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For all exoplanet candidates, the reliability of a claimed detection needs to be assessed through a careful study of systematic errors in the data to minimize the false positives rate. We present a method to investigate such systematics in microlensing data sets using the microlensing event OGLE-2013-BLG-0446 as a case study. The event was observed from multiple sites around the world and its high magnification ($A_{\text{max}} \sim 3000$) allowed us to investigate the effects of terrestrial and annual parallax. Real-time modeling of the event while it was still ongoing suggested the presence of an extremely low-mass companion ($\sim 3M_J$) to the lensing star, leading to substantial follow-up coverage of the light curve. We test and compare different models for the light curve and conclude that the data do not favor the planetary interpretation when systematic errors are taken into account.
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1. INTRODUCTION

For the past 10 years, gravitational microlensing has been used to detect cool planets around G, K, and M-stars in the Milky Way, allowing access to a planetary regime difficult to observe with the transit or radial velocity methods (i.e., microlensing is sensitive to planets beyond the snowline). Due to the increased field of view of the OGLE-IV and MOA-II surveys, and the recently improved performance of follow-up teams, the number of planets detected by microlensing has gone up substantially (typically 10–20 planets detected per year and 33 published to date).

Another advantage of the microlensing method is that detection of planetary companions is possible over a larger mass range ($\sim 1M_J$–$\sim 13M_J$), including brown dwarfs, if the projected orbital radius $a$ is in the range 0.6–1.6 $R_E$ (i.e., the classical “lensing zone”). Thanks to better photometric coverage of light curves, recent studies have advanced claims about the detection of small planets (Bennett et al. 2014). However, smaller mass ratios tend to produce smaller deviations from a single lens model most of the time. Failing to account for photometric systematics can potentially lead to false detections. The analysis of photometric systematics has been important in transit searches and has substantially improved the reliability of detections (Kovács et al. 2005; Smith et al. 2012). This point is too often neglected by the microlensing community.

In this work, we present an extensive study of photometric systematics for the case of OGLE-2013-BLG-0446 and we compare the significance when different microlensing models are considered. Section 2 presents a summary of the observations of microlensing event OGLE-2013-BLG-0446 from multiple sites around the world. We present our modeling process in Section 3 and conduct a study of systematics in the data in Section 4. We present our conclusions in Section 5.

2. OBSERVATIONS

Microlensing event OGLE-2013-BLG-0446 ($\alpha = 18^h06^m$ 56'18', $\delta = -31^\circ39'27''/2$ (J2000.0); $l = 0^\circ049$, $b = -5^\circ344$) was discovered on 2013 April 6 by the Optical Gravitational Lens Experiment (OGLE) Early Warning System (Udalski 2003b) and later alerted by the Microlensing Observations in Astrophysics (MOA) (Bond et al. 2001). Observations obtained on the rising part of the light curve indicated that this event could be highly magnified and might therefore be highly sensitive to planets (Griest & Safizadeh 1998; Gould et al. 2009; Yee et al. 2009). Follow-up teams, such as $\mu$FUN (Gould et al. 2006), PLANET (Beaulieu et al. 2006), RoboNet (Tsapras et al. 2009), and MiNDSTep (Dominik et al. 2008), then began observations a few days before the peak of the event. The peak magnification was $\sim 3000$ and the peak was densely sampled from different observatories. The various teams used difference image analysis (DIA) to obtain photometry: $\mu$FUN used pySIS (Albrow et al. 2009), with the exception of the Auckland data, which were re-reduced using DanDIA (Bramich 2008; Bramich et al. 2013). DanDIA was also used to reduce the RoboNet and the Danish data sets. PLANET data were reduced online with the WISIS pipeline, and final data sets were
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prepared using pySIS.\textsuperscript{61} OGLE (Udalski & Szymański 2015) and MOA (Bond et al. 2001) used their own DIA code to reduce their frames. All other data sets were reduced using pySIS.

A total of 2955 data points from 16 telescopes were used for our analysis, after problematic data points were masked. A summary of each data set is available in Table 1.

