

## WASP-4 is Accelerating Towards the Earth

L. G. BOUMA,<sup>1</sup> J. N. WINN,<sup>1</sup> H. ISAACSON,<sup>2</sup> A. W. HOWARD,<sup>3</sup> S. B. HOWELL,<sup>4</sup> AND H. KNUTSON<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Department of Astrophysical Sciences, Princeton University, 4 Ivy Lane, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA*

<sup>2</sup> *Astronomy Department, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

<sup>3</sup> *Cahill Center for Astrophysics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA*

<sup>4</sup> *NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA 94035, USA*

<sup>5</sup> *Division of Geological and Planetary Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA*

(Received January 24, 2020; Revised —; Accepted —)

Submitted to AAS journals.

### ABSTRACT

We recently reported that space and ground-based transit observations showed the orbital period of WASP-4b to be decreasing. Possible explanations included tidal orbital decay, orbital precession, and light-travel time effects. In this work we present new observations of the radial velocity of WASP-4, acquired with Keck-HIRES. The new data show that the system is accelerating towards our line of sight, at  $\dot{\gamma} = X.XX \pm Y.YY \text{ m s}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ . This implies a period decrease of X.XX milliseconds per year, compared to the observed value of Y.YY. Combining the radial velocities with new speckle imaging from Gemini-Zorro, we find that the WASP-4 system likely has a 10-200  $M_{\text{Jup}}$  companion with semi-major axis between 10 and 100 AU. As observing baselines continue to extend, long-term tracking of hot Jupiter radial velocities will be necessary to distinguish tidal orbital decay from the Rømer delay.

**Keywords:** Exoplanet tides (497), Exoplanet dynamics (490), Radial velocity (1332), Transit timing variation method (1710)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Since the first discovery of transiting hot Jupiters, the hunt for tidal orbital decay has received much attention (CITE LIKE 20 PAPERS). These efforts are gradually beginning to yield fruit: by combining transit and occultation timing and radial velocity measurements, CITE Yee et al. have shown that the data for the hot Jupiter WASP-12b are most compatible with orbital decay.

The present study highlights a point that, while obvious, has perhaps not yet received due attention. The point is that the hunt for orbital decay of hot Jupiters will be crippled without long-term radial velocity monitoring programs. The reason is simple: when the timescale of orbital period change far exceeds the observing baseline, the first deviation from constant periodicity is always quadratic in the transit number.

There are ample reasons to expect orbital decay to be common (CITE). However there are reasons to expect the Rømer delay to perhaps be even *more* common (CITE Knutson 14, Bryan 16). Both manifest to first order identically in transit

times (up to the sign of the line-of-sight acceleration) – as a non-zero period derivative.

Specifically, Knutson et al. (2014) showed that X% of hot Jupiters show some form of radial acceleration in radial velocity time-series with baselines of YY years. Assuming a separation distribution of (WHATEVER), this implies that ZZ% of hot Jupiters will *always* show a changing orbital period, over timescale of say 10 years. The abundance of giant planets exterior to Super-Earth sized systems is also high (CITE Bryan 2019), but this is not so much of a concern to us, as their planetary masses and therefore tidal timescales are typically expected to be at least an order of magnitude shorter than hot Jupiters.

The main focus of this study is the hot Jupiter WASP-4b, which has an orbital period that from transits appears to be decreasing by about 10 milliseconds per year. We discovered the timing variations using data from TESS and a decade of ground-based monitoring (Bouma et al. 2019, hereafter B19).

Thereafter, Southworth et al. (2019) reported 22 new transit times for the system, and confirmed that the updated series of transit times was consistent with a quadratic ephemeris. With additional data, they found a lower best-fit decay rate of  $\dot{P} = -XX.X \pm X.X$  milliseconds per year.

A separate study by Baluev et al. (2019) reported additional archival transit light curves of WASP-4b, most no-

tably from the TRAPPIST archive, and a select few other observers. [Baluev et al.](#) found that when they used all the available TTV data, the need for a quadratic ephemeris was present “at the high  $\sim 5-7$  sigma level”. However, they pointed out that if they used lower-precision subsets of the available timing data, the necessity for the quadratic term decreased. This is not particularly surprising.

