

# THE FIVE PLANETS ASSOCIATED WITH THE KEPLER-296 STELLAR BINARY ORBIT THE PRIMARY

THOMAS BARCLAY<sup>1,2</sup>, ELISA V. QUINTANA<sup>1,7</sup>, DAVID CIARDI<sup>3</sup>, DANIEL HUBER<sup>1,4</sup>, DANIEL FOREMAN-MACKEY<sup>5</sup>, DOUGLAS CALDWELL<sup>1,4</sup>, FRED C. ADAMS<sup>6</sup>, BENJAMIN T. MONTET<sup>7</sup>,

*To be submitted to ApJ*

## ABSTRACT

Five transiting planets have been confirmed to be associated with Kepler-296. However, Kepler-296 is a binary system with two M-dwarf components separated by 0.2". Hitherto, the uncertainty in knowing which star the planets orbit has made it difficult to constrain the planets' orbital and physical properties. We show here through statistical arguments that all five planets are highly likely to orbit the same star. We then performed a Markov-Chain Monte Carlo simulation using a five transiting planet model, leaving the stellar density and dilution with uniform priors. Using importance sampling, we then compared the model probabilities under the priors of the planets orbiting either the brighter or the fainter component in the binary. Our strongly preferred model is that the planets orbit the brighter component, Kepler-296A. Given our assertion that all five planets orbit the same star, the two outer planets in the system, Kepler-296 Ae and Kepler-296 Af have radii of  $1.55 \pm 0.28$  and  $1.82 \pm 0.32$   $R_{\oplus}$ , respectively and receive incident fluxes of  $1.41 \pm 0.24$  and  $0.62 \pm 0.10$  times the incident flux the Earth receives from the Sun. This level of irradiation places both planets within or close to the circumstellar habitable zone of their parent star.

*Subject headings:* planetary systems; stars: fundamental parameters; stars: individual (Kepler-296, KIC 11497958, KOI-1422); techniques: photometric; stars: statistics

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Most stars are components of multiple star systems (Abt 1979; Duquennoy & Mayor 1991; Raghavan et al. 2010), therefore it seems logical to assume that most planets also reside in multiple star systems. Planet formation was once thought to be inhibited in binary star systems due to the large gravitational perturbations from a companion star (?). However, with the discovery of many hundreds of exoplanets (e.g. Rowe et al. 2014), it has been shown that not only do many planets exist in binary star systems (?), but that provided the stellar components are well separated there is no suppression in the planet occurrence rates (Wang et al. 2014). Indeed, as many as 40–50% of known exoplanets may orbit a component of a multiple star system (Horch et al. 2014).

In multiple star systems with transiting planets it is often not trivial to determine which stellar component a planet orbits. Most binary stars will not be resolved as separate stars. Radial velocity observations of a planet in a binary star system can help identify which of the stars is the exoplanet host (except perhaps for an equal mass binary), and in some cases even reveal the presence of a stellar companion (?). Radial velocity observations are not always available, however, thus it is often the case that we know that a transiting planet exists but that the planet's host star remains uncertain.

Kepler-296 is a binary star system that contains five small planets. The system consists of two stars sepa-

rated by 0.22" (Horch et al. 2012) with a brightness difference of 1.72 mag at 692 nm. Lissauer et al. (2014) and Star et al. (2014) have reported that these two stars are highly likely to be M-dwarfs in a binary star system. The Kepler pipeline detected five transiting planet candidates associated with this system (Batalha et al. 2013; Tenenbaum et al. 2013, 2014; Burke et al. 2014) which were designated Kepler Object of Interest numbers KOI-1422.01 to .05<sup>7</sup>. These five candidates were later verified as planets through multiplicity arguments (Rowe et al. 2014; Lissauer et al. 2014)<sup>8</sup>. However, as pointed out by Lissauer et al. (2014), which of the two stars any of the planet orbit is difficult to establish.

The Kepler-296 planets are too small and the star is too faint to obtain detectable radial velocity measurements. The goal of this article is to determine which star hosts the transiting planets and provide updated orbital and physical parameters for the planets.

## 2. DETERMINING THE FLUX RATIO BETWEEN THE TWO STARS

We observed Kepler-296 using the NIRC-2 instrument on the Keck-II telescope using the Laser Guide Star Adaptive Optics (LGS-AO) system on 2013-08-08. We obtained a total integration time of 80 s with the *Ks* filter and 36 s in *J* band. As shown in Figure 1, two stellar components are clearly resolved in the AO images. The flux ratio between the two stars in the *J*-band image is  $1.10 \pm 0.04$  and in the *Ks*-band image is  $1.14 \pm 0.04$  (brightnesses are shown in Table 1).

<sup>7</sup> The KOI numbers for this system do not increase monotonically with orbital period but represent the order they were discovered. Hence, KOI-1422.05 has a shorter orbital period than KOI-1422.04.

<sup>8</sup> We note that both Rowe et al. and Lissauer et al. report a planet with an orbital period of 3.62 d. However, we believe that this planet has an orbital period three times longer at 10.86 d.

