Two intermediate-mass brown dwarfs from the TESS mission
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ABSTRACT

We report the discovery of two intermediate-mass brown dwarfs (BDs), TOI-569b and TOI-1406b, from NASA’s Transiting Exoplanet Survey Satellite mission. TOI-569b has an orbital period of $P = 6.55604 \pm 0.00016$ days, a mass of $M_b = 63.8 \pm 1.0 M_{\odot}$, and a radius of $R_b = 0.75 \pm 0.02 R_{\odot}$. Its host star, TOI-569, has a mass of $M_*= 1.21 \pm 0.03 M_{\odot}$, a radius of $R_* = 1.48 \pm 0.03 R_{\odot}$, and an effective temperature of $T_{\text{eff}} = 5705 \pm 76 K$. TOI-1406b has an orbital period of $P = 10.57415 \pm 0.00063$ days, a mass of $M_b = 46.0 \pm 2.7 M_{\odot}$, and a radius of $R_b = 0.86 \pm 0.03 R_{\odot}$. The host star for this BD has a mass of $M_*= 1.18 \pm 0.09 M_{\odot}$, a radius of $R_* = 1.35 \pm 0.03 R_{\odot}$, and an effective temperature of $T_{\text{eff}} = 6290 \pm 100 K$. Both BDs are in circular orbits around their host stars and join an increasing number of known transiting intermediate-mass BDs. TOI-569 is one of two slightly evolved stars known to host a transiting BD (the other being KOI-415). TOI-1406b is one of three known transiting BDs to occupy the mass range of 40-50 $M_{\odot}$ and one of two to have a circular orbit at a period near 10 days (with the first being KOI-205b). Based on the relatively long circularization timescales for both BDs, we believe that they must have formed in nearly circular orbits and migrated inward to their present orbital configurations.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The Transiting Exoplanet Survey Satellite (TESS) mission has aided in the discovery and characterization
of two new transiting brown dwarfs (BDs) in the past year (Jackman et al. 2019; Subjak et al. 2019). BDs are generally defined as objects with masses between 13 and 80 Jupiter masses ($M_J$) and, for those that orbit main-sequence stars, are typically observed to be 0.7 to 1.4 Jupiter radii ($R_J$) in size (Csizmadia & CoRot Team 2016; Carmichael et al. 2019). The mass limits correspond to the threshold required to fuse deuterium in the core of the BD (roughly 13 $M_J$, separating planets from BDs) and the threshold to fuse hydrogen in the core (80 $M_J$, separating BDs from stars). The mass and radius of a BD are measured through a combination of observational techniques, with two of the most important being transit photometry and radial velocity (RV) measurements. The transit method is best utilized for BDs in relatively short orbital periods (on order of 10 days or less to detect multiple transits), which is why the TESS mission has been particularly useful in making the initial detection of the transiting BD that Subjak et al. (2019) recently discovered. The transit light curves from TESS are taken over roughly 28 consecutive days per sector (or up to one year for overlapping sectors), with occasional gaps in coverage due to instrumental systematics. These light curves give estimates of the radius of the candidate companions to stars. This informs us on whether or not a candidate companion is within the typical range of radii expected for a BD orbiting a main-sequence star.

Follow up spectra are then taken to construct a series of RV measurements to determine an orbit and measure a mass to verify whether or not the candidate companion is in the BD mass range. This is an important step as objects ranging from roughly 1 $M_J$ to 100 $M_J$ may have the same radius ($\sim$1 $R_J$), so the only way to distinguish them is through measuring the mass. We are particularly fortunate at the present time to be able to utilize the parallax measurements from Gaia DR2 to derive precise stellar radii for the stars hosting transiting BDs, which directly impacts how well we measure the companion radius.

Though this process of detecting and characterizing transiting BDs is well-established and fairly accessible given the precision of modern spectrographs, we only know of 23 transiting BDs (e.g. Siverd et al. 2012; Bonomo et al. 2015; Zhou et al. 2019; Carmichael et al. 2019; Subjak et al. 2019). When compared to the number of known transiting hot Jupiters and eclipsing low-mass stellar companions in comparable orbital periods (i.e. less than 100 days), it is clear that there is a lack of BDs; this is the so-called “brown dwarf desert” (Marcy & Butler 2000).

Despite not fully understanding the origins of this desert, we may still strive to understand the nature of the population of the objects in the 13 $M_J$ to 80 $M_J$ mass range. Ma & Ge (2014) contribute to this pursuit of knowledge by proposing the existence of a gap within the the brown dwarf desert centered on 42.5 $M_J$, implying that two sub-populations of BDs exist above and below this mass. Another study by Persson et al. (2019) implies that the mass range of giant planets spans 0.3-73 $M_J$ based on a mass-density relation. These differences in ideas highlight the importance of the detection and characterization of new transiting BDs. With a transit, orbital solution, and well-determined stellar radius, we have all the components required to precisely measure the mass and radius of a transiting BD. So, each newly discovered transiting BD will add another member to this scarcely populated region of objects.

The mass and radius of a transiting BD are useful in understanding how these substellar objects evolve when compared to evolutionary models that consider the presence of a main sequence host star (e.g. Baraffe et al. 2003). Since a BD may only fuse deuterium and not hydrogen, it lacks the energy source needed to stave off gravitational contraction on long timescales as effectively as stars do, so the BD’s radius will shrink as it ages. Thus, the age also becomes an important property of a transiting BD, and this is something we may explore with substellar evolutionary models.

Age is a particularly difficult parameter to measure for stars and BDs. This makes it all the more important that we have some reasonable estimate of the age as the age of a transiting BD may be compared to its circularization timescale for the system it is in. These timescales, though not well-understand for short-period, transiting BDs, are used to understand a BDs formation and past orbital evolution.

One method to measuring the age of a transiting BD is done via its association with a star cluster or stream. There are only 3 transiting BD systems that are in clusters or stellar associations (Nowak et al. 2017; Gillen et al. 2017; David et al. 2019), so in general, this population is lacking in systems with directly measured ages. If we are not fortunate enough to have a directly measurable age, then we rely on stellar isochrone models in combination with parallax measurements form the Gaia mission and measurements of the spectral energy distribution (SED) of the host star. This method is limited by how well the metallicity and effective temperature of the star is measured.

Here we report the discovery and characterization of TOI-569b and TOI-1406b. TOI-569b orbits a recently evolved star in a circular orbit. TOI-1406b orbits an
F-type star, joining 7 other transiting BDs that orbit F-type stars, and is also in a circular orbit. Section 2 gives details on the light curves and spectra that were obtained for this study with additional attention given to the determination of the orbital period of TOI-569b, which was initially reported incorrectly due to gaps in the TESS data. Section 3 describes the analysis techniques used to derive the host star and BD properties. Section 4 contains discussion of the implications of these new discoveries in the BD mass-radius diagram and some discussion on the circularization timescales for each system.

2. OBSERVATIONS

2.1. TESS and ground-based light curves

The light curves of TOI-569 come from the TESS mission in sectors 7 and 8, and the Las Cumbres Observatory (LCO). For the TESS light curve for TOI-569, we use the Pre-search Data Conditioning Simple Aperture Photometry flux (PDCSAP; Stumpe et al. 2014; Smith et al. 2012) from the Mikulski Archive for Space Telescopes (MAST). The PDCSAP light curve has systematic effects removed and with this, we then normalize light curve with the lightkurve package in Python (the Lightkurve Collaboration et al. 2018). The light curves used for TOI-1406 come from the full-frame images (30 minute cadence) from the TESS mission in sectors 4, 5, and 6. We use the lightkurve package to extract and normalize the light curve of TOI-1406.