To determine the origin of the period change, we acquired four additional radial velocity measurements using Keck-HIRES, extending the RV baseline from 3 to 9 years. Previously, the radial velocities were sparse and showed a weak ( $< 2\sigma$ ) linear trend. Our new measurements reveal a line of sight acceleration of  $\dot{\gamma} = -XX\text{m s}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$ . This translates to an expected period decrease simply from the light travel time effect of ZZ milliseconds per year — about commensurate with what is observed.

§ 2 presents the new observations... § 3 describes our analysis... § 4 discusses... § 5 gives conclusions...

## 2. OBSERVATIONS

### 2.1. Transits

**Table N** lists the transit times we used in our analysis. We include data from the peer-reviewed literature for which (a) the analysis was based on observations of a single transit, (b) the midpoint was fitted as a free parameter, and (c) the time system specified both the absolute reference (TDB or UTC) and also whether any barycentric or heliocentric corrections had been performed.

The majority of times are identical to those we collected in [B19](#). Twenty-two new times reported by [Southworth et al. \(2019\)](#) are included. These transits were observed from the 3.58m NTT and Danish 1.54m telescopes at La Silla, and the SAO 1.0m telescope.


A number of additional times were also recently reported by [Baluev et al. \(2019\)](#), based on a homogeneous analysis of archival ground-based observations. We included their “high quality” transit times with provenance from the TRAPPIST and El Sauce telescopes, for which we verified with the original observers that appropriate time-system corrections had been performed (M. Gillon, P. Evans, priv. comm.).

The four available occultation data points tabulated by [B19](#) are sparse and have negligible statistical value due to their large uncertainties, and we forgo their use in this analysis.

### 2.2. Radial velocities

After identifying the period decrease in [B19](#), we acquired four additional radial velocity measurements with the Keck High Resolution Echelle Spectrometer (HIRES, [Vogt et al. 1994](#)). Our observations were acquired under the purview of the California Planet Survey ([Howard et al. 2010](#)). The spectra were reduced using **software X**. Previously, the HIRES data-points spanned 2010 to 2013 ([Knutson et al. 2014](#)). Our new measurements triple the HIRES observing baseline to nine years.

The complete set of radial velocity observations is given in **Table M**. Along with the 2010-2019 HIRES observations, there are also earlier measurements from CORALIE and



**Figure 1. Timing residuals and best-fit models for WASP-4b.**

The vertical axis shows the observed times minus the calculated times assuming a constant orbital period. Darker points correspond to more precise data. The quadratic ephemeris and its  $1\sigma$  uncertainties are shown in blue. The binned TESS point (red square) is the weighted average of 18 TESS transits and is for display purposes only. The models were fitted to all of the individual transit times.

HARPS. Following [B19](#), we included the CORALIE measurements from [Wilson et al. \(2008\)](#) and [Triaud et al. \(2010\)](#), using the homogeneous radial velocities calculated by the latter authors. We included the HARPS values reported by [Pont et al. \(2011\)](#) and [Husnoo et al. \(2012\)](#). We omitted the HARPS data points taken over three nights by [Triaud et al. \(2010\)](#) for Rossiter-McLaughlin observations because they have a systematic offset from the remaining datasets.

### 2.3. Speckle imaging

A cursory analysis of the new HIRES observations led to our detection of a linear trend in the residuals after fitting the orbit of WASP-4b. This prompted us to acquire speckle imaging using Zorro at Gemini-South (see [Scott et al. 2018](#), and the instrument web-pages<sup>1</sup>). Zorro (and its counterpart, Alopeke, on Gemini-North) are dual-channel speckle interferometers that can be used to observe in narrow-band filters centered at 562 nm and 832 nm.

We observed WASP-4 twice, on the night of September 11-12 (8 sets of 1000 frames each) and also on the night of September 28-29 (7 sets of 1000 frames each). The second night had better seeing and produced a slightly better result, which we opt to use for our analysis.

