Deriving accurate surface gravity values for planet host stars

Annelies Mortier

Nuno C. Santos, S.G. Sousa, V.Zh. Adibekyan, I.M. Brandão

Towards Other Earths II The Star-Planet Connection

17 September 2014, Porto







Deriving accurate surface gravity values for planet host stars FGK dwarfs

Annelies Mortier

Nuno C. Santos, S.G. Sousa, V.Zh. Adibekyan, I.M. Brandão

Towards Other Earths II The Star-Planet Connection

17 September 2014, Porto







Outline

Introduction

2 Deriving stellar parameters

- Method
- Line list

Surface gravity determination

- Transits
- Asteroseismology
- Correction formulae
- Compare with IRFM

Conclusions

Introduction



Stellar and planetary characterization – Star-planet connection – Galactic evolution – . . .

Annelies Mortier (St Andrews)

Accurate loggs for FGK dwarfs

Introduction



Annelies Mortier (St Andrews)

Spectroscopic analysis: high-resolution spectroscopy



Spectroscopic analysis: high-resolution spectroscopy



Individual spectral line analysis

FGK stars - Method overview



FGK stars - Method overview



Carefully chosen stable line list set



(Tsantaki et al. 2013)

• Sousa et al. (2008) for stars with $T_{eff} > 5200\,K$ • Tsantaki et al. (2013) for stars with $T_{eff} \le 5200\,K$

SWEET-Cat: a catalog of stellar parameters for stars with planets

Download Data

																				_
Name	HD number	RA	Dec	Vmag	o(Vmag)	π	σ(π)	Source of π	Teff	σ(Teff)	logg	σ(logg)	LC logg	σ(LC logg)	Vt	σ(Vt)	[Fe/H]	σ([Fe/H])	Mass	σ(1
11 Com	107383	12 20 43.02	+17 47 34.33	4.74	0.02	11.25	0.22	Simbad	4830	79	2.61	0.13			1.70	0.10	-0.34	0.06	2.00	0.1
11 UMi	136726	15 17 05.88	+71 49 26.04	5.02		8.19	0.19	Simbad	4340	70	1.60	0.15			1.60	0.80	0.04	0.04	1.80	0.1
14 And	221345	23 31 17.41	+39 14 10.30	5.22		12.63	0.27	Simbad	4773	100	2.53	0.10			1.64	0.30	-0.26	0.11	1.45	
14 Her	145675	16 10 24.31	+43 49 03.52	6.67		56.91	0.34	Simbad	5311	87	4.42	0.18			0.92	0.10	0.43	0.08	0.95	0.0
16 Cyg B	186427	19 41 51.97	+50 31 03.08	6.20		47.14	0.27	Simbad	5772	25	4.40	0.07			1.07	0.04	0.08	0.04	1.00	0.0
18 Del	199665	20 58 25.93	+10 50 21.42	5.52		13.28	0.31	Simbad	5076	38	3.08	0.10			1.32	0.04	0.00	0.03	2.33	0.0
24 Sex	90043	10 23 28.37	-00 54 08.09	6.44	0.01	12.91	0.38	Simbad	5069	62	3.40	0.13			1.27	0.07	-0.01	0.05	1.81	0.0
<u>30 Ari B</u>	16232	02 36 57.74	+24 38 53.02	7.09		24.52	R.68	Simbad	6377	170	4.49	0.05		÷	κ.		0.14	0.18	1.16	0.0
4 Uma	73108	08 40 12.81	+64 19 40.57	4.60		12.74	0.26	Simbad	4564	100	2.28	0.10			1.69	0.30	-0.16	0.13	1.48	
42 Dra	170693	18 25 59.13	+65 33 48.52	4.83		10.36	0.20	Simbad	4513	100	2.24	0.10			1.59	0.30	-0.39	0.12	1.74	
47.Uma	95128	10 59 27.97	+40 25 48.92	5.04	0.05	71.11	0.25	Simbad	5954	25	4.44	0.10			1.30	0.04	0.06	0.03	1.04	0.0
<u>51 Peg</u>	217014	22 57 27.98	+20 46 07.79	5.46	0.05	64.07	0.38	Simbad	5804	36	4.42	0.07			1.20	0.05	0.20	0.05	1.04	0.0
55 Cnc	75732	08 52 35.81	+28 19 50.95	5.95	0.05	81.03	0.75	Simbad	5279	62	4.37	0.18			0.98	0.07	0.33	0.07	0.93	0.0
6 Lyn	45410	06 30 47.10	+58 09 45.48	5.88		17.92	0.47	Simbad	4978	18	3.16	0.05		-	1.10	0.07	-0.13	0.02	1.70	0.3
																(5	Santo	s et al.	2013	3)

Catalogue of homogeneously derived parameters for planet hosts

Surface gravity from photometric transit

90 transit hosts analysed



$$\rho_* + k^3 \rho_p = \frac{3\pi}{GP^2} \left(\frac{a}{R_*}\right)^3$$

Spectroscopic surface gravity not well constrained. Transit light curve surface gravity more precise and accurate



Mean differences

 $19\,K$ and $0.02\,dex$

Mean absolute deviation 66.5 K and 0.03 dex

Systematic, but small trends, even for very large logg differences

Transit logg may also be inaccurate (Huber et al. 2013)



Annelies Mortier (St Andrews)

86 FGK stars analysed



Use large separation $\Delta \nu$, maximum frequency ν_{max} , effective temperature $T_{\rm eff}$, metallicity [Fe/H], and PARSEC isochrones

Asteroseismic surface gravity more precise and accurate



Mean differences

68 K and 0.04 dex

Mean absolute deviation 28.5 K and 0.02 dex

Same systematic, but small trends as with the transit sample

Linear correction formula



Correcting for the spectroscopic logg will not make it more precise, but it will make it more accurate!

Comparison with accurate IRFM



Our unconstrained spectroscopic results can be trusted!

Conclusions

- Precise, homogeneous, and accurate stellar parameters are crucial
- Our long-standing spectroscopic method to analyse **FGK stars** provides precise, accurate, and homogeneous results
- Surface gravity is not well constrained by spectroscopy but by using the ARES+MOOG method combined with SO08+TS13 line list set, there is only a marginal effect on the other atmospheric parameters
- $\bullet\,$ Planetary mass and radius differ only by 1.3-2% and 1-1.5%
- **Temperatures, metallicities, and microturbulences** developed by our method+linelist have been proven to be **consistent** with various methods
- Our spectroscopic surface gravity can be **easily corrected with a linear formula**

Conclusions

- Precise, homogeneous, and accurate stellar parameters are crucial
- Our long-standing spectroscopic method to analyse **FGK stars** provides precise, accurate, and homogeneous results
- Surface gravity is not well constrained by spectroscopy but by using the ARES+MOOG method combined with SO08+TS13 line list set, there is only a marginal effect on the other atmospheric parameters
- $\bullet\,$ Planetary mass and radius differ only by 1.3-2% and 1-1.5%
- **Temperatures, metallicities, and microturbulences** developed by our method+linelist have been proven to be **consistent** with various methods
- Our spectroscopic surface gravity can be **easily corrected with a linear formula**

