# 51 Pegasis b, and the Exoplanet Revolution

Nobel Lecture, December 8, 2019 by

Didier Queloz
University of Cambridge, Cavendish Laboratory, UK & University of Geneva, Department of Astronomy, Switzerland.

Αλλὰ μὴν καὶ κόσμοι ἄπειροί εἰσιν, οἵ θ΄ ὅμοιοι τούτῳ καὶ ἀνόμοιοι
‘the worlds also are infinite, whether they resemble this one of ours or whether they are different from it’

Epicurus 300BC[1]

## I. FOREWORD

Scientific experiments leading to a paradigm shift are rare and unexpected. They are the combined result of hard work, opportunity, technology readiness, and contributions by many people. With a bit of luck, all these elements play together in harmony and converge to create an exceptional moment where knowledge makes a step forward. Eventually, only a small number of key contributors get the chance to be rewarded for results that include the contributions and ideas of many others. I feel indebted to all these people. I would particularly like to express my deep gratitude to all engineers, technicians and collaborators of the Observatoire de Haute Provence (OHP) and Geneva Observatory that contributed to the construction and operations of the ELODIE spectrograph and the 193-cm telescope of the OHP. Without their professionalism and unfailing motivation, the discovery of the first exoplanet would have been different, and my story as well.

This paper is about the story of the discovery of 51Pegasis b, an exoplanet, a planet orbiting another star than our Sun. I will describe methods and challenges faced at that time. I will elaborate on the profound impact this discovery had on our general knowledge and understanding about planet formation and why it has been a seminal moment for the emergence of a new field of research in astrophysics, as well as a formidable incentive to kick-start the exploration of life in the universe.

## II. PRECISE DOPPLER SPECTROSCOPY

An orbiting planet can be inferred by the observation of reflex motion of its parent star. The orbital trajectory of the host star around the centre-of-gravity set by the star-planet system may be detected either through its astrometric orbit or periodic radial velocity changes. When by chance the geometry of the planetary orbital plane is such that the line of sight between the observer and the star is crossed by the planet a transit event occurs. Any of these "indirect" methods may be considered to detect a planet as an alternative to "direct" detection by spatially resolving a planet from its star, a formidable technical challenge still today.

In the 20th century, various exoplanet discovery claims by astrometric techniques have been made, to be later dismissed on the basis of new data[2]. For half a century, astrometry was essentially the only technique considered to detect a giant planet in an orbital configuration, similar to Jupiter. Nobody had really considered searching for planets by measuring stellar radial velocities. They had a good reason for that. A giant planet orbiting at a few astronomical units away would produce a change of radial velocity of its parent star in the order of $10ms^{-1}$. Detecting a variation of that order of magnitude with available technology at that time was a utopian perspective.

In 1952, Struve published a surprising visionary short note[3] mentioning conducting "high -precision radial velocity work" to look for planets "much closer to their parent stars than is the case in the Solar System." This idea was way ahead of its time until a series of innovations would significantly reduce uncertainties on radial velocity measurements. Nobody considered seriously searching for planets using Doppler spectroscopy methods at the time for the next decade.

In 1967, the successful implementation of spectral matching techniques to derive stellar radial velocity[4] by Griffin, followed a few years later by a publication:[5] "On the possibility of determining stellar radial velocities to $0.01\ kms^{-1}$," changed the perspective. It opened a realistic prospect to reach the required performance to eventually detect planets by precise Doppler spectroscopy.

Campbell & Walker achieved the first successful implementation of ideas earlier sketched by Griffin & Griffin, a spectroscopic line reference source superimposed on the stellar light optical path, using an absorption cell located at the spectrograph entrance and filled with hydrogen fluoride (HF) gas.[6] Despite the safety and handling challenges to operate this equipment, they conducted, during 12 years, the first survey looking for "substellar companions to solar-type stars" using precise Doppler Spectroscopy measurements[7,8]. The use of a gas cell as a self-reference to obtain precise radial velocities was later perfected by Marcy & Butler by replacing the meter-long lethally corrosive HF cell with a more compact and easy to handle cell fill with iodine ($I_2$).[9] The ease and flexibility offered by the use of an $I_2$ cell would open the possibility for almost any existing high-resolution spectrograph to produce precise radial velocity measurements and to be used for a planet search survey. The apparent simplicity of this technical solution would, however, face the arduous challenge of dealing with non-trivial data analysis inherent to the dense and blended forest of molecular line transitions of $I_2$.[10]