**We reduced the speckle images to contrast curves by ...**

## 3. ANALYSIS

### 3.1. Transits

We considered two possible models for the observed transit times. The first model assumes a constant orbital period on a

<sup>1</sup> [www.gemini.edu/sciops/instruments/alopeke-zorro/](http://www.gemini.edu/sciops/instruments/alopeke-zorro/)

circular orbit:

$$t_{\text{tra}}(E) = t_0 + PE, \quad (1)$$

$$(2)$$

where  $E$  is the epoch number and  $t_0$  is a reference epoch. The second model assumes the period changes at a steady rate:

$$t_{\text{tra}}(E) = t_0 + PE + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dP}{dE} E^2. \quad (3)$$

The free parameters are the reference epoch  $t_0$ , the period at the reference epoch, and the period derivative,  $dP/dt = (1/P)dP/dE$ . We defined the epoch numbers such that  $E = 0$  is near the weighted average of the observed times. This helps to reduce the covariance between  $t_0$  and  $P$ . A third possible model that we did not consider for reasons that will become apparent is a precessing, eccentric orbit (e.g., [Giménez & Bastero 1995](#); [Patra et al. 2017](#)).

We fitted each of the two models by assuming a Gaussian likelihood and sampling over the posterior probability distributions. We sampled the posterior using the algorithm proposed by [Goodman & Weare \(2010\)](#) and implemented by ? in `emcee`. The prior for the quadratic model allowed the period derivative to have any sign.

Figure 1 shows the observed transit times, minus the best-fit constant period model. The best-fitting constant-period model has  $\chi^2 = XXX$  and  $YY$  degrees of freedom. The best-fitting quadratic model has  $\chi^2 = YYY$  and  $ZZ$  degrees of freedom. The difference in the BIC ([Kass & Raftery 1995](#)) between the linear and quadratic and models is  $\Delta\text{BIC} = ZZ.Z$ , strongly favoring the quadratic case.

The best-fit period derivative in the quadratic model is


$$\dot{P} = -(X.XX \pm 0.XX) \times 10^{-10} = -YY.Y \pm Z.Z \text{ ms yr}^{-1}. \quad (4)$$

This agrees with the value reported by [Southworth et al. \(2019\)](#) after their including an additional 22 archival transit measurements ( $\dot{P} = -9.2 \pm 1.1 \text{ ms yr}^{-1}$ ). It is smaller than the rate of period decrease found by [B19](#) ( $-12.6 \pm 1.2 \text{ ms yr}^{-1}$ ), presumably because of missing coverage filled in by [Southworth et al.](#)'s observations. The other best-fit transit timing model parameters are reported in **Table X**.

### 3.2. Radial Velocities: WASP-4's acceleration towards the Earth

We began by fitting a single Keplerian orbit, plus instrument offsets, jitters, and a long-term trend ([Fulton et al. 2018](#), `radvel`). We set Gaussian priors on the period and time of inferior conjunction using the values from Table 4 of [B19](#), and fixed the eccentricity to zero, per the results of [Beerer et al. \(2011\)](#), [Knutson et al. \(2014\)](#) and [Bonomo et al. \(2017\)](#). The free parameters were the velocity semi-amplitude, the instrument zero-points, the instrument jitters (an additive white noise term for each instrument), linear ( $\dot{v}_r$ ), and optionally second-order ( $\ddot{v}_r$ ) acceleration terms.

We found that the best-fitting model with both linear and quadratic radial velocity terms was marginally preferred (by



**Figure 2. Radial velocity observations of WASP-4.** The best-fit Keplerian orbit of WASP-4b has been subtracted. The linear trend inferred from the RV data is shown with a black line, with  $1\sigma$  errors in gray. The trend that would be needed to produce the period decrease seen in transits ( $\dot{P} = -YY.Y \pm Z.Z \text{ ms yr}^{-1}$ ) is indicated with the purple dotted line. The four new RV measurements presented in this work increased the significance of the slope from  $\approx 2\sigma$  to  $15\sigma$ .