3. MODELING

3.1. Source Properties

This event shows clear signs of finite-source effects and the limb darkening coefficients must be evaluated for each data set. We first consider a point-source point-lens model (PSPL) (Paczyński 1986). The PSPL model allows the estimation of the source and blended fluxes in the $V$ and $I$ passbands for the calibrated OGLE photometry, leading to a good approximation for the $V$ and $I$ magnitudes of the source, which in turn allows us to derive a rough color for the source. We found $(I, (V − I))_{\text{PSPL}} = (19.07, 1.48)$. Using the Interstellar Extinction Calculator on the OGLE website\textsuperscript{62} based on Nataf et al. (2013), we found that the Galactic Bulge true distance modulus for this line of sight is $\mu = 14.578 \pm 0.326$ mag ($d_{\text{Bulge}} = 8.2 \pm 1.2$ kpc), the $I$ band extinction is $A_I = 0.804$ mag, and the reddening is $E(V − I) = 0.683 \pm 0.036$ mag, leading to $R_I = A_I/E(V − I) = 1.777$, lower than the standard value of 1.5. This low extinction is known as the anomalous extinction law toward the Galactic Bulge; see Udalski (2003a). We derive the source properties as follows:

1. Assuming that the source suffers the same extinction as the Red Giant Clump (i.e., the source is at the same distance), we have $M_I = 19.07 - 0.804 - 14.578 = 3.7$ mag, so the source star is most likely a main sequence star. We adopt $log g \sim 4.5$.

2. We derive its effective temperature using the dereddened color–magnitude relation for dwarfs and subgiants (relation (3) in Casagrande et al. 2010) with solar metallicity.

3. From Claret (2000) and using log $g \sim 4.5$, we are able to find the linear limb-darkening coefficients $u_\lambda$ (Milne 1921) for each filter. Following Albrow et al. (1999) and Yoo et al. (2004), we use the transformation:

$$\Gamma_\lambda = \frac{2u_\lambda}{3 - u_\lambda}. \quad (1)$$

These calculations form the starting point for an iterative fit of the finite source point lens (FSPL) model, together with error-bar rescaling as described in Section 3.3. Our best FSPL model converges to source magnitude and color $(I, (V − I)) = (19.00, 1.49)$. Correcting for extinction and reddening we have $(I_\circ, (V − I)_\circ) = (18.20, 0.81)$. The corresponding effective temperature of the source is $T_{\text{eff}} \sim 5400K$, leading to $\Gamma_\circ = 0.63$ ($u_\circ = 0.72$), $\Gamma_R = 0.55$ ($u_R = 0.65$) and $\Gamma_I = 0.46$ ($u_I = 0.56$) for log $g \sim 4.5$. Note that we also use $\Gamma_I = 0.46$ for the RoboNet telescopes (SDSS-i filter). Finally, given the dereddened magnitude and color of the source from our best FSPL model, we are able to estimate the angular source star radius $\theta_\circ$ using Kervella & Fouqué (2008):

$$log_{10}(\theta_\circ) = 3.1982 + 0.4895(V − I)_\circ \times 0.0657(V − I)_\circ + 0.2I_\circ. \quad (2)$$

The uncertainty of this relation is 0.0238. The errors on our magnitude estimates are $(\Delta I, \Delta V) = (0.02, 0.02)$ mag. Assuming a conservative estimate of the error on $A_I$ (0.1 mag) and using standard error propagation gives 9% precision: $\theta_\circ = 0.82 \pm 0.07$ mas. With the adopted source distance (8.234 kpc), the source star radius is $R_\circ = 1.4 \pm 0.3R_\odot$. Therefore the source is a G6 or K0 star (Bessell & Brett 1988).

3.2. Single Lens Model

The PSPL model is described by the standard single-lens parameters: $t_E$, the Einstein crossing time, $u_\circ$ the minimum impact parameter, and $t_o$ the time of this minimum. The

