HAT-P-44b, HAT-P-45b, AND HAT-P-46b: THREE TRANSITING HOT JUPITERS IN POSSIBLE MULTI-PLANET SYSTEMS
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ABSTRACT

We report the discovery by the HATNet survey of three new transiting extrasolar planets orbiting moderately bright (V = 13.2, 12.8, and 11.9) stars. The planets have orbital periods of 4.3012, 3.1290, and 4.4631 days, masses of 0.35, 0.89, and 0.49 M_J, and radii of 1.24, 1.43, and 1.28 R_J. The stellar hosts have masses of 0.94, 1.26, and 1.28 M_Sun. Each system shows significant systematic variations in its residual radial velocities, indicating the possible presence of additional components. Based on its Bayesian evidence, the preferred model for HAT-P-44 consists of two planets, including the transiting component, with the outer planet having a period of 872 days, eccentricity of 0.494 ± 0.081, and a minimum mass of 4.0 M_J. Due to aliasing we cannot rule out alternative solutions for the outer planet having a period of 220 days or 438 days. For HAT-P-45, at present there is not enough data to justify the additional free parameters included in a multi-planet model; in this case a single-planet solution is preferred, but the required jitter of 22.5 ± 6.3 m s^{-1} is relatively high for a star of this type. For HAT-P-46 the preferred solution includes a second planet having a period of 78 days and a minimum mass of 2.0 M_J, however the preference for this model over a single-planet model is not very strong. While substantial uncertainties remain as to the presence and/or properties of the outer planetary companions in these systems, the inner transiting planets are well characterized with properties that are fairly robust against changes in the assumed models for the outer planets. Continued radial velocity monitoring is necessary to fully characterize these three planetary systems, the properties of which may have important implications for understanding the formation of hot Jupiters.
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1. INTRODUCTION

There is mounting evidence that systems containing close-in, gas-giant planets (hot Jupiters) are fundamentally different from systems that do not contain such a planet. These differences are seen in the occurrence rate of multiple planets between systems with and without hot Jupiters and in the distribution of projected orbital obliquities18 of hot Jupiters compared to that of other planets.

1 Based on part on observations obtained at the W. M. Keck Observatory, which is operated by the University of California and the California Institute of Technology. Keck time has been granted by NOAO (A284hr) and NASA (N154hr, N108hr).
16 Sloan Fellow.
17 Packard Fellow.
18 We use the term obliquity here to refer to the angle between the orbital axis of a planet and the spin axis of its host star.

Out of the 192 systems listed in the exoplanets orbit database19 (Wright et al. 2011) containing a planet with P < 10 days and M_p sin i > 0.1 M_J, only 5 (2.6%) include confirmed, and well-characterized outer planets (these are υ And, Butler et al. 1997, 1999; HD 217107, Fischer et al. 1999; Vogt et al. 2005; HD 187123, Butler et al. 1998; Wright et al. 2007; HIP 14810, Wright et al. 2007; and HAT-P-13, Bakos et al. 2009). By contrast there are 98 multi-planet systems among the 421 systems (23%) in the database that do not have a hot Jupiter. In addition to the five confirmed multi-planet hot Jupiter systems, there are a number of other hot-Jupiter-bearing systems for which long term trends in their radial velocities (RVs) have been reported. These trends could be due to long-period planetary companions, but their periods are significantly longer than

19 http://www.exoplanets.org, accessed 2014 January 29.
the time spanned by the observations, and one cannot generally rule out stellar mass companions (a few examples from the Hungarian Automated Telescope Network, or HATNet, survey include HAT-P-7, Pál et al. 2008; HAT-P-17, Howard et al. 2012; Fulton et al. 2013; HAT-P-19, Hartman et al. 2011; and HAT-P-34, Bakos et al. 2012; see also recent results from the “Friends of Hot Jupiters” survey, Knutson et al. 2014). Differences in the occurrence rate of multiple planets between hot-Jupiter-hosting systems and other systems are also apparent from the sample of Kepler transiting planet candidates (Latham et al. 2011).

Observations of the Rossiter–McLaughlin effect have revealed that hot Jupiters exhibit a broad range of projected obliquities (e.g., Albrecht et al. 2012). In contrast, the ~5 multi-planet systems not containing a hot Jupiter, for which the projected obliquity of at least one of the planets has been determined, are all aligned (Albrecht et al. 2013). Differences in the obliquities have been interpreted as indicating different migration mechanisms between the two populations (Sanchis-Ojeda et al. 2012; Albrecht et al. 2013).

There are, however, selection effects which complicate this picture. While most multi-planet systems have been discovered by RV surveys or by the NASA Kepler space mission, the great majority of hot Jupiters have been discovered by ground-based transiting planet searches. For the latter surveys access to high-precision RV resources may be scarce, and the candidates are usually several magnitudes fainter than those targeted by RV surveys. To deal with these factors, ground-based transit surveys leverage the known ephemerides of their candidates so as to minimize the number of RV observations needed to detect the orbital variation. In practice this means that many published hot Jupiters do not have the long-term RV monitoring that would be necessary to detect other planetary companions, if present. Moreover, ground-based surveys produce light curves with much shorter time coverage and poorer precision than Kepler, so whereas Kepler has identified numerous multi-transiting-planet systems, ground-based surveys have not yet discovered any such systems.

In this paper we report the discovery of three new transiting planet systems by the HATNet survey (Bakos et al. 2004). The transiting planets are all classical hot Jupiters, confirmed through a combination of ground-based photometry and spectroscopy, including high-precision RV measurements made with Keck-I/HIRES which reveal the orbital motion of the star about the planet–star center-of-mass. In addition to the orbital motion due to the transiting planets, the RV measurements for all three systems show systematic variations indicating the possible presence of additional planetary-mass components. As we will show, for two of these systems (HAT-P-44 and HAT-P-46) we find that the observations are best explained by multi-planet models, while for the third system (HAT-P-45) additional RV observations would be necessary to claim an additional planet.

In Section 2 we summarize the detection of the photometric transit signal and the subsequent spectroscopic and photometric observations of each star to confirm the planets. In Section 3 we analyze the data to determine the stellar and planetary parameters. Our findings are discussed in Section 4.

2. OBSERVATIONS

The planets presented in this paper were first identified based on data from the HATNet telescopes, and then confirmed through follow-up observations with a variety of ground-based facilities. A general discussions of these procedures are provided in Bakos et al. (2010) and Latham et al. (2009). Here we provide details related to the identification and confirmation of the HAT-P-44, HAT-P-45, and HAT-P-46 systems.

2.1. Photometric Detection

Table 1 summarizes the HATNet discovery observations of each new planetary system. The HATNet images were processed and reduced to trend-filtered light curves following the procedure described by Bakos et al. (2010). The light curves were searched for periodic box-shaped signals using the Box Least-Squares (BLS; see Kovács et al. 2002) method. Figure 1 shows phase-folded HATNet light curves for HAT-P-44, HAT-P-45, and HAT-P-46 which were selected as showing highly significant transit signals based on their BLS spectra. Cross-identifications, positions, and the available photometry on an absolute scale are provided later in the paper together with other system parameters (Table 10).

We removed the detected transits from the HATNet light curves for each of these systems and searched the residuals for additional transits using BLS, and for other periodic signals using the Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT). Using DFT we do not find a significant signal in the frequency range 0 d$^{-1}$ to 50 d$^{-1}$ in the light curves of any of these systems. For HAT-P-44 we exclude signals with amplitudes above 1.2 mmag, for HAT-P-45 we exclude signals with amplitudes above 1.1 mmag, and for HAT-P-46 we exclude signals with amplitudes above 0.6 mmag. Similarly we do not detect additional transit signals in the light curves of HAT-P-44 or HAT-P-45. For HAT-P-46 we do detect a marginally significant transit signal with a short period of $P = 0.388$ d, a depth of 2.3 mmag, and a S/N in the BLS spectrum of 8.5. The period is neither a harmonic
nor an alias of the primary transit signal. Based on our prior experience following up similar signals detected in HATNet light curves we consider this likely to be a false alarm, but mention it here for full disclosure.

2.2. Reconnaissance Spectroscopy

High-resolution, low-S/N “reconnaissance” spectra were obtained for HAT-P-44, HAT-P-45, and HAT-P-46 using the Tillinghast Reflector Echelle Spectrograph (TRES; Füresz 2008) on the 1.5 m Tillinghast Reflector at FLWO. Medium-resolution reconnaissance spectra were also obtained for HAT-P-45 and HAT-P-46 using the Wide Field Spectrograph (WiFeS) on the ANU 2.3 m telescope at Siding Spring Observatory. The reconnaissance spectroscopic observations and results for each system are summarized in Table 2. The TRES observations were reduced and analyzed following the procedure described by Quinn et al. (2012) and Buchhave et al. (2010), yielding RVs with a precision of ∼50 m s$^{-1}$, and an absolute velocity zero-point accuracy of ∼100 m s$^{-1}$. The WiFeS observations were reduced and analyzed as described in Bayliss et al. (2013), providing RVs with a precision of 2.8 km s$^{-1}$.

