

Three ≈ 40 Million Year Old Mini-Neptunes from Kepler, TESS, and Gaia

L. G. BOUMA,^{1,*} R. KERR,² J. L. CURTIS,^{3,4} H. ISAACSON,⁵ L. A. HILLENBRAND,¹ A. W. HOWARD,¹ A. L. KRAUS,² A. BIERYLA,⁶
D. W. LATHAM,⁶ E. A. PETIGURA,⁷ AND D. HUBER⁸

¹*Cahill Center for Astrophysics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA*

²*Department of Astronomy, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA*

³*Department of Astronomy, Columbia University, 550 West 120th Street, New York, NY 10027, USA*

⁴*Department of Astrophysics, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY 10024, USA*

⁵*Astronomy Department, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

⁶*Center for Astrophysics | Harvard & Smithsonian, 60 Garden St, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA*

⁷*Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA*

⁸*Institute for Astronomy, University of Hawaii, 2680 Woodlawn Drive, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA*

(Received March 27, 2022; Revised —; Accepted —)

ABSTRACT

Stellar positions and velocities from Gaia are yielding a new and refined view of how stellar clusters evolve. Here we present an analysis of a group of ≈ 40 million year old stars spanning Cepheus ($l = 100^\circ$) to Hercules ($l = 40^\circ$), hereafter the Cep-Her complex. The group includes four known Kepler Objects of Interest: Kepler-1627 Ab ($R_p = 3.85 \pm 0.11 R_\oplus$, $P = 7.2$ days), Kepler-1643 b ($R_p = 2.32 \pm 0.14 R_\oplus$, $P = 5.3$ days), KOI-7368 b ($R_p = 2.22 \pm 0.12 R_\oplus$, $P = 6.8$ days), and KOI-7913 Ab ($R_p = 2.34 \pm 0.18 R_\oplus$, $P = 24.2$ days). Kepler-1627 is a Neptune-sized planet in a sub-component of the complex called the δ Lyr cluster (Bouma et al. 2022). Here we focus on the latter three systems, which are in other sub-components of the complex (RSG-5 and CH-2). Based on kinematic evidence from Gaia, stellar rotation periods from TESS, and spectroscopy, these three systems are also ≈ 40 million years old. More specifically, we find that Kepler-1643 (in RSG-5) is 46_{-7}^{+9} Myr old, while KOI-7368 and KOI-7913 (in CH-2) are 36_{-8}^{+10} Myr old. Based on the transit shapes and high resolution imaging, they are all most likely planets, with false positive probabilities of 6×10^{-9} , 5×10^{-3} , and 1×10^{-4} for Kepler-1643, KOI-7368, and KOI-7913 respectively. Kepler-1643 and KOI-7913 are therefore the first empirical demonstration that mini-Neptunes with sizes of ≈ 2 Earth radii exist at ages of ≈ 40 million years.

Keywords: exoplanet evolution (491), open star clusters (1160), stellar ages (1581)

1. INTRODUCTION

The discovery and characterization of transiting planets younger than a billion years is a major frontier in current exoplanet research. The reason is that the properties of young planets provide benchmarks for studies of planetary evolution. For instance, there are the questions of when hot Jupiters arrive on their close-in orbits (Dawson & Johnson 2018), how the sizes of planets with massive gaseous envelopes evolve (Rizzuto et al. 2020), when and if close-in multiplanet systems fall out of resonance (Arevalo et al. 2022; Goldberg & Batygin 2022), and whether and how

mass-loss explains the radius valley (Lopez et al. 2012; Owen & Wu 2013; Fulton et al. 2017; Ginzburg et al. 2018; Lee & Connors 2021).

The discovery of a young planet requires two claims to be fulfilled: the planet must exist, and its age must be secured. Spaced-based photometry from K2 and TESS has yielded a number of young planets for which the planetary evidence comes from transits, and the age evidence is based on either cluster membership (Mann et al. 2017; David et al. 2019; Newton et al. 2019; Bouma et al. 2020; Nardiello et al. 2020, e.g.) or else on correlates of youth such as stellar rotation, photospheric lithium abundances, x-ray activity, or emission line strength (Zhou et al. 2021; Hedges et al. 2021, e.g.).