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Summary of Observations}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
Name & Collaboration & Location & Aperture(m) & Filter & Code & $N_{\text{data}}$ & Longitude(deg) & Latitude(deg) \\
\hline
OGLE_1 & OGLE & Chile & 1.3 & $I$ & Wozniak & 463 & 289.307 & -29.015 \\
OGLE_V & OGLE & Chile & 1.3 & $V$ & Wozniak & 24 & 289.307 & -29.015 \\
Canopus_I & PLANET & Tasmania & 1.0 & $I$ & pySIS & 132 & 147.433 & -42.848 \\
Auckland_R & $\mu$FUN & New Zealand & 0.4 & $R$ & DanDIA & 107 & 147.777 & -36.906 \\
LSCB_i & RoboNet & Chile & 1.0 & SDSS-i & DanDIA & 378 & 289.195 & -30.167 \\
LSCA_i & RoboNet & Chile & 1.0 & SDSS-i & DanDIA & 385 & 289.195 & -30.167 \\
CPTA_i & RoboNet & South Africa & 1.0 & SDSS-i & DanDIA & 22 & 20.810 & -32.347 \\
CTIO_I & $\mu$FUN & Chile & 1.3 & $I$ & pySIS & 112 & 289.196 & -30.169 \\
CTIO_V & $\mu$FUN & Chile & 1.3 & $V$ & pySIS & 13 & 289.196 & -30.169 \\
Danish_z & MiNDSTEp & Chile & 1.5 & $i + z$ & DanDIA & 452 & 289.261 & -29.255 \\
MOA_Red & MOA & New Zealand & 1.8 & Red & Bond & 454 & 170.464 & -43.987 \\
Possum_N & $\mu$FUN & New Zealand & 0.4 & $N$ & pySIS & 244 & 177.856 & -38.623 \\
Salerno_I & MiNDSTEp & Italy & 0.4 & $I$ & pySIS & 20 & 14.799 & 40.772 \\
Turteia_R & $\mu$FUN & New Zealand & 0.4 & $R$ & pySIS & 31 & 175.630 & -40.353 \\
Weizmann_I & $\mu$FUN & Israel & 0.4 & $I$ & pySIS & 60 & 34.811 & 31.908 \\
SAAO_I & PLANET & South Africa & 1.0 & $I$ & pySIS & 58 & 20.789 & -32.374 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{61} Data from Tasmania were obtained at the Canopus 1 m observatory by John Greenhill. This was the last planetary candidate observed from Canopus before its decommissioning. These observations were also the last collected and reduced by John Greenhill (at the age 80). He has been our loyal collaborator and friend over the past 18 years and passed away on 2014 September 28.

\textsuperscript{62} http://ogle.astrouw.edu.pl/
normalized angular source radius $\rho = \theta_* / \theta_E$ (Gould 1994; Nemiroff & Wickramasinghe 1994; Witt & Mao 1994; Bennett & Rhie 1996; Vermaak 2000), where $\theta_E$ is the angular Einstein ring radius, is included in the model along with the previous parameters to take into account finite-source effects close to the magnification peak. We used the method described in Yoo et al. (2004) to take into account the change in magnification due to the extended source. The FSPL model significantly improves the fit (see Table 3). The best FSPL model is shown in Figure 1.

Using the value of $\rho$ from the FSPL model, we are able to estimate the angular radius of the Einstein ring $\theta_E = \theta_* / \rho = 1.57 \pm 0.1$ mas and the lens-source proper motion $\mu = \theta_E / \theta_E = 7.4 \pm 0.7$ mas yr$^{-1}$.

### 3.3. Treatment of Photometric Uncertainties and Rejection of Outliers

Because of the diversity of observatories and reduction pipelines used in microlensing, photometric uncertainties need careful rescaling to accurately represent the real dispersion of each data set. This is an important preliminary step in modeling the event. Following Bachelet et al. (2012b), Miyake et al. (2012), and Yee et al. (2013), we rescale the uncertainties using:

$$e'_i = \sqrt{(fe'_i)^2 + e^2_{\text{min}}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $e_i$ are the original magnitude uncertainties, $f$ is the rescaling parameter for low magnification levels, $e_{\text{min}}$ is a minimal uncertainty to reproduce the practical limitations of photometry, and $e'_i$ are the adjusted magnitude uncertainties. The classical rescaling method is to adjust $f$ and $e_{\text{min}}$ to force $\chi^2$/degrees of freedom (dof) to be unity.

In this paper, we follow an alternative method of first adjusting $f$ and $e_{\text{min}}$ to force the residuals, normalized by $e'_i$, to follow a Gaussian distribution around the model. If possible, we also aim to obtain $\chi^2$/dof $\sim 1$. Note that these two methods lead to the same results, except for the OGLE_I data set. For OGLE_I, the distribution without rescaling shows some data points with large residuals. This is not surprising because the OGLE_I data set covers the entire light curve with a large number of points, especially the faint baseline magnitude ($I \sim 17.8$), with a constant exposure time on the order of 100 s. Inspection of the OGLE_I light curve reveals that the uncertainties during high magnification are underestimated, so we adjust the $e_{\text{min}}$ parameter. We tried to force $\chi^2$/dof $\sim 1$ for this data set, but this generated large uncertainties for the low magnification part (i.e., the baseline), leading to a non-Gaussian distribution (lots of normalized residuals too close to the mean).