We observed an ingress of TOI-569 continuously for 140 minutes on April 15, 2019 using 15 s exposures and a z-short band filter from the LCO (Brown et al. 2013) 1.0 m node at Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory. We used the TESS Transit Finder, which is a customized version of the Tapir software package (Jensen 2013), to schedule our transit observations. The 4996 × 4996 LCO SINISTRO cameras have an image scale of 0.389" per pixel, resulting in a 26′ × 26′ field of view. The images were calibrated by the standard LCO BANZAI pipeline, and photometric data were extracted with the AstroImageJ software package (Collins et al. 2017) using a circular aperture with radius 5.8". The images have typical stellar point-spread-functions with a half-width-half-maximum of 1″. We detect a ~3000 ppm ingress on target with apertures as small as 2″. Systematic effects start to dominate the light curve for smaller apertures. Thus, we confirm that the source of the TESS detection is within 3″ of the target star location and that the transit depth from the LCO partial transit is consistent with the TESS depth for all aperture radii we checked down to 2″. We do not take any ground-based photometric followup of TOI-1406.

2.1.1. Light curve modulation and the orbital period of the TOI-569 system

Previous to the transit detections of TOI-569b from TESS, the Wide Angle Search for Planets (WASP) found a 13-day modulation in the light curve of TOI-569. The phased light curve for WASP is shown in Figure 2. The WASP data were taken during the 2011 to 2012 seasons with a total of 150 days of coverage. The transits of TOI-569b are too shallow to be detected in the WASP light curve, but they can be seen in the TESS light curve in the top panel of Figure 2. The WASP and TESS light curves show a similar but not exactly equal modulation. The period peaks and dips in both light curves are likely from brightness variations due to star spots, which may vary in the total brightness difference over time (especially the 150-day WASP observing period). The unevenness in the peaks in the TESS light curves are likely from two different star spot configurations on different areas on the surface of the star.

The gaps in the TESS light curve occur during every other transit of TOI-569b in the sectors the host star was observed. This means that the initial orbital period was reported to be 13.11 days (twice the true orbital period of 6.56 days). We discovered that this was the case as the orbital solution developed with RV follow

---

Table 1. Coordinates and magnitudes for TOI-569 and TOI-1406.

| Description | TOI-569 | TOI-1406 | Source |
|-------------|---------|----------|--------|
| αJ2000      |         |          |        |
| δJ2000      |         |          |        |
| T           | TESS    | 9.473 ± 0.006 | 11.427 ± 0.006 | 2 |
| G           | Gaia    | 9.936 ± 0.001 | 11.759 ± 0.001 | 1 |
| Bp          | Tycho   | 11.036 ± 0.048 | 13.352 ± 0.359 | 3 |
| Vp          | Tycho   | 10.173 ± 0.032 | 12.074 ± 0.195 | 3 |
| J           | 2MASS   | 8.829 ± 0.020 | 10.929 ± 0.020 | 4 |
| H           | 2MASS   | 8.575 ± 0.060 | 10.787 ± 0.030 | 4 |
| Ks          | 2MASS   | 8.444 ± 0.020 | 10.675 ± 0.020 | 4 |
| W1E1        | WISE    | 8.419 ± 0.023 | 10.649 ± 0.023 | 5 |
| W1E2        | WISE    | 8.467 ± 0.020 | 10.692 ± 0.021 | 5 |
| W1E3        | WISE    | 8.414 ± 0.021 | 10.651 ± 0.062 | 5 |
| W1E4        | WISE    | 8.180 ± 0.188 | -        | 5 |

Note—References: 1 - Lindegren et al. (2018), 2 - Stassun et al. (2018b), 3 - Høg et al. (2000), 4 - Cutri et al. (2003), 5 - Cutri & et al. (2013)
Figure 1. Top: Detrended TESS light curve of TOI-569. The star was observed at 2 minutes cadence in TESS sectors 7 and 8. This star also exhibits 1-3% periodic variations in flux likely due to star spots; these effects have been removed for the transit analysis. Bottom: Detrended TESS light curve of TOI-1406 obtained from the full-frame images at 30 minute cadence from TESS sectors 4, 5, and 6.

up using the instruments described in later sections. It seems coincidental that this erroneous orbital period of 13.11 days is nearly equal to the 13-day modulation in the WASP light curve. This would make the BD appear to have a synchronized orbit with the rotation rate of the star, but this is not the case upon a more thorough investigation that accounts for the orbital solution derived from RVs.

2.2. High resolution imaging and contaminating sources

For TOI-569, we use SOAR speckle imaging to verify that there are no objects within the TESS aperture that would significantly contaminate the transit and RV signals we observe. Nearby stars which fall within the same TESS image profile as the target can cause photometric contamination or be the source of an astrophysical false positive, such as a background or nearby eclipsing binary star. We searched for nearby sources to TOI-569 with SOAR speckle imaging (Tokovinin 2018) on May 18, 2019, observing in a similar visible bandpass as TESS (the Cousins-I band). Further details of the observations are available in Ziegler et al. (2019). We detect no nearby stars within 3″ of TOI-569. The 5-σ detection sensitivity and the speckle auto-correlation function from the SOAR observation are plotted in Figure 3. We also use data from Gaia DR2 to confirm this, finding that no stars brighter than G=17.0 are within 25″ and only two stars with G=13.7 and G=14.9 are approximately 26″ from TOI-569, which has a brightness of G=9.9 (Table 2). These other fainter stars also do not share the same proper motion as TOI-569, which further indicates that they are not associated with TOI-569 and are more distant background stars (Gaia Collaboration et al. 2018).

We do not have any high resolution imaging for TOI-1406, but using Gaia DR2 data (Gaia Collaboration et al. 2018), we find only 3 other stars within 30″ of TOI-1406. The brightest of these other stars has a magnitude of G=15.8 and is 19″ from TOI-1406, which has a magnitude of G=11.8. We also find that none of these
Table 2. Nearby sources from Gaia DR2 data. This table lists sources within 30′′ of each star (TOI-569 and TOI-1406) that are $G < 16$ in magnitude. Listing sources fainter than this results in too many items to reasonably list here. The parallaxes ($\pi$) and proper motions ($\mu_\alpha$, $\mu_\delta$) of the nearby stars indicate that none are associated with TOI-569 or TOI-1406.

| Gaia DR2 ID                | $\alpha_{J2000}$ | $\delta_{J2000}$ | $\pi$ (mas)   | $\mu_\alpha$ (mas/yr) | $\mu_\delta$ (mas/yr) | $G$ (mag) |
|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------|
| 553547335855685760 (TOI-569) | 07 40 24.67      | -42 09 16.79     | 6.3723 ± 0.0306 | 6.317 ± 0.053        | -3.968 ± 0.048        | 9.94     |
| 5535473392915426304       | 07 40 26.44      | -42 09 06.02     | 0.0899 ± 0.0193 | -1.790 ± 0.035       | 2.832 ± 0.030         | 13.69    |
| 553547335855686656        | 07 40 23.61      | -42 09 39.57     | 0.8838 ± 0.0275 | 12.130 ± 0.047       | -13.344 ± 0.041       | 14.88    |
| 553547335856195840        | 07 40 23.25      | -42 09 38.38     | 0.1963 ± 0.0141 | -4.600 ± 0.072       | 5.585 ± 0.060         | 15.64    |
| 4797030079342886784 (TOI-1406) | 05 28 30.71      | -48 24 32.64     | 2.3855 ± 0.0291 | 0.889 ± 0.057        | -21.885 ± 0.066       | 11.76    |
| 4797030079342886656       | 05 28 29.07      | -48 24 41.93     | 1.1846 ± 0.0396 | 1.222 ± 0.073        | -1.752 ± 0.093        | 15.78    |

Figure 2. Top: Offset-normalized raw TESS light curve from sectors 7 and 8 of TOI-569. The offset between each sector is removed using lightkurve, but no other systematic effects are removed since the focus of this figure is to show the missed transits of TOI-569b and provide context for the flux variability of the host star. The rapid ramp down at 515 days and ramp up at 535 days are instrumental systematics from the spacecraft. The blue lines show the transits of TOI-569b. Bottom: WASP light curve of TOI-569 phase folded at 13.03 days from observations taken over a time of 150 days.