<sup>1</sup> NASA Ames Research Center, M/S 244-30, Moffett Field, CA 94035, USA

<sup>2</sup> Bay Area Environmental Research Institute, 596 1st Street West, Sonoma, CA 95476, USA

<sup>3</sup> California Institute of Technology

<sup>4</sup> SETI Institute, 189 Bernardo Ave, Mountain View, CA 94043, USA

<sup>5</sup> NYU

<sup>7</sup> NASA Senior Fellow

TABLE 1  
SUMMARY OF PROPERTIES DERIVED FROM AO DATA

Property	Primary	Secondary
J	$13.73 \pm 0.03$	$14.83 \pm 0.03$
Ks	$12.93 \pm 0.03$	$14.07 \pm 0.03$
(J-Ks)	$0.80 \pm 0.04$	$0.76 \pm 0.04$
$\Delta R.A.$ (arcsec)		-0.130
$\Delta Dec.$ (arcsec)		-0.174
$\Delta\theta$ (arcsec)		0.217

Kepler-296 was observed as part of a campaign to obtain infrared spectra of cool Kepler Objects of Interest (KOIs) (Muirhead et al. 2012, 2014). They reported a stellar effective temperature,  $T_{\text{eff}} = 3520 \pm 70$  K and an iron abundance  $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = -0.08 \pm 0.14$  dex.

We reanalyzed the spectrum from Muirhead et al. (2014) using the same spectral fitting technique (Rojas-Ayala et al. 2012) but with a two spectrum model fit applied to account for the two stars in Kepler-296. In the fitting routine we fixed the  $\Delta J$ -band magnitude difference between the two stars to the values we measured using the AO data. With this analysis we find temperatures for the two stars of  $3435 \pm 58$  K and  $3770 \pm 128$  K and a surface gravity of  $4.89 \pm 0.04$  dex and  $4.74 \pm 0.04$  dex, for the secondary and primary star, respectively. In our fitting we assumed that the two stars have an identical metallicity which we fit for and found an  $[\text{M}/\text{H}] = -0.05 \pm 0.29$ . We note that the parameters found here are somewhat cooler than Star et al. (2014) who used HST photometry to determine their stellar properties. We have opted to use our values which are derived from spectroscopy to the photometric properties measured previously.

Starting with the temperature, gravity and metallicity from our spectral fitting, we used a Markov-Chain Monte Carlo approach to infer additional stellar properties such as radius, mass, density and flux ratio in the Kepler bandpass of the two stars. To do this we sampled from Dartmouth isochrones (Dotter et al. 2008)... **We need to write in how Huber gets the stellar properties using his fancy new MCMC algorithm**

Kepler has 4" pixels, therefore the two components which are separated by  $0.217''$  are unresolved in the Kepler data and can be treated as a point source. From our MCMC modeling we estimate a brightness difference in the Kepler bandpass of  $\Delta K_p = 1.362 \pm 0.080$  which is equivalent to saying that  $78.8 \pm 1.3\%$  of the light is coming from the primary and  $22.2 \pm 1.3\%$  from the secondary star in the binary. This is in good agreement with the results of ? who report unpublished Hubble Space Telescope observations that measure a brightness ratio of the two components of 5-to-1. Hereafter we define dilution as the proportion of total light coming from the other star, so the dilution of the primary star is  $0.222 \pm 0.013$ .

### 3. KEPLER LIGHT CURVE MODELING

We modeled the long cadence Kepler data (Quintana et al. 2010; Twicken et al. 2010b) using a light curve model described by Rowe et al. (2014) and Quintana et al. (2014) that comprises of limb darkened transits (Mandel & Agol 2002) of five planet and allows the planets to be on eccentric orbits. The parameters that describe the model are the mean density of the star, a linear and a quadratic limb darkening coefficient, a pho-




FIG. 1.— NIRC-2 images of Kepler-296 in  $K_s$  and  $J$  filters show two stars separated by  $0.217''$ . The two images are scaled appropriately to account for differences in exposure time. The magnitude difference between the two stars is  $\Delta J = 1.10$  and  $\Delta K_s = 1.14$ .

TABLE 2  
DERIVED STELLAR PROPERTIES

Property	Primary	Secondary
$T_{\text{eff}}$ (K)	$3730^{+140}_{-140}$	$3441^{+75}_{-78}$
$\log g$ (dex)	$4.771^{+0.083}_{-0.056}$	$4.924^{+0.081}_{-0.061}$
$[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ (dex)	$-0.06^{+0.27}_{-0.26}$	$-0.0^{+0.27}_{-0.26}$
Radius ( $R_{\odot}$ )	$0.483^{+0.063}_{-0.080}$	$0.331^{+0.058}_{-0.064}$
Mass ( $M_{\odot}$ )	$0.502^{+0.064}_{-0.079}$	$0.336^{+0.067}_{-0.074}$
$\rho$ (g/cc)	$6.3^{+2.8}_{-1.4}$	$13^{+6}_{-3}$
$\Delta K_p$	0	$1.362 \pm 0.080$
Dilution	$0.222 \pm 0.013$	$0.788 \pm .013$

tometric zero-point, and for each planet, the mid-point of the first transit, the orbital period of the planet, the impact parameter at time of mid-transit, the planet-to-star radius ratio and two eccentricity vectors  $e \sin \omega$  and  $e \cos \omega$  where  $e$  is the eccentricity and  $\omega$  is the argument of periastron. We also include an additional white noise term that is added in quadrature with the uncertainty reported in the Kepler data products. Finally, we include the dilution from the other star as a model parameter.




