Searching for occultations in young open clusters

Suzanne Aigrain (IoA, Cambridge)

Jonathan Irwin, Simon Hodgkin, Cathie Clarke, Mike Irwin, Dan Bramich, Gerry Gilmore (Cambridge) Leslie Hebb (St Andrews), Estelle Moraux, Jerome Bouvier (Grenoble), Fabio Favata (ESA) Ettore Flaccomio (Palermo), Mark McCaughrean (Exeter), Michael Ashley (UNSW)

with thanks to
F. Pont (Geneva), Jon Holtzman (NMSU) Maria Roasa Zapatero Osorio (LAEFF/INTA), E. Martin (IAC) Gwendolyn Meeus (Postdam) Alexis Brandeker, Ray Jayawardhana (Toronto)
M-R relation at low masses

Isochrones:
- Baraffe et al. (1998)
- Chabrier et al. (2000)
- Baraffe et al. (2003)
- Burrows et al. (1997)

Ages:
1, 10, 150, 1000 Myr

Constraints:
- Field systems:
  interferometry, OGLE, M-M EBs
  transiting planets

- PMS systems:
  Stassun et al. (2004, Ori 1c)
  Stassun et al. (2006, ONC)
  Hebb et al. (2004, NGC1647)

  global agreement with models,
  but significant discrepancies

- Field systems:
  interferometry, OGLE, M-M EBs
  transiting planets

- PMS systems:
  Stassun et al. (2004, Ori 1c)
  Stassun et al. (2006, ONC)
  Hebb et al. (2004, NGC1647)

  global agreement with models,
  but significant discrepancies
Motivation

**Noticeable features:**
- importance of age
- BD desert
- few PMS M-dwarf systems
- no young (transiting) planets

**Monitor goals:**
- **Populate the PMS relation**
  - constrain evolutionary models
- **Statistics of young low-mass binaries**
  - constrain star formation scenarios
- **first young planets**
  - constrain planet formation timescales
OC transit surveys

• Existing surveys
  • EXPLORE-OC, UStAPS, PISCES, STEPSS: focussed on planets
    • No detections so far (some candidates)
  • Hebb et al.: focussed on low-mass EBs
    • 1 confirmed detection, 2 candidates
  • All target older open clusters (mostly >1 Gyr)

• Pros
  • Known parameters: ages, [Fe/H], (rough) mass
  • Less contamination (membership selection)

• Cons (for planets)
  • Too few target stars
  • Faint targets: difficult RV follow-up

See Pepper & Gaudi (2005) for (single transit, white noise only) scaling laws
Monitor: YOC transit survey

- **Pros:**
  - More & deeper eclipses
  - Lower mass primaries
  - Even less contamination

- **Cons**
  - More photometric variability and RV jitter
  - Even fainter targets (2-4m telescopes)

- **Observations (ongoing)**
  - 2-4m telescopes
  - >=100h/target
  - up to 2yr baseline
  - <15min sampling
  - I-band
Photometric performance

See Monitor data processing paper (Irwin et al in prep) for details

M50, 14 nights, fully processed & detrended data

- frame-to-frame rms
- rms on 2h timescales
- white noise expectation

correlated noise on transit/eclipse timescales 1-2mmag (see Pont et al 2006)
Detection estimates

Aigrain et al. (submitted to MNRAS)

• Follow concept of Pepper & Gaudi (2005)
  \[
  \frac{d^3 N_{\text{det}}}{dM \, dr \, dP} = N_* f_p \frac{d^2 P}{dr \, dP} \mathcal{P}_{\text{tot}}(M, P, r) \frac{dn}{dM}.
  \]
• ... BUT:
  • replace planet radius \( r \) with mass ratio \( q \) for binaries
  • include grazing eclipses & mass of secondary
  • use mass function and companion probabilities appropriate for M-type primaries
  • use double-trapezoid extension of BLS (Aigrain, Mazeh & Tamuz in prep.)
  • account for correlated noise in detection (Pont, Zucker & Queloz 2006)
  • use real (observed) time sampling and noise budget versus magnitude
  • require \( S_{\text{red}} > 8 \), \( > 2 \) observed eclipses, \( > 8 \) in-eclipse points for detection
  • incorporate a term representing the feasibility of RV follow-up

→ try to be as realistic as possible while keeping workload manageable
Sensitivity to eclipses