The alternative to the self-calibration method with a gas cell is to operate a stable and precise spectrograph. In 1990, in a comprehensive review, Brown considered design optimisation trade-offs needed to build such an instrument.[11] Use of échelle spectrograph design is essential to produce, with the same exposure, spectra with high resolution and large wavelength range. These two characteristics allowed us to observe enough stellar spectral lines to precisely compute radial velocity from the Doppler effect by cross-correlation with a match filter (correlation numerical mask)[12] and to reach $10\mathrm{ms}^{-1}$considering realistic observation sequences with telescopes.[13]

In the 90s only a handful of instruments have been successfully developed along these guidelines, reaching their design purpose to deliver high precision radial velocities. The successful ones[14–16] are essentially built with similar concepts. Optics are mounted on a static bench located in stable environment away from all kinds of telescope and dome mechanical, thermal and acoustic perturbations. They use a multi-mode optical fiber to illuminate the spectrograph entrance (slit) with the image obtained by the telescope and another fiber to track instrument and air index variations in the spectrograph. In addition to removing the instrument away from the noisy telescope environment, optical fiber injection of the stellar image has the essential intrinsic property of scrambling the intensity distribution of the telescope image and producing a nearly uniform illuminated disk at the entrance slit almost suppressing guiding and seeing effects.[17]

## ELODIE

The ELODIE spectrograph (see Fig. 1) started its scientific operation in 1994 on the 193cm telescope of the Observatoire de Haute Provence (OHP). Its construction began in 1989 as a collaboration between OHP and the astronomy department of the University of Geneva. Its main purpose was to offer a new modern observation capability particularly for "bright time" period (when the Moon is visible) while at the same time, a twin copy (CORALIE) was built in parallel to be later mounted on the 1.2m Swiss telescope at La Silla (European Southern Observatory, ESO) in Chile.[18]

The spectrograph had been designed to achieve precise Doppler spectroscopy measurements. The optical concept was constrained by the requirement to have a compact, stable instrument and to maximize the use of all available area of the E2V 1024x1024 pixels CCD detector to obtain a recorded échelle spectra with the highest possible resolution over the whole visible range, from 390nm to 681nm. This was made possible by using a large and high angle of incidence diffraction échelle grat-

*Figure 1.* ELODIE spectrograph on display at OHP. On the left we see the échelle grating with the grooves facing us. On the left side, the optical fibers feeding the spectrograph are clearly visible (in orange). On the top sits the cryostat with the CCD detector inside. The "cross-dispersing" optic (not visible) is located in the vertical dark painted holding structure. ©Collection Photothèque OHP/CNRS.

ing recently produced by Milton and Roy manufacture. To improve slit illumination stability, an efficient double scrambler was included in the fiber-feed train.

In addition, ELODIE was uniquely equipped with a data reduction pipeline delivering radial velocity by numerical cross-correlation shortly after observation.[14]

The development of an on-line data reduction pipeline, routinely delivering high precision radial velocities, was at that time a challenging task only made possible by the opportunity offered by the generous RAM and clock speed of the newly available *SPARCstation* minicomputer by Sun Microsystem. The ELODIE spectral information that is recorded on CCD is distributed over 67 curved and overlapping orders. This complex data structure of échelle spectra creates various software algorithmic challenges. For example, the spectroscopy resolution element was only about 10 kms$^{-1}$, a thousand times bigger that the Doppler precision we were aiming at. Inspired by the work of Griffin Photometric Velocimeter and CORAVEL[19] implementation, algorithms based on match filter (correlation mask) have been developed. These optimally combined together in an optimal way all of the Doppler spectroscopic information recorded on the spectra. The use of a reference fiber, fed by a thorium lamp during the exposure, produced a reference spectrum the reduction pipeline was using to correct for mechanical variability and air index changes occurring between the time of wavelength calibrations and actual observations of stars (see Fig. 2). The implementation of "simultaneous referencing" was one of the cleverest tricks at the heart of data analysis to reach high precision in radial velocity measurements. The ELODIE spectrograph design and software development implemented with success a whole set of new concepts that have become standards in succeeding generations of stable spectrograph allowing further improvements in precision performances.[20–22]



*Figure 2*. Middle cut of ELODIE image of a stellar spectra observed with simultaneous thorium recorded on the CCD. One clearly distinguishes the curved spectroscopic order of the stellar spectra from the interlaced emission spectrum due to simultaneous thorium lamp illuminating the second fiber.

## III. A PLANET THAT SHOULD NOT EXIST

### 51Pegasi

In spring 1994, with ELODIE barely operational, we started our survey. Our goal was to determine the occurrence of sub-stellar companions in the solar neighborhood. Finding giant planets were not the only objective of the survey. It is worth recalling that in the 90s, the search for brown dwarfs was a fashionable theme of research that stretched to the planet regime.[23,24] Moreover our compelling need to make a convincing and realistic case for the Telescope Allocation Committee to obtain access to telescope observations could not be neglected.