FIG. 2.— Results of an MCMC simulation to determine the stellar properties of Kepler-296A and B. The upper panel shows the effective temperature and mean stellar density of stellar tracks that match the metallicity constraint from the spectroscopy. The red and green data points with uncertainties are shown for Kepler-296 A and B. The hotter star has a temperature and density of  $3730^{+140}_{-140}$  K and  $6.3^{+2.8}_{-1.4}$  g/cc while the cooler star is  $3441^{+75}_{-78}$  K with a density of  $13^{+6}_{-3}$  g/cc. We use the density constraints as priors in our transit modeling. **Make a less ugly figure**

We used the Q1-Q15 Kepler light curves. This target falls onto the failed Module 3 which resulted in no data for this source being taken in Quarters 8, 12 and 16. We used pre-search conditioned light curve data (Twicken et al. 2010a) which minimizes the instrumental signals. To remove astrophysical variability such as star spots we used a running median filter but weighted the transits zero in this filtering so as to avoid overly distorting the transit profiles.

We used a `emcee` implementation of an affine invariant Markov Chain Monte Carlo algorithm to efficiently explore the posterior probability of our transit model (Goodman & Weare 2010; Foreman-Mackey et al. 2013). We have made the assumption that all the planets orbit a single star but that star could either be Kepler-296A or Kepler-296B. In the sampling we assumed uniform priors on the mean stellar density between  $10^{-4}$  and 200 g/cc and a dilution,  $f$  that is uniform between 0 and 1 where the total light from the system is unity and the light from the targets star is  $1 - f$ .

We use uniform priors on the photometric zero point, the transit mid-point times, the orbital period of the planets, the impact parameters are positive uniform as is the planet-to-star radius ratio. Following Kipping (2013) we use a prior on the eccentricity of the orbits of the planets that takes the form of a beta distribution

$$P_{\beta} = \frac{1}{B(a, b)} e^{a-1} (1-e)^{b-1} \quad (1)$$

where  $e$  is the orbital eccentricity of each planet and  $B$




FIG. 3.—

is the beta function. Rowe et al. (2014) found that for multiple transiting planet systems the best fitting values for parameters  $(a, b)$  are  $a=0.4497$  and  $b=1.7938$  which we use in this work. In addition to the beta distribution prior on  $e$  we also enforce a  $1/e$  prior on the eccentricity which is required owing to our parameterization in terms of  $e \sin \omega$  and  $e \cos \omega$  (Eastman et al. 2013). Finally, we do not allow eccentricities that would allow for crossing orbits of any of the planets.

Limb darkening is poorly constrained in the regime of cool stars (Claret et al. 2012; ?), so we assume a uniform distribution of the two limb darkening parameters but do enforce priors that keep the stellar brightness profile physical (Burke et al. 2008).

In each simulation we used 800 chains with each chain calculating 50,000 realization of the transit model. However, we discarded the first 10,000 steps in each chain for burn-in which leaves 32M samples of the posterior probability.

#### 4. MODEL COMPARISON

In our MCMC sampling we assumed uniform priors on stellar density and dilution. However, we are not ignorant of these parameters, indeed Section 2 describes out efforts to constrain these parameters. The reason for using uniform priors is that sampling from a bi-model parameter space which have well separated modes in difficult for standard MCMC algorithms (?), while performing two MCMC simulations makes comparing models with different priors difficult when the number of parameters is larger than 6-10 (?) and in our case we have 36 parameters.

We used a technique called importance sampling to re-

sample the sampled posterior under different priors than were used in the MCMC sampling. This is a well tested and used method when the posterior is difficult to sample directly (?). In this example we have two models let's call them  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ , with two different sets of priors that contain are our prior knowledge of the dilution and density for the planets orbiting the brighter star and the fainter star, respectively. Let's call  $\alpha$  the model we actually sampled from which is uniform in density and dilution. So we have  $K$  samples of  $(\rho_k, f_k)$  where

$$(\rho_k, f_k) \sim p(\rho, f | \mathbf{x}, \alpha) = \frac{p(\rho, f | \alpha) p(\mathbf{x} | \rho, f)}{p(\mathbf{x} | \alpha)} \quad (2)$$

$(\rho_k, f_k)$  is drawn from  $p(\rho, f | \mathbf{x}, \alpha)$  where  $\mathbf{x}$  is the observed data. Now what we want to compute is the marginalized likelihood of the data under models  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ , e.g.

$$p(\mathbf{x} | \theta_n) = \int d\rho df p(\mathbf{x}, \rho, f | \theta_n) \quad (3)$$

$$= \int d\rho df p(\rho, f | \theta_n) p(\mathbf{x} | \rho, f) \quad (4)$$

where  $p(\rho, f | \theta_n)$  is the prior we want to enforce ( $\theta_n$  can be either  $\theta_1$  or  $\theta_2$ ) and is based on the measured density  $\rho_q$  and dilution  $f_q$  with uncertainties  $\delta\rho_q, \delta f_q$  such that

$$p(\rho, f | \theta_n) = N(\rho; \rho_q, \delta\rho_q) N(f; f_q, \delta f_q) \quad (5)$$

