



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Using exoplanets to test the universality of biology

Citation for published version:

Cockell, CS 2018, 'Using exoplanets to test the universality of biology', Nature Astronomy, vol. 2, no. 10, pp. 758-759. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41550-018-0586-x>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1038/s41550-018-0586-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41550-018-0586-x)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Nature Astronomy

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Using exoplanets to test the universality of biology

The detection of biosignatures on extrasolar planets would allow us to explore the predictability of evolution. What could we learn without directly obtaining a sample of life?

Charles S Cockell

A profound unanswered scientific question is to what extent biological evolution is deterministic. In other words, how universal are the characteristics of life?¹ (Fig. 1). Exoplanetary science offers us the potential to search for other examples of life in the Universe and to find out whether Earth's evolutionary experiment is an idiosyncratic and contingent outcome, unique to this planet. How far could exoplanets take us in this endeavour?

It is clear that even if we found a gaseous signature associated with life in the atmosphere of an exoplanet, let us say an atmospheric disequilibrium of oxygen and methane², we would be denied a great deal of information about that life. Short of the science fiction possibility of an exoplanet sample return mission, which requires a planet within a reasonable distance and a considerable improvement in propulsion technology, we will be unable to get a material sample of the extraterrestrial biology. This is categorically different to the search in our own Solar System, where the discovery of life could be followed by its collection and subsequent laboratory analysis. Although the task of using exoplanets to understand the universality of life may seem insuperable, I suggest there are a surprising number of directions we might take.

Fig. 1 Universal biology? Potentially habitable exoplanets will exhibit a diversity of characteristics, including differences in planetary composition and atmospheres. Does this imply a plethora of evolutionary outcomes, or convergence to a similar structure of life? Credit: PHL@UPR Arcibo.

30 Consider the hypothetical detection of a putative life-bearing planet. What else might
31 we learn other than that it hosts life? We might seek the ancillary signature of water in the
32 atmospheric spectrum and thus be able to say that like life on Earth, this life likely uses water
33 as its solvent. That would constitute a simple observation, but one that is important with respect
34 to the long-enduring discussion on whether life can use an alternative solvent to water, such as
35 liquid ammonia³.

36 For example, the detection of an atmospheric biosignature in a spectrum that otherwise
37 suggested a lack of water, but an abundance of an alternative solvent such as ammonia would
38 be a remarkable discovery. Conversely, the detection of many life-bearing planets associated
39 with liquid water would not prove the incompatibility of other solvents with life, but it would
40 strongly suggest either that other solvents are incompatible or that the abundance of water on
41 planetary bodies is such that other evolutionary experiments invariably use it. We would also
42 know that the use of water as a solvent in biochemistry is not a highly contingent and difficult
43 partnership.

44 The atmospheric biosignature itself would tell us something about the universality of
45 energy acquisition, fundamental to the thermodynamics of how biospheres work. As a waste
46 product of photosynthesis, oxygen would be evidence that life has fathomed how to split water
47 as a source of electrons, suggesting that like life on Earth, this alien biology has rummaged
48 through the periodic table and its associated compounds to find sources of electrons to drive
49 energy harvesting. As it would be strange if a planetary biota had only evolved the capacity to
50 use one source of electrons, we would expect that it would have tapped into others.

51 Hydrogen, the diverse oxidation states of iron and sulfur, and other simple inorganic
52 electron donors and acceptors are a potentially universal way for life to gather free energy from
53 its environment. By using the inferred density of the exoplanet and observed spectra, we may
54 be able to make predictions on the planet's composition and oxidation state and thus the forms

55 of energy available to life. Expectations on how these modes of energy acquisition would affect
56 the concentrations of atmospheric gases, such as CH₄ (produced for example by the
57 methanogenic H₂/CO₂ redox couple), H₂S (produced for example by sulfate reduction) or CO
58 (consumed for example in anaerobic carboxydrotrophy) could thus be empirically tested. To
59 achieve this we need to advance our observational and modelling capacities to predict planetary
60 compositions and our ability to quantify accurately the concentration of a wide range of gases
61 specifically relevant to energy acquisition.

62 Exoplanet observation data might allow us to test the universality of the physical
63 boundaries to life. For example, we could attempt to determine the surface temperature of the
64 planet to compare it with the known limits to life on Earth. The upper temperature limit for life
65 is currently set by the microorganism *Methanopyrus kandleri* at 122°C⁴. There are reasons to
66 suspect that although this temperature could go higher⁵, the requirement to repair and
67 synthesise cellular biomass against increasing damage at higher temperatures ultimately
68 establishes a boundary. That organic chemists routinely use ovens to heat glassware to 450°C
69 to volatilise and remove organic contamination shows that ultimately the stability of the bonds
70 in carbon-based macromolecules sets a limit to life.

71 If, by convolving the radiation flux of a star with the atmospheric composition of a
72 planet, we were to conclude that a biosignature was associated with a surface temperature of
73 say at least 300°C across the whole planet, this would be an extraordinary challenge to our
74 knowledge of the putative universal physical boundaries to life. Similarly, low temperature
75 planets and ones with high ionizing and UV radiation fluxes, but with biosignatures, would
76 allow us to test whether these physico-chemical conditions are within the limits of known life.
77 The discovery of biosignatures associated with conditions within the currently known bounds
78 for life would not prove that the extremes for life are universal, but they would strongly suggest
79 that life elsewhere is restricted to similar conditions that bound life on Earth. Testing these

80 limits to biology can motivate us to develop better observational capacities and models to
81 calculate exoplanetary surface and subsurface conditions.