The original target sample included 142 F,G,K main sequence stars25 selected on the basis they were not spectroscopic binaries, located in a 25pc neighborhood and – to our knowledge – not yet observed by another high precision Doppler survey. Our strategy was to start with a sample size significantly larger than the one previously observed by Campbell *et al.* that didn't succeed in detecting sub-stellar companions.[7,26]

In autumn 1994, Michel Mayor (my PhD advisor), literally left me keys of operation and went to Hawaii on sabbatical leave for a 6 month period. I was delighted and excited to be left in charge of the program, regularly going observing with ELODIE I, which I considered a bit as "my baby", and incidentally gathering more data for my PhD which was due the year after.

In the original survey sample, we had previously identified 24 bright stars equally distributed in the sky. One would observe this subset a bit more frequently than others to serve us as precision validation. The star HD217014 known as 51Peg was part of this group. We had an observing mission about every two months and they typically lasted one week.

In January 1995, it is fair to say that my first reaction was a moment of panic when I realized that the star HD217014 exhibited radial velocity variations larger than the sole effect of Doppler precision I expected from the spectroscopic information available. I thought something was going wrong in the spectrograph or with the data analysis. After days and nights anxiously spent alone checking any element and software step I could think about and gathering more data, I eventually came to the only conclusion I could think about to explain the variability pattern: A planet of Jupiter's mass is orbiting the star 51Peg with a 4.25d period corresponding to an orbital distance of 0.05 astronomical units. The planet is literally roasted, and its atmosphere is 1,000K degrees hot. When retrospectively I think about it, I realize how fearless and foolish this idea was, the privilege of an enthusiastic PhD student …

When later I reported to Michel Mayor that I had found a planet, unsurprisingly he reacted with restrained enthusiasm. I think he couldn't believe it. That was fair enough. When we started the survey, I still remember him telling me I should not expect to find any planets for my PhD, it would take years! He eventually changed his mind when additional radial velocity measurements collected in July 1995 confirmed my initial ephemerides based on previous observations.

We spent summer 1995 writing the paper to report our discovery. We had a fantastic challenge to overcome to convince our peers, considering our planet had no counterpart in the Solar System and no theoretical back-up to explain a hot Jupiter configuration. Moreover, ELODIE was a brand-new challenger without yet any demonstrated results and the field was historically littered with series of misjudgments and mistakes in data analysis. Finally, small changes in Doppler shift may potentially be due to stellar photosphere effects and explain our data as well. It was an impossible job! In the following years we would be confronted with a wave of skepticism. It would take years for the community at large to accept the reality of 51Peg hot Jupiter and to modify the paradigm about the universality of solar system planetary architecture.

## Alternative to planet hypothesis

The strongest resistance we faced about our interpretation was related to the fact that the measurement of radial velocity variation from stellar emerging spectra does not always imply the star is moving due to an orbiting planet. Convective transport of heat in Sun-like stars is carried out by about a million gas cells in motion with typical vertical velocities of kilometers per second.

The resulting visible effect at stellar surface is described as “photosphere granulation”. A magnetic field is generated from the sheer motion of the convection mechanism through the alpha dynamo process, producing active regions on the photosphere that may display dark spots at the location of emerging strong magnetic field lines. Magnetic flux tubes form and decay on timescales typically comparable to the stellar rotation period and long-term magnetic cycles modify the convection patterns. The combined result of all these effects is to produce spectral lines of variable shape with underlying periodic and pseudo-periodic patterns. Practically, when measuring radial velocity, it is rather easy to observe variations produced by a combination of all these effects, in particular when the star is young and active.[27]

In the discovery paper[28] we carefully addressed all possible ways to produce the observed changes in radial velocity by stellar atmospheric effects. We looked for records of photometric amplitude changes indicating a young and fast rotating star. We used the property of the correlation function to look for stellar line profile changes. We clearly ruled out all alternative origins by stellar atmosphere features but the idea of "hot Jupiter" planets was so awkward it had hard time being accepted. The main issue was that it didn't fit in the planetary formation paradigm without seriously tweaking this paradigm. Changing a well-established theory is rarely the first idea a physicist is considering out of an unusual experimental result. And yet the foundation of planet formation theory needed to be revised.

## Challenging planetary formation

The process of forming a planet is based on core accretion mechanisms in the disk. The underlying principle is a series of steps where a planet grows by stages by accreting material available in the disk. In early stages, proto-planetary disks are dominated by H and He gas. The disk also contains a small fraction of solids. Close to the star one finds refractory dust. In the outer part of the disk, "beyond snow lines,"[29] there are frozen ices originating from the solid phase transition of molecular gas ($H_2O$, CO, $CO_2$, $CH_4$...).