Using the posterior samples from our MCMC sampling, we can approximate the integral as

$$p(\mathbf{x} | \theta_n) = \int d\rho df p(\rho, f | \theta_n) p(\mathbf{x} | \rho, f) \frac{p(\rho, f | \mathbf{x}, \alpha)}{p(\rho, f | \mathbf{x}, \alpha)} \quad (6)$$

$$= p(\mathbf{x} | \alpha) \times \quad (7)$$

$$\int d\rho df \frac{p(\rho, f | \theta_n) p(\mathbf{x} | \rho, f)}{p(\rho, f | \mathbf{x}, \alpha) p(\mathbf{x} | \rho, f)} p(\rho, f | \mathbf{x}, \alpha) \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{p(\mathbf{x} | \theta_n)}{p(\mathbf{x} | \alpha)} \approx \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{p(\rho_k, f_k | \theta_n)}{p(\rho_k, f_k | \alpha)} \quad (9)$$

which allows us to resample our data under the new priors. For a straight comparison between  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  where the the initial model sampled uniformly in the parameters that we are importance sampling over the ratio between our two models is

$$\frac{p(\mathbf{x} | \theta_1)}{p(\mathbf{x} | \theta_2)} \approx \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K p(\rho_{k1}, f_{k1} | \theta_1)}{\sum_{k=1}^K p(\rho_{k2}, f_{k2} | \theta_2)}. \quad (10)$$

We performed the above calculated with our sampled distribution and found that  $p(\mathbf{x} | \theta_1)/p(\mathbf{x} | \theta_2) = 1527$ , that is we are confident that the planets orbiting the primary with a confidence level of 99.9%, provided all planets orbit the same star star.

## 5. REVISED PARAMETERS WITH THE PLANETS ORBITING THE PRIMARY

Given we are very confident that all the planets orbit the primary star (provided they all orbit the same star), we can revise the stellar and planetary properties we calculated from our light curve modeling. The inferred parameters were calculated by weighting the original samples by the marginalized likelihood under the model of the planet orbiting Kepler-296 – weights are equal to

the probability  $p(\mathbf{x} | \theta)/p(\mathbf{x} | \alpha)$ . In Table 3 the weighted median and weighted quartiles are reported where, for example, a weighted median has 50% of the weight on either side. In addition to the sampled parameters we report the ratio of the semi-major axis to the stellar radius ( $a/R_s$ ), the semi-major axis ( $a$ ), the planetary radius ( $R_p$ ) and the stellar flux incident on the planets ( $S_p$ ).  $a/R_s$  depends only on stellar density and orbital period, while  $a$  and  $R_p$  rely on the stellar radius. We draw  $n$  stellar radii samples from the MCMC stellar property chains to properly include the stellar radius uncertainty and multiply these by  $a/R_s$  and  $R_p/R_s$  to infer  $a$  and  $R_p$ , where  $n$  is the number of transit model samples.  $S_p$  in solar-earth units can be parameterized as a function of  $a/R_s$  and  $T_s$  so that

$$S_p/S_{\oplus} = \left( \frac{R_s}{a} \times \frac{a_{\oplus}}{R_{\odot}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{T_s}{T_{\odot}} \right)^4 \quad (11)$$

where  $S_{\odot}$  is the incident flux on the Earth from the Sun,  $a_{\oplus}/R_{\odot}$  is the semi-major axis of the Earth in units of stellar radius and  $T_{\odot}$  is the effective temperature of the Sun.

The five planets have radii of between 1.5 and 2.1  $R_{\oplus}$ , which places places Kepler-296A into an elite group of planets with five small transiting planet that also includes Kepler-62 (Borucki et al. 2013), Kepler-186 (Quintana et al. 2014) and KOI-3158 (Campante 2014). Kepler-296A is also one of a very small number stars to host a sub-2  $R_{\oplus}$  with incident flux an less than Earth receives from the Sun.

## 6. DISCUSSION

The key assumption made in the analysis so far all five planets orbit the same star. However, there is at least one example of a planetary system with planets orbiting each star - Kepler-132 (Lissauer et al. 2014). In the Kepler-132 system, two planets orbit one star while one planet the other.

For both components in a binary system to host transiting planets, the planetary orbital plane of both stars must be closely aligned, otherwise we would not see transits from both stars. With a projected separation of just 0.217" and at a distance of  $163^{+55}_{-10}$  pc these stars are at a projected separation of  $35^{+11}_{-2}$  AU. Whether the two stars in a binary have mutually aligned disks is partially dependent on their formation mechanism.

We constructed a simulation where we assumed that the found outer planets orbit the same star (in our simulation the secondary) and the inner planet orbits the primary star and then looked at what the chance of the inner planet transiting given the outer planets transit by (a) first assuming that there is no mutual inclinations between planetary disks in binaries and then (b) assuming the mutual inclination between planetary planes is uniform in  $\cos i$  between -30 and 30 degrees. By placing the planets around the fainter star and the inner planet around the larger, brighter stars we have constructed the most conservative case because the innermost planet has the highest probability to transit the larger stars owing to transit probability scaling with  $R/a$  where  $a$  is the semi-major axis and  $R$  is the stellar radius. For the inner planet to transit the outer star the inclination must be less than  $\pm 2.2^\circ$ . With no mutual inclination, given we

TABLE 3  
INFERRED STELLAR AND PLANETARY PARAMETERS FROM OUR MCMC MODELING. PARAMETERS ARE THE WEIGHTED QUANTILES OF THE POSTERIOR DISTRIBUTION WHERE THE WEIGHTS WERE CALCULATED VIA IMPORTANCE SAMPLING.