2.3. CHIRON spectra

To characterize the RVs and stellar atmospheric parameters of TOI-569 and TOI-1406, we obtained a series of spectroscopic observations using the CHIRON spectrograph on the 1.5 m SMARTS telescopes, located at Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, Chile. CHIRON is a high resolution echelle spectrograph that is fed via an image slicer and a fiber bundle. CHIRON achieves a spectral resolving power of $\lambda/\Delta \lambda \equiv R \sim 80,000$ over the wavelength region 4100 to 8700 Å. The wavelength calibration is obtained via Thorium-Argon hollow-cathode lamp exposures that bracket each stellar spectrum.

To derive the stellar RVs, we performed a least-squares deconvolution (Donati et al. 1997) between the observed spectra and a non-rotating synthetic template generated via ATLAS9 atmospheric models (Castelli & Kurucz 2004) at the stellar atmospheric parameters of each target. We then model the stellar line profiles derived from the least-squares deconvolution via an analytic ro-
Table 3. Relative radial velocities of TOI-569 from CHIRON, CORALIE, and FEROS and of TOI-1406 from CHIRON and ANU.

| BJD<sub>TDB</sub> − 2450000 | RV (m/s) | σ<sub>RV</sub> (m/s) | Instrument | Target |
|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|------------|--------|
| 8594.61690               | 75132.3  | 16.6             | CHIRON     | TOI-569|
| 8606.50771               | 77754.5  | 20.7             | CHIRON     | TOI-569|
| 8596.60323               | 66265.0  | 18.9             | CHIRON     | TOI-569|
| 8607.53323               | 75982.6  | 17.8             | CHIRON     | TOI-569|
| 8611.59733               | 71966.8  | 24.9             | CHIRON     | TOI-569|
| 8612.57581               | 76679.3  | 30.6             | CHIRON     | TOI-569|
| 8649.44500               | 66193.1  | 24.2             | CHIRON     | TOI-569|
| 8651.48774               | 74957.8  | 34.9             | CHIRON     | TOI-569|
| 8654.46711               | 70453.9  | 27.2             | CHIRON     | TOI-569|
| 8593.58587               | 79347.5  | 13.0             | CORALIE    | TOI-569|
| 8596.47058               | 68533.2  | 31.6             | CORALIE    | TOI-569|
| 8599.52446               | 78333.6  | 16.8             | CORALIE    | TOI-569|
| 8602.58595               | 69230.9  | 13.3             | CORALIE    | TOI-569|
| 8603.46595               | 67533.0  | 29.3             | CORALIE    | TOI-569|
| 8614.49353               | 71040.4  | 25.9             | CORALIE    | TOI-569|
| 8594.49170               | 77148.3  | 6.5              | FEROS      | TOI-569|
| 8595.52217               | 70681.8  | 8.4              | FEROS      | TOI-569|
| 8597.51010               | 68686.8  | 6.8              | FEROS      | TOI-569|
| 8617.52568               | 70033.1  | 6.0              | FEROS      | TOI-569|

8540.61381 -13631.0 69.2 CHIRON TOI-1406
8541.60193 -15950.3 91.8 CHIRON TOI-1406
8542.65709 -17888.9 45.1 CHIRON TOI-1406
8544.52353 -19087.2 166.4 CHIRON TOI-1406
8614.51779 -15936.1 91.8 CHIRON TOI-1406
8622.5958  -15177.2 126.9 CHIRON TOI-1406
8666.55925 -18101.1 97.7 CHIRON TOI-1406
8697.59295 -16029.1 8.4 CHIRON TOI-1406
8698.54388 -13973.3 124.3 CHIRON TOI-1406
8696.57364 -12432.3 110.3 CHIRON TOI-1406
8533.07797 -19568.3 465.0 ANU TOI-1406
8534.98787 -17679.4 197.8 ANU TOI-1406
8535.06364 -15764.1 260.2 ANU TOI-1406
8537.96961 -12090.1 725.7 ANU TOI-1406
8538.93516 -12135.5 282.9 ANU TOI-1406
8561.89365 -13798.5 270.0 ANU TOI-1406

The derived RVs for TOI-569 and TOI-1406 are listed in Table 3. The stellar parameters derived from the spectra of TOI-569 are $T_{\text{eff}} = 5669 \pm 106$ K, $\log g = 4.11 \pm 0.18$, $[\text{Fe/H}] = 0.23 \pm 0.05$ dex, and $v \sin i = 6.65 \pm 0.10$ km/s.

2.4. **ANU 2.3m echelle spectra**

To help identify TOI-1406b as a BD, we obtained six spectroscopic observations with the echelle spectrograph on the Australian National University (ANU) 2.3 m telescope, located at Siding Spring Observatory, Australia. The ANU 2.3 m echelle is a slit-fed spectrograph that yields a resolving power of $R \sim 23,000$ over the wavelength region of 3700 − 6700 Å. Wavelength calibration was provided by bracketing Thorium-Argon lamp exposures, and the spectra were reduced as per Zhou et al. (2014). The RVs from each exposure were measured via the least-squares deconvolution technique as described in Section 2.3. To derive $T_{\text{eff}}$, $\log g$, and $[\text{Fe/H}]$ for TOI-1406, we use SpecMatch-emp (Yee et al. 2017), which matches the input spectra to a vast library of stars with well-determined parameters derived with a variety of independent methods, e.g., interferometry, optical and NIR photometry, asteroseismology, and LTE analysis of high-resolution optical spectra. From the ANU spectra and SpecMatch-emp we find $T_{\text{eff}} = 6283 \pm 110$ K, $\log g = 4.13 \pm 0.12$, and $[\text{Fe/H}] = -0.09 \pm 0.09$ dex for TOI-1406.

2.5. **CORALIE spectra**
TOI-569 was observed with the CORALIE spectrograph on the Swiss 1.2 m Euler telescope at La Silla Observatories, Chile (Queloz et al. 2001), between April 19 and May 11, 2019. CORALIE has a resolving power of $R \sim 60,000$ and is fed by two fibres: one 2″ on-sky science fibre encompassing the star and another which can either be connected to a Fabry-Pérot etalon for simultaneous wavelength calibration or on-sky for background subtraction of the sky-flux. RVs were computed for each epoch by cross-correlating with a binary G2 mask (Pepe et al. 2002). Bisector-span, full-width half-max. and other line-profile diagnostics were computed as well using the standard CORALIE data reduction software. Initial observations showed a 10.8 km/s RV shift over 3 days, and we subsequently reduced the exposure time from 1200 seconds to 450-600 seconds depending on seeing and airmass. We obtain a precision of 13-32 m/s. The resulting velocities are plotted in Figure 4, and are listed in Table 3.

The CORALIE spectra were shifted to the stellar rest frame and stacked while weighting the contribution from each spectrum with its mean flux to produce a high signal-to-noise spectrum for spectral characterization using SpecMatch-emp (Yee et al. 2017). We used the spectral region around the Mgb triplet (5100 – 5340˚A) to match our spectrum to the library spectra through $\chi^2$ minimization. A weighted linear combination of the five best matching spectra were used to extract bulk stellar parameters; $T_{\text{eff}} = 5481 \pm 110$K, $\log g = 4.08 \pm 0.12$ and [Fe/H] = 0.41 \pm 0.09 dex for TOI-569.

2.6. FEROS spectra

TOI-569 was observed with the FEROS spectrograph (Kaufer & Pasquini 1998) mounted on the MPG 2.2 m telescope installed at the ESO La Silla Observatory. Four spectra were obtained between April 20 and May 14, 2019. Observations were performed with the simultaneous calibration mode where a second fibre is illuminated with a Thorium-Argon lamp for tracking the instrumental drift in RV during the science exposure. The adopted exposure time was of 400s which produced spectra with a typical signal-to-noise ratio per resolution element of 90. FEROS data was processed with the cere pipeline (Brahm et al. 2017a), which performs the optimal extraction of the raw data, the wavelength calibration, the instrumental drift correction, and the computation of precise RVs and bisector spans, which are presented in Table 3. The four FEROS spectra were combined in order to measure the atmospheric parameters using the zaspe package (Brahm et al. 2017b), obtaining $T_{\text{eff}} = 5669 \pm 80$ K, $\log g = 4.21 \pm 0.12$, [Fe/H] = 0.28 \pm 0.05 dex, and $v_{\text{sin}i} = 6.45 \pm 0.30$ km/s for TOI-569.