We finally checked isolated points far away from this Gaussian distribution, and reject as outliers (>7$\sigma$) two data points in the Auckland_R data set. The rescaling coefficients are presented in Table 2.


3.4. Annual and Terrestrial Parallaxes

We looked for second-order effects in the light curve. First, the relatively long Einstein-ring crossing time ($t_E \sim 80$ days) should allow the measurement of the displacement of the line of sight toward the target due to the Earth’s rotation around the Sun. This annual parallax (Gould & Loeb 1992; Gould 2000, 2004; Smith et al. 2003; Skowron et al. 2011) is described by the vector $\pi_E = \Delta U/E = (\pi_{EN}, \pi_{EE})$, where $E$ is the angular radius of the Einstein ring of the lens projected onto the observer plane and $\pi_{EN}$ and $\pi_{EE}$ are the components of this vector in the north and east directions respectively. In practice, the introduction of this parameter slightly changes the value of $\pi$.

Note that we also compute the annual parallax model for a positive impact parameter ($u_0 > 0$) and found no significant difference with the model reported in the Table 3. This is the $u_0$ degeneracy described in the literature (Smith et al. 2003; Gould 2004; Skowron et al. 2011). For the terrestrial parallax, a positive impact parameter leads to a better fit ($\Delta \chi^2 \sim 60$) for equivalent $\pi_{EN}$ and $\pi_{EE}$ values, which is a similar result to Yee et al. (2009).

3.5. Binary Model

At the end of the 2013 observing season, several planetary models circulated (private communication) indicating the presence of the smallest microlensing planet ever detected ($q \sim 2 \times 10^{-5}$). In order to investigate these claims of the existence of a very low-mass ratio planetary companion to the primary lens, and to exclude the possibility of a false alarm, we used a finite-source binary lens model (FSBL) with three extra parameters: the projected separation (normalized by $\theta_E$) between the two bodies $s$, the mass ratio $q$ using the convention described in Bachelet et al. (2012a) (the most massive component on the left), and $\alpha$ the source trajectory angle measured from the line joining the two components (counterclockwise angle). We first used a grid search and we finally explore minima with a full Markov-Chain Monte Carlo algorithm. Please see, for example, Dong et al. (2009) or Bachelet et al. (2012a) for more details. We find two local minima which correspond to the known theoretical degeneracy $s \propto s^{-1}$. We only explore the “wide” solution, which gives the best grid-search $\chi^2$, for three reasons. First, as explained in the next section, the reliability of the planetary model is not clear. Second, we expect a strong degeneracy in terms of $s \propto s^{-1}$, so models should converge to solutions with similar shapes for the central caustic and therefore similar residuals. Finally, due to the really small value of $\rho$, modeling this event is very time consuming. We present our results in Table 3, our best caustic-crossing geometry in Figure 2, and residuals to the FSBL model for data sets covering the magnification peak are plotted in Figure 3.

4. STUDY OF SYSTEMATIC TRENDS IN THE PHOTOGRAPHY

4.1. Generality and Method

Our best planetary model claims the detection of smooth deviations in the light curve away from the FSBL model at a peak-to-peak level of $\leq 1\%$, which is supposedly caused by the source passing over the central planetary caustic. It is well known to photometrists, however, that from ground-based telescopes the photometric precision at this level can be affected by systematic trends (or red noise) in the data.

In the early days of planet hunting using the transit method, researchers were confounded as to why they were not finding as many planets as predicted. The predictions were of course based on simulated light curves taking into account stochastic noise from the photons (sky and star) and the charge-coupled device (CCD), but ignoring the effects of sub-optimal data calibration/reduction that introduce correlated noise (e.g., Mallén-Ornelas et al. 2003; Pepper & Gaudi 2005). It was soon realized that transit detection thresholds were severely affected by systematic trends in the light curves (Pont et al. 2006; Aigrain & Pont 2007) with the knock-on effect of reducing the predicted planetary yield of a transit survey, and at
transparency variations in the data sets should be modeled in the DIA procedure by the photometric scale factor. However, there is no guarantee that the DIA modeling is perfect and this can create systematic trends in the data. As recently discussed by Bramich et al. (2015), an error \( \epsilon_p \) in the estimate of the photometric scale factor leads directly to an error \( \epsilon_p \) in the photometry. For example, the passage of clouds during data acquisition can create inhomogeneous atmospheric transparency in the frames and lead to a spatially varying photometric scale factor. The estimation of the photometric scale factor in DIA by using a “mean” value for the whole frame will produce different systematic trends for each star in the field of view. In practice, the expected error \( \epsilon_p \) is of order of a few per cent, which is non-critical for the majority of microlensing deviations, but can easily imitate the smallest such as in OGLE-2013-BLG-0446.