Body	Parameter	W. Med	84.1%	15.9%
Kepler-296 A	$\rho$ (g/cc)	7.04	+0.87	-0.93
	$\gamma_1$	0.79	+0.20	-0.27
	$\gamma_2$	-0.13	+0.34	-0.26
	Dilution	0.222	+0.013	-0.013
Kepler-296 Ac	Epoch (BKJD)	135.9229	+0.0013	-0.0013
	Period (days)	5.8416364	+9.9e-6	-9.7e-6
	Impact parameter	0.25	+0.18	-0.16
	$R_p/R_s$	0.0382	+0.0014	-0.0012
	$e \cos \omega$	0.000	+0.043	-0.048
	$e \sin \omega$	-0.000	+0.019	-0.046
	Radius ( $R_\oplus$ )	2.02	+0.34	-0.34
	Incident Flux ( $S_\oplus$ )	14.9	+2.8	-2.3
	$a/R_s$	23.3	+0.9	-1.1
	$a$ (AU)	0.0521	+0.0090	-0.0088
Kepler-296 Ad	Epoch (BKJD)	133.6495	+0.0022	-0.0022
	Period (days)	19.850292	+6.2e-5	-5.7e-5
	Impact parameter	0.27	+0.18	-0.16
	$R_p/R_s$	0.0400	+0.0014	-0.0013
	$e \cos \omega$	0.000	+0.048	-0.0041
	$e \sin \omega$	-0.001	+0.020	-0.048
	Radius ( $R_\oplus$ )	2.11	+0.36	-0.35
	Incident Flux ( $S_\oplus$ )	2.91	+0.54	-0.45
	$a/R_s$	52.7	+2.1	-2.4
	$a$ (AU)	0.118	+0.020	-0.020
Kepler-296 Ab	Epoch (BKJD)	131.1284	+0.0030	-0.0039
	Period (days)	10.864384	+5.1e-5	-4.6e-5
	Impact parameter	0.65	+0.09	-0.20
	$R_p/R_s$	0.0309	+0.0019	-0.0021
	$e \cos \omega$	0.000	+0.087	-0.072
	$e \sin \omega$	0.01	+0.15	-0.04
	Radius ( $R_\oplus$ )	1.63	+0.30	-0.28
	Incident Flux ( $S_\oplus$ )	6.5	+1.2	-1.0
	$a/R_s$	35.3	+1.4	-1.6
	$a$ (AU)	0.079	+0.014	-0.013
Kepler-296 Af	Epoch (BKJD)	162.6067	+0.0070	-0.0071
	Period (days)	63.33628	+0.00057	-0.00062
	Impact parameter	0.55	+0.10	-0.23
	$R_p/R_s$	0.0345	+0.0021	-0.0019
	$e \cos \omega$	0.000	+0.066	-0.081
	$e \sin \omega$	-0.00	+0.010	-0.04
	Radius ( $R_\oplus$ )	1.82	+0.32	-0.31
	Incident Flux ( $S_\oplus$ )	0.62	+0.11	-0.10
	$a/R_s$	114.3	+4.5	-5.3
	$a$ (AU)	0.255	+0.044	-0.043
Kepler-296 Ae	Epoch (BKJD)	136.0348	+0.0066	-0.0058
	Period (days)	34.14211	+0.00025	-0.00025
	Impact parameter	0.35	+0.19	-0.23
	$R_p/R_s$	0.0292	+0.0019	-0.0015
	$e \cos \omega$	0.000	+0.054	-0.055
	$e \sin \omega$	0.000	+0.045	-0.040
	Radius ( $R_\oplus$ )	1.55	+0.28	-0.27
	Incident Flux ( $S_\oplus$ )	1.41	+0.26	-0.22
	$a/R_s$	75.7	+3.0	-3.5
	$a$ (AU)	0.169	+0.029	-0.029




FIG. 4.— default

see four planets transit the fainter star, the probability we will see a transit of the planet around the innermost star is 3.8%, while with a uniform distribution in  $\cos i$  between -30 and 30 degrees the probability of transit increases to 4.4%. Let us compare this to the probability that the planet orbits the same star the other planets in the system, and assume for now that a star with known planets is not favored a priori to host more. The probability to transit the cooler star would be close to 100% assuming a mutual inclination of rocky planets of  $< 2^\circ$ ?, so we favor a scenario where the innermost planet orbits the same star as the other planets by a factor of 23 over the planet orbiting the companion star. Similar arguments can be made for the other planets and while we do not consider the planets orbiting different stars

inconceivable, it is not especially likely.

Our confidence that the planets all orbit the same star is further strengthened looking at the transit durations of the five planets scaled by the orbital speed assuming a circular orbit.....

Habitable zone discussion.