![Figure 5. Top: Relative radial velocities of TOI-1406 with EXOFASTv2 orbital solution plotted in red. Bottom: TESS light curve with EXOFASTv2 transit model in red.](image)

3. ANALYSIS

3.1. Modeling with EXOFASTv2

The masses and radii of the BDs are derived using EXOFASTv2. A full description of EXOFASTv2 is given in Eastman et al. (2019). EXOFASTv2 uses the Monte Carlo-Markov Chain (MCMC) method. For each MCMC fit, we use N=36 ($N = 2 \times n_{\text{parameters}}$) walkers, or chains, and run for 50,000 steps, or links. To derive stellar parameters, EXOFASTv2 utilizes the MIST isochrone models (Dotter 2016; Choi et al. 2016; Paxton et al. 2015) or the Yonsei-Yale isochrone models (YY; Spada et al. 2013). We use the MIST models for the analysis of TOI-1406 and the YY models for TOI-569. The YY models include a metallicity range of up to [Fe/H] = +0.78 dex while the MIST models currently implemented in EXOFASTv2 extend [Fe/H] to only +0.5 dex. Based on our spectroscopic measurements of the metallicity for
TOI-569 (roughly +0.4), we choose to report the results for TOI-569 from the YY models in order to avoid approaching the upper limit on metallicity in the MIST models during the MCMC analysis. We see a difference of 0.1 dex between the metallicity found by the MIST models ([Fe/H]_MIST = 0.30^{+0.14}_{-0.21} dex) to that found by the YY models ([Fe/H]_YY = 0.40^{+0.08}_{-0.07} dex). The parameters for which we set priors and the types of priors we set for each (i.e. uniform \( U[a,b] \) or Gaussian \( G[a,b] \)) are shown in Tables 7 and 8. We rely on our spectroscopic measurements and parallax measurements from *Gaia* to define our Gaussian priors, which penalize the fit for straying beyond the width, \( b \), away from the mean, \( a \) of the parameter. We use an upper limit for the \( A_V \) extinction. See Table 3 of Eastman et al. (2019) for a detailed description of priors in EXOFASTv2. The spectral energy distribution for each star is also taken into account with EXOFASTv2 and this is discussed in more depth in Section 3.3.

We also see bimodality in the posterior distribution for the age (and correlated parameters) of TOI-569, so we present the two most probable solutions resulting from the bimodal posterior distributions with the absolute most probable solution taken as the final reported value (Table 8). The most relevant bimodal posterior distributions are shown in Figure 6. The probability of the solution we report here is 0.73, with the less likely solution having a probability of 0.27.

### 3.2. Analysis with pyaneti

As an independent check on our EXOFASTv2 analysis, we also carried out an analysis with the pyaneti\(^2\) (Barragán et al. 2019) software. Using a Bayesian approach combined with MCMC sampling, we performed a joint analysis of the RV measurements and the TESS light curves and modelled posterior distributions of the fitted parameters. The RV data were fitted with Keplerian orbits, and for each different instrumental set-up, an offset term for each systemic velocity was included. The photometric data are modeled with the quadratic limb-darkening model of Mandel & Agol (2002).

We use uniform priors and fit for the BD-to-star radius ratio, the orbital period, the mid-transit time, the scaled orbital distance, the eccentricity, the argument of periastron, the impact parameter \( (b) \), and the Doppler semi-amplitude variation \( (K) \). The allowed ranges for the fit parameters for pyaneti are shown in Table 4.

We used 500 independent chains, and checked for convergence after every 5,000 iterations. After convergence, a posterior distribution of 250,000 independent points for every parameter was computed from the last 5,000 iterations. The eccentricity was found to be consistent with zero for both BDs. We find a mass and radius of TOI-569b and TOI-1406b to be consistent within 1-\( \sigma \) of the values from the EXOFASTv2 models.

### 3.3. Stellar parameters from broadband photometry

As an independent check on the derived stellar parameters, we performed an analysis of the broadband spectral energy distribution (SED) together with the *Gaia* DR2 parallax in order to determine an empirical measurement of the stellar radius, following the procedures...
Table 4. Allowed ranges for fit parameters from pyaneti.

| Parameter                  | TOI-569               | TOI-1406              |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| $R_{BD}/R_*$               | [0, 0.1]              | [0, 0.1]              |
| $P_{BD}$ (days)            | [6.5541, 6.5580]      | [10.5721, 10.5762]    |
| $T_0 - 2458400$ (BJD$_{TDB}$) | [96.858, 96.878]     | [14.5061, 14.7061]    |
| $a/R_*$                    | [1.1, 12]             | [1.1, 19]             |
| $e\cos\omega$             | [-1, 1]               | [-1, 1]               |
| $e\sin\omega$             | [-1, 1]               | [-1, 1]               |
| Impact parameter $b$       | [0, 1]                | [0, 1]                |
| Semi-amplitude $K$ (km/s)  | [0, 15]               | [0, 15]               |

3.4. Circularization and synchronization timescales

In previous works (Persson et al. 2019; Subjak et al. 2019), we have calculated the timescale for the orbital period of an intermediate-mass BDs to synchronize with the rotation of their host star and to have their orbit circularized. In the case of EPIC 212036875b, a short-period BD with mass $M_b = 51 \pm 2\, M_J$, Persson et al. (2019) found that the BD still has some orbital eccentricity ($e = 0.132$) and its current orbital configuration is a result of a relatively quick inward migration, favoring a formation scenario that the BD did not form at or near its current orbital configuration (i.e., not in-situ). In the case of TOI-503b, Subjak et al. (2019) find a relatively young ($\sim 180\, \text{Myr}$) A-type host star with a BD ($M_b = 53.7\, M_J$) in a circular orbit. This system has been more complex to describe with established tidal interaction models (e.g. Jackson et al. 2008) given that these models are not tailored to A-type stars with radiative envelopes and BD companions as massive as TOI-503b. Given this, Subjak et al. (2019) do not conclusively determine a formation scenario for TOI-503b (in-situ versus not) and instead offer some discussion of the tidal quality factors, $Q$, that may be most appropriate for this system. Here, we will examine the circularization timescales for TOI-569 and TOI-1406 in a similar way.

Following the formalism from Jackson et al. (2008), the equations for orbital circularization timescale for a close-in companion are:

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{\text{circ,*}}} = \frac{171}{16} \sqrt{\frac{G}{M_*}} \frac{R_*^2 M_{BD}}{Q_* a^\frac{13}{2}}$$  

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{\text{circ, BD}}} = \frac{63}{4} \sqrt{\frac{G M_* R_*^3}{Q_{BD} M_{BD}}} a^{-\frac{13}{2}}$$  

$$\frac{1}{\tau_e} = \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{circ,*}}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{circ, BD}}}$$

where $\tau_e$ is the circularization timescale, $a$ is the semi-major axis, $M_*$ is the stellar mass, $R_*$ is the stellar ra-
Table 5. Circularization timescales for different values of $Q_*$ and $Q_{BD}$ with stellar rotational period and BD orbital period. These rotation periods are calculated using $v \sin i$ and $R_\star$. Note for TOI-1406, the shortest $\tau$ for reasonable choices of $Q_*=10^7$ and $Q_{BD}=10^{4.5}$ is $\tau_e=91.5^{+18.4}_{-17.8}$ Gyr. These show 1-$\sigma$ uncertainties.