Obtaining a photon-noise limited data calibration and photometric extraction is not always feasible. Therefore complementary techniques have been developed to perform a relative calibration of the ensemble photometry after the data reduction (i.e., a post-calibration). These techniques can be divided into two broad groups, namely, detrending methods that do not use any a priori knowledge about the data acquisition or instrumental set up (e.g., Tamuz et al. 2005), and photometric modeling methods that attempt to model the systematic trends based on the survey/instrumental properties (e.g., Honeycutt 1992; Padmanabhan et al. 2008; Regnault et al. 2009). Each data point is associated with a unique object and a unique image (epoch), and carries associated metadata such as magnitude uncertainty, airmass, \((x, y)\) detector coordinates, PSF FWHM, etc. To investigate the systematic trends in the photometry, we first identified a set of object/image properties which we suspected of having influenced the quality of the data reduction. For each of these quantities, we defined a binning that covers the full range of values with an appropriate bin size. For each bin, we introduced an unknown magnitude offset to be determined, the purpose of which is to model the mean difference of the photometric measurements within the corresponding bin from the rest of the photometric measurements. We constructed our photometric model by adopting the unknown true instrumental magnitude of each object\(^{63}\) and the magnitude offsets as parameters.

\(^{63}\) Except for one object where we fixed the true instrumental magnitude to an arbitrary value to avoid degeneracy.
Since the model is linear, the best-fit parameter values corresponding to the minimum in $\chi^2$ may be solved for directly (and in a single step using some matrix algebra—see Bramich & Freudling 2012). Iteration is of course mandatory to remove variable stars and strong outliers from the photometric data set. A valid criticism of this method is that the systematic trends are derived from the constant stars but then applied to all stars including the variable stars (the microlensing event in our case). The question arises as to whether this approach is consistent. To argue our case, we are limited to showing that the method works in practice and we direct the reader to Figure 1 of Kains et al. (2015) where RR Lyrae light curves in M68 are much improved by this self-calibration method. We used this method to analyze systematic trends in three data sets. They are listed below.

4.2. LSCA$_i$ and LSCB$_i$ : the Twins Paradox

We opted to employ the above methodology in order to investigate and understand the systematic trends in the LSCB$_i$ and LSCA$_i$ data sets using the algorithms described in Bramich & Freudling (2012). These telescopes are twins: both are LCOGT 1 m telescope clones, both supporting Kodak SBIG STX-16803 CCDs at the time of these observations. SDSS-$i$ prescription filters manufactured at the same time were use to observe OGLE-2013-BLG-0446 during the same period of observation, though not precisely synchronously.

We first chose to study LSCB$_i$ because this telescope most strongly favors the planetary model ($\Delta \chi^2 \sim 128.3$; see Table 6). For LSCB$_i$, the DanDIA pipeline extracted 4272 light curves from the images in the LSCB$_i$ data set, each with 378 data points (or epochs), which yields a total of 1,614,816 photometric data points. We investigated each object/image property in turn using the above method, and determined the peak-to-peak amplitude of the magnitude offsets in each case. The results are reported in Table 4. The trends in the photometry were found to be at the sub-mmag level for all correlating properties except for the epoch (2.0 mmag). The magnitude offsets determined for each epoch (or image) serve to correct for any errors in the fitted values of the photometric scale factors during DIA. The magnitude offsets as a function of detector coordinates (commonly referred to as an illumination correction—e.g., Coccato et al. 2014) were modeled using a two-dimensional cubic surface (as opposed to the binning previously described) so as to better capture the large-scale errors in the flat-fielding. The peak-to-peak amplitude of the cubic surface over the full detector area was found to be $\sim$60 mmag, but since the LSCB$_i$ observations only drifted by $\sim$50 pixels in each coordinate, we found that the magnitude offsets applicable to the OGLE-2013-BLG-446 light curve have a peak-to-peak amplitude of only $\sim$0.2 mmag. This can be seen in Figure 4. The overall level of systematic trends in the LSCB$_i$ data set for OGLE-2013-BLG-446 is $\sim$2.0 mmag. To conclude, this analysis reveals that the illumination correction is not sufficient to explain the observed systematics.
Table 4
The Peak-to-Peak Amplitude of the Magnitude Offsets for Each Object/Image Property that We Investigated for
Causing Systematic Trends in the Photometry for the LSCB_i, LSCA_i and Auckland_R Data Sets