Figure 7. Diagrams of Pd for binaries (top) and planets (bottom), ... in medium and dark grey correspond to systems that are too faint or saturated respectively.
Sensitivity to transits
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Figure 7. Diagrams of Pd for binaries (top) and planets (bottom), ... in medium and dark grey correspond to systems that are too faint or saturated respectively.
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Expected detections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>( N_c )</th>
<th>( N_o )</th>
<th>( N_d )</th>
<th>( N_c )</th>
<th>( N_o )</th>
<th>( N_d )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ONC</td>
<td>152.9</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 2362</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h&amp;\chi Per</td>
<td>2590.3</td>
<td>560.1</td>
<td>201.2</td>
<td>515.7</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 2457</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 4665</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanco 1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M50</td>
<td>245.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 2516</td>
<td>154.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M34</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3400.2</td>
<td>702.5</td>
<td>278.9</td>
<td>812.0</td>
<td>144.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Expected number of binaries, eclipsing binaries and detectable eclipsing binaries, and of planets, transiting planets and detectable transiting planets, for each cluster and for the survey as a whole, under the assumptions described in the text.

- RV follow-up:
  - 100% of the EBs whose eclipses can be detected also produce RV modulations detectable with VLT +FLAMES
  - 25% can be detected from a 4m
  - Only 29% of the planets in the ONC, and 10% of those in NGC2547, produce a detectable RV signal
Membership selection
Candidates

- 25 priority 1 candidates in 4 clusters so far
- ages 1 - 130 Myr
- 10 with depths compatible with planet
- completely unprecedented sample
- spectroscopy needed to
  - confirm cluster membership
  - measure companion masses
- follow-up strategy
  - start with medium res from 4m
  - move to high res from 8m
  - optical fro precision RV
  - IR to resolve both sets of lines
ONC 1-295

- bright (I=12.65), likely member (proper motion, Hillenbrand 1997), M2V, M~0.2M☉
- 3 partial primary eclipses + 1 partial primary eclipse in 2004B INT data + 2006A NMSU 1m data (courtesy J. Holzman)
- sine fit to remove out-of-eclipse variations (rotational modulation, p=0.78d)
- double trapeze fit: period=4.674d, depths=13.8% & 8.4%
- spectroscopy (WHT+ISIS, Magellan+MIKE, VLT+ISAAC): M4-M5V, RV amplitude > 50km/s (few km/s precision)
- independently discovered by Stassun et al.
- full double-lined orbital solution + multi-band light curve fits to be published soon
ONC 1-290

- likely member (Hillenbrand 1997)
- 5 partial eclipses observed in 2004B INT + 2006A NMSU 1m data
- no detrending applied (variability irregular)
- box fit: period=2.65d, depth=4%
- spectroscopy: M1V, no RV variations at the 3-4km/s level: v low mass
- single high resolution spectrum (courtesy K. Stassun) shows it’s an SB2
- more data coming this season
M50 2-3089

- $I = 16.41, V = 17.64$
- 3 partial + 2 full primary eclipses & 1 secondary eclipse in 2005A/B CTIO data
- Secondary eclipse (as well as more primaries) seen in second season
- $I = 16.41, V = 17.64, P = 1.350$ days, $\text{dur} = 0.09$ days, $\text{depths} = 9 / 1.5$
- First guess at component masses from relative eclipse depths and apparent magnitudes: $M_1 \sim 0.7 M_\odot, M_2 \sim 0.2 M_\odot$ (Baraffe et al. 1998, 130 Myr).
- That would lead to $K \sim 41$ km/s.
What can we say already?

- **ONC-1-290**
  - $0.15 \leq M_1 \leq 0.25 \ M_\odot$
  - $1.6 \leq R_1 \leq 1.8 \ R_\odot$ (from $T_{\text{eff}}$ & $L$)
  - $M_2 \leq 0.04 \ M_\odot$
  - $0.39 \leq R_2 \leq 0.44 \ R_\odot$

- **ONC-1-295**
  - $0.35 \leq M_1 \leq 0.9 \ M_\odot$
  - $2.3 \leq R_1 \leq 2.6 \ R_\odot$
  - $M_2 \geq 0.1 \ M_\odot$
  - $R_2 \geq 0.7 \ R_\odot$

- **M50-2-3089**
  - $M_1 \sim 0.7 \ M_\odot$
  - $R_1 \sim 0.6 \ R_\odot$
  - $M_2 \sim 0.2 \ M_\odot$
  - $R_2 \sim 0.18 \ R_\odot$