In this work, we leverage recent analyses of the Gaia data, which have greatly expanded our knowledge of stellar group memberships (e.g., Cantat-Gaudin et al. 2018; Kounkel & Covey 2019; Kerr et al. 2021). Broadly speaking these analy-

Corresponding author: L. G. Bouma
luke@astro.caltech.edu

* 51 Pegasi b Fellow

ses cluster on the stellar positions and on-sky velocities measured by Gaia, with varying degrees of filtering and supervision. One important result is the identification of diffuse streams and tidal tails comparable in stellar mass to the previously known cores of nearby open clusters (Meingast et al. 2019; Meingast et al. 2021; Gagné et al. 2021). These spatially diffuse groups typically have velocity dispersions of $\approx 1 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, though they can be much higher due to both projection effects and internal dynamics. As an extreme example, in the Hyades the apparent velocities of stars in the tidal tails are expected to span up to $\pm 40 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ relative to the cluster center (Jerabkova et al. 2021). The stars in such diffuse regions can be verified to be the same age as the core members (*i.e.*, co-eval) through analyses of color-absolute magnitude diagrams, stellar rotation periods (Curtis et al. 2019; Bouma et al. 2021), and chemical abundances (Hawkins et al. 2020). While there are many implications for our understanding of star formation and cluster evolution (*e.g.* Dinnbier & Kroupa 2020), a more immediate consequence is that we now know the ages of many more stars, including previously known planet hosts.

The prime Kepler mission (Borucki et al. 2010) found most of the currently known transiting exoplanets, and it was conducted before Gaia. It therefore seems sensible to revisit the Kepler field, given our new knowledge of the stellar ages.

In this work, we expand on our previous study of a 38_{-6}^{+7} million year old Neptune-sized planet in the Kepler field (Kepler-1627 Ab; Bouma et al. 2022). The age of this planet was derived based on its host star’s membership in the δ Lyr cluster. Our analysis of the cluster focused on the immediate spatial and kinematic vicinity of Kepler-1627 A in order to confirm the age of the planet. However it became clear that the δ Lyr cluster seems to also be part of a much larger group of similarly aged stars. This group, which is at a distance of ~ 330 parsecs from the Sun, appears to span Cepheus to Hercules (galactic longitudes, l , between 40° and 100°), at galactic latitudes roughly between 0° and 20° . We therefore refer to it as the Cep-Her complex. It exhibits significant substructure over its ≈ 250 parsec length, and a detailed analysis of its memberships, kinematics, and possible origin is currently being prepared by R. Kerr and collaborators.

Here, our focus is on the intersection of the Cep-Her complex with the Kepler field. Cross-matching the full set of candidate Cep-Her members against known Kepler Objects of Interest (KOIs) (Thompson et al. 2018) yielded four candidate cluster members: Kepler-1627, Kepler-1643, KOI-7368, and KOI-7913. Given our previous analysis of Kepler-1627, we will mostly focus on the latter three. After analyzing the relevant properties of Cep-Her (Section 2), we discuss the stellar properties (Section 3) and validate the planetary nature of each system using a combination of the Kepler photometry and high-resolution imaging (Section 4). We conclude with

a discussion of implications for the size-evolution of close-in mini-Neptunes (Section 5).

2. THE CEP-HER COMPLEX

2.1. Previous Related Work

Our focus is on a region of the Galaxy approximately 200 to 500 parsecs from the Sun, above the galactic plane, and spanning galactic longitudes of roughly 40° to 100° degrees. Two rich clusters in this region are the δ Lyr cluster (Stephenson 1959) and RSG-5 (Röser et al. 2016). Each of these clusters was known before Gaia. They have reported ages between ≈ 30 and ≈ 60 million years. Early empirical evidence that these two clusters could be part of a large and more diffuse population was apparent in the Gaia-based photometric analysis of pre-main-sequence stars by Zari et al. (2018, see their Figures 11 and 13). Further kinematic connections and complexity were highlighted by Kounkel & Covey (2019), who included these previously known groups in the larger structures dubbed “Theia 73” and “Theia 96”¹. The connection made by Kounkel & Covey (2019) between the previously known open clusters and the other groups in the region was made as part of an unsupervised clustering analysis of the Gaia DR2 positions and tangential velocities with a subsequent manual “stitching” step, and generally supports the idea that there is an overdensity of ≈ 30 and ≈ 60 million year old stars in this region of the Galaxy. Kerr et al. (2021), in a volume-limited analysis of the Gaia DR2 point-source catalog out to one third of a kiloparsec, identified three of the nearest sub-populations, dubbed “Cepheus-Cygnus”, “Lyra”, and “Cerberus”. Kerr et al. (2021) reported ages for each of these subgroups between 30 and 35 million years.