Based on the observations summarized in Table 2 we find that all three systems have rms residuals consistent with no significant RV variation within the precision of the measurements (the WiFeS observations of HAT-P-46 have an rms of 3.3 km s$^{-1}$ which is only slightly above the precision determined from observations of RV stable stars). All spectra were single-lined, i.e., there is no evidence that any of these targets consist of more than one star. The gravities for all of the stars indicate that they are dwarfs.

2.3. High Resolution, High S/N Spectroscopy

We obtained high-resolution, high-S/N spectra of each of these objects using HIRES (Vogt et al. 1994) on the Keck-I telescope in Hawaii. The data were reduced to radial velocities in the barycentric frame following the procedure described by Butler et al. (1996). The RV measurements and uncertainties are given in Tables 3–5 for HAT-P-44 through HAT-P-46, respectively. The period-folded data, along with our best fit described below in Section 3, are displayed in Figures 2–4.

![Figure 1. HATNet light curves of HAT-P-44 (top), HAT-P-45 (middle), and HAT-P-46 (bottom). See Table 1 for a summary of the observations. For each planet we show two panels. The top panel shows the unbinned light curve folded with the period resulting from the global fit described in Section 3. The solid line shows the model fit to the light curve (Section 3.4). The bottom panel shows the region zoomed in on the transit. The dark filled circles show the light curve binned in phase with a bin size of 0.002. These are plotted with 1σ uncertainties.](image-url)
Table 3: Relative Radial Velocities, Bisector Spans, and Activity Index Measurements of HAT-P-44

| BJD   | RV\(^a\)  | \(\sigma_{RV}\)\(^b\) | BS   | \(\sigma_{BS}\) | \(\gamma\) | Phase |
|-------|-----------|----------------------|------|---------------|-----------|-------|
| (2,454,000+) | (m s\(^{-1}\)) | (m s\(^{-1}\)) | (m s\(^{-1}\)) | (m s\(^{-1}\)) |          |       |
| 1606.11152 | 113.45 | 4.35 | 1.87 | 7.34 | 0.131 | 0.885 |
| 1612.12701 | 4.22 | 3.65 | -9.31 | 5.29 | 0.122 | 0.282 |
| 1612.14300 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1613.03742 | 77.12 | 12.22 | -56.34 | 75.72 | 0.232 | 0.494 |
| 1614.11905 | 108.82 | 4.03 | 0.97 | 9.57 | 0.106 | 0.745 |
| 1634.02686 | 14.58 | 3.88 | -2.67 | 6.52 | 0.146 | 0.374 |
| 1663.90061 | -3.95 | 3.76 | -3.28 | 8.67 | 0.127 | 0.340 |
| 1671.88450 | -15.99 | 4.06 | -8.30 | 7.31 | 0.115 | 0.175 |
| 1672.95630 | 12.47 | 4.01 | -11.18 | 6.83 | 0.134 | 0.425 |
| 1673.87329 | 67.10 | 3.84 | 12.67 | 4.49 | 0.123 | 0.638 |
| 1696.81647 | 16.79 | 4.38 | 31.92 | 19.95 | 0.087 | 0.972 |
| 1697.81428 | -38.27 | 3.61 | 19.79 | 16.14 | 0.113 | 0.204 |
| 1698.88909 | 16.14 | 6.12 | -46.14 | 50.95 | 0.211 | 0.454 |
| 1699.79550 | 27.16 | 3.65 | 25.24 | 12.06 | 0.141 | 0.665 |
| 1700.84720 | 7.68 | 3.34 | -0.46 | 4.24 | 0.118 | 0.909 |
| 1703.83608 | -4.51 | 3.34 | 3.70 | 8.02 | 0.123 | 0.604 |
| 1704.77051 | 21.04 | 3.83 | -18.05 | 12.24 | 0.123 | 0.822 |
| 1705.79848 | -47.96 | 3.40 | -3.55 | 3.95 | 0.089 | 0.060 |
| 1707.82993 | -17.44 | 3.90 | 1.48 | 6.23 | 0.137 | 0.533 |
| 1723.83103 | -96.08 | 4.37 | -11.27 | 6.41 | 0.133 | 0.253 |
| 1945.04563 | -1.68 | 4.68 | 0.13 | 19.98 | ... | 0.683 |
| 2019.98862 | -29.28 | 4.18 | 20.91 | 18.95 | ... | 0.107 |
| 2115.75933 | -17.99 | 3.90 | 27.32 | 25.83 | ... | 0.373 |

Notes. Note that for the iodine-free template exposures we do not measure the RV but do measure the BS and \(\gamma\) index. Such template exposures can be distinguished by the missing RV value.

\(^a\) The zero point of these velocities is arbitrary. An overall offset \(\gamma_{\text{int}}\) fitted to these velocities in Section 3.4 has not been subtracted.

\(^b\) Internal errors excluding the component of astrophysical jitter considered in Section 3.4. The formal errors are likely underestimated in cases where \(\sigma_{RV} > 10\ \text{m s}^{-1}\), as the HIRES Doppler code is not reliable for low S/N observations.

\(^c\) Chromospheric activity index computed as in Isaacson & Fischer (2010).

We also show the chromospheric activity \(\gamma\) index. The \(\gamma\) index for each star was computed following Isaacson & Fischer (2010) and converted to \(R_{HK}\) following Noyes et al. (1984). We find median values of \(R_{HK} = -5.247 \pm 0.058 \pm 0.10, -5.394 \pm 0.072 \pm 0.25, -5.257 \pm 0.036 \pm 0.21\) for HAT-P-44 through HAT-P-46, respectively. The listed uncertainties are the standard errors on the median given the scatter in the individual measurements, followed by the estimated systematic uncertainties assuming an 11% uncertainty in the calibration for \(\gamma\) (Isaacson & Fischer 2010). Taken at face value these imply that all three stars are chromospherically quiet. However, since HAT-P-45 is hotter than the \(T_{\text{eff}} = 6200\ \text{K}\) upper limit over which the Noyes et al. (1984) relation is calibrated, its value should be treated with skepticism. Similarly for HAT-P-46, which has a temperature just below this limit. For HAT-P-44 the low activity index is consistent with the slow projected rotation velocity \(v \sin i = 0.2 \pm 0.5 \text{ km s}^{-1}\) (see Section 3.1).

Additionally we show the spectral line bisector spans. The bisector spans were computed as in Torres et al. (2007) and Bakos et al. (2007) and show no detectable variation in phase with the RVs, allowing us to rule out various blank scenarios as possible explanations of the observations (see Section 3.2). For HAT-P-45 the bisector spans may be correlated with the residual RVs which may indicate that the jitter for this object is due to stellar activity (see Section 3).

2.4. Photometric Follow-up Observations

Additional photometric observations of each of the transiting planet systems were obtained using the following facilities: the KeplerCam CCD camera on the FLWO 1.2 m telescope, the CCD imager on the 0.8 m remotely operated Byrme Observatory at Sedgwick (BOS) reserve in California, and the Spectral Instrument CCD on the 2.0 m Faulkes Telescope North (FTN) at Haleakala Observatory in Hawaii. Both BOS and FTN are...
operated by the Las Cumbres Observatory Global Telescope (LCOGT; Brown et al. 2013). The observations for each target are summarized in Table 1.

The reduction of the KeplerCam images was performed using the aperture photometry procedure described by Bakos et al. (2010). The BOS and FTN observations were reduced in a similar manner. The resulting differential light curves were further filtered using the External Parameter Decorrelation (EPD) and Trend Filtering Algorithm (TFA) methods applied simultaneously with light curve modeling so that uncertainties in the noise filtering process contribute to the uncertainties on the physical parameters (for more details, see Bakos et al. 2010). The light curves, and best-fit models, are shown in Figures 5–7 for HAT-P-44 through HAT-P-46, respectively; the individual measurements are reported in Tables 6–8.

3. ANALYSIS

3.1. Properties of the Parent Star

Stellar atmospheric parameters for each star were measured using the Spectroscopy Made Easy (SME; Valenti & Piskunov 1996) and the Valenti & Fischer (2005) atomic line database.
We analyzed the Keck/HIRES template spectra for each star, which yielded the following initial values and uncertainties.

1. **HAT-P-44**—effective temperature $T_{\text{eff}} = 5295 \pm 100$ K, metallicity [Fe/H] = 0.33 $\pm$ 0.1 dex, stellar surface gravity log $g_\star = 4.42 \pm 0.1$ (cgs), and projected rotational velocity $v \sin i = 0.2 \pm 0.5$ km s$^{-1}$.

2. **HAT-P-45**—effective temperature $T_{\text{eff}} = 6270 \pm 100$ K, metallicity [Fe/H] = 0.03 $\pm$ 0.1 dex, stellar surface gravity log $g_\star = 4.26 \pm 0.1$ (cgs), and projected rotational velocity $v \sin i = 9.0 \pm 0.5$ km s$^{-1}$.