In the disk, solid materials rapidly, dynamically decouple from the gas and settle down on the disk mid-plane where they agglomerate by sticking together. The result is a swarm of planetesimals that grow by collision amongst themselves to eventually form planetary embryos.[30] The formation of giant planets proceeds from these embryos by accreting the gas left in the disk.[31] The outcome depends on two competing processes: on one hand the dispersion of the gas disk, on the other hand the formation of a massive core big enough to efficiently accrete all the gas left around.

The fact that 90% of Jupiter's mass is made of H and He means that the core formed quick enough to accrete a significant amount of gas before it got dispersed. Such favorable timing requires a high solid surface density of planetesimals available when the gas is still around. It is only encountered in the outer part of the disk at a few astronomical units.[32] Therefore, for the formation theory to account for the presence of close-in giant planets one must consider strong and efficient dynamical interaction with the disk (migration) and other massive bodies in the system to change the initial orbital configuration.[33] This element was never seriously considered or looked at by researchers working on planetary formation models despite being explicitly mentioned and computed fifteen years before.[34] The 80s Goldreich & Tremaine paper prediction resurfaced at the time the first migration model was published,[35] shortly after 51Pegb was announced.

## IV. A FEAST OF EXOPLANETS

I concluded my PhD defense with a prophetic statement that the discovery of 51Pegb exoplanet was just the tip of the iceberg and more planets of that kind would soon be detected. I simply couldn't believe we had, by some extraordinary luck, detected an extremely rare planetary configuration. I didn't have to wait long to be proven right.

### Here comes the transit

A few months after the publication of 51Pegb, two exoplanets detected by the radial velocity technique were announced[36,37]. Three years later, eight exoplanets had been found, all with mass in the range of giant planets and three hot Jupiter planets[38]. Then in late 1999 a new hot Jupiter was found orbiting the star HD209458 and luckily it happened to be transiting. This result, concluding on a similar interpretation from two independent techniques, had the final word and swept any reservations left on the reality of exoplanets discoveries.[39,40]

When the community realized that hot Jupiters truly existed, we saw blossoming dedicated exoplanet transit surveys.[41] A hot Jupiter exoplanet is 10 times smaller than our Sun and has a 10% chance of being seen with an orbital configuration aligned with its host star, making it a good target to look for transit by ground-based differential photometry. The transit method provides us with an alternative to Doppler spectroscopy searches for planets. It allows us to derive the size of a planet instead of its mass.

In 2006 the first exoplanet transit survey from space – the COROT satellite – was launched and rapidly brought us evidence of the first rocky exoplanet COROT-7b.[43,44] The Kepler mission, launched three years later,



*Figure 3.* Cumulative histogram of exoplanet discoveries[42] through time by various detection techniques. The spectacular growth of transit detection from space is due to the Kepler mission.

eventually produced a stream of discoveries of small multi-planetary systems.45 In barely a decade, planet hunting activity went from repeated failures to an exoplanet gold rush, involving big survey and space missions carried out by large international consortiums. As a result of this rapid expansion of survey capabilities, the number of exoplanet detections spectacularly increased (see Fig. 3), lifting the veil on the extraordinary diverse exoplanet realm.

## Change of perspectives

The discovery of the exoplanet 51Pegb kick-started a new field of research of contemporary astrophysics. It acted as a stimulus to develop new instruments and observing facilities. A quarter century later, combined results from precise Doppler spectroscopy surveys, transit search space missions and wide field transit ground-based surveys have completely modified our perspective on the architecture and nature of planetary systems in the universe. We have learned that our solar system architecture is far from being the norm. The wealth of diversity observed in exoplanet structures and orbital configurations (Fig. 4) is oddly contrasting with our Solar System.

Transit and precise Doppler spectroscopic methods favor detection of exoplanets with short orbital period. The significant number of planets orbiting close to their star, so embarrassing for planetary formation theory, ironically turns out to be a fortunate situation from a detection point of view. It is fascinating to think that if the Solar System would be the norm, Fig.4 would display few measurement points.

The interest and spectacular growth of the detection community would not be the same as we see today.

Exoplanets with characteristics comparable to our solar system's planets are far more challenging to detect than most of the planets so far discovered. It explains the lack of Earth twin ("Goldilocks" planet) in current findings. By comparison to telluric planets a "Jupiter-twin" exoplanet is easier and within reach of Doppler surveys. It still needs long-term series of measurements and extensive telescope time access. In the near future, with the release of the GAIA mission final catalogue, Fig. 4 is likely to display more data points in the mass-period region similar to Jupiter.[46,47]

Measurement by transit method of the planet radius is efficient when the orbital period is short. For long period exoplanets, the probability of getting the right geometrical alignment of line of sight is so negligibly low that it becomes impractical. This limitation is clearly visible on Fig. 4 by the increased scarcity of radius measurements gathered for exoplanets with orbital period typically longer than about 100 days.