## 7. NOMENCLATURE

We want to briefly touch upon our naming system for the planets this system. The five planets have KOI numbers 1422.01, 1422.03, KOI-1422.02, KOI-1422.05 and KOI-1422.04 in order of increasing orbital period. Owing to the additional data available to us in this work, we realized that KOI-1422.03 had an orbital period of 10.86 days, a factor of three longer than was reported by Rowe et al. (2014) and Lissauer et al. (2014) who assigned the Kepler number 296 to this system. To retain consistency with Rowe et al. (2014) we stick with identified letter *b* to identify KOI-1422.03 even though planet *b* now has a long orbital period than planet *c*. We also include the letter *A* to recognize out belief that the planet orbit the primary star in the binary. Consequently, identifiers now used for these planets, in order of increasing orbital period are Kepler-296 Ac, Kepler-296 Ab, Kepler-296 Ad, Kepler-296 Ae and Kepler-296 Af. We summarize this information in Table 4.

TABLE 4  
NOMENCLATURE FOR THE KEPLER-296 A PLANETS.

$P_{\text{orb}}$ (d)	Burke et al. 2014	Rowe et al. 2014	This work
5.8	KOI-1422.01	Kepler-296 c	Kepler-296 Ac
10.9	KOI-1422.03	Kepler-296 b	Kepler-296 Ab
19.9	KOI-1422.02	Kepler-296 d	Kepler-296 Ad
34.1	KOI-1422.05	Kepler-296 e	Kepler-296 Ae
63.3	KOI-1422.04	Kepler-296 f	Kepler-296 Af

## 8. CONCLUSIONS

## APPENDIX

If transiting planets are observed in a binary system, they could in principle orbit either stellar member. If multiple planets are observed in transit, then the possibility that some planets orbit the primary while other planets orbit the secondary arises only if the orbital planes of the planetary systems orbiting the two stars nearly coincide. This set of notes presents arguments suggesting that the probability of such alignment is low.

## INTRODUCTION

Five planets are observed to transit the binary system Kepler-296 (which is also called KOI-1422). A key issue is thus to determine which of the two stars the planets are orbiting (?, main paper). In principle, one or more planets could orbit the secondary, while the others orbit the primary. In order for the planets to orbit different stars, and yet be seen in transit, the orbital planes of the two planetary systems must nearly line up (their angular momentum vectors must point in nearly the same direction).

In approximate terms, the difference in angle between the two orbital planes (of the two putative planetary systems), must be less than the alignment necessary for the planets to transit, i.e.,

$$\Delta\theta \lesssim \frac{R_*}{a_P} \sim \frac{0.3R_\odot}{0.2\text{AU}} \sim 0.0070 \text{ rad} \sim 0.4^\circ, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where we have used the small angle approximation. In other words, the required alignment is extremely tight, with a tolerance of less than a half a degree. The binary has a projected separation of about 35 AU, so the question becomes: What is the probability that nature will produce two planetary systems around the two binary components separated by at least 35 AU, such that the orbital angular momenta point in the same direction (within  $0.5^\circ$ )?

## CONSIDERATIONS OF DISK FORMATION

Molecular cloud cores are the sites of star formation and their angular momentum profiles drive the formation of the circumstellar disks (which, in turn, provides the sites for planet formation). The rotation rate of these cores is estimated by measuring the velocity gradient of a given molecular line across a map of the core (starting with ?). However, the direction of the inferred (two-dimensional) angular momentum vector varies from point to point within the map (?). As a result, the mean velocity gradients have values of  $\sim 1 - 2 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ pc}^{-1}$ , but the direction of the rotation varies by  $10 - 30$  degrees across the map. Moreover, the emission maps show a coherence length of  $\ell \approx 0.01 \text{ pc}$ , i.e., for two points separated by distances larger than  $\ell$ , the directions of the rotation vectors are uncorrelated. Here, “uncorrelated” means chosen randomly from the distribution of values within the measured range, where the measured range is of order 30 degrees. (The range is *not* 360 degrees; if that were the case, the rotation vectors would take on a purely random direction for points separated by distances greater than  $\ell$ .)

We can build a simple model of star/binary/disk formation using the results given above. As a first approximation, consider the density profile of the initial molecular cloud core to have the isothermal form

$$\rho = \Lambda \frac{a^2}{2\pi G r^2}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where  $a$  is the isothermal sound speed and  $\Lambda \sim 1 - 2$  is the overdensity factor (?) that accounts for the observed condensation velocities (?). The corresponding enclosed mass is thus given by

$$M(r) = \Lambda \frac{2a^2}{G} r. \quad (\text{B2})$$

The radius  $r_P$  that initial encloses the mass  $M_P$  of the primary can be written in the form

$$r_P = \frac{GM_P}{2\Lambda a^2} \approx 3 \times 10^{16} \text{ cm} \left( \frac{M_P}{0.33M_\odot} \right) \left( \frac{a}{0.20 \text{ km/s}} \right)^{-2}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

We thus note that  $r_p \sim \ell \sim 0.01 \text{ pc}$ , i.e., the sphere that initially contained the mass of the primary is comparable to the coherence length observed in molecular cloud cores. As a result, the primary, and the inner disk that forms its planetary system, can have a different direction for its angular momentum vector than the material that collapses later to form the secondary. Further, we would expect that the angle between the angular momenta of these different layers of the core to be 10s of degrees. With this type of initial conditions, the direction of the orbit of the binary companion is predicted to differ from that of the planetary system by 10s of degrees.