| Object name & Age | $Q_*$ | $Q_{BD}$ | $\tau_e$ (Gyr) |
|-------------------|-------|---------|----------------|
| TOI-569 | $10^8$ | $10^6$ | $78.6^{+17.7}_{-11.7}$ |
| $4.79^{+0.73}_{-0.73}$ Gyr | $10^8$ | $10^{4.5}$ | $47.6^{+5.2}_{-4.7}$ |
| | $10^7$ | $10^6$ | $8.0^{+0.8}_{-1.2}$ |
| | $10^7$ | $10^{4.5}$ | $7.5^{+0.7}_{-1.1}$ |
| TOI-569 | 11.3 | 6.6 | $6.7 \pm 0.1$ |
| TOI-1406 | 4.5 | 10.6 | $15.0 \pm 1.0$ |

$M_{BD}$ is the BD mass, $R_{BD}$ is the BD radius, $Q_*$ is the tidal quality factor for the star, and $Q_{BD}$ is the tidal quality factor for the BD. The individual contributions of the effects of tides raised on the star and the BD are accounted for in Equations 1 & 2, respectively, and summed together in Equation 3. Equation 3 is a prediction on how long it takes for the orbital eccentricity of an object to decrease by an exponential factor (the relationship $\tau_e \propto dt \propto -de/e$). Use of this equation comes with a number of assumptions that we reiterate here from Jackson et al. (2008): 1) the BD is in a short orbital period (10 days or less), 2) the orbital eccentricity $e$ is small (though for companions in the planetary mass range, higher-order terms may be important to account for higher $e$ in the past), 3) the BD’s orbital period $P_{\text{orb}}$ is smaller than the host star’s rotation period $P_{\text{rot}}$. Admittedly, Equation 3 and these assumptions cater to hot Jupiters and not much more massive BDs, which is important to highlight as $P_{\text{rot}}$ of the host star is influenced by the presence of a massive companion. We also note that Equation 3 produces longer estimates for the circularization timescale compared to solutions worked out by Zahn (1977) and others, which predict tidal evolution to occur on shorter timescales.

We also highlight that the circularization timescale and the synchronization timescale, $\tau_\Omega$, change over time as the host star and especially the BD change in radius. The equation for $\tau_\Omega$ from Goldreich & Soter (1966) is:

$$\frac{1}{\tau_\Omega} = \frac{3}{4} \frac{GR_\star^2 M_{BD}^2}{\alpha_* M_\star Q_\star \Omega_\star^6}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)$$

where $\Omega_\star$ is the angular velocity of the star and $\alpha_*$ is the stellar moment of inertia.

With these considerations in mind, we calculate $\tau_e$ for TOI-569b and TOI-1406b for a range of $Q_*$ and $Q_{BD}$ for each system in Table 5. The rotation period of each star is estimated using the projected rotation rate $v \sin i$ and the radius of the star from EXOFASTv2. The choice to adopt a $Q_{BD}$ as low as $10^{4.5}$ comes from Beatty et al. (2018), who directly constrain $Q_{BD}$ for CWW 89Ab, a $M_{BD} = 39$ M$_J$ BD. For the bimodal posterior distribu-
tions of TOI-569, we only use the most probable $M_\star$, $R_\star$, $M_{\text{BD}}$, $R_{\text{BD}}$, and $a$ (Table 8). Each parameter ($M_\star$, $R_\star$, $M_{\text{BD}}$, $R_{\text{BD}}$, and $a$) is a randomly sampled posterior distribution from EXOFASTv2 and so the $\tau_\text{e}$ distribution is as well. From the $\tau_\text{e}$ distribution for our selected combinations of $Q_\star$ and $Q_{\text{BD}}$, we calculate the median and 1-$\sigma$ uncertainties as the 16th and 84th percentiles of the distribution. For TOI-569, we find a range of $\tau_\text{e} = 7.5$ Gyr to $\tau_\text{e} = 78.6$ Gyr. For TOI-1406, we see $\tau_\text{e} > 91$ Gyr for the lowest reasonable choices of tidal quality factors, however, since $P_{\text{orb}} > P_{\text{rot}}$ in this system, these timescales are generally invalid. We also note that Jackson et al. (2008) provide equations for the orbital decay timescale $\tau_\text{a}$ and for both TOI-569 and TOI-1406, the decay timescale is at least an order of magnitude longer than the age of either system.

We see from Table 5 and Figure 8 that all reasonable choices of $Q_\star$ and $Q_{\text{BD}}$ for TOI-1406 yield $\tau_\text{e}$ and $\tau_\text{f}$ values much longer that the system’s likely age ($3.20^{+2.20}_{-1.60}$ Gyr), but TOI-1406 does not meet the assumptions accounted for with Equation 3. Namely, the orbital period of TOI-1406b is not much shorter than the star’s rotation period. In fact, $P_{\text{orb}}$ of the BD is more than twice as long as $P_{\text{rot}}$ for the star.

The narrative is different for TOI-569. In this system, $P_{\text{orb}} < P_{\text{rot}}$ and we find for certain permutations of $Q_\star$ and $Q_{\text{BD}}$ that $\tau_\text{e}$ is comparable to the age of TOI-569 ($4.79 \pm 0.73$ Gyr). Additionally, this system is predicted to synchronize within 1 Gyr, yet we see from the TESS light curve (Figure 2) and $P_{\text{rot}}$ derived from $v \sin i$ and $R_\star$ that the system is not synchronized. In order to explain why the stellar rotation and BD orbital period are not synchronized ($P_{\text{orb}} \neq P_{\text{rot}}$), a value of $Q_\star = 10^8$ is more appropriate for TOI-569. This is because higher values of $Q$ indicate that the star or BD is more resistant to circularization or synchronization, which makes the timescales for these processes longer. A high value for $Q_\star$ is consistent with recent statistical estimates by Collier Cameron & Jardine (2018) and theoretical calculations by Penev & Sasselov (2011).

4. DISCUSSION

Including the new BDs in this work, the total number of known BDs that transit a star is 23 (Table 6). With the discovery of TOI-569b and TOI-1406b, the total number of new transiting BDs discovered or observed by the TESS mission is now 4 (Subjak et al. 2019; Jackman et al. 2019, this work). We expect at least as many more to be discovered as TESS continues its observations over the remainder of its primary mission. At present, we do not have enough transiting BDs to perform a statistical study of the population and draw conclusions about the fundamental origins of BDs and how the mass of a BD precisely reflects its formation and evolution.

The mass distribution for the current population of BDs is shown in Figure 9 with the effective temperature of the host star indicated by the colors of the points. From all published studies of transiting BDs to date, there is no preference for a particular type of host star to BDs. This could be compared to the distribution of primary stars in short-period binary systems and to hot Jupiter host stars in future works once the total number of transiting BDs increases. Interestingly, we see that 6 transiting BDs (roughly 20% of the transiting BD population, see Table 6) are hosted by an M dwarf star. This is in contrast to hot Jupiters where only a few percent of the hot Jupiter population are found transiting M dwarf stars (e.g. Kepler-45b Johnson et al. (2012), HATS-6b Hartman et al. (2015), WASP-80b Triaud et al. (2015), NGTS-1b Bayliss et al. (2018)). It may be the case as TESS completes its primary mission that we continue to discover more BDs around M dwarfs. If so, we will be challenged to explain why this is the case for BDs and less so for giant planets.

4.1. TOI-569b and TOI-1406b in the mass-radius diagram

The mass-radius diagram for transiting BDs is shown in Figure 10. All of the BDs on this diagram are necessarily transiting because it is through the transit method
that we can measured the radius. However, even though a transit provides some measure of the radius, the measurement is not always very precise. Exactly how precise can be quantified with the aid of substellar evolutionary models (Baraffe et al. 2003, COND03). For example, we see from Figure 10 that an uncertainty of 0.3\(R_J\) (\(\sim30\%\)) for any BD mass translates to an uncertainty of hundreds to thousands of Myr. These large (10-30\%) uncertainties in the radii typically arise from grazing transits of the BDs, as is the case with CoRoT-33b (Csizmadia et al. 2015), NLTT 41135b (Irwin et al. 2010), and TOI-503b (Subjak et al. 2019). So, what may seem to be a reasonably precise radius uncertainty of 10\% actually turns out to be a rather large uncertainty in the age.