*Figure 4*. Measured mass, radius and orbital period of all known exoplanets[42]. Color codes indicate techniques used to discover the planet (same as Fig. 3). For mass measured by Doppler spectroscopy *sin* i = 1 is considered. Location of Jupiter, Earth and Venus are indicated for the sake of comparison. A grey scale density map is overlaid to locate "cluster of similar exoplanets" on these diagrams.

On Fig. 4 three distinct groups of exoplanets are visible. The hot Jupiter population is the group of giant planets found on short period (less than 10 days), with 51Pegb its most emblematic member. On the colder end, further out, one finds "classical" giant planets like our own Jupiter. Then one sees a cluster of smaller exoplanets mostly on short orbit, casually named "Super Earth" or "Mini-Neptune" compact systems. This group of planets is a mixed bag of anything fitting in a range defined on one side by Earth's physical characteristics and on the other side by Neptune.

Detailed statistical analysis of the occurrence of each group of exoplanets is not a trivial task. The apparent number of discoveries can't be simply converted to the occurrence of each type of exoplanet per star. Limitations in the techniques used to detect them and diversity of thresholds of each survey considered need to be carefully taken into account to produce a robust result[48]. Hot Jupiter planets, easy to detect by both techniques, are actually not that frequently found orbiting stars. An average occurrence rate of 1% is derived, with a tendency to be more frequently present when the host star's metallicity is higher[49] The occurrence of cold Jupiters is about 10% for Jupiter analogs.[48] If a broader definition is considered, including any exoplanet more massive than Neptune and up to 20$M_J$ planets, the occurrence rises almost to 50%. Note that this large group of exoplanets clearly distinguishes themselves from outer planets of our Solar System with a wider range of orbital eccentricities. The planetary configuration corresponding to the group of "superearth & mini-neptune" exoplanets seem to be the most commonly found configuration in our galaxy. One derives, on average, an occurrence of about 60% per star with orbital periods less than 100 days.[50] The discovery of such a massive population of planets during short periods is a challenge to planetary formation theory. It is understood as a failure to properly account for dynamic effects occurring during planet formation.[51] It raises the perplexing possibility as well that our Solar System's configuration may be far less common than expected.

## Exoplanetary science begins

The exoplanet discovery bonanza not only unveiled the diversity of planetary orbital configurations but also a large range of physical structures. The combination of transit and precise Doppler spectroscopy allows us to measure exoplanet bulk density and to gain insights into the structure of planet interiors. The mass and radius measurement diagram in Fig. 5 displays all exoplanets for which these two physical parameters have been measured as well as a set of superimposed computed bulk density relations for different planet interiors.[52]



*Figure 5*. All known exoplanets[42] with a measurement of their mass and radius. Hatched lines indicate model of bulk density for three different compositions. Jupiter, Saturn and Neptune are indicated for the sake of comparison.

The computed bulk density for hydrogen-helium composition dominated planets, applicable to Jupiter, lies on the upper value boundary of observed giant exoplanets densities. The fact that most giant planet measurements displayed on this diagram indicate lower densities than Jupiter's is the consequence of a bias that favors short period exoplanet detections, and the fact that Hot Jupiter planet diameters are observed to be inflated.[53] Some exoplanets have been found with barely 10% Jupiter bulk density.[54] Physical mechanisms at the origins of their bloated nature may be related to the combination of different effects due to their proximity to their host star and their formation process.[22]

In the case of exoplanets with mass smaller than Saturn, for any given range, computed bulk density shows a large dispersion, suggesting a mixture of planet interior structures. Some exoplanets have a bulk density that could be understood as a down-scaling extrapolation of Jupiter's interior. Others with denser values can be modelled by decreasing the value of H and He to 10% and increasing "heavy" elements (such as $H_2O$, $NH_3$, $CO_2$, ...) in planet interiors like in the planet interiors of Uranus and Neptune for example. Going further down in the sub-Saturn mass range one finds exoplanets having bulk density too high to be simply accounted by downscaling Jupiter or Neptune planetary interiors. New structure without H and He should be considered.