As a consistency check, consider the centrifugal radius produced during the collapse. When the inner portion of the core has collapsed to form the primary, the centrifugal radius

$$R_C = \frac{G^3 M_P^3 \Omega^2}{16\Lambda^3 a^8} \approx 2 - 20 \text{ AU}. \quad (\text{B4})$$

As a result, the primary and its planetary system, whose size is determined by  $R_C$  to leading order, can fit inside the observed binary orbital separation of the Kepler-296 system (which has projected separation of 35 AU and hence expected separation of about 70 AU).



This simple theoretical argument predicts that the disks observed in binary systems should not be perfectly aligned with the angular momentum vectors of the binary orbits and that the disks surrounding the two stars should not be aligned with each other. Since disks polarize the light scattered from their central stars, polarization measurements can be used to estimate the angular orientation of disks on the plane of the sky. Such a study has been carried out for a collection of 19 binary and higher-order multiple T Tauri systems (?); the results show that disks in binary systems are aligned with each other to within about  $20^\circ$ , but are not exactly coplanar. A similar study for southern star formation regions (?) finds similar results; for 15 binary systems, the observed angle differences shows a distribution of values, with all but one in the range  $0 - 40^\circ$ , and more than half of the sources showing relatively small angles  $\Delta\theta < 10^\circ$ .

Both the theoretical argument and the observational studies indicate that two planetary systems associated with the two members of a binary pair should be roughly – but not exactly – aligned. The range of possible orientation angles appears to be about  $\pm 20^\circ$ . We can thus make a simple estimate of the probability to find highly aligned planetary systems: If the relative inclination angle is drawn uniformly from the range  $-20^\circ < \Delta\theta < 20^\circ$ , and if we need  $|\Delta\theta| < 0.5^\circ$  to observe transits, then the required alignment will occur only about 1 out of 40 times (2.5%).

#### PROBABILITY

This section considers a simple probability argument: The five periods of the planets are observed to be almost equal spaced in a logarithmic sense: The period ratios between successive pairs of planets are all  $\sim 1.8$  (more precisely, 1.88, 1.83, 1.71, and 1.86, with a mean of  $1.82 \pm 0.066$ ). This chain of nearly equal period ratios can naturally be produced if the planets experienced convergent migration during their early stages of evolution. On the other hand, if one or more planets orbit the secondary (with the rest of the planets orbiting the primary), then this set of nearly equal period ratios would be highly unlikely.

If the five planets detected in association with Kepler-296 do not orbit the same star, then there should be no correlation (or anti-correlation) between the orbital periods of the planets orbiting the two different stars. Since there are many possibilities, let's illustrate this point by assuming that one planet orbits the secondary, while the other four planets orbit the primary. The period of the secondary planet should be independent of the periods of the four primary planets, so there is some chance that the secondary planetary period would be close to one of the periods of the others – close enough to render the system apparently unstable if one mistakenly considered the planets to orbit a single star.

To make a numerical estimate, let's say that the orbital periods are distributed with a log-random distribution. The observed planets have periods with a spacing of  $\sim 1.8$  (as described above). However, if a planetary pair were to have a period ratio that is too close to unity, it would (most likely, in the absence of a well-tuned resonant state) be unstable. In theory, instability sets in if/when the semi-major axes are too close, where “too close” means that their separation is less than several mutual Hill radii. In practice, however, we see that the Kepler multi-planet systems have extremely few period ratios less than 4:3, i.e., the ratio is almost never observed to be less than  $4/3=1.33$ .

Suppose we have a chain of planets with a factor of 1.8 spacing in period and we choose another planet from a log-random distribution. Then the chances of the new planet being too close to another planet in the chain is given approximately by the expression

$$P = \frac{\ln(4/3)}{\ln(1.8)} \approx 0.49. \quad (C1)$$

In other words, about 49 percent of the time, if you choose a planet around the secondary, it would have a period that is too close to one of the other planets (orbiting the primary), such that it would apparently lead to an unstable system.

One can derive a wide variety of probabilities, depending on how you define the system and what information you take as given. Let's now consider a more extreme case. Suppose that you have a planetary system with 4 planets orbiting the primary, with the observed factor of  $\sim 1.8$  spacing in orbital periods. And then suppose that you choose a 5th planet to orbit the secondary. In principle the 5th planet can have any orbital period and be stable. For the sake of definiteness, we take the allowed range of periods to be the range observed in the system, i.e., a factor of  $\sim 11$  in period. If we then require that the fifth planet continue the chain of period ratios, it must have a value in the range  $1.82 \pm 0.066$  times the period of the fourth planet. Thus, the probability of the 5th planet continuing the chain of period ratios is approximately given by

$$P \approx \frac{\ln(1.886/1.754)}{\ln(11)} \approx 0.030. \quad (C2)$$

In other words, the probability of continuing the observed chain of orbital period ratios is about 3 percent (and this value would be smaller if we allowed for a wider range of orbits to choose from).

#### DISCUSSION

The two arguments given above suggest that two highly aligned planetary systems orbiting the two members of a binary pair will be rare. More specifically, the chances of forming such a system (Section B) and the chances that planets orbiting two stars produce a coherent chain of period ratios (Section C) are both approximately 2 – 3%.