| Correlating Quantity | Possible Underlying Cause | LSCA_i Peak-To-Peak Amplitude (mmag) | LSCB_i Peak-To-Peak Amplitude (mmag) | Auckland_R Peak-To-Peak Amplitude (mmag) |
|----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Exposure time        | CCD non-lineairties       | 20                                  | 0.3                                 | 60                                     |
| Airmass              | Varying extinction        | 22                                  | 0.8                                 | 40                                     |
| PSF FWHM             | Varying seeing disk       | 25                                  | 0.4                                 | 28                                     |
| Photometric scale factor | Reduction quality at different transparencies | 20                                  | 0.2                                 | 40                                     |
| Epoch                | Errors in photometric scale factor | 60                                  | 2.0                                 | 120                                    |
| Detector coordinates | Flat-field errors         | 10                                  | 0.2                                 | *                                      |
| Background           | Reduction quality         | 27                                  | 0.5                                 | 45                                     |

Note. We also list a possible underlying cause for any systematic trends that are found as a function of the corresponding object/image property.

4.4. Correction of Systematics

For the three studied data sets (LSCA_i, LSCB_i and Auckland_R), we corrected the systematics for the quantity that yielded the largest peak-to-peak amplitude in the magnitude offsets: namely the epoch. Moreover, this quantity is correlated with other quantities (airmass for example) and so the epoch correction should decrease the systematic trends measured for the other parameters listed in Table 4. We checked this and found that for the three data sets, the epoch correction leads to a significant improvement (order of a factor 10) for the systematics of the correlated quantities. This is a first order correction and we wanted to see the impact on the different models we analyzed. We repeated our modeling process with these new data sets using the previous models as starting points. The results are presented in Table 5. The new Auckland_R residuals can be seen in Figure 6. After correction, the amplitude of the “anomaly” is smaller but still exists. This is probably due to the fact that the amplitude of this feature in the light curves is brightness dependent, and the microlensing target is much brighter than all of the other stars, leading to an insufficient correction for the microlensing event.

As can be seen in Table 6, the correction of the systematics has a significant impact on the LSCA_i and Auckland_R data sets, which appear to suffer the most systematics. Note also that the planetary model is more significant after systematics correction, especially for these two telescopes. Even though the planetary model changes slightly before and after correction (the new s and q values are outside the error bars of the uncorrected data sets model), the caustic crossing is virtually
unchanged (e.g., the central caustic is similar). However, the clearest signature of the planetary anomaly is still in the Auckland_R data set around HJD $\sim$ 6446.02.

4.5. Discussion

Due to strong finite source effects around a very small central caustic, the suspected planetary signature in OGLE-2013-BLG-0446 is very small. First of all, the low $\chi^2$ improvement ($\Delta \chi^2 \sim 350$ and $\Delta \chi^2 \sim 389$ before and after the systematics correction respectively) of the planetary model is far from the minimum value generally adopted in microlensing for a safe detection (Yee et al. 2013). Note also that even though the caustic crossing is similar, the two planetary models are not fully equivalent. As defined by Chung et al. (2005), the $R_c$ parameter is the ratio of the vertical length and the horizontal length of a central caustic. This caustic parameter before and after correction is significantly different ($\sim 30\%$). Second, the highest $\Delta \chi^2$ contributor ($LSCB_i$) presents photometric systematics at the same level as the planetary deviations (2 versus 6 mmag). As can be seen in Figure 6, the systematics correction decreases the amplitude of the “anomaly” in the Auckland_R data set and it is therefore better fit by the planetary model. However, the increase in the FSPL residuals after HJD $\sim$ 6446.02 (from 1% to zero) is not
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**Figure 5.** (a): Residuals of the FSPL model for the Auckland_R data set. (b): Light curves of the two other brightest stars in the field. (c): Systematics magnitude offsets as a function of the epoch computed for this data set; see text. (d): Photometric scale factor (normalized to a single exposure).