3. **HAT-P-46**—effective temperature $T_{\text{eff}} = 6280 \pm 100$ K, metallicity [Fe/H] = 0.38 $\pm$ 0.1 dex, stellar surface gravity log $g_\star = 4.38 \pm 0.1$ (cgs), and projected rotational velocity $v \sin i = 4.5 \pm 0.5$ km s$^{-1}$.

These values were used to determine initial values for the limb-darkening coefficients, which we fix during the light curve modeling (Section 3.4). This modeling, when combined with the Yonsei-Yale (YY) theoretical stellar evolution models (Yi et al. 2001), provides a refined determination of the stellar surface...
Figure 4. Keck/HIRES observations of HAT-P-46. The panels are as in Figure 2. The parameters used in the best-fit model are given in Table 13.

Table 8
High-precision Differential Photometry of HAT-P-46

| BJD     | Mag^a  | σMag | Mag(ori)\(^b\) | Filter |
|---------|--------|------|----------------|--------|
| 55687.79447 | −0.00440 | 0.00112 | 10.45700 | i |
| 55687.79497 | 0.00288 | 0.00113 | 10.46460 | i |
| 55687.79596 | 0.00087 | 0.00113 | 10.46190 | i |
| 55687.79647 | −0.00065 | 0.00113 | 10.46210 | i |
| 55687.79699 | −0.00327 | 0.00112 | 10.45850 | i |
| 55687.79749 | 0.00222 | 0.00112 | 10.46330 | i |
| 55687.79798 | 0.00089 | 0.00113 | 10.46300 | i |
| 55687.79850 | −0.00339 | 0.00112 | 10.45840 | i |
| 55687.79901 | 0.00378 | 0.00112 | 10.46610 | i |
| 55687.79952 | 0.00308 | 0.00113 | 10.46470 | i |

Notes.
^a The out-of-transit level has been subtracted. These magnitudes have been subjected to the EPD and TFA procedures, carried out simultaneously with the transit fit.
^b Raw magnitude values without application of the EPD and TFA procedures.

The values of log \( g_\star \) as well as of properties inferred from the evolution models (such as the stellar masses and radii) depend on the eccentricity and semi-amplitude of the transiting planet’s orbit, which in turn depend on how the RV data are modeled. In modeling these data we varied the number of planets considered for a given system, and whether or not these planets are fixed to circular orbits. Although \( T_{\text{eff}}^\star, [\text{Fe/H}], \) and \( v \sin i \) will also depend on the fixed value of log \( g_\star \), we found generally that log \( g_\star \) did not change enough between the models that provide a good fit to the data to justify carrying out a separate SME analysis using the log \( g_\star \) value determined from each model. As we discuss in Section 3.4.2 we tested numerous models; our final adopted values for these model-dependent parameters are presented in that section.
We determine the distance and extinction to each star by comparing the \( J \), \( H \), and \( K_s \) magnitudes from the 2MASS Catalogue (Skrutskie et al. 2006), and the \( V \) and \( I_C \) magnitudes from the TASS Mark IV Catalogue (Droege et al. 2006), to the expected magnitudes from the stellar models. We use the transformations by Carpenter (2001) to convert the 2MASS magnitudes to the photometric system of the models (ESO), and use the Cardelli et al. (1989) extinction law, assuming a total-to-selective extinction ratio of \( R_V = 3.1 \), to relate the extinction in each bandpass to the \( V \)-band extinction \( A_V \). The resulting \( A_V \) and distance measurements are given with the other model-dependent parameters. We find that HAT-P-44 is not significantly affected by extinction, consistent with the Schlegel et al. (1998) dust maps which yield a total extinction of \( A_V = 0.038 \) mag along the line of sight to HAT-P-44. HAT-P-45 and HAT-P-46, on the other hand, have low Galactic latitudes \( (b = 6.0 \) and \( b = 9.6 \), respectively), and are significantly affected by extinction. We find \( A_V = 1.900 \pm 0.169 \) mag and \( A_V = 0.832 \pm 0.145 \) mag for our preferred models for HAT-P-45 and HAT-P-46, respectively. For comparison, the Schlegel et al. (1998) maps yield a total line of sight extinction of \( A_V = 5.89 \) mag and \( A_V = 3.25 \) mag for HAT-P-45 and HAT-P-46, respectively, or \( A_V \sim 0.8 \) mag to both sources after applying the distance and excess extinction corrections given by Bonifacio et al. (2000). At these low Galactic latitudes the extinction estimates based on the Schlegel et al. (1998) dust maps are not reliable, so the discrepancy between the dust-map-based and photometry-based \( A_V \) estimates for HAT-P-45 is not unexpected. After correcting for extinction the measured and expected photometric color indices are consistent for each star.

### 3.2. Excluding Blend Scenarios

To rule out the possibility that any of these objects might be a blended stellar eclipsing binary system we carried out a blend analysis as described in Hartman et al. (2012).

We find that for HAT-P-44 we can exclude most blend models, consisting either of a hierarchical triple star system, or a blend between a background eclipsing binary and a foreground bright star, based on the light curves. Those models that cannot be excluded with at least 5\( \sigma \) confidence would have been detected as obviously double-lined systems, showing many km s\(^{-1} \) RV and BS variations.

For HAT-P-45 and HAT-P-46 the significant reddening (Section 3.1) allows a broader range of blend scenarios to fit the photometric data. For a system like HAT-P-44, where there is no significant reddening and the available calibrated broadband photometry agrees well with the spectrophotometrically determined temperature, the calibrated photometry places a strong constraint on blend scenarios where the two brightest stars in the blend have different temperatures. For HAT-P-45 and HAT-P-46, on the other hand, such blends can be accommodated by reducing the reddening in the fit. Indeed we find for both
HAT-P-45 and HAT-P-46 that the calibrated broadband photometry are fit slightly better by models that incorporate multiple stars (blends) together with reddening, than by a model consisting of only a single reddened star. The difference between these models is small enough, however, that we do not consider this improvement to be significant; such differences may be due to the true extinction law along this line of sight being slightly different from our assumed $R_V = 3.1$ Cardelli et al. (1989) extinction law.

To better constrain the possible blend scenarios we obtained a partial $g$ band light curve for HAT-P-45 using Keplercam on the night of 2013 May 20. The photometry was reduced as described in Section 2.4 and included in our blend analysis procedure. We show this light curve in Figure 6, though we note that it was not included in the planet parameter determination which was carried out prior to these observations. Even though it is only a partial event, this light curve significantly restricts the range of blends that can explain the photometry for HAT-P-45, excluding scenarios that predict substantially different $g$ and $i$ band transit depths.

Although the broadband photometry permits a wide range of possible blend scenarios, for both HAT-P-45 and HAT-P-46 the nonplanetary blend scenarios which fit the photometric data can be ruled out based on the BS and RV variations. For HAT-P-45 we find that blend scenarios that fit the photometric data (scenarios that cannot be rejected with $>5\sigma$ confidence) yield several km s$^{-1}$ BS and RV variations, whereas the actual BS rms is 24 m s$^{-1}$. Without the $g$ band light curve for HAT-P-45 some of the blend scenarios consistent with the photometry for this system predict BS and RV variations only slightly in excess of what was measured, illustrating the importance of this light curve. For HAT-P-46 the blend scenarios that fit the photometric data would result in BS variations with rms $> 80$ m s$^{-1}$, much greater than the measured scatter of 14 m s$^{-1}$.

Figure 7. Similar to Figure 5; here we show the follow-up light curves for HAT-P-46.

Figure 8. Model isochrones from Yi et al. (2001) for the metallicities of HAT-P-44 (top), HAT-P-45 (center), and HAT-P-46 (bottom). For HAT-P-44 the isochrones are shown for ages of 0.2 Gyr, 0.6 Gyr, and 1.0 Gyr to 13.0 Gyr in steps of 1.0 Gyr (left to right), while for HAT-P-44 and HAT-P-45 the isochrones are shown for ages of 0.2 Gyr, and 0.5 Gyr to 3.0 Gyr in steps of 0.5 Gyr (left to right). The adopted values of $T_{\text{eff}}$, $a/R_*$ and $a/R_*$ from the first SME and light curve analyses are represented with a triangle.
planet with $P \sim 220$ days (when fitting the data simultaneously for two planets this model provides a slightly better fit than when the outer planet has a period of $P = 423$ days) yields a peak at $P = 17.7$ days with a false alarm probability of 0.16. Alias peaks are also seen at $P = 17.3$ days, $P = 18.6$ days, $P = 11.4$ days, $P = 11.7$ days, $P = 13.3$ days, and several other values with decreasing significance.