Either argument, by itself, is highly suggestive but not definitive. With a 3% occurrence rate, if we observe  $\sim 35$  binary systems containing multiple transiting planets, then we would expect to find sufficient alignment in (of order)



one system. In this case, however, the two arguments are independent. We need to see the five planets of the Kepler-296 system in transit (a 2.5% effect) and also see the observed chain of period ratios (another 3% effect). The chances of both properties occurring is thus much lower, with a probability  $P \sim (0.025)(0.03) = 7.5 \times 10^{-4}$ . With this probability, we would need to observe more than 1300 binary systems with multiple planets in order expect one with these properties.

Key question: How many binary systems with multiple planets are in the current version of the Kepler data set?

This paper includes data collected by the *Kepler* mission. Funding for the *Kepler* mission is provided by the NASA Science Mission Directorate. We would like to express out gratitude to all those who have worked on the Kepler pipeline over the many years of the Kepler mission. Some *Kepler* data presented in this paper were obtained from the Mikulski Archive for Space Telescopes (MAST) at the Space Telescope Science Institute (STScI). STScI is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., under NASA contract NAS5-26555. Support for MAST for non-HST data is provided by the NASA Office of Space Science via grant NNX09AF08G and by other grants and contracts. This research has made use of the NASA Exoplanet Archive, which is operated by the California Institute of Technology, under contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under the Exoplanet Exploration Program. This research made use of APLpy, an open-source plotting package for Python hosted at <http://aplpy.github.com>. This work was supported by a NASA Keck PI Data Award, administered by the NASA Exoplanet Science Institute. Some of the data presented herein were obtained at the W. M. Keck Observatory from telescope time allocated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration through the agency's scientific partnership with the California Institute of Technology and the University of California. The Observatory was made possible by the generous financial support of the W. M. Keck Foundation. The authors wish to recognize and acknowledge the very significant cultural role and reverence that the summit of Mauna Kea has always had within the indigenous Hawaiian community. We are most fortunate to have the opportunity to conduct observations from this mountain. E.V.Q. is supported by a NASA Senior Fellowship at the Ames Research Center, administered by Oak Ridge Associated Universities through a contract with NASA.

#### REFERENCES

- Abt, H. A. 1979, *AJ*, 84, 1591
- Batalha, N. M., Rowe, J. F., Bryson, S. T., et al. 2013, *ApJS*, 204, 24
- Borucki, W. J., Agol, E., Fressin, F., et al. 2013, *Science*, 340, 587
- Burke, C. J., McCullough, P. R., Valenti, J. A., et al. 2008, *ApJ*, 686, 1331
- Burke, C. J., Bryson, S. T., Mullally, F., et al. 2014, *ApJS*, 210, 19
- Campante, T. L. 2014, *ApJ*, submitted
- Claret, A., Hauschildt, P. H., & Witte, S. 2012, *A&A*, 546, A14
- Dotter, A., Chaboyer, B., Jevremović, D., et al. 2008, *ApJS*, 178, 89
- Duquennoy, A., & Mayor, M. 1991, *A&A*, 248, 485
- Eastman, J., Gaudi, B. S., & Agol, E. 2013, *PASP*, 125, 83
- Foreman-Mackey, D., Hogg, D. W., Lang, D., & Goodman, J. 2013, *PASP*, 125, 306
- Goodman, J., & Weare, J. 2010, *Comm. App. Math. Comp. Sci.*, 5, 65
- Horch, E. P., Howell, S. B., Everett, M. E., & Ciardi, D. R. 2012, *AJ*, 144, 165
- . 2014, *ArXiv e-prints*
- Kipping, D. M. 2013, *MNRAS*, 434, L51
- Lissauer, J. J., Marcy, G. W., Bryson, S. T., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 784, 44
- Mandel, K., & Agol, E. 2002, *ApJ*, 580, L171
- Muirhead, P. S., Hamren, K., Schlawin, E., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 750, L37
- Muirhead, P. S., Becker, J., Feiden, G. A., et al. 2014, *ApJS*, 213, 5
- Quintana, E. V., Jenkins, J. M., Clarke, B. D., et al. 2010, in *Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series*, Vol. 7740, Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series
- Quintana, E. V., Barclay, T., Raymond, S. N., et al. 2014, *Science*, 344, 277
- Raghavan, D., McAlister, H. A., Henry, T. J., et al. 2010, *ApJS*, 190, 1
- Rojas-Ayala, B., Covey, K. R., Muirhead, P. S., & Lloyd, J. P. 2012, *ApJ*, 748, 93
- Rowe, J. F., Bryson, S. T., Marcy, G. W., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 784, 45
- Star, K. M., Gilliland, R. L., Wright, J. T., & Ciardi, D. R. 2014, *ArXiv e-prints*
- Tenenbaum, P., Jenkins, J. M., Seader, S., et al. 2013, *ApJS*, 206, 5
- . 2014, *ApJS*, 211, 6
- Twicken, J. D., Chandrasekaran, H., Jenkins, J. M., et al. 2010a, in *Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series*, Vol. 7740, Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series
- Twicken, J. D., Clarke, B. D., Bryson, S. T., et al. 2010b, in *Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series*, Vol. 7740, Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series
- Wang, J., Xie, J.-W., Barclay, T., & Fischer, D. A. 2014, *ApJ*, 783, 4