We are fortunate that the transits of TOI-569b and TOI-1406b are not grazing, which means we have a nicely constrained measurement (< 5\% uncertainty) of the radius of each BD. This means that these two new transiting BDs have precisely predicted ages from substellar evolutionary models. The COND03 models consider the effects of irradiation on the BD’s radius over time, while another set of models by Saumon & Marley (2008) (SM08) does not and instead focuses on the effects of metallicity.

![Transiting brown dwarf population with evolutionary models](image)

**Figure 10.** Mass-radius diagram of transiting BDs featuring the Baraffe et al. (2003) (COND03) and Saumon & Marley (2008) (SM08) models. TOI-569b and TOI-1406b are shown as a red star and a purple square, respectively. Both models overestimate the age of TOI-569b yet seem to approximately estimate the age of TOI-1406b.

We see that both sets of models seem to overestimate the age of TOI-569b to be \(\sim10\) Gyr compared to the age of the host star modelled from MIST (4.79 \(\pm\) 0.73 Gyr). For TOI-1406, we find that both the COND03 and SM08 models roughly predict the age of the system (3.20 \(\pm\) 2.20 Gyr). This is difficult to reconcile since the COND03 and SM08 models overestimate the age of the TOI-569b while these same models reasonably predict the age of TOI-1406b. It may be that the age of TOI-1406b is only coincidentally predicted and that more generally these models overestimate a BD’s age. Evidence for this may be seen in how both models overestimate the ages of CWW 89Ab (Beatty et al. 2018) and AD 3116b Gillen et al. (2017), which are two BDs with directly measured ages via their association with stellar clusters/streams. Another way to convey this is to say that the COND03 models may underestimate the rate at which irradiated, short-period transiting BDs contract over long timescales.

### 4.2. Possible formation pathways for TOI-569b and TOI-1406b

Though the COND03 and SM08 models may not accurately estimate the ages of these BDs, we do have reasonable estimates of the ages of the host stars. So, we may compare the Jackson et al. (2008) models for circularization and synchronization timescales to these ages. We do this in an effort to find evidence in favor of a formation scenario for short-period BDs that is either more similar to that of giant planets or instead more similar to the formation of the smallest, least massive stars. The different types of formation pathways can be broadly reduced into three methods: 1) cloud fragmentation, 2) gravitational disk instability, 3) core accretion in a protoplanetary disk. Considering now the short-period BDs in this study, each of these possible BD pathways may happen at different distances from a host star and somehow result in a close-in BD. Given this, we may break down these pathways further into three scenarios:

**Scenario 1:** formation *in-situ* at or very close to the BD’s current orbit

**Scenario 2:** formation in a disk at a wide separation from the host star and a slow or “dynamically quiet” migration inward

**Scenario 3:** formation in a disk at a high eccentricity with tidal damping aiding in migration inward to a circular orbit

Now, we may examine each scenario in the context of the three aforementioned formation pathways (cloud fragmentation, gravitational instability, core accretion). Note that we have ruled out Scenario 3 for all formation pathways in Section 3.4 (see Table 5 and Figure 8).
4.2.1. Cloud or core fragmentation in the disk

Scenario 1 is not possible for TOI-569b and TOI-1406b because fragmentation has been shown to occur on scales of tens to thousands of AU (Delgado-Donate et al. 2004; Offner et al. 2010; Bate 2019), so in-situ cloud fragmentation cannot happen at the orbital separations of these BDs. Scenario 2 may be possible although the migration through the disk will take place after formation through the dissipative interactions with gases in the disk. Scenario 2 also faces resistance in that disk evolutionary models do not produce BDs at sub-AU scales very well.

4.2.2. Gravitational disk instability

Scenario 1 for in-situ formation cannot happen in the case of either BD due to high disk temperatures and a Toomre $Q > 1$ at scales of a few AU or less (Kratter & Lodato 2016). With the ideal conditions, Scenario 2 is possible. That is, single or multiple fragments may form at wide separations (30-100 AU) from the host star and migrate inward. Single fragments may even migrate quickly if they avoid gap openings in the disk as the travel inward (Malik et al. 2015; Stamatellos & Inutsuka 2018). This sort of migration is enhanced when multiple fragments form (Forgan et al. 2018). Whether or not these fragments can migrate inward while maintaining a nearly circular orbit and build to a single $40-65\, M_J$ object is unclear.

4.2.3. Core accretion in the disk

Scenario 1 is not possible given the large masses of TOI-569b and TOI-1406b. Hot Jupiters may be able to form in-situ with a sufficiently massive enough core (15$M_\oplus$, Coleman et al. 2017), but it is not clear that this scales to $40-50\, M_J$. Scenario 2 is not possible for similar reasons; the mass budget for gas in the disk may not be high enough to grow a core to tens of Jupiter masses. Though with TOI-569, the high metallicity helps in massive core growth (Mordasini et al. 2012), this does not appear to explain the resulting $63\, M_J$ BD.

Though a clear explanation has yet to present itself, it seems that TOI-569b and TOI-1406b may have formed in nearly circular orbits and migrated inwards in such a way to maintain their zero eccentricity over a few billion years.

Ultimately, we find TOI-569b and TOI-1406b to be special in that they contribute new measurements to the still sparsely populated mass-radius diagram for transiting BDs. These systems also offer themselves as new data to examine circularization and synchronization models. As we continue to characterize new short-period, intermediate mass BDs, we are learning that no single formation scenario seems to adequately describe these type of BDs. Perhaps then, it is the systems like TOI-569 and TOI-1406 that may be the most informative in our endeavors to understand BD formation.
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Table 6. List of published transiting brown dwarfs as of September 2019.