For HAT-P-45 a number of frequencies are detected in the periodogram of the RV residuals from the best-fit single-planet model. These periods are all aliases of each other. The highest peak is at $f = 0.065289 \text{ day}^{-1}$ ($P = 15.316$ days), with a false alarm probability of $\sim 10^{-2}$. For HAT-P-46 the two highest peaks are at $f = 0.012977 \text{ day}^{-1}$ ($P = 77.061$ days) and $f = 0.014708 \text{ day}^{-1}$ ($P = 67.988$ days), each with false alarm probabilities of $\sim 10^{-2}$ (or $\sim 10^{-4}$ if uniform uncertainties are adopted as discussed further below).

The false alarm probabilities given above include a correction for the so-called “bandwidth penalty” (i.e., a correction for the number of independent frequencies that are tested by the periodogram); here we restricted the search to a frequency range of 0.02 day$^{-1} < f < 0.2$ day$^{-1}$ and used the Horne & Baliunas (1986) approximation to estimate the number of independent frequencies tested (the resulting false alarm probability may be inaccurate by as much as a factor of $\sim 10$). Note that adopting a broader frequency range for the periodograms (e.g., up to the Nyquist limit, which for the HAT-P-44 data would be $\sim 250$ day$^{-1}$) significantly increases the false alarm probabilities. We expect, however, that systems containing multiple Jupiter-mass planets with orbital periods less than 5 days would be dynamically unstable, allowing us to restrict the frequency range to consider on physical grounds.

For HAT-P-44 and HAT-P-45 the false alarm probabilities are approximately the same for high jitter as they are when the jitter is set to 0. For HAT-P-46 the false alarm probabilities are smaller when the errors are dominated by jitter ($10^{-4}$ with jitter versus $10^{-2}$ without jitter).

### 3.4. Global Model of the Data

We modeled simultaneously the HATNet photometry, the follow-up photometry, and the high-precision RV measurements using a procedure similar to that described in detail by Bakos et al. (2010) with modifications described by Hartman et al. (2012). For each system we used a Mandel & Agol (2002) transit model, together with the EPD and TFA trend-filters, to describe the follow-up light curves, a Mandel & Agol (2002) transit model for the HATNet light curve(s), and a Keplerian orbit using the formalism of Pál (2009) for the RV curve. A significant change that we have made compared to the analysis conducted in our previous discovery papers was to include the RV jitter as a free parameter in the fit, which we discuss below. We then discuss our methods for distinguishing between competing classes of models used to fit the data, and comment on the orbital stability of potential models.

#### 3.4.1. RV Jitter

It is well known that high-precision RV observations of stars show non-periodic variability in excess of what is expected based on the measurement uncertainties. This “RV jitter” depends on properties of the star including the effective temperature of its photosphere, its chromospheric activity, and the projected equatorial rotation velocity of the star (see Wright 2005; Isaacson & Fischer 2010, who discuss the RV jitter from Keck/HIRES measurements). In most exoplanet studies the typical

---

21 Using alternative methods, such as the Discrete Fourier Transform, the Lomb-Scargle periodogram, or a $\Delta \chi^2$ periodogram, yield similar frequencies, but the false alarm probabilities differ between the methods due to differences in the statistics adopted.

---

**Figure 9.** Harmonic AoV periodograms of the RV residuals from the best-fit single planet models for HAT-P-44, HAT-P-45, and HAT-P-46.
method for handling this jitter has been to add it in quadrature to the measurement uncertainties, assuming that the jitter is Gaussian white noise. One then either adopts a jitter value that is found to be typical for similar stars, or chooses a jitter such that $\chi^2$ per degree of freedom is unity for the best-fit model. In our previous discovery papers we adopted the latter approach.

When testing competing models for the RV data the jitter is an important parameter—the greater the jitter the smaller the absolute $\chi^2$ difference between two models, and the less certain one can be in choosing one over the other. Both of the typical approaches for handling the jitter have shortcomings: the former does not allow for the possibility that a star may have a somewhat higher (or lower) than usual jitter, while the latter ignores any prior information that may be used to disfavor jitter values that would be very unusual. An alternative approach is to treat the jitter as a free parameter in the fit, but use the empirical distribution of jitters as a prior constraint.

The method of allowing the jitter to vary in an MCMC analysis of an RV curve was previously adopted by Gregory (2005). As was noted in that work, when allowing terms which appear in the uncertainties to vary in an MCMC fit, the logarithm of the likelihood is no longer simply $\ln L = -\chi^2/2 + C$ where $C$ is a normalization constant that is independent of the parameters, and can be ignored for most applications. Instead one should use $\ln L = -\chi^2/2 + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln(1/e_i) + C$, where $e_i$ is the error for measurement $i$ and in this case is given by $e_i = \sqrt{\sigma_i^2 + \sigma_{\text{jitter}}^2}$ for formal uncertainty $\sigma_i$ and jitter $\sigma_{\text{jitter}}$. When the uncertainties do not include free parameters, the term $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln(1/e_i)$ is constant, and included in $C$.

The analysis by Gregory (2005) used an uninformative prior on the jitter, which effectively forces the jitter to the value that results in $\chi^2$/dof = 1; here we make use of the empirical jitter distribution found by Wright (2005) to set a prior on the jitter. Wright (2005) provides the distributions for stars in a several bins separated by $B - V$, activity, and luminosity above the main sequence. The histograms appear to be well-matched by log-normal distributions of the form:

$$P(\sigma_{\text{jitter}}) d\sigma_{\text{jitter}} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\text{jitter}} \sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^2} e^{-\frac{(\ln\sigma_{\text{jitter}} - \bar{\sigma})^2}{2\sigma^2}} d\sigma_{\text{jitter}}. \quad (1)$$

Figure 10 compares this model to the jitter histograms. For HAT-P-44, which falls in the low-activity bin with $\Delta M < 1$ and $0.6 < B - V < 1.4$, we find $\bar{\sigma} = 0.496$, $\mu = 1.251$, with $\sigma_{\text{jitter}}$ measured in units of m/s$^{-1}$. For HAT-P-45 and HAT-P-46, which fall in the bin of low-activity stars with $\Delta M < 1$ and $B - V < 0.6$, we find $\bar{\sigma} = 0.688$, and $\mu = 1.419$.

The posterior probability density for the parameters $\theta$, given the data $D$ and model $M$ is given by Bayes’ relation:

$$P(\theta|D, M) = \frac{P(\theta|M)P(D|\theta, M)}{P(D|M)} \quad (2)$$

which in our case takes the form:

$$P(\theta|D, M) = C \exp(\ln L + \ln P(\theta|M))$$

$$= C \exp(-\chi^2/2 + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln(1/e_i) + \ln P(\sigma_{\text{jitter}}))$$

where $C$ represents constants that are independent of $\theta$ (note we adopt uniform priors on all jump parameters other than $\sigma_{\text{jitter}}$). We use a differential evolution MCMC procedure (ter Braak 2006; Eastman et al. 2013) to explore this distribution.

As discussed in the previous subsection, modeling these objects as single-planet systems yields RV residuals with large scatter and evidence of long-term variations. We also attempted fitting the data for HAT-P-44 and HAT-P-46 including linear or quadratic trends in addition to the single-planet systems, but found that these models do not provide good fits to the data. We therefore performed the analysis of each system including additional Keplerian components in their RV models.

We use the Bayes Factor to select between these competing models; here we describe how this is computed. The Bayesian evidence $Z$ is defined by

$$Z = P(D|M) = \int d\theta P(\theta|M)P(D|\theta, M) \quad (3)$$

where $P(D|M)$ is the probability of observing the data $D$ given the model $M$, marginalized over the model parameters $\theta$. The Bayes factor $K_{1,2}$ comparing the posterior probabilities for models $M_1$ and $M_2$ given the data $D$ is defined by

$$K_{1,2} = \frac{P(M_1|D)}{P(M_2|D)} = \frac{P(M_1)P(D|M_1)}{P(M_2)P(D|M_2)} \quad (4)$$

where $P(M)$ is the prior probability for model $M$. Assuming equal priors for the different models tested, the Bayes factor is then equal to the evidence ratio:

$$K_{1,2} = \frac{Z_1}{Z_2}. \quad (5)$$

If $K_{1,2} > 1$ then model $M_1$ is favored over model $M_2$.

In practice $Z$ is difficult to determine as it requires integrating a complicated function over a high-dimensional space (e.g.,
Feroz et al. (2009). Recently, however, Weinberg et al. (2013) have suggested a simple and relatively accurate method for estimating \( \Delta \text{Z} \) directly from the results of an MCMC simulation. Their method involves using the MCMC results to identify a small region of parameter space with high posterior probability, numerically integrating over this region, and applying a correction to scale the integral from the subregion to the full parameter space. The correction is determined from the posterior parameter distribution estimated as well from the MCMC. We use this method to estimate \( \Delta \text{Z} \) and \( K \) for each model. However, for practical reasons we use the MCMC sample itself to conduct a Monte Carlo integration of the parameter subregion, rather than following the suggested method of using a uniform resampling of the subregion. As shown by Weinberg et al. (2013) the method that we follow provides a somewhat biased estimate of \( \Delta \text{Z} \), with errors in \( \ln \Delta \text{Z} \lesssim 0.5 \). For this reason we do not consider \( \ln \Delta \text{Z} \) differences between models that are \( \Delta \text{Z} \) to be significant.