$\Delta\text{BIC} = 5.8$ ) over the best-fitting model with only a linear term. Regardless, for consistency with [Knutson et al. \(2014\)](#), who fixed the quadratic component of the long-term trend to zero, in Figure 2 we show best-fitting models for the linear-trend case.

WASP-4 was found to be accelerating towards our line of sight at high confidence,

$$\dot{v}_r = -0.0422^{+0.0028}_{-0.0027} \text{ ms}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}. \quad (5)$$

For comparison, before our recent observing run,  $\dot{v}_r$  was thought to be about five times smaller, and was only marginally significant ([Knutson et al. 2014](#); [Bouma et al. 2019](#)).


The system's acceleration towards our line of sight causes a decrease in the apparent orbital period (the Rømer delay). The period derivative expected from radial velocities is

$$\dot{P}_{\text{RV}} = \frac{\dot{v}_r P}{c} \quad (6)$$

$$\dot{P}_{\text{RV}} = -5.94 \pm 0.39 \text{ ms yr}^{-1}. \quad (7)$$

In other words, the majority of the period decrease observed in transits ( $\dot{P} = -X.X \pm 1.1 \text{ ms yr}^{-1}$ ) seems to be explained by the acceleration of the host star. All the available TTV data show a period decrease of  $\approx 8 - 12$  milliseconds per year (?[Southworth et al. 2019](#); ?).

An important consideration is whether the measured RV trend is at all correlated with stellar activity. We investigate this by analyzing WASP-4's emission in the Ca II H & K lines, as quantified with the chromospheric  $S$ -index ([Wright et al. 2004](#)). We only examined the HIRES velocities for this step, since they are the main source of signal for our




**Figure 3.** *Top:* Speckle image reconstructed from 1000 40 millisecond frames in an 832 nm bandpass, and acquired on September 28, 2019. The image scale is  $2.46'' \times 2.46''$ . *Bottom:* Contrast curve derived from point-source injection-recovery experiments.

analysis. First, we subtracted the orbital solution from the Keck-HIRES velocities. Then, following [Bryan et al. \(2016, 2019\)](#), we calculated the Spearman rank correlation coefficient between the  $S$ -index and the orbit-subtracted velocities. We found a correlation coefficient of 0.16. Though suggestive, it is not statistically significant (the corresponding  $p$ -value is 0.65). Furthermore, inspection of the  $S$ -index time-series showed no secular or sinusoidal trends, as would be expected if we were observing a long-term magnetic activity cycle. The  $S$ -index values are included in [Table X](#). We conclude that it would be highly unlikely for the linear trend to be caused by stellar activity.

### 3.3. Constraints on companion masses and semi-major axes

Given a linear radial velocity trend, we can place lower-limits on the mass and semi-major axis of additional bodies in the system. The constraints on the two parameters are degenerate:  $\dot{\gamma} \propto M_p a^{-2}$ . Nonetheless, the Zorro images and contrast curves can limit the available parameter space by



**Figure 4.** Masses and semi-major axes of companions that meet requirements of both the radial velocity and the speckle imaging. The likelihood inferred from radial velocities is shown in grayscale, and the region excluded from the imaging is shown with a cross-hatch pattern.

setting an upper limit on the semimajor axis, and a maximum brightness (and thereby mass) of any putative companions.

The general procedure we use to derive constraints on possible companion masses and semi-major axes has been developed by [Wright et al. \(2007\)](#), [Crepp et al. \(2012\)](#), [Montet et al. \(2014\)](#), [Knutson et al. \(2014\)](#), [Bryan et al. \(2016, 2019\)](#), and others.

*Speckle imaging constraints*—First, we would like to convert the contrast ratios obtained through the Zorro imaging ([Figure 3](#)) to limits on the masses of putative companions and their separations from the host star.

To do this, we followed [Montet et al. \(2014\)](#), and opted to employ the [Baraffe et al. \(2003\)](#) models for substellar mass objects and the MIST isochrones for stellar mass objects ([Paxton et al. 2011, 2013, 2015](#); [Dotter 2016](#); [Choi et al. 2016](#)). We assumed that the system age was 5 Gyr, so that companions would have fully contracted.