| Parameters | FSPL_c | FSPL_c + Annual Parallax | FSPL_c + Terrestrial Parallax | Wide Planetary (FSBL_c) |
|------------|--------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| $t_c$(HJD) | 6446.04818 ± 2 $10^{-5}$ | 6446.04681 ± 3 $10^{-5}$ | 6446.04680 ± 3 $10^{-5}$ | 6446.04665 ± 3 $10^{-5}$ |
| $u_c$(days) | -4.21 $10^{-4}$ ± 1 $10^{-6}$ | -4.01 $10^{-4}$ ± 8 $10^{-6}$ | -4.19 $10^{-4}$ ± 7 $10^{-6}$ | -4.34 $10^{-4}$ ± 5 $10^{-6}$ |
| $\rho$(θE) | 76.8 ± 0.1 | 80.6 ± 1.5 | 77.2 ± 1.3 | 74.9 ± 0.9 |
| $\rho$(θE) | 5.22 $10^{-4}$ ± 1 $10^{-6}$ | 4.97 $10^{-4}$ ± 4 $10^{-5}$ | 5.20 $10^{-4}$ ± 9 $10^{-6}$ | 5.40 $10^{-4}$ ± 7 $10^{-6}$ |
| $l_c$(mag) | 19.00 ± 0.01 | 19.05 ± 0.02 | 19.01 ± 0.02 | 18.97 ± 0.01 |
| $l_c$(mag) | 20.49 ± 0.01 | 20.55 ± 0.02 | 20.50 ± 0.02 | 20.46 ± 0.01 |
| $l_c$(mag) | 18.21 ± 0.01 | 18.19 ± 0.01 | 18.21 ± 0.01 | 18.23 ± 0.01 |
| $l_c$(mag) | 22.72 ± 0.10 | 22.35 ± 0.10 | 22.70 ± 0.11 | 22.98 ± 0.11 |
| $\Pi_{BB}$ | ... | 0.34 ± 0.12 | 0.05 ± 0.01 | ... |
| $\Pi_{BB}$ | ... | 0.28 ± 0.04 | -0.00 ± 0.01 | ... |
| $a(\theta_E)$ | ... | ... | ... | 1.5054 ± 0.04 |
| $q$ | ... | ... | ... | 2.304 $10^{-3}$ ± 1.9 $10^{-6}$ |
| $\alpha$(rad) | ... | ... | ... | -2.39 ± 0.02 |
| $\chi^2$ | 3647.999 | 3571.000 | 3625.150 | 3258.842 |
explained by the planetary model, but similar behavior is seen in other bright stars. This clearly indicates that bright stars suffer from systematic effects in this data set which were not revealed by the different quantities we studied.

The planetary model is highly favored by the Canopus_I data set ($\Delta \chi^2 \approx 60$). However, a closer look at Figure 3 reveals that the planetary deviations are at a very low level ($\leq 0.5\%$). It cannot be excluded that the FSPL model correctly fits this data set and that this telescope also suffers from low level systematics errors. We however decided to not realize the same study of photometric systematic errors for the Canopus_I data set because there are no obvious deviations in the FSPL residuals and also because enough doubt has already been cast on the planetary model we found.

All these points reveal strong doubts about the reality of the planetary signature in OGLE-2013-BLG-0446. Even if we cannot firmly guarantee that the planet is not detected, we prefer to stay conservative and claim that we do not detect a planet in this event.

5. Conclusions

We presented the analysis of microlensing event OGLE-2013-BLG-0446. For this highly magnified event ($A \sim 3000$), several higher-order effects were investigated in the modeling process: annual and terrestrial parallax and planetary deviations. The study of photometric systematics for several data sets leads to various levels of confidence in the photometry. Moreover, a closer look at the data residuals and a precise study of photometric systematics reveals enough doubt to question any potential signals. Regarding the level of planetary signal ($\sim 1\%$) versus the various levels of systematics, we are not confident about the planetary signature in OGLE-2013-BLG-0446. Unfortunately, the clearest signature of the planetary signal was observed only in a single data set which presents some unexplained behavior for the brightest stars at the time of the anomaly. These doubts in addition to the relatively low improvement in $\chi^2$ ($\Delta \chi^2 \lesssim 400$) encourage us to remain conservative and not to claim a planetary detection. This study stresses the importance of studying and quantifying the photometric systematic errors down to the level of 1% or lower for the detection of the smallest microlensing planets.