In Table 9 we list the models fit for each system, and provide estimates of the Bayes Factors for each model relative to a fiducial model of a single transiting planet on an eccentric orbit. For reference we also provide the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) estimator for each model, which is given by

\[
\text{BIC} = -2 \ln L_{\text{max}} + N_p \ln N_d
\]

for a model with \( N_p \) free parameters fit to \( N_d \) data points yielding a maximum likelihood of \( L_{\text{max}} \). The BIC is determined solely from the highest likelihood value, making it easier to calculate than \( K \). Models with lower BIC values are generally favored. Note, however, that the BIC is a less accurate method for distinguishing between models than is \( K \). We also provide, for reference, the Bayes Factors determined when the jitter of each system is fixed to a typical value throughout the analysis.

### 3.5. Resulting Parameters

The planet and stellar parameters for each system that are independent of the models that we test are listed in Table 10. Stellar parameters for HAT-P-44, and parameters of the transiting planet HAT-P-44b, that depend on the class of model tested are listed in Table 11, while parameters for the candidate outer component HAT-P-44c are listed in Table 12. In both cases we only show results for the fiducial model of a single transiting planet and for those models that have \( |\ln K - \ln K_{11}| < 5 \), where \( K_{11} \) is the Bayes factor for model 11, which has the highest evidence. Stellar parameters for HAT-P-45 and HAT-P-46, and parameters for the transiting planets HAT-P-45b and HAT-P-46b that depend on the class of model tested are listed in Table 13. While parameters for the candidate outer component HAT-P-45c and HAT-P-46c are listed in Table 14. For both systems we only show parameters for models 1 and 2, which have the highest Bayesian evidences.

For HAT-P-44 we find that the preferred model, based on the estimated Bayes Factor, consists of two planets, the outer one on an eccentric orbit. This model, labeled number 11 in Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12, includes: the transiting planet HAT-P-44b with a period of \( P = 4.301219 \pm 0.000019 \) days, a mass of \( M_p = 0.352 \pm 0.029 M_J \), and an eccentricity of \( e = 0.044 \pm 0.052 \); an outer planet HAT-P-44c with a period of \( P = 872.2 \pm 1.7 \) days, a minimum mass of \( M_p \sin i = 4.0 \pm 0.8 M_J \), and an eccentricity of \( e = 0.494 \pm 0.081 \). We find that we are not able to definitively choose this model over alternative models, labeled numbers 2, 3, and 4, which are similar in form to the preferred model, but with different periods

| Model | Bayes Factor and BIC Differences for Models Tested |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------|
| HAT-P-44 | |
| 2 | 220 | ... | ... | ... | ... | 7 | 10.4 | 90.7 | 46.9 |
| 3 | 438 | ... | ... | ... | ... | 7 | 10.2 | 89.7 | 45.2 |
| 4 | 221 | ✓ | ... | ... | ... | 9 | 8.9 | 90.6 | 46.3 |
| 5 | 219 | ... | 17 | ... | ... | 10 | 3.1 | 86.0 | 57.7 |
| 6 | 219 | ✓ | 17 | ... | ... | 12 | -22.5 | 82.9 | 54.9 |
| 7 | 216 | ✓ | 18 | ✓ | ... | 14 | 2.5 | 82.0 | 59.2 |
| 8 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 1 | 6 | -2.8 | 9.5 | 0.9 |
| 9 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 2 | 7.3 | 76.1 | 32.3 |
| 10 | 1981 | ... | ... | ... | ... | 7 | 5.4 | 94.7 | 32.2 |
| 11 | 872 | ✓ | ... | ... | ... | ... | 9 | 12.4 | 95.2 | 54.5 |

**Notes.**

- The number associated with this model in Tables 11–14. Model 1 for each system is the fiducial model of a single planet on an eccentric orbit. By definition this model has \( \ln(K) = 0 \) and \( \Delta \text{BIC} = 0 \).
- The orbital period used for component \( c \) or \( d \) in days. Models for which the period of a component is listed as "..." did not include that planet. We list here the median value from the posterior distribution for this parameter. For HAT-P-44 model 10, this value is substantially different from the value of \( P = 872 \) used to initialize the fit.
- Flag indicating whether or not the component is allowed to be eccentric (indicated by a ✓), or if the eccentricity was fixed to 0 (indicated by "...").
- Number of varied parameters constrained by the RV observations, including four parameters for the inner transiting planet and one parameter for the jitter. Although the two parameters used to describe the ephemeris of the inner planet are varied in the joint fit of the RV and photometric data, they are almost entirely determined by the photometric data alone, so we do not include them in this accounting.
- The natural logarithm of the Bayes Factor between the given model, and a fiducial model of a single planet on an eccentric orbit. Models with higher values of \( \ln \Delta \text{K} \) are preferred. In this case the RV jitter is allowed to vary in the fit, subject to a prior constraint from the empirical jitter distribution found by Wright (2005).
- The natural logarithm of the Bayes Factor between the given model, and a fiducial model of a single planet on an eccentric orbit. In this case the RV jitter is fixed to a typical value for each star (these were determined such that \( \chi^2 \) per degree of freedom was unity for one of the models; we adopted 9.1 m s\(^{-1}\) for HAT-P-44, 12.7 m s\(^{-1}\) for HAT-P-45, and 2.7 m s\(^{-1}\) for HAT-P-46). We provide these to show how the model selection depends on the method for treating the RV jitter.
- \( \Delta \text{BIC} = \text{BIC}_{\text{fiducial}} - \text{BIC}_{\text{model}} \), i.e., the difference between the BIC for the fiducial model and for the given model. Models with higher values of \( \Delta \text{BIC} \) are preferred.

for the outer planet \( P = 220 \) days, or \( P = 438 \) days. Note that due to the sharpness of the peaks in the likelihood as a function of the period of the outer planet, an MCMC simulation takes an excessively long time to transition between the different periods. For this reason we treat these as independent models. We adopt the model with the long period and high eccentricity for the outer component because it has the highest Bayes factor. This model is favored over the fiducial model of a single planet transiting the
Model-independent Stellar and Light Curve Parameters for HAT-P-44–HAT-P-46

| Parameter                        | HAT-P-44b Value | HAT-P-45b Value | HAT-P-46b Value | Sourcea |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Stellar astrometric properties   |                |                |                |         |
| GSC ID                           | GSC 3465-00123 | GSC 5102-00262 | GSC 5100-00045 |         |
| 2MASS ID                         | 2MASS 14123457+4700528 | 2MASS 18172957-0322517 | 2MASS 18014660-0258154 |         |
| R.A. (J2000)                     | 14h12m34.56    | 18h17m29.40    | 18h01m46.56   |         |
| Decl. (J2000)                    | +47°00′52.9″   | −03°22′51.7″   | −02°58′15.4″  |         |
| μR.A. (mas yr⁻¹)                | −29.0 ± 12.6   | 9.2 ± 4.1      | −7.5 ± 4.3    |         |
| μDecl. (mas yr⁻¹)               | 12.3 ± 11.4    | −3.1 ± 8.2     | 2.0 ± 7.9     |         |
| Stellar spectroscopic properties |                |                |                |         |
| T_eff (K)                       | 5295 ± 100     | 6330 ± 100     | 6120 ± 100    | SMEb   |
| [Fe/H]                          | 0.33 ± 0.10    | 0.07 ± 0.10    | 0.30 ± 0.10   | SME    |
| v sin i (km s⁻¹)                | 0.2 ± 0.5      | 9.3 ± 0.5      | 4.9 ± 0.5     | SME    |
| v_mic (km s⁻¹)                  | 3.28           | 4.88           | 4.55          | SME    |
| v_rad (km s⁻¹)                  | 0.85           | 0.85           | 0.85          | SME    |
| y_MV (km s⁻¹)                   | −33.45 ± 0.05  | 23.903 ± 0.1   | −20.911 ± 0.1 | TRES   |
| log R_MV                       | −5.247 ± 0.058 ± 0.10 | −5.394 ± 0.072 ± 0.25 | −5.257 ± 0.036 ± 0.21 | Keck/HIRESc |
| Stellar photometric properties   |                |                |                |         |
| V (mag)                         | 13.21 ± 0.12   | 12.79 ± 0.18   | 11.94 ± 0.12  | TASS   |
| V − Ic (mag)                    | 0.90 ± 0.24    | 1.11 ± 0.19    | 0.87 ± 0.14   | TASS   |
| J (mag)                         | 11.729 ± 0.021 | 10.730 ± 0.027 | 10.330 ± 0.024 | 2MASS |
| H (mag)                         | 11.360 ± 0.019 | 10.350 ± 0.026 | 9.972 ± 0.022 | 2MASS |
| K (mag)                         | 11.275 ± 0.018 | 10.201 ± 0.023 | 9.924 ± 0.023 | 2MASS |
| Transiting planet light curve parameters |                |                |                |         |
| P (days)                        | 3.401219 ± 0.000019 | 3.128992 ± 0.000021 | 4.463129 ± 0.000048 |         |
| T_P (BJD)                       | 2455696.93695 ± 0.00024 | 2455729.98612 ± 0.00041 | 2455701.33646 ± 0.00047 |         |
| T_{14} (days)                   | 0.1302 ± 0.0008 | 0.1436 ± 0.0013 | 0.1291 ± 0.0018 |         |
| T_{12} = T_{34} (days)          | 0.0158 ± 0.0006 | 0.0154 ± 0.0011 | 0.0174 ± 0.0017 |         |
| \(\xi/\rho\star\)              | 17.49 ± 0.07   | 15.60 ± 0.08   | 17.83 ± 0.13  |         |
| R_P/R_*                        | 0.1343 ± 0.0010 | 0.1110 ± 0.0021 | 0.0942 ± 0.0017 |         |
| b^2                             | 0.038^+0.037−0.038 | 0.079^+0.055−0.043 | 0.391^+0.047−0.059 |         |
| b                             | 0.178^+0.079−0.074 | 0.281^+0.085−0.106 | 0.629^+0.036−0.051 |         |
| Assumed limb-darkening coefficients^d |              |                |                |         |
| c₁, i (linear term)            | 0.3648         | 0.1935         | 0.2222         | Claret (2004) |
| c₂, i (quadratic term)         | 0.2817         | 0.3680         | 0.3651         | Claret (2004) |