The core accretion planet formation scenario produces a composite interior structure with schematically three distinct layers: core (densest component), envelope and atmosphere (visible part). The level of freedom that one can play with by balancing these three components produces naturally a confusing range of bulk density values. Practically, a given bulk density can correspond to different ratios between these components. To simplify, the interpretation on Fig. 5 is displayed a "pure ice" hypothetical planet model. It is revealing to compare it with Earth-like bulk structure extrapolated in the same mass range. The group of exoplanets in the super-earth & mini-neptune range (Fig. 5) exhibits a large dispersion suggesting an underlying diversity of planetary models. For example, some planets with $5M_\oplus$ have been found compatible with Earth-like bulk density, while others with Neptune-like structures. This situation is reflected by the fact that for that group of planets, we do not observe a direct relation between mass and radius. A careful inspection of this diagram would demonstrate the statistical significance of two groups of bulk density structures: One more "water-like" and the other more "Earth-like"[50]. This suggests the super-earth & mini-neptune exoplanet category is potentially a group of mixed origins with different interior compositions.[55]

## V. PROSPECTS

The fascinating diversity of bulk density encountered among compact super-earth andminineptune exoplanets, and the fact they have no equivalent to be readily compared with solar system planets, is a challenge to modeling their interior as well as tracing their origins. Fortunately, it is likely to change with the launch of the James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) and the availability of large ground-based facilities currently under construction (like for example extremely large telescopes, ELTs). Using transit spectroscopy observations and occultation combined-light techniques, it will be possible to learn far more about these exoplanets.[56] Insights about atmospheric and surface composition[57,58] will offer an exciting opportunity to clarify their nature and their origins.

The imminent prospect of measuring atmospheric features of small transiting exoplanets opens the fascinating possibility of addressing the remote detection of life in these systems. The habitable zone that expresses a range of distances from its host star to maintain liquid water[59] is largely considered as a minimum condition for an exoplanet orbit to be of potential interest for the purpose of searching for biomarkers.[60]

Practically, the concept of habitable zones is a guideline for planning future observations. The habitable zone assumes an ad-hoc atmosphere and planetary surface conditions[61] and scaled the illumination $S_{eff}$ received by the planet to maintain liquid water (assuming water is present ...). For small and cooler stars (Mdwarfs) the inner boundary of the habitable zone gets close enough to overlap the range of short period small exoplanets discovered. Among them, the recent confirmation of rocky planets with a bulk density similar to the Earth,[62,63] located in the habitable zone, reasonably questions the possibility of life on these systems. The prospect of eventually getting insights into the atmosphere and geochemical conditions in these systems is drawing attention beyond the usual astronomy community.

Answering the big question about life on exoplanets will require a combined effort between astrophysics, planetary scientists, geophysicists, biochemists and molecular biologists. Recent developments on the origin of life on Earth[64] as a planetary phenomenon and its relevance to the search for life on another planet is steering us on a new exciting research route. Current efforts to identify true Earth-twin planetary systems on nearby stars[65] will eventually lead to the development of a series of research programs and future facilities to look for bio-signatures and to address the origin, nature, and prevalence of life in the universe. Near us, Mars, Venus and satellites of giant planets in our Solar System are obvious locations to look closer for life signatures.

The discovery of the exoplanet realm is an extraordinary moment in mankind's pursuit of knowledge and natural inclination to be curious. It follows the steps of the Copernican revolution, extending it further out by placing our Solar System among countless planetary systems and by addressing the physical conditions conducive to the emergence of life. The large diversity and high occurrence of exoplanets orbiting stars in our galaxy offers so many opportunities for the chemistry of life to happen, eventually if we shall detect it on another planet. It is just a matter of time …

## Acknowledgements

I thank the Nobel Foundation and the Royal Swedish Academy for the great honor and privilege of receiving and sharing this award with Prof. Peeble and my mentor and colleague Prof. Michel Mayor. I am grateful to the University of Geneva and University of Cambridge and all my collaborators for their trust and support in my endeavor to develop a comprehensive research program on exoplanets and the search for life in the universe. I am delighted and feel fortunate to enjoy and share this exceptional moment with my family and particularly Tina my wonderful wife. Their unfailing support and love is a priceless gift. Thank you!

## REFERENCES

1. Epicurus. *The Letter of Epicurus to Herodotus in Diogenes Laertius: The Letter of Epicurus to Herodotus, Book 10, Sections 45,* translation is by C.D. Yonge (1895).
2. *Boss, A. Looking for Earths: The race to find new solar systems* (1998).
3. Struve, O. Proposal for a project of high-precision stellar radial velocity work. *The Observatory* **72**, 199–200 (1952).
4. Griffin, R. F. A Photoelectric Radial Velocity Spectrometer. *Astrophysical Journal* (1967).
5. Griffin, R. F. & Griffin, R. E. M. On the possibility of determining stellar radial velocities to 0.01 km $s^{-1}$. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **162**, 243–253 (1973).
6. Campbell, B. & Walker, G. A. H. Precision radial velocities with an absorption cell. *Astronomical Society of the Pacific* (1979).
7. Campbell, B., Walker, G. A. H. & Yang, S. A search for substellar companions to solar-type stars. *Astrophysical Journal* (1988).
8. Walker, G. A. H. *et al.* A search for Jupiter-mass companions to nearby stars. *Icarus* (1995).
9. Marcy, G. W. & Butler, R. P. Precision radial velocities with an iodine absorption cell. *Astronomical Society of the Pacific* (1992).