| Name           | P (days) | MR/MP/M_J | R/R_J | e    | M/M/⊙ | R/R/⊙ | T eff(K) | [Fe/H] | Reference |
|----------------|----------|-----------|-------|------|--------|--------|----------|--------|-----------|
| TOI-569b       | 6.556    | 63.8 ± 1.0| 0.75 ± 0.02 | 0 | 1.21 ± 0.03 | 1.48 ± 0.03 | 5705 ± 76 | +0.40 ± 0.08 | this work |
| TOI-1406b      | 10.574   | 46.0 ± 2.7| 0.86 ± 0.03 | 0 | 1.18 ± 0.09 | 1.35 ± 0.03 | 6290 ± 100 | −0.08 ± 0.09 | this work |
| HATs-70b       | 1.888    | 12.9 ± 1.8| 1.38 ± 0.08 | < 0.18 | 1.78 ± 0.12 | 1.88 ± 0.07 | 7930 ± 820 | +0.04 ± 0.11 | 1 |
| KELT-1b        | 1.218    | 27.4 ± 0.9| 1.12 ± 0.04 | 0.01 ± 0.01 | 1.34 ± 0.06 | 1.47 ± 0.05 | 6516 ± 49 | +0.05 ± 0.08 | 2 |
| NLTT 41135b    | 2.889    | 33.7 ± 2.8| 1.13 ± 0.27 | < 0.02 | 0.19 ± 0.03 | 0.21 ± 0.02 | 3230 ± 130 | −0.25 ± 0.25 | 3 |
| LHS 6343c      | 12.713   | 62.9 ± 2.3| 0.83 ± 0.02 | 0.056 ± 0.032 | 0.37 ± 0.01 | 0.38 ± 0.01 | - | +0.02 ± 0.19 | 4 |
| LP 261-75b     | 1.882    | 68.1 ± 2.1| 0.90 ± 0.02 | < 0.007 | 0.30 ± 0.02 | 0.31 ± 0.01 | 3100 ± 50 | - | 5 |
| WASP-30b       | 4.157    | 61.0 ± 0.9| 0.89 ± 0.02 | 0 | 1.17 ± 0.03 | 1.30 ± 0.02 | 6201 ± 97 | −0.08 ± 0.10 | 6 |
| WASP-128b      | 2.209    | 37.2 ± 0.9| 0.94 ± 0.02 | < 0.007 | 0.16 ± 0.04 | 0.15 ± 0.02 | 5950 ± 50 | +0.01 ± 0.12 | 7 |
| CoRoT-3b       | 4.257    | 21.7 ± 1.0| 1.01 ± 0.07 | 0 | 1.37 ± 0.09 | 1.56 ± 0.09 | 6740 ± 140 | −0.02 ± 0.06 | 8 |
| CoRoT-15b      | 3.060    | 63.3 ± 4.1| 1.12 ± 0.30 | 0 | 1.32 ± 0.12 | 1.46 ± 0.31 | 6350 ± 200 | +0.10 ± 0.20 | 9 |
| CoRoT-33b      | 5.819    | 59.0 ± 1.8| 1.10 ± 0.53 | 0.070 ± 0.002 | 0.86 ± 0.04 | 0.94 ± 0.14 | 5225 ± 80 | +0.44 ± 0.10 | 10 |
| Kepler-39b     | 21.087   | 20.1 ± 1.3| 1.24 ± 0.10 | 0.112 ± 0.057 | 1.29 ± 0.07 | 1.40 ± 0.10 | 6350 ± 100 | +0.10 ± 0.14 | 11 |
| KOI-189b       | 30.360   | 78.0 ± 3.4| 1.00 ± 0.02 | 0.275 ± 0.004 | 0.76 ± 0.05 | 0.73 ± 0.02 | 4952 ± 40 | -0.07 ± 0.12 | 12 |
| KOI-205b       | 11.720   | 39.9 ± 1.0| 0.81 ± 0.02 | < 0.031 | 0.92 ± 0.03 | 0.84 ± 0.02 | 5237 ± 60 | +0.14 ± 0.12 | 13 |
| KOI-415b       | 166.788  | 62.1 ± 2.7| 0.79 ± 0.12 | 0.689 ± 0.001 | 0.94 ± 0.06 | 1.15 ± 0.15 | 5810 ± 80 | −0.24 ± 0.11 | 14 |
| EPIC 201702477b| 40.737   | 66.9 ± 1.7| 0.76 ± 0.07 | 0.228 ± 0.003 | 0.87 ± 0.03 | 0.90 ± 0.06 | 5517 ± 70 | −0.16 ± 0.05 | 15 |
| EPIC 21203875b | 5.170    | 52.3 ± 1.9| 0.87 ± 0.02 | 0.132 ± 0.004 | 1.29 ± 0.07 | 1.50 ± 0.03 | 6238 ± 60 | +0.01 ± 0.10 | 18, 21 |
| AD 3116b       | 1.983    | 54.2 ± 4.3| 1.02 ± 0.28 | 0.146 ± 0.024 | 0.28 ± 0.02 | 0.29 ± 0.08 | 3200 ± 200 | +0.16 ± 0.10 | 17 |
| CWW 89Ab       | 5.293    | 39.2 ± 1.1| 0.94 ± 0.02 | 0.189 ± 0.002 | 1.10 ± 0.05 | 1.03 ± 0.02 | 5755 ± 49 | +0.20 ± 0.09 | 16, 18 |
| RIK 72b        | 97.760   | 59.2 ± 6.8| 3.10 ± 0.31 | 0.146 ± 0.012 | 0.44 ± 0.04 | 0.96 ± 0.10 | 3349 ± 142 | - | 19 |
| TOI-503b       | 3.677    | 53.7 ± 1.2| 1.34 ± 0.26 | 0 | 1.80 ± 0.06 | 1.70 ± 0.05 | 7650 ± 160 | +0.61 ± 0.07 | 22 |
| NGTS-7Ab       | 0.676    | 75.5 ± 0.0 | 1.38 ± 0.13 | 0 | 0.48 ± 0.13 | 0.61 ± 0.06 | 3359 ± 106 | - | 23 |
| 2M0535-05a     | 9.779    | 56.7 ± 4.8| 6.50 ± 0.33 | 0.323 ± 0.006 | - | - | - | - | 20 |
| 2M0535-05b     | 9.779    | 35.6 ± 2.8| 5.00 ± 0.25 | 0.323 ± 0.006 | - | - | - | - | 20 |

Note—References: 1 - Zhou et al. (2019), 2 - Siverd et al. (2012), 3 - Irwin et al. (2010), 4 - Johnson et al. (2011), 5 - Irwin et al. (2018), 6 - Anderson et al. (2011), 7 - Hodžić et al. (2018), 8 - Deleuil et al. (2008), 9 - Bouchy et al. (2011), 10 - Csizmadia et al. (2015), 11 - Bonomo et al. (2015), 12 - Díaz et al. (2014), 13 - Díaz et al. (2013), 14 - Moutou et al. (2013), 15 - Baylis et al. (2017), 16 - Nowak et al. (2017), 17 - Gillen et al. (2017), 18 - Carmichael et al. (2019), 19 - David et al. (2019), 20 - Stassun et al. (2006), 21 - Persson et al. (2019), 22 - Subjak et al. (2019), 23 - Jackman et al. (2019)
Table 7. MIST median values and 68% confidence interval for TOI-1406, created using EXOFASTv2 commit number 65aa674. Here, $U[a,b]$ is the uniform prior bounded between $a$ and $b$, and $G[a, b]$ is a Gaussian prior of mean $a$ and width $b$.

| Parameter                  | Units                  | Priors                  | Values                  |
|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| **Stellar Parameters:**    |                        |                         |                         |
| $M_*$                      | Mass ($M_\odot$)       | $-$                     | $1.18^{+0.08}_{-0.09}$  |
| $R_*$                      | Radius ($R_\odot$)     | $-$                     | $1.36^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$  |
| $L_*$                      | Luminosity ($L_\odot$) | $-$                     | $2.56 \pm 0.15$         |
| $\rho_*$                   | Density (cgs)          | $-$                     | $0.58^{+0.15}_{-0.15}$  |
| log$g$                     | Surface gravity (cgs)  | $-$                     | $4.252^{+0.041}_{-0.041}$|
| $T_{\text{eff}}$           | Effective Temperature (K) | $G[6282,110]$       | $6290 \pm 100$          |
| $[\text{Fe/H}]$            | Metallicity (dex)      | $G[-0.09,0.09]$         | $-0.08 \pm 0.09$        |
| $Age$                      | Age (Gyr)              | $-$                     | $3.20^{+0.20}_{-0.10}$  |
| $EEP$                      | Equal Evolutionary Point | $-$                     | $377^{+40}_{-36}$       |
| $A_V$                      | V-band extinction (mag) | $U[0,0.08804]$        | $0.043^{+0.030}_{-0.029}$|
| $\sigma_{SED}$            | SED photometry error scaling | $-$                     | $3.04^{+1.2}_{-0.73}$   |
| $\omega$                   | Parallax (mas)         | $G[2.3855,0.0291]$     | $2.386 \pm 0.029$       |
| $d$                        | Distance (pc)          | $-$                     | $419.1^{+5.2}_{-5.0}$   |
| **Brown Dwarf Parameters:**|                        |                         |                         |
| $P$                        | Period (days)          | $-$                     | $10.57398^{+0.00060}_{-0.00059}$ |
| $M_p$                      | Mass ($M_J$)           | $-$                     | $46.0^{+2.6}_{-2.7}$    |
| $R_p$                      | Radius ($R_J$)         | $-$                     | $0.86 \pm 0.03$         |
| $T_C$                      | Time of conjunction (BJD$_{TDB}$) | $-$             | $2458414.6065^{+0.0018}_{-0.0019}$ |
| $T_0$                      | Optimal conjunction Time (BJD$_{TDB}$) | $-$             | $2458435.7545^{+0.0012}_{-0.0011}$ |
| $a$                        | Semi-major axis (AU)   | $-$                     | $0.1010^{+0.0022}_{-0.0020}$ |
| $i$                        | Inclination (Degrees)  | $-$                     | $87.70^{+0.19}_{-0.20}$ |
| $e$                        | Eccentricity           | $-$                     | $0$ (adopted)           |
| $T_{eq}$                   | Equilibrium temperature (K) | $-$                     | $1108^{+18}_{-138}$     |
| $K$                        | RV semi-amplitude (m/s) | $-$                     | $3.720^{+0.120}_{-0.130}$ |
| log$K$                     | Log of RV semi-amplitude | $-$               | $3.570^{+0.014}_{-0.015}$ |
| $R_p/R_* $                 | Radius of planet in stellar radii | $-$             | $0.0654 \pm 0.0011$     |
| $a/R_*$                    | Semi-major axis in stellar radii | $-$             | $16.11^{+0.56}_{-0.58}$ |
| $\delta$                   | Transit depth (fraction) | $-$                     | $0.00428 \pm 0.00014$   |
| $Depth$                    | Flux decrement at mid transit | $-$             | $0.00428 \pm 0.00014$   |
| $\tau$                     | Ingress/egress transit duration (days) | $-$             | $0.0180^{+0.0016}_{-0.0014}$ |
| $b$                        | Transit Impact parameter | $-$             | $0.648^{+0.033}_{-0.036}$ |
| $\rho_p$                   | Density (cgs)          | $-$                     | $96^{+11}_{-10}$         |
| log$g_p$                   | Surface gravity        | $-$                     | $5.190^{+0.040}_{-0.042}$ |
| $M_p \sin i$               | Minimum mass ($M_J$)   | $-$                     | $45.9^{+2.0}_{-2.1}$    |
| $M_p/M_*$                  | Mass ratio             | $-$                     | $0.0372^{+0.0016}_{-0.0015}$ |
| **Wavelength Parameters:** |                        |                         |                         |
| $u_1$                      | linear limb-darkening coeff |              | $0.224 \pm 0.050$       |
| $u_4$                      | quadratic limb-darkening coeff |             | $0.299 \pm 0.050$       |
| **RV Parameters:**         |                        |                         |                         |
| $\gamma_{\text{rel}}$      | Relative RV Offset (m/s) |              | $-15490^{+200}_{-240}$  |
| $\sigma_f$                 | RV Jitter (m/s)        | $-$                     | $380^{+40}_{-20}$       |
| $\sigma_f^2$               | RV Jitter Variance     | $-$                     | $150000^{+400000}_{-130000}$ |
| $\sigma_r$                 | Added Variance         | $-$                     | $-0.000000154^{+0.000000011}_{-0.000000010}$ |
| $F_0$                      | Baseline flux          | $-$                     | $0.999996 \pm 0.000013$ |
### Table 8. Yonsei-Yale median values and 68% confidence interval for TOI-569, created using EXOFASTv2 commit number 65aa674. The most likely values (probability of 0.73) and the ones we report for this system are shown in boldface. Here, \( U[a,b] \) is the uniform prior bounded between \( a \) and \( b \), and \( G[a,b] \) is a Gaussian prior of mean \( a \) and width \( b \).