Notes.

^a We list the source only for the stellar properties. The listed transiting planet light curve parameters are determined from our joint fit of the RV and light curve data, but are primarily constrained by the light curves.

^b SME = "Spectroscopy Made Easy" package for the analysis of high-resolution spectra (Valenti & Piskunov 1996). These parameters rely primarily on SME, but have a small dependence also on the iterative analysis incorporating the isochrone search and global modeling of the data, as described in the text.

^c Median values of log R_MV (Noyes et al. 1984) are computed from the Keck/HIRES spectra following the procedure of Isaacson & Fischer (2010). Uncertainties are the standard error on the median given the scatter in the individual measurements, followed by our estimate of the systematic uncertainty assuming an uncertainty of 11% in the calibration of S (Isaacson & Fischer 2010). Note that this index has not been calibrated for stars with T_eff, \(\geq\) 6200 K so the results for HAT-P-45 and HAT-P-46, which are above and just below this threshold, should be treated with caution.

^d T_P: reference epoch of mid transit that minimizes the correlation with the orbital period. T_{14}: total transit duration, time between first to last contact; T_{12} = T_{34}: ingress/egress time, time between first and second, or third and fourth contact. Barycentric Julian dates (BJD) throughout the paper are calculated from Coordinated Universal Time (UTC).

^e Values for a quadratic law.

host star by a factor of \(\sim 2 \times 10^5\), indicating that the data strongly favor the two-planet model over the single-planet model. The preferred model has an associated jitter of 10.7 ± 2.0 m s⁻¹ and a \(\chi^2\) per degree of freedom, including this jitter, of 1.67. Based on Equation (1), one expects only 1.2% of stars like HAT-P-44 to have jitter values \(\geq 10.7 \text{ m s}^{-1}\) thus the excess scatter in the RV residuals from the best-fit two-planet model suggests that perhaps more than two planets are present in this system, though we cannot conclusively detect any additional planets from the data currently available.

For HAT-P-45 the fiducial model of a single planet on an eccentric orbit is preferred over the other models that we tested.

This model, labeled number 1 under the HAT-P-45 headings in Tables 9, 13, and 14, includes only the transiting planet HAT-P-45b with a period of \(P = 3.128992 \pm 0.000021\) days, a mass of \(M_p = 0.892^{+0.037}_{-0.035} M_J\), and an eccentricity of \(e = 0.049 \pm 0.063\). The preferred model has a jitter of 22.5 ± 6.3 m s⁻¹ and \(\chi^2\) per degree of freedom of 2.1. Only \(\sim 0.8\%\) of stars like HAT-P-45 are expected to have a jitter this high. Moreover, the RV residuals from the preferred best-fit model appear to show a variation that is correlated in time (see the third panel down in Figure 3). Both these factors may suggest that a second planet is in the HAT-P-45 system. Nonetheless the data do not at present support such a complicated model. The single-planet model has a Bayes
Table 11
Model-dependent System Parameters for HAT-P-44

| Parameter | Model 1 Value | Model 2 Value | Model 3 Value | Model 4 Value | Adopted Model 11 Value |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------|
| $a/R_*$   | 9.34 ± 1.70   | 11.11$^{+0.70}_{-1.03}$ | 10.13 ± 1.08  | 11.37$^{+0.54}_{-0.97}$ | 11.49$^{+0.46}_{-0.85}$ |
| $i$ (deg) | 88.7$^{+6.8}_{-1.6}$ | 89.0 ± 0.5    | 88.8$^{+0.8}_{-0.8}$ | 89.1 ± 0.5     | 89.1 ± 0.4             |

Table 12
Model-dependent Parameters for Outer Planet in HAT-P-44

| Parameter | Model 1 Value | Model 2 Value | Model 3 Value | Model 4 Value | Adopted Model 11 Value |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------|
| $M_*$ ($M_J$) | 0.953$^{+0.083}_{-0.045}$ | 0.939 ± 0.041 | 0.938 ± 0.042 | 0.941 ± 0.041 | 0.942 ± 0.041 |
| $R_*$ ($R_J$) | 1.165$^{+0.334}_{-0.023}$ | 0.979$^{+0.110}_{-0.023}$ | 1.072$^{+0.144}_{-0.129}$ | 0.969$^{+0.096}_{-0.075}$ | 0.949$^{+0.080}_{-0.073}$ |
| log $g_*$ (cgs) | 4.28 ± 0.16 | 4.43 ± 0.07 | 4.35 ± 0.09 | 4.45 ± 0.06 | 4.46 ± 0.06 |
| $L_*$ ($L_J$) | 0.96 ± 0.07 | 0.31$^{+0.23}_{-0.19}$ | 0.8$^{+0.16}_{-0.15}$ | 0.66$^{+0.14}_{-0.09}$ | 0.64$^{+0.13}_{-0.08}$ |
| $M_*$ (mag) | 4.97 ± 0.46 | 5.34 ± 0.23 | 5.15 ± 0.28 | 5.38 ± 0.21 | 5.41 ± 0.19 |
| $M_*$ (mag,ESO) | 3.06 ± 0.44 | 3.44 ± 0.20 | 3.24 ± 0.23 | 3.48 ± 0.16 | 3.50 ± 0.14 |
| Age (Gyr) | 11.5$^{+0.0}_{-1.0}$ | 8.9 ± 0.3 | 11.5 ± 0.8 | 8.1 ± 0.3 | 7.5 ± 0.6 |
| Age (Ste) | 0.000 ± 0.083 | 0.000 ± 0.081 | 0.000 ± 0.083 | 0.000 ± 0.080 | 0.000 ± 0.080 |
| Distance (pc) | 445$^{+55}_{-26}$ | 374$^{+55}_{-23}$ | 409$^{+55}_{-39}$ | 367$^{+55}_{-19}$ | 363$^{+55}_{-17}$ |

Notes.

a Correlation coefficient between the planetary mass $M_*$ and radius $R_*$.
b The Safronov number is given by $\beta = 1/2(V_0/\nu_0)^2 = (a/R_*)/(M_*/M_*)$ (see Hansen & Barman 2007).
c Incoming flux per unit surface area, averaged over the orbit, measured in units of $10^8$ erg s$^{-1}$ cm$^{-2}$.