2.2. Member Selection

The possibility that the δ Lyr cluster, RSG-5, and the sub-populations identified by Kerr et al. (2021) share a common origin has yet to be fully substantiated, and is the subject of the upcoming study by R. Kerr and collaborators. Our primary interest in the region stems from the fact that a portion of it was observed by Kepler (Figure 1, top panel). To further explore the population of stars that were observed, we select candidate Cep-Her members through four steps, the first three being identical to those described in Section 3 of Kerr et al. (2021). We briefly summarize them here.

The first step is to select stars that are photometrically distinct from the field star population based on Gaia EDR3 magnitudes $\{G, G_{\text{RP}}, G_{\text{BP}}\}$, parallaxes and auxiliary reddening estimates (Lallement et al. 2019). This step yielded 1097 stars with high-quality photometric and astrometry, which are either pre-main-sequence K and M dwarfs due to their

¹ See their visualization online at <http://mkounkel.com/mw3d/mw2d.html> (accessed 15 March 2022)




Figure 1. Positions and velocities of candidate members of the Cep-Her complex. *Top row:* On-sky positions in galactic coordinates. Black points are stars for which group membership is more secure than for gray points (see Section 2.2). Kepler-1627 is in the outskirts of the δ Lyr cluster (Bouma et al. 2022), which is centered at $\{l, b\} \approx \{66^\circ, 12^\circ\}$. *Middle row:* Galactic positions. The Sun is at $\{X, Y, Z\} = \{0, 0, 20.8\}$ pc; lines of constant heliocentric distance are shown between 250 and 400 pc, spaced by 50 pc. *Bottom row:* Galactic tangential velocities (left) and longitudinal tangential velocity versus galactic latitude (right). The gray band in the lower-right shows the $\pm 1\text{-}\sigma$ projection of the Solar velocity with respect to the local standard of rest. There is a strong spatial and kinematic overlap between Kepler-1643 and RSG-5 ($\{l, b\} \approx \{82^\circ, 6^\circ\}$; $\{X, Y, Z\} \approx \{60, 330, 50\}$ pc). The local population of candidate young stars around KOI-7368 and KOI-7913 is more diffuse – we call this region “CH-2”. The **interactive figure** enables a few different cuts to be shown.

long contraction timescales, or massive stars near the zero-age main sequence due to their rapid evolutionary timescales.

The second step is to perform in an unsupervised HDBScan clustering on the photometrically selected population (Campello et al. 2015; McInnes et al. 2017). The parameters we use in this clustering analysis are $\{X, Y, Z, cv_b, cv_{l^*}\}$, where c is the size-velocity corrective factor, which is taken as $c = 6 \text{ pc/km s}^{-1}$ to ensure that the spatial and velocity scales have identical standard deviations. Positions are computed assuming the `astropy v4.0` coordinate standard (Astropy Collaboration et al. 2018), which places the Sun 8122 pc from the galactic center, and assumes the solar velocity with respect to the local standard of rest from Schönrich et al. (2010). As input parameters to HDBScan, we set the minimum ϵ threshold past which clusters cannot be fragmented as 25 parsecs in physical space, and $c \text{ km s}^{-1}$ in velocity. The minimum cluster size N is set to 10, as is k , the parameter used to define the “core distance” density metric.

This unsupervised clustering in our case yielded 8 distinct groups. These groups are then used as the “seed” populations for the third step, which is to search for objects at least as close to the 10th nearest HDBSCAN-identified member in space-velocity coordinates. This third step yields stars that are spatially and kinematically close to the photometrically young stars, but which cannot be identified as young based on their positions in color versus absolute magnitude.