10. Butler, R. P. *et al.* Attaining Doppler Precision of 3 M s-1. *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific* (1996).
11. Brown, T. M. *High precision Doppler measurements via echelle spectroscopy* in *IN: CCDs in astronomy; Proceedings of the Conference* (1990).
12. Queloz, D. Echelle Spectroscopy with a CCD at Low Signal-To-Noise Ratio. *IAU Symposium No. 167* (1995).
13. Bouchy, F., Pepe, F. & Queloz, D. Fundamental photon noise limit to radial velocity measurements. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* (2001).
14. Baranne, A. *et al.* ELODIE: A spectrograph for accurate radial velocity measurements. *Astronomy and Astrophysics Supplement* (1996).
15. Kaufer, A., Wolf, B., Andersen, J. & Pasquini, L. FEROS, the fiber-fed extended range optical spectrograph for the ESO 1.52-m telescope. *The Messenger* (1997).
16. Brown, T. M., Noyes, R. W., Nisenson, P., Korzennik, S. G. & Horner, S. The AFOE: A spectrograph for precise Doppler studies. *Astronomical Society of the Pacific* (1994).
17. Heacox, W. D. *Wavelength-precise slit spectroscopy with optical fiber image scramblers in: Fiber optics in astronomy; Proceedings of the Conference* (1988).
18. Queloz, D. *et al.* The CORALIE survey for southern extra-solar planets. I. A planet orbiting the star Gliese 86. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* (2000).
19. Baranne, A., Mayor, M. & Poncet, J. L. CORAVEL – A new tool for radial velocity measurements. *Vistas in Astronomy* (1979).
20. Queloz, D. *et al.* From CORALIE to HARPS. The way towards 1 m s-1 precision Doppler measurements. *The Messenger* (2001).
21. Plavchan, P. *et al.* Radial Velocity Prospects Current and Future: A White Paper Report prepared by the Study Analysis Group 8 for the Exoplanet Program Analysis Group (ExoPAG). *arXiv.org*. arXiv: 1503.01770 (2015).
22. Pepe, F., Bouchy, F., Mayor, M. & Udry, S. High-Precision Spectrographs for Exoplanet Research: CORAVEL, ELODIE, CORALIE, SOPHIE and HARPS. *Handbook of Exoplanets* (2018).
23. Marcy, G. W. & Butler, R. P. A Search for Brown Dwarfs using Doppler Shifts. *Cool Stars; Stellar Systems; and the Sun; Eighth Cambridge Workshop. Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series* (1994).
24. Latham, D. W., Mazeh, T., Stefanik, R. P., Mayor, M. & Burki, G. The unseen companion of HD114762 - A probable brown dwarf. *Nature (ISSN 0028-0836)* (1989).
25. Queloz, D. et al. The Observatoire de Haute-Provence Search for Extrasolar Planets with ELODIE. *Brown dwarfs and extrasolar planets* (1998).
26. Campbell, B., Yang, S., Irwin, A. W. & Walker, G. A. H. *Towards an Estimate of the Fraction of Stars with Planets from Velocities of High Precision* in *Bioastronomy The Search for Extraterrestial Life — The Exploration Broadens: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Bioastronomy Held at Val Cenis* (1991).
27. Queloz, D. *et al.* No planet for HD 166435. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* (2001).
28. Mayor, M. & Queloz, D. A Jupiter-mass companion to a solar-type star. *Nature* (1995).
29. Williams, J. P. & Cieza, L. A. Protoplanetary Disks and Their Evolution. *Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics* (2011).
30. Safronov, V. S. & Zvjagina, E. V. Relative Sizes of the Largest Bodies during the Accumulation of Planets. *Icarus* (1969).
31. Pollack, J. B. et al. Formation of the Giant Planets by Concurrent Accretion of Solids and Gas. *Icarus* (1996).