Table 11
Derived transiting planet (HAT-P-44b) parameters

| Parameter | Model 1 Value | Model 2 Value | Model 3 Value | Model 4 Value | Adopted Model 11 Value |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------|
| $K$ (m s$^{-1}$) | 5.1 ± 0.71 | 51.5 ± 3.9 | 52.5 ± 4.7 | 48.1 ± 4.1 | 45.9 ± 3.6 |
| $\sqrt{\langle \cos \omega \rangle}$ | 0.206$^{+0.257}_{-0.189}$ | $-0.006 \pm 0.121$ | $-0.113 \pm 0.113$ | $-0.046 \pm 0.125$ | $-0.023 \pm 0.121$ |
| $\sqrt{\langle \sin \omega \rangle}$ | 0.421$^{+0.172}_{-0.112}$ | 0.219$^{+0.151}_{-0.236}$ | 0.364$^{+0.122}_{-0.233}$ | 0.147 ± 0.185 | 0.114 ± 0.175 |
| $e$ cos $i$ | $-0.099 \pm 0.129$ | $-0.001 \pm 0.037$ | $-0.041 \pm 0.047$ | $-0.008^{+0.030}_{-0.042}$ | $-0.003 \pm 0.032$ |
| $e$ sin $i$ | 0.214 ± 0.170 | 0.055$^{+0.039}_{-0.059}$ | 0.144 ± 0.103 | 0.029$^{+0.092}_{-0.042}$ | 0.019$^{+0.080}_{-0.006}$ |
| $\omega$ (deg) | 117 ± 50 | 98 ± 84 | 108 ± 44 | 114 ± 82 | 113 ± 90 |
| RV jitter (m s$^{-1}$) | 31.0 ± 4.2 | 12.7 ± 2.5 | 13.4 ± 2.3 | 11.5 ± 2.1 | 10.7 ± 2.0 |

Table 12
Model-dependent Parameters for Outer Planet in HAT-P-44

| Parameter | Model 1 Value | Model 2 Value | Model 3 Value | Model 4 Value | Adopted Model 11 Value |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------|
| $P_c$ (days) | ... | 219.9 ± 4.5 | 437.5 ± 17.7 | 221.4 ± 4.4 | 872.2 ± 1.7 |
| $T_c$ (BJD)$^a$ | ... | 2455686.2 ± 4.1 | 2455727.0 ± 4.5 | 2455713.4 ± 4.3 | 2455711.2 ± 13.4 |
| $T_{144}$ (days)$^a$ | ... | 0.505 ± 0.039 | 0.691 ± 0.067 | 0.652 ± 0.091 | 0.505 ± 0.047 |
| $K_c$ (m s$^{-1}$) | ... | 36 ± 6 | 104 ± 12 | 93 ± 4 | 99 ± 33 |
| $\sqrt{\langle \cos \omega_c \rangle}$ | ... | 0 | $-0.373 \pm 0.105$ | $-0.453 \pm 0.152$ |
| $\sqrt{\langle \sin \omega_c \rangle}$ | ... | 0 | $-0.474 \pm 0.115$ | 0.510 ± 0.103 |
| $e$ cos $i_c$ | ... | 0 | $-0.226 \pm 0.071$ | $-0.313 \pm 0.124$ |
| $e$ sin $i_c$ | ... | 0 | $-0.286 \pm 0.075$ | 0.349 ± 0.078 |
| $e_c$ | ... | 0 | 0.379 ± 0.075 | 0.494 ± 0.081 |
| $\omega_c$ (deg) | ... | ... | 232.1 ± 13.3 | 131.3 ± 14.4 |
| $M_p$ sin $i_c$ ($M_J$) | ... | 1.6 ± 0.2 | 3.7 ± 0.5 | 2.5 ± 0.1 | 4.0$^{+1.4}_{-0.8}$ |
| $a_c$ (AU) | ... | 0.699 ± 0.014 | 1.104$^{+0.039}_{-0.027}$ | 0.702 ± 0.014 | 1.752 ± 0.025 |

Note. $^a$ $T_c$: reference epoch of mid transit that minimizes the correlation with the orbital period. $T_{144}$: total transit duration, time between first to last contact; Barycentric Julian dates (BJD) throughout the paper are calculated from Coordinated Universal Time (UTC).
factor of $\sim 20$ relative to the two-planet model, indicating a slight preference for the single-planet model. We also note that the BSs and RV residuals from the single-planet model may be correlated. A Spearman rank-order correlation test (e.g., Press et al. 1992) yields a correlation coefficient of $r_s = 0.54$ which indicates a weak correlation with a $10\%$ false alarm probability. A correlation between these quantities suggests that at least some of the excess RV scatter in this system may due to stellar activity.

For HAT-P-46 the preferred model consists of a transiting planet together with an outer companion on a circular orbit. This model, labeled number 2 under the HAT-P-46 headings in Tables 9, 13, and 14, includes: the transiting planet HAT-P-46b with a period of $P = 4.463129 \pm 0.000048$ days, a mass of $M_p = 0.493^{+0.082}_{-0.052} M_j$, and an eccentricity of $e = 0.123 \pm 0.120$; and an outer planet HAT-P-46c with a period of $P = 77.7 \pm 0.6$ days, and a minimum mass of $M_p \sin i = 2.0 \pm 0.3 M_j$. Although the two-planet model is preferred, it has a Bayes factor of only $K \sim 16$ relative to the fiducial single-planet model, indicating that the preference is not very strong. The preferred model has a jitter of $6.6 \pm 3.0$ m s$^{-1}$ and $\chi^2$ per degree of freedom of 1.6. The resulting jitter is typical for a star like HAT-P-46 ($\sim 25\%$ of such stars have a jitter higher than $6.6 \pm 3.0$ m s$^{-1}$), so there is no compelling reason at present to suspect that there may be more planets in this system beyond HAT-P-46c.

For both HAT-P-44 and HAT-P-46 allowing the jitter to vary in the fit substantially reduces the significance of the multi-planet solutions relative to the single planet solution. If we had not allowed the jitter to vary, we would have concluded that the two-planet model is $\sim 10^{20}$ times more likely than the one-planet model for HAT-P-44, and $\sim 10^{24}$ times more likely for HAT-P-46. For HAT-P-45, it is interesting to note that allowing the jitter to vary actually increases the significance of the

| Parameter | Adopted | HAT-P-45 | HAT-P-46 | Adopted |
|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|           | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 1 | Model 2 |
| $a/R_\star$ | $7.36^{+0.99}_{-1.02}$ | $7.56 \pm 0.31$ | $8.84^{+1.04}_{-1.76}$ | $8.86^{+0.89}_{-1.24}$ |
| $i$ (deg) | $87.8 \pm 0.9$ | $87.9 \pm 0.8$ | $85.4^{+1.0}_{-4.1}$ | $85.5^{+0.8}_{-2.3}$ |
| $K (m/s^{-1})$ | $106.6 \pm 13.6$ | $106.9 \pm 4.5$ | $40.9 \pm 19.7$ | $52.2 \pm 6.8$ |
| $\sqrt{T \cos \omega}$ | $-0.009 \pm 0.160$ | $-0.031 \pm 0.086$ | $0.180^{+0.239}_{-0.317}$ | $0.143^{+0.098}_{-0.134}$ |
| $\sqrt{T \sin \omega}$ | $0.045 \pm 0.192$ | $-0.084 \pm 0.131$ | $0.242 \pm 0.269$ | $0.305^{+0.170}_{-0.258}$ |
| $\omega$ (deg) | $146 \pm 98$ | $239 \pm 87$ | $82 \pm 113$ | $70 \pm 87$ |
| RV jitter (m s$^{-1}$) | $22.5 \pm 6.3$ | $4.7 \pm 3.5$ | $28.4 \pm 6.7$ | $6.6 \pm 3.0$ |
| $M_p (M_J)$ | $0.892^{+0.137}_{-0.109}$ | $0.890 \pm 0.046$ | $0.383^{+0.218}_{-0.122}$ | $0.493^{+0.082}_{-0.052}$ |
| $R_p (R_J)$ | $1.426^{+0.175}_{-0.087}$ | $1.382 \pm 0.076$ | $1.286^{+0.426}_{-0.150}$ | $1.284^{+0.271}_{-0.133}$ |
| $\rho_p (g/cm^3)$ | $0.45$ | $0.40$ | $0.43$ | $0.72$ |
| $\omega$ (AU) | $0.0452 \pm 0.0007$ | $0.0451 \pm 0.0006$ | $0.0577^{+0.0020}_{-0.0010}$ | $0.0577^{+0.0014}_{-0.0009}$ |
| $T_{eq}$ (K) | $1652^{+96}_{-78}$ | $1627 \pm 44$ | $1465^{+220}_{-89}$ | $1458^{+140}_{-75}$ |
| $\theta^2$ | $0.044 \pm 0.006$ | $0.046 \pm 0.003$ | $0.025 \pm 0.009$ | $0.034 \pm 0.004$ |
| $<F>$ | $1.68^{+0.44}_{-0.20}$ | $1.58 \pm 0.17$ | $1.04^{+0.89}_{-0.22}$ | $1.02^{+0.50}_{-0.19}$ |

Notes.

a Correlation coefficient between the planetary mass $M_p$ and radius $R_p$.

b The Safronov number is given by $\Theta = 1/2(V_{esc}/V_{orb})^2 = (a/R_p)(M_p/M_*)$ (see Hansen & Barman 2007).

c Incoming flux per unit surface area, averaged over the orbit, measured in units of $10^8$ erg s$^{-1}$ cm$^{-2}$.
two-planet model, perhaps due to the relatively high jitter value that must be adopted to achieve $\chi^2$/dof $\approx 1$.