| Parameter | Units | Priors | Most likely values | Less likely values |
|-----------|-------|--------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Stellar Parameters: | | | | |
| \( M_\star \) | Mass (M\(_\odot\)) | - | 1.21 ± 0.03 | 1.11 ± 0.02 |
| \( R_\star \) | Radius (R\(_\odot\)) | - | 1.48 ± 0.03 | 1.48 ± 0.03 |
| \( L_\star \) | Luminosity (L\(_\odot\)) | - | 2.08 ± 0.10 | 2.03 ± 0.09 |
| \( \rho_* \) | Density (cgs) | - | 0.52 ± 0.03 | 0.48 ± 0.03 |
| \( \log g_* \) | Surface gravity (cgs) | - | 4.18 ± 0.019 | 4.14 ± 0.02 |
| \( T_{\text{eff}} \) | Effective Temperature (K) | \( G[5605, 100] \) | 5705 ± 68 | 5651 ± 62 |
| \([\text{Fe/H}]\) | Metallicity (dex) | \( G[0.41, 0.1] \) | 0.49 ± 0.07 | 0.33 ± 0.08 |
| \( \sigma_{\text{ED}} \) | SED photometry error scaling | - | 0.06 ± 0.083 | 0.052 ± 0.074 |
| \( \sigma_{\text{ED}} \) | - | - | 2.94 ± 0.71 | 3.08 ± 1.40 |
| \( \varpi \) | Parallax (mas) | \( G[6.3723, 0.0306] \) | 6.374 ± 0.031 | 6.374 ± 0.030 |
| \( d \) | Distance (pc) | - | 156.88 ± 0.75 | 156.83 ± 0.75 |

| Brown Dwarf Parameters: | | | | |
| \( P \) | Period (days) | - | 6.55604 ± 0.00016 | 6.55603 ± 0.00015 |
| \( MP \) | Mass (M\(_J\)) | - | 0.7 ± 1.0 | 60.1 ± 0.8 |
| \( RP \) | Radius (R\(_J\)) | - | 0.75 ± 0.02 | 0.76 ± 0.02 |
| \( T_\text{CD} \) | Time of conjunction (BJD-TDB) | - | 2458523.09192 ± 0.00070 | 2458523.09199 ± 0.00070 |
| \( T_0 \) | Optimal conjunction Time (BJD-TDB) | - | 2458529.64796 ± 0.00070 | 2458529.64803 ± 0.00070 |
| \( a \) | Semi-major axis (AU) | - | 0.07428 ± 0.00059 | 0.07207 ± 0.00059 |
| \( i \) | Inclination (Degrees) | - | 85.37 ± 0.13 | 85.15 ± 0.13 |
| \( e \) | Eccentricity | - | 0 (adopted) | 0 (adopted) |
| \( T_{eq} \) | Equilibrium temperature (K) | - | 1277 ± 13 | 1237 ± 12 |
| \( K \) | RV semi-amplitude (m/s) | - | 5884 ± 17 | 5884 ± 18 |
| \( \log K \) | Log of RV semi-amplitude | - | 3.7697 ± 0.0013 | 3.7697 ± 0.0013 |
| \( a/R_\star \) | Radius of planet in stellar radii | - | 0.05217 ± 0.00094 | 0.05258 ± 0.0010 |
| \( \delta \) | Transit depth (fraction) | - | 0.00272 ± 0.00010 | 0.002765 ± 0.00011 |
| \( D_{\text{depth}} \) | Flux decrement at mid transit | - | 0.00270 ± 0.000096 | 0.002765 ± 0.00010 |
| \( T \) | Transit Impact parameter | - | 0.8739 ± 0.0082 | 0.8820 ± 0.0068 |
| \( \rho \) | Density (cgs) | - | 187 ± 17 | 169 ± 16 |
| \( N_{\text{trans}} \) | Ingress/egress transit duration (days) | - | 5.444 ± 0.029 | 5.412 ± 0.026 |
| \( M_P \) | Minimum mass (M\(_J\)) | - | 63.6 ± 1.0 | 59.9 ± 0.8 |
| \( M_P/M_\star \) | Mass ratio | - | 0.05043 ± 0.00097 | 0.05195 ± 0.00045 |

| Wavelength Parameters: | | | | |
| \( u_1 \) | linear limb-darkening coeff | - | 0.292 ± 0.050 | 0.335 ± 0.049 |
| \( u_2 \) | quadratic limb-darkening coeff | - | 0.260 ± 0.050 | 0.269 ± 0.049 |

| RV Parameters: | | | | |
| \( \gamma_{\text{rel}} \) | Relative RV Offset (m/s) | - | 71964 ± 14 | 73413 ± 17 |
| \( \sigma_f \) | RV Jitter (m/s) | - | 37 ± 17 | 37 ± 17 |
| \( \sigma_f^2 \) | RV Jitter Variance | - | 1420 ± 2300 | 1390 ± 2300 |

| Transit Parameters: | | | | |
| \( \sigma^2 \) | Added Variance | - | 0.00000202 ± 0.00000030 \( 0.000000026 \) | 0.000001792 ± 0.0000000063 \( 0.0000000062 \) |
| \( F_0 \) | Baseline flux | - | 0.99981 ± 0.00013 | 1.0000143 ± 0.0000053 |