\sim 5M_\oplus$) in the outer 2:1 resonance place proposed by Ribas et al.^[14]. However, even it exists, it does not account for the eccentricity of GJ 436b.

Based on the extensive investigations in this paper, we think $e_1 = 0.16$ of GJ 436b can not be maintained by a companion in either nearby or distance orbits through secular perturbation or mean motion resonance. Thus the maintaining of its eccentricity remains a challenge problem, unless GJ 436b has a extremely high dissipation factor ($Q' > 6 \times 10^6$).

Acknowledgments. We thanks Dr. Gregory Laughlin for useful discussions.

REFERENCES

- 1 Wolszczan, A., & Frail, D. A., A planetary system around the millisecond pulsar PSR1257 + 12, 1992, *Nature*, 355, 145
- 2 Mayor, M., & Queloz, D., A Jupiter-mass companion to a Solar-type star, 1995, *Nature*, 378, 355
- 3 Udry, S., & Santos, N. C., Statistical properties of exoplanets, 2007, *ARA&A*, 45, 397
- 4 Bennett, D. P., Bond, I. A., Udalski, A., et al., A low-mass planet with a possible sub-stellar-mass host in microlensing event MOA-2007-BLG-192, 2008, *ApJ*, 684, 663
- 5 Butler, R. P., Vogt, S. S., Marcy, G. W., et al., A Neptune-mass planet orbiting the nearby M dwarf GJ 436, 2004, *ApJ*, 617, 580
- 6 Maness, H. L., Marcy, G. W., Ford, E. B., et al., The M dwarf GJ 436 and its Neptune-mass planet, 2007, *PASP*, 119, 90
- 7 Gillon, M., Demory, B.-O., Barman, T., et al., Accurate spitzer infrared radius measurement for the hot Neptune GJ 436b, 2007a, *A&A*, 471, L51
- 8 Gillon, M., Pont, F., Demory, B.-O., et al., Detection of transits of the nearby hot Neptune GJ 436b, 2007b, *A&A*, 472, L13
- 9 Deming, D., Harrington, J., Laughlin, G., et al., Spitzer transit and secondary eclipse photometry of GJ 436b, 2007, *ApJ*, 667, L199
- 10 Demory, B.-O., Gillon, M., Barman, T., et al., Characterization of the hot Neptune GJ 436b with spitzer and ground-based observations 2007, *A&A*, 475, 1125
- 11 Torres, G., The transiting exoplanet host star GJ 436: A test of stellar evolution models in the lower main sequence, and revised planetary parameters, 2007, *ApJ*, 671, L65
- 12 Bean, J. L., Benedict, G. F., Charbonneau, D., et al., A Hubble space telescope transit light curve for GJ 436b, 2008, *A&A*, 486, 1039
- 13 Shporer, A., Mazeh, T., Winn, J. N., et al., Photometric follow-up observations of the transiting Neptune-mass planet GJ 436b, 2008, arXiv:0805.3915
- 14 Ribas, I., Font-Ribera, A., & Beaulieu, J.-P., A $\sim 5 M_{\oplus}$ super-earth orbiting GJ 436? The power of near-grazing transits, 2008, *ApJ*, 677, L59

- 15 Mardling, R. A., On the long-term tidal evolution of GJ 436b in the presence of a resonant companion, 2008, arXiv:0805.1928
- 16 Coughlin, J. L., Stringfellow, G. S., Becker, A. C., et al., New observations and a possible detection of parameter variations in the transits of Gliese 436b, 2008, arXiv:0809.1664
- 17 Marcy, G. W., & Butler, R. P., Detection of extrasolar giant planets, 1998, ARA&A, 36, 57
- 18 Marchal, C., & Bozis, G., Hill stability and distance curves for the general three-body problem, 1982, Cele. Mech., 26, 311
- 19 Gladman, B., Dynamics of systems of two close planets, 1993, Icarus, 106,247
- 20 Goldreich, P., & Soter, S., Q in the solar system, 1966, Icarus, 5, 375
- 21 Murray, C. D., & Dermott, S. F. 1999, Solar system dynamics, Cambridge, Cambridge university Press, C. D., 1999
- 22 Eggleton, P. P., Kiseleva, L. G., & Hut, P., The equilibrium tide model for tidal friction, 1998, ApJ, 499, 853
- 23 Mardling, R. A., & Lin, D. N. C., Calculating the tidal, spin, and dynamical evolution of extrasolar planetary systems, 2002, ApJ, 573, 829
- 24 Dobbs-Dixon, I., Lin, D. N. C., & Mardling, R. A., Spin-orbit evolution of short-period planets, 2004, ApJ, 610, 464
- 25 Zhou, J.-L., & Lin, D. N. C., Migration and final location of hot super earths in the presence of gas giants, in *Exoplanets: Detection, Formation and Dynamics*, eds: Sun,Y.-S., Ferraz-Mello,S., Zhou,J.-L., Proc. of IAU Symp. 249, Cambridge, Cambridge university Press, 2008, 285-291
- 26 Mardling, R. A., Long-term tidal evolution of short-period planets with companions, 2007, MNRAS, 382, 1768
- 27 Beaugé, C., & Michtchenko, T. A., Modelling the high-eccentricity planetary three-body problem. Application to the GJ876 planetary system, 2003, MNRAS, 341, 760
- 28 Laskar, J., NATO Advanced Study Institute on Predictability, Stability, and Chaos in N-Body Dynamical Systems (A.E.Roy, ed.), Plenum Press, New York, 1991, 93 - 114,