32. Lecar, M., Podolak, M., Sasselov, D. & Chiang, E. On the Location of the Snow Line in a Protoplanetary Disk. *The Astrophysical Journal* (2006).
33. Dawson, R. I. & Johnson, J. A. Origins of Hot Jupiters. *arXiv.org*. arXiv: 1801.06117 (2018).
34. Goldreich, P. & Tremaine, S. Disk-satellite interactions. *Astrophysical Journal (1980).*
35. Lin, D. N. C., Bodenheimer, P. & Richardson, D. C. Orbital migration of the planetary companion of 51 Pegasi to its present location. *Nature* (1996).
36. Marcy, G. W. & Butler, R. P. A Planetary Companion to 70 Virginis. *Astrophysical Journal Letters v.464* (1996).
37. Butler, R. P. & Marcy, G. W. A Planet Orbiting 47 Ursae Majoris. *Astrophysical Journal Letters v.464* (1996).
38. Marcy, G. W. & Butler, R. P. Detection of Extrasolar Giant Planets. *Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics* (1998).
39. Charbonneau, D., Brown, T. M., Latham, D. W. & Mayor, M. Detection of Planetary Transits Across a Sun-like Star. *The Astrophysical Journal* (2000).
40. Mazeh, T. *et al.* The Spectroscopic Orbit of the Planetary Companion Transiting HD 209458. *The Astrophysical Journal* (2000).
41. Pollacco, D. L. et al. The WASP Project and the SuperWASP Cameras. *The Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific* (2006).
42. Akeson, R. L. et al. The NASA Exoplanet Archive: Data and Tools for Exoplanet Research. *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific* (2013).
43. Leger, A., Rouan, D., Schneider, J., Barge, P. & Fridlund. Transiting exoplanets from the CoRoT space mission. VIII. CoRoT7b: the first super-Earth with measured radius. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* (2009).
44. Queloz, D. et al. The CoRoT-7 planetary system: two orbiting super-Earths. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* (2009).
45. Lissauer, J. J., Dawson, R. I. & Tremaine, S. Advances in exoplanet science from Kepler. arXiv.org. arXiv: 1409.1595v1 (2014).
46. Lattanzi, M. G. & Sozzetti, A. Gaia and the Astrometry of Giant Planets. *arXiv.org.* arXiv: 1003.3921v1 (2010).
47. Perryman, M., Hartman, J., Bakos, G. & Lindegren, L. Astrometric exoplanet detection with Gaia. a*rXiv.org.* arXiv: 1411.1173v1 (2014).
48. Winn, J. N. Planet Occurrence: Doppler and Transit Surveys. *arXiv.org.* arXiv: 1801.08543v5 (2018).
49. Santos, N. C., Israelian, G. & Mayor, M. The metal-rich nature of stars with planets. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* (2001).
50. Fulton, B. J. et al. The California-Kepler Survey. III. A Gap in the Radius Distribution of Small Planets. *The Astronomical Journal* (2017).
51. Winn, J. N. & Fabrycky, D. C. The Occurrence and Architecture of Exoplanetary Systems. *arXiv.org.* arXiv: 1410.4199v4 (2014).
52. Fortney, J. J., Marley, M. S. & Barnes, J. W. Planetary Radii across Five Orders of Magnitude in Mass and Stellar Insolation: Application to Transits. *The Astrophysical Journal* (2007).
53. Guillot, T. & Gautier, D. Giant Planets. *arXiv.org*. arXiv: 0912.2019 (2009).
54. Anderson, D. R. et al. WASP-17b: An Ultra-Low Density Planet in a Probable Retrograde Orbit. *The Astrophysical Journal* (2010).
55. Neil, A. R. & Rogers, L. A. A Joint MassRadius-Period Distribution of Exoplanets. *arXiv.org.* arXiv: 1911.03582v1 (2019).
56. Winn, J. N. Exoplanet Transits and Occultations. *Exoplanets* (2010).

57. Demory, B.-O. *et* al. A map of the large day-night temperature gradient of a superEarth exoplanet. *Nature* (2016).
58. Kreidberg, L. *et al.* Absence of a thick atmosphere on the terrestrial exoplanet LHS 3844b. *arXiv.org*. arXiv: 1908.06834v1 (2019).
59. Hart, M. H. The evolution of the atmosphere of the earth. *Icarus* (1978).
60. Kaltenegger, L. How to Characterize Habitable Worlds and Signs of Life. *arXiv.org.* arXiv: 1911.05597v1 (2019).
61. Kopparapu, R. K. et al. Habitable Zones Around Main-Sequence Stars: New Estimates. *arXiv.org*. arXiv: 1301.6674v2(2013).
62. Gillon, M. *et al.* Seven temperate terrestrial planets around the nearby ultracool dwarf star TRAPPIST-1. *Nature* (2017).
63. Grimm, S. L. *et al.* The nature of the TRAPPIST-1 exoplanets. *arXiv.org.* arXiv: 1802.01377v1 (2018).
64. Sasselov, D. D., Grotzinger, J. P. & Sutherland, J. D. The origin of life as a planetary phenomenon. *Science Advances* **6**, eaax3419 (2020).
65. Hall, R. D., Thompson, S. J., Handley, W. & Queloz, D. On the Feasibility of Intense Radial Velocity Surveys for Earth-Twin Discoveries. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* (2018).