82 A prominent feature of the Earth's biosphere is the phenomenon of convergent
83 evolution⁶, many instances of which can be ascribed to physical limits acting on biology⁷.
84 Although we will not be able to examine individual organisms, we may not be completely
85 bereft of the opportunity to test the phenomenon of convergence on exoplanets. The detection
86 of a biosignature would lead to efforts to study the surface reflectance spectrum to seek, for
87 example, absorbing pigments associated with a biota. The well-known 'red edge' in oxygenic
88 photosynthetic organisms, which is pronounced in land vegetation, is proposed as one such⁸.
89 The extent to which the red edge is a contingent product of terrestrial evolution or a result of
90 functional selection, for example to reject heat in land plants, has been debated⁹. Alternative
91 schemes for energy capture from a star, for example to collect the longer-wavelength infrared
92 radiation from M stars, have been proposed¹⁰.

93 We would have no way of studying whether the biochemical architecture of the light
94 harvesting apparatus was convergent with terrestrial biology, but we could find out whether
95 the absorbance pigments of surface biota were selected to match the stellar radiation and thus
96 were a feature of biology tightly hemmed in by physical principles. Optimistically, if one had
97 enough of these examples, one could study the correlation between surface pigment
98 absorbances and stellar fluxes to discern convergence, or the lack thereof, of photosynthetic
99 biospheres to their environments.

100 At a more fundamental biochemical level, exoplanet atmospheric and surface spectra
101 could allow us to test the universality of life's atomic structure. Non-carbon-based
102 biochemistries, for example silicon-based life, remain speculative, but nevertheless a
103 continuing point of discussion³. The detection of surface spectra exhibiting complex organic
104 chemistry or the detection of organic carbon-based biosignatures gases, such as methyl

105 chloride, analogous to those produced by terrestrial life¹¹ might allow us to conclude a carbon-
106 based biology. However, an alternative life might cycle gases such as CO, CO₂ and CH₄ in
107 energy gathering redox reactions without carbon assimilation into its biomolecules. Thus, the
108 detection of carbon-containing gases out of equilibrium with abiotic processes need not *a priori*
109 suggest a carbon-based life. Nevertheless, a diversity of gases similar to those exuded by
110 terrestrial life as metabolic by-products would suggest a biochemistry similar to ours. Crucial
111 to the success of these studies would be the effective elimination of false positives¹², for
112 example the detection of carbon-containing gases that can be produced abiotically, but yield a
113 false conclusion of a terrestrial-like life.

114 It is sometimes said that the detection of an exoplanetary biosignature would be a dead-
115 end. With no way to directly sample such a biosphere, all we could do is to find more of these
116 planets in order to derive some statistically satisfying statement about the occurrence of life.
117 Here, I have highlighted just some of the ways in which, from atomic structure through to the
118 physical limits to life, we might use exoplanet observations to test the universality of biology.
119 Testing the hypothesis that the products and trajectories of evolution are universal might lead
120 to the identification of new gaseous and surface spectral features that are not just biosignatures,
121 but can be used to determine characteristics about the underlying biochemistry and structure of
122 life.

123 If we find no life on any exoplanets and ultimately conclude that we live in a cosmic
124 desert that is devoid of other biology, then we will not have advanced the question of whether
125 the biochemical architecture of life is universal. However, we will have shown that the
126 emergence of the process of biological evolution itself is a contingent event and not a universal
127 convergent outcome of the presence of habitable conditions. This would also constitute a
128 significant insight into the universality of biology.

129

130 Charles S. Cockell*
131 *UK Centre for Astrobiology, School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Edinburgh,*
132 *Edinburgh, EH9 3JZ, UK*
133 **email: c.s.cockell@ed.ac.uk*

134

135 References

- 136 1. Cleland, C.E. *Biological Theory* **7**, 368–379 (2013).
- 137 2. Lovelock, J.E. *Nature* **207**, 568–570 (1965).
- 138 3. Schulze-Makuch, D. & Irwin, L.N. *Life in the Universe: Expectations and Constraints.*
139 Springer, Heidelberg (2008).
- 140 4. Takai, K. et al. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **105**, 10949–10954 (2008).
- 141 5. Cowan, D.A. *Trend. Microbiol.* **12**, 58–60 (2004).
- 142 6. Conway-Morris, S. *Life's Solution: Inevitable Humans in a Lonely Universe.* Cambridge
143 University Press, Cambridge (2004).
- 144 7. McGhee G. *The Geometry of Evolution.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p. 148
145 (2007).
- 146 8. Seager, S. et al. *Astrobiology* **5**, 372–390 (2005).
- 147 9. Kiang, N.Y. et al. *Astrobiology* **7**, 252–274 (2007).
- 148 10. Wolstencroft, R.D. & Raven, J.A. *Icarus* **157**, 535–548 (2002).
- 149 11. Kaltenegger, L & Sasselov, D. *Astrophys. Journ.* **708**, 1162-1167 (2010).
- 150 12. Segura, A. et al. *Astron. Astrophys.* **472**, 665-679 (2007).

151

152 Acknowledgements

153 Charles Cockell acknowledges support from STFC grant ST/R000875/1 and helpful
154 comments from John Raven and an anonymous reviewer.