The authors would like to thank the anonymous referee for the useful comments. This publication was made possible by the NPRP grant # X-019-1-006 from the Qatar National Research Fund (a member of Qatar Foundation). The statements made herein are solely the responsibility of the authors. The authors thank the OGLE collaboration for the access of the optimized photometry. This work makes use of observations from the LCOGT network. This research has made use of the LCOGT Archive, which is operated by the California Institute of Technology, under contract with the Las Cumbres Observatory. This research has made much use of NASA’s Astrophysics Data System. This research made use of the SIMBAD database, the VizieR catalog access tool, and the cross-match service provide by CDS, Strasbourg, France. T.S. acknowledges the financial support from the

| Telescope   | rms (mag) | $\chi^2_{\text{FSPL}}$ | $\chi^2_{\text{Raw}}$ | $\Delta \chi^2$ | rms (mag) | $\chi^2_{\text{FSPL}}$ | $\chi^2_{\text{Raw}}$ | $\Delta \chi^2$ |
|-------------|-----------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| OGLE_I      | 0.029     | 770.308 (459)          | 655.364 (456)          | 114.944         | 0.029     | 765.677 (459)          | 661.426 (456)          | 104.251         |
| OGLE_V      | 1.348     | 23.998 (20)            | 24.005 (17)            | -0.007          | 1.348     | 23.998 (20)            | 23.979 (17)            | 0.019           |
| Canopus_I   | 0.007     | 191.996 (128)          | 132.410 (125)          | 59.586          | 0.007     | 204.40 (128)           | 137.769 (125)          | 66.631          |
| Auckland_R  | 0.006     | 142.839 (103)          | 128.294 (106)          | 14.545          | 0.006     | 112.917 (103)          | 72.331 (100)           | 40.586          |
| LSCB_i      | 0.007     | 446.170 (374)          | 317.883 (371)          | 128.287         | 0.007     | 442.338 (374)          | 311.049 (371)          | 131.189         |
| CPTA_i      | 0.023     | 21.972 (18)            | 21.926 (15)            | 0.047           | 0.023     | 21.972 (18)            | 21.925 (15)            | 0.047           |
| CTIO_I      | 0.006     | 159.174 (108)          | 171.347 (15)           | -12.173         | 0.006     | 158.986 (108)          | 167.376 (105)          | -8.48           |
| CTIO_V      | 0.005     | 2.986 (9)              | 5.385 (6)              | -2.399          | 0.005     | 3.036 (9)              | 5.227 (6)             | -2.191          |
| Danish_z    | 0.017     | 448.804 (448)          | 470.960 (445)          | -22.156         | 0.017     | 450.589 (448)          | 471.304 (445)          | -20.712         |
| MOA_Red     | 0.785     | 727.979 (450)          | 725.116 (447)          | 2.863           | 0.783     | 727.760 (450)          | 721.763 (447)          | 5.997           |
| Possum_N    | 0.012     | 355.767 (240)          | 312.101 (237)          | 43.666          | 0.012     | 354.002 (240)          | 324.301 (237)          | 29.701          |
| Salerno_I   | 0.020     | 20.016 (16)            | 18.911 (13)            | 1.105           | 0.020     | 19.990 (16)            | 18.872 (13)            | 1.118           |
| Turitie_R   | 0.005     | 29.565 (27)            | 29.341 (24)            | 0.224           | 0.005     | 29.539 (27)            | 28.965 (24)            | 0.574           |
| Weizmann_I  | 0.034     | 92.383 (56)            | 92.667 (53)            | -0.284          | 0.034     | 92.389 (56)            | 92.649 (53)            | -0.260          |
| SAAO_I      | 0.014     | 67.100 (54)            | 66.442 (51)            | 0.658           | 0.014     | 67.085 (54)            | 66.487 (51)            | 0.598           |

Total: 3900.781, 3551.217, 349.564, 3647.99, 3258.842, 389.157

Note: The three corrected data sets are rendered in bold. Numbers in parentheses are the degrees of freedom for each model/data set.
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