3.5.1. Orbital Stability

To check the orbital stability of the multi-planet solutions that we have found, we integrated each orbital configuration forward in time for a duration of 1 Myr using the MERCURY symplectic integrator (Chambers 1999). We find that the adopted solutions for HAT-P-44 and HAT-P-46 are stable over at least this time period, and should be stable for much longer given the large, and non-resonant, period ratio between the components in each case. For HAT-P-44 the three-planet models that we tested quickly evolved in less than $10^5$ years to a different orbital configuration. In particular, when we start HAT-P-44b on a 4.3012 day period, HAT-P-44c on a 215.7 $\pm$ 3.9 day period, and HAT-P-44d on a 17.6 $\pm$ 0.2 day period, HAT-P-44d migrates to a 15.1 day period orbit, while HAT-P-44b migrates to a 4.6928 day period. While this final configuration appears to be stable for at least $4 \times 10^5$ yr, it is inconsistent with the RV and photometric data. We did not carry out a full exploration of the parameter space allowed by our uncertainties, but the fact that the best-fit three-planet model for HAT-P-44 shows rapid planetary migration indicates that this model may very well be unstable. If additional RV observations support a three-planet solution for HAT-P-44, it will also be important to test the stability of this solution.

4. DISCUSSION

We have presented the discovery of three new transiting planet systems. The inner transiting planets have masses, radii, and orbital periods typical of other hot Jupiters. The planets are located on well occupied areas of both the mass–radius and the equilibrium temperature–radius diagrams. Nonetheless, as objects with well measured masses and radii, these planets will be important contributors to statistical studies of exoplanetary systems.

A notable feature of all three systems is the systematic variation seen in each of their residual RV curves. We allow in our modeling for the possibility that this excess scatter can be attributed to jitter using the empirical jitter distribution from Keck/HIRES as a prior constraint. To our knowledge this is the first time an empirical constraint on the jitter has been used in modeling the RV data for a transiting exoplanet system. Using the empirical jitter distribution significantly affects the conclusions: if we had fixed the jitter to a typical value, or a value where $\chi^2$/dof $= 1$ for the best-fit model, we would have claimed with much greater confidence the existence of multiple planets in each system. Accounting for the uncertainty in the jitter, which must be inferred from the observations, leads to a lower confidence that we believe is more realistic.

We find that for two of the targets, HAT-P-44 and HAT-P-46, a two-planet model best explains the observations. HAT-P-44 appears to have, in addition to the $P = 4.3012$ day transiting planet, a long period planet on a $P = 872$ day, $P = 220$ day, or $P = 438$ day orbit, where the ambiguity is due to aliasing. HAT-P-46 appears to have a $P = 4.4631$ day transiting planet, and a long period planet on a $P = 78$ day orbit, though we caution that the preference for this model over a single-planet model is not very strong for this system. Due to the limited number of RV observations, we are unable to confirm that the variation in the HAT-P-45 residual RV curve is due to a second planet, rather than being the result of anomalously high jitter for this star. Nonetheless, the high scatter, and apparent temporal correlation in that scatter, are both suggestive of a second planet, though could also be due to stellar activity.

As noted in the introduction, outer planetary companions have been confirmed for only five hot Jupiter systems ($\nu$ And; HD 217107; HD 187123; HIP 14810; and HAT-P-13). Only one of these, HAT-P-13, is a transiting planet system. In several other cases long-term trends have been detected, but so far the periods have not been constrained. For both HAT-P-44 and HAT-P-46 the periods of the outer planets in our adopted models are significantly longer than the transiting planet periods. This is in line with the five previously known multi-planet hot-Jupiter-bearing systems, where the shortest period outer component is HIP 14810c with a period of 147.8 days, and is unlike other multi-planet systems where densely packed systems with components having similar periods appear to be common (e.g., Lissauer et al. 2011; Fabrycky et al. 2012).

---

**Table 14**

Model-dependent Parameters for Outer Planets in HAT-P-45 and HAT-P-46

| Parameter | Adopted Parameter | Value | Adopted Parameter | Value |
|-----------|------------------|-------|------------------|-------|
| HAT-P-45  | $P_{c}$ (days)   | $15.3 \pm 0.1$ | $P_{c}$ (days)   | $77.7 \pm 0.6$ |
|           | $T_{c,c}$ (BJD)  | $2455700.0 \pm 0.3$ | $T_{c,c}$ (BJD)  | $245695.6 \pm 2.0$ |
|           | $T_{14,c}$ (days) | $0.242 \pm 0.009$ | $T_{14,c}$ (days) | $0.446 \pm 0.058$ |
|           | $K_{c}$ (m s$^{-1}$) | $36 \pm 5$ | $K_{c}$ (m s$^{-1}$) | $81 \pm 9$ |
|           | $\sqrt{e} \cos \omega_{c}$ | $0$ | $\sqrt{e} \cos \omega_{c}$ | $0$ |
|           | $\sqrt{e} \sin \omega_{c}$ | $0$ | $\sqrt{e} \sin \omega_{c}$ | $0$ |
|           | $e \cos \omega_{c}$ | $0$ | $e \cos \omega_{c}$ | $0$ |
|           | $e \sin \omega_{c}$ | $0$ | $e \sin \omega_{c}$ | $0$ |
|           | $\omega_{c}$ | $0$ | $\omega_{c}$ | $0$ |
|           | $\omega_{c}$ (deg) | $0$ | $\omega_{c}$ (deg) | $0$ |
|           | $M_{p} \sin i_{c}$ ($M_{J}$) | $0.5 \pm 0.1$ | $M_{p} \sin i_{c}$ ($M_{J}$) | $2.0 \pm 0.3$ |
|           | $a_{c}$ (AU) | $0.130 \pm 0.002$ | $a_{c}$ (AU) | $0.387^{+0.010}_{-0.007}$ |

**Notes:**

- $T_{c,c}$: reference epoch of mid transit that minimizes the correlation with the orbital period. $T_{14,c}$: total transit duration, time between first to last contact; Barycentric Julian dates (BJD) throughout the paper are calculated from Coordinated Universal Time (UTC).
Another interesting aspect of the three systems presented here is that they all have super-solar metallicities ([Fe/H] = 0.33 ± 0.10, 0.07 ± 0.10, and 0.30 ± 0.10 for HAT-P-44, HAT-P-45, and HAT-P-46, respectively), as do the five confirmed multi-planet hot Jupiter systems ([Fe/H] = 0.153 ± 0.03, 0.389 ± 0.03, 0.121 ± 0.03, 0.230 ± 0.03, and 0.410 ± 0.08 for ν And, HD 217107, HD 187123, HIP 14810, and HAT-P-13, respectively). That giant planets are more common around metal-rich stars is well known (Fischer & Valenti 2005); moreover, evidence suggests that the relation between metallicity and occurrence is even stronger for multi-planet systems than it is for single planet systems (e.g., Wright et al. 2009). Recently Dawson & Murray-Clay (2013) suggested that giant planets orbiting metal-rich stars are more likely to show signatures of planet–planet interactions. Of the 166 hot-Jupiter-hosting stars in the exoplanets orbit database with measured metallicities, 109 have [Fe/H] > 0 and 57 have [Fe/H] < 0. While there is a 12% probability of finding 5 systems with [Fe/H] > 0 if 109/(57 + 109) = 66% of systems have such a metallicity, if we include HAT-P-44 and HAT-P-46 then the probability decreases to 5%. A Kolmogorov–Smirnov (K-S) test yields a 0.6% chance that the sample of seven multi-planet hot Jupiter systems (including HAT-P-44 and HAT-P-46) have metallicities drawn from the same distribution as all hot Jupiter-hosting systems. However, if we compare the multi-planet hot Jupiter-hosting systems to the 48 multi-planet systems with metallicities in the database that have at least one component with \( M_p \sin i > 0.1 \ M_J \), the K-S test yields a 23% chance that the metallicities are drawn from the same distribution. We conclude that multi-planet systems with Hot Jupiters may be more common around metal rich stars than single Hot Jupiters, to a similar extent that multi-planet systems with giant planets are in general more likely to be found around metal rich stars. A more definitive conclusion requires a careful consideration of selection effects, and a uniform determination of metallicities.

Multi-planet systems with transiting components are potentially useful for a number of applications. For example, RV observations during transit can be used to determine the projected obliquity of the transiting planet via the Rossiter–McLaughlin effect (e.g., Quezada et al. 2000). Measuring this angle for several systems would test whether the orientations of hot Jupiters in multi-planet systems are significantly different from isolated hot Jupiters, thereby testing if these two classes of systems have experienced different formation and/or evolution processes. Another example is the tidal Love number, which carries information about the interiors of planets, and can potentially be determined for transiting planets in multi-planet systems (Batygin et al. 2009; Mardling 2010; Kramm et al. 2012).

While we have explored numerous classes of models for each system, we have not exhausted all possibilities, and it may be that the any one of these systems has a planetary architecture that is substantially different from what we have considered in this paper. Further long-term RV monitoring of these objects is needed to confirm the outer planets in these systems and characterize their properties.
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