Due to the custom filters of the Zorro imager, and corresponding lack of synthetic photometry, we further assumed that all sources had blackbody spectra. While this is clearly false, we do not readily have access to the planetary and stellar atmosphere models needed for the consistent calculation with the `COND03` and `MESA` models. We therefore adopted the effective temperatures and bolometric luminosities from the [Baraffe et al. \(2003\)](#) and MIST isochrones. Using these theoretical quantities and the empirical Zorro bandpass functions, we calculated absolute magnitudes in the 562 and 832 nm Zorro bandpasses for stellar and planetary mass companions. Applying the same calculation to WASP-4 itself using the effective temperature and bolometric luminosity from [B19](#), we derived the transformation from contrast ratio to companion mass. The resulting limits are shown as the cross-hatched region in [Figure 4](#).



*Radial velocity constraints*—To derive constraints on possible companion masses and separations from the radial velocities, we followed the procedure of [Bryan et al. \(2019\)](#). We began by defining a  $50 \times 50$  grid in true planetary mass and semimajor axis, evenly spaced from 1 to  $300 M_{\text{Jup}}$  and 3 to 500 AU. We then considered the possibility that an additional companion in any particular cell could explain the observed linear trend. In each cell, we simulated 500 hypothetical companions.

We assigned each companion a mass and semimajor axis from log-uniform distributions within the grid cell. We drew the inclination from a uniform distribution in  $\cos i$ . The eccentricity was drawn from [Kipping \(2013\)](#)’s long-period exoplanet Beta distribution ( $a = 1.12$ ,  $b = 3.09$ ). For each simulated companion, we then drew a sample from the converged chains of our initial model of WASP-4b, plus its linear trend. We subtracted the planet’s orbital solution, leaving the linear trend. Given  $(a_c, M_c, e_c)$  for each simulated outer companion, and the fixed instrument offsets and jitters from the MCMC chains, we then performed a maximum likelihood fit for the time and argument of periastron of the outer simulated companion. We converted the resulting  $50 \times 50 \times 500$  cube of best-fit log-likelihood values to probabilities, and averaged over the samples in each grid cell to derive a probability distribution in mass and semi-major axis.

The result is shown as grayscale background in Figure 4.

## 4. DISCUSSION


### 4.1. Implications for WASP-4

Previous possibilities suggested to explain the period decrease of WASP-4b included tidal orbital decay, orbital precession, and light-travel time effects ([Bouma et al. 2019](#)). Our new radial velocity measurements have now shown the least exotic option—light-travel time effects—is also the most likely explanation. Transits show the orbital period to decrease by  $YY.Y \pm Z.Z \text{ ms yr}^{-1}$ ; the line-of-sight acceleration observed in radial velocities implies an expected period decrease of  $YY.Y \pm Z.Z \text{ ms yr}^{-1}$ . Though the quantitative agreement is not perfect, Occam’s razor would suggest that the line of sight acceleration is probably a sufficient explanation for the apparent decrease of WASP-4b’s orbital period.

The corresponding requirements for the companion causing the acceleration are that it is likely either a brown-dwarf or low mass star, and that it is between 10-100 AU from the host star (Figure 4). Given such a mass, this companion could at one time have influenced the orbital evolution of the inner giant. Further radial velocity monitoring should eventually reveal the orbital parameters and minimum mass of the companion.

### 4.2. How many other hot Jupiters will show the Rømer delay?

We identified WASP-4b’s decreasing orbital period as part of a search for tidal orbital decay. However, over half of hot Jupiters have companions outside of 1 AU with super-Jovian masses ([Knutson et al. 2014](#)). Line-of-sight accelerations are therefore relatively common in hot Jupiter systems.



**Figure 5. Predicted hot Jupiter period changes from linear radial velocity trends.** Including WASP-4b, 16 of 51 hot Jupiters from [Knutson et al. \(2014\)](#) have shown long-term radial velocity trends. The HAT-P-11 signal is plotted, though its radial velocity signal may be caused by stellar activity. Three hot Jupiters are not plotted because their radial velocity curves better described as quadratic trends in time: HAT-P-17, WASP-8, and WASP-34. Objects are ordered in the y dimension by the absolute value of  $dP/dt$ .

To evaluate the importance of these effects in future transit timing searches, we collected the linear trends reported by [Knutson et al. \(2014\)](#), and computed the expected orbital period derivatives  $\dot{P}_{\text{RV}} = \dot{v}_r P / c$  for all the systems. The results are given in [Table X](#), and visualized for hot Jupiters with significant linear trends in Figure 5.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

We found that WASP-4 is accelerating towards the Earth, at  $X.XX \text{ m/s/yr}$ . This seems like the most plausible explanation for the orbital period decrease observed in transits — not tidal orbital decay, or apsidal precession. The most likely parameters for the companion are  $XXX$ . Over half of hot Jupiters have super-Jovian outer companions, so the Rømer delay will become an increasingly large nuisance in the hunt for orbital decay as the observing baselines for hot Jupiters increase. The requirement to avoid missing out is to have long-term radial velocity monitoring with the same spectrograph (or else to calibrate instrumental offsets by observing the same stars simultaneously).

*Software:* [astrobases](#) ([Bhatti et al. 2018](#)), [astroplan](#) ([Morris et al. 2018](#)), [astropy](#) ([Collaboration et al. 2018](#)), [astroquery](#) ([Ginsburg et al. 2018](#)), [corner](#) ([Foreman-Mackey 2016](#)), [emcee](#) (?), [IPython](#) ([Pérez & Granger 2007](#)), [matplotlib](#) ([Hunter 2007](#)), [MESA](#) ([Paxton et al. 2011, 2013, 2015](#)) [numpy](#) ([Walt et al. 2011](#)), [pandas](#) ([McKinney 2010](#)), [radvel](#) ([Fulton et al. 2018](#)), [scipy](#) ([Jones et al. 2001](#)).

**Table 1.** Best-fit transit timing model parameters.

Parameter	Median Value (Unc.) <sup>a</sup>
<i>Constant period</i>	
$t_0$ [BJD <sub>TBD</sub> ]	2455804.515752(+19)(-19)
$P$ [days]	1.338231466(+23)(-22)
<i>Constant period derivative</i>	
$t_0$ [BJD <sub>TBD</sub> ]	2455804.515918(+24)(-24)

$P$ [days]	1.338231679(+31)(-31)
$dP/dt$	$-4.00(+37)(-38) \times 10^{-10}$

<sup>a</sup> **FIXME table needs numbers** The numbers in parenthesis give the 68% confidence interval for the final two digits, where appropriate.

## REFERENCES

- Baluev, R. V., Sokov, E. N., Jones, H. R. A., et al. 2019, [arXiv:1908.04505 \[astro-ph\]](#), arXiv: 1908.04505
- Baraffe, I., Chabrier, G., Barman, T. S., Allard, F., & Hauschildt, P. H. 2003, [A&A](#), **402**, 701
- Beerer, I. M., Knutson, H. A., Burrows, A., et al. 2011, [ApJ](#), **727**, 23
- Bhatti, W., Bouma, L. G., & Wallace, J. 2018, [astrobase](#)
- Bonomo, A. S., Desidera, S., Benatti, S., et al. 2017, [A&A](#), **602**, A107
- Bouma, L. G., Winn, J. N., Baxter, C., et al. 2019, [AJ](#), **157**, 217
- Bryan, M. L., Knutson, H. A., Lee, E. J., et al. 2019, [AJ](#), **157**, 52
- Bryan, M. L., Knutson, H. A., Howard, A. W., et al. 2016, [ApJ](#), **821**, 89
- Choi, J., Dotter, A., Conroy, C., et al. 2016, [ApJ](#), **823**, 102, arXiv: 1604.08592
- Collaboration, T. A., Price-Whelan, A. M., Sipőcz, B. M., et al. 2018, [arXiv:1801.02634 \[astro-ph\]](#), arXiv: 1801.02634
- Crepp, J. R., Johnson, J. A., Howard, A. W., et al. 2012, [ApJ](#), **761**, 39
- Dotter, A. 2016, [ApJS](#), **222**, 8
- Foreman-Mackey, D. 2016, [The Journal of Open Source Software](#), **24**
- Fulton, B. J., Petigura, E. A., Blunt, S., & Sinukoff, E. 2018, [arXiv:1801.01947 \[astro-ph\]](#), arXiv: 1801.01947
- Giménez, A., & Bastero, M. 1995, [Ap&SS](#), **226**, 99
- Ginsburg, A., Sipocz, B., Madhura Parikh, et al. 2018, [Astropy/Astroquery: V0.3.7 Release](#)
- Goodman, J., & Weare, J. 2010, [Communications in Applied Mathematics and Computational Science](#), **5**, 65
- Howard, A. W., Johnson, J. A., Marcy, G. W., et al. 2010, [ApJ](#), **721**, 1467
- Hunter, J. D. 2007, [Computing in Science & Engineering](#), **9**, 90
- Husnoo, N., Pont, F., Mazeh, T., et al. 2012, [MNRAS](#), **422**, 3151
- Jones, E., Oliphant, T., Peterson, P., et al. 2001, [Open source scientific tools for Python](#)
- Kass, R. E., & Raftery, A. E. 1995, [Journal of the American Statistical Association](#), **90**, 773
- Kipping, D. M. 2013, [MNRAS](#), **434**, L51
- Knutson, H. A., Fulton, B. J., Montet, B. T., et al. 2014, [ApJ](#), **785**, 126
- McKinney, W. 2010, in [Proceedings of the 9th Python in Science Conference](#), ed. S. van der Walt & J. Millman, 51
- Montet, B. T., Crepp, J. R., Johnson, J. A., Howard, A. W., & Marcy, G. W. 2014, [ApJ](#), **781**, 28
- Morris, B. M., Tollerud, E., Sipőcz, B., et al. 2018, [AJ](#), **155**, 128
- Patra, K. C., Winn, J. N., Holman, M. J., et al. 2017, [AJ](#), **154**, 4
- Paxton, B., Bildsten, L., Dotter, A., et al. 2011, [ApJS](#), **192**, 3
- Paxton, B., Cantiello, M., Arras, P., et al. 2013, [ApJS](#), **208**, 4
- Paxton, B., Marchant, P., Schwab, J., et al. 2015, [ApJS](#), **220**, 15
- Pérez, F., & Granger, B. E. 2007, [Computing in Science and Engineering](#), **9**, 21
- Pont, F., Husnoo, N., Mazeh, T., & Fabrycky, D. 2011, [MNRAS](#), **414**, 1278
- Scott, N. J., Howell, S. B., Horch, E. P., & Everett, M. E. 2018, [PASP](#), **130**, 054502
- Southworth, J., Dominik, M., Jorgensen, U. G., et al. 2019, [arXiv:1907.08269 \[astro-ph\]](#), arXiv: 1907.08269
- Triaud, A. H. M. J., Collier Cameron, A., Queloz, D., et al. 2010, [A&A](#), **524**, A25
- Vogt, S. S., Allen, S. L., Bigelow, B. C., et al. 1994, [SPIE Conference Series](#), Vol. 2198, [SPIE Conference Series](#), ed. D. L. Crawford & E. R. Craine, 362
- Walt, S. v. d., Colbert, S. C., & Varoquaux, G. 2011, [Computing in Science & Engineering](#), **13**, 22
- Wilson, D. M., Gillon, M., Hellier, C., et al. 2008, [ApJL](#), **675**, L113
- Wright, J. T., Marcy, G. W., Butler, R. P., & Vogt, S. S. 2004, [ApJS](#), **152**, 261
- Wright, J. T., Marcy, G. W., Fischer, D. A., et al. 2007, [ApJ](#), **657**, 533