The outcome of the analysis up to the point of the third step is shown in Figure 1. To enable a selection cut that filters out field-star contaminants, we also compute a weight metric, defined such that the group member with the smallest core distance has a weight of 1, the group member with the greatest core distance has a weight of 0, and weights for the other group members are log-normally distributed between these two extremes. In Figure 1, we show 26,960 objects with weight exceeding 0.02 as gray points, and overplot 7,560 objects with weights exceeding 0.10 as black points. **TODO: FIXME these object numbers impose pretty weak quality cuts and include junk at $G > 18$... use `get_clean_gaia_photometric_sources` too, since they come in for the CAMDs.**

The previously known δ Lyr cluster ($l, b = 68^\circ, 15^\circ$; $v_l, v_b = -4.5 \text{ kms}, -4 \text{ kms}$) is visible, as is RSG-5 ($l, b = 83^\circ, 6^\circ$, $v_l, v_b = +5.5 \text{ kms}, -3.5 \text{ kms}$). Most of the other subclusters, including in Cep-Cyg ($l, b = 90^\circ, 7^\circ$) and Cerberus ($l, b = 48^\circ, 18^\circ$) are too small or dispersed to have previously been analyzed in great detail.

The fourth and final step was to cross-match our candidate Cep-Her member list against all known Kepler Objects of Interest. We used the Cumulative KOI table from the NASA Exoplanet Archive from 27 March 2022, and also compared against the `q1_q17_dr25` table (Thompson et al. 2018). This yielded 32 matches, of which 18 were known false pos-

itives, 7 were designated “confirmed”, and 8 were designated “candidates”. A cursory inspection of the Kepler data validation summaries and Robovetter classifications for these objects quickly showed whether they were potentially consistent with being *i*) planets, and *ii*) $\lesssim 10^8$ years old, based on the presence of rotational modulation at the expected period and amplitude (e.g., Rebull et al. 2020, Figure 9). Four objects remained after this inspection: Kepler-1627, Kepler-1643, KOI-7368, and KOI-7913.

Figure 1 shows the positions of the KOIs along various projections. Kepler-1643 is near the core RSG-5 population both spatially and kinematically. KOI-7368 and KOI-7913 are in a diffuse region ≈ 40 parsecs above RSG-5 in Z and ≈ 100 parsecs closer to the Sun in Y . In tangential galactic velocity space, there may be some kinematic overlap between the region the latter two KOIs are in, and the main RSG-5 group.

We define two sets of stars in the local vicinity of our objects of interest. For candidate RSG-5 members, we require:

$$\begin{aligned} X/\text{pc} &\in [45, 75] \\ Y/\text{pc} &\in [320, 350] \\ Z/\text{pc} &\in [40, 70] \\ v_b/\text{km s}^{-1} &\in [-4, -3] \\ v_{l^*}/\text{km s}^{-1} &\in [4, 6] \end{aligned}$$

For the diffuse stars near KOI-7368 and KOI-7913, we require

$$\begin{aligned} X/\text{pc} &\in [20, 70] \\ Y/\text{pc} &\in [230, 270] \\ Z/\text{pc} &\in [75, 105] \\ v_b/\text{km s}^{-1} &\in [-3.5, -1.5] \\ v_{l^*}/\text{km s}^{-1} &\in [2, 6] \end{aligned}$$

and we call this latter set of stars “CH-2”. These cuts yield 141 candidate RSG-5 members, and 37 candidate CH-2 members. An important consideration, especially for CH-2, is the contamination rate by field stars. We assess this in the following section.

2.3. The Cluster’s Age

2.3.1. Color-Absolute Magnitude Diagram

Color-absolute magnitude diagrams (CAMDs) of the candidate RSG-5 and CH-2 members are shown in the upper row of Figure 2. The stars from the δ Lyr cluster are from Bouma et al. (2022), and the field stars are from the Gaia EDR3 Catalog of Nearby Stars (Gaia Collaboration et al. 2021b). To make these diagrams, we imposed the data filtering criteria from Gaia Collaboration et al. (2018a, Appendix B), which are designed to include binaries while omitting instrumental artifacts from for instance low photometric signal to noise,




Figure 2. The stellar groups near KOI-7368, KOI-7913, and Kepler-1643 are ≈ 40 million years old. *Top row:* Color-absolute magnitude diagram of candidate Cep-Her members, in addition to candidate members of the δ Lyr cluster (≈ 38 Myr; Bouma et al. 2022) and the Gaia EDR3 Catalog of Nearby Stars (gray background). The left and right columns show stars in RSG-5 and CH-2, respectively. The range of colors is truncated to emphasize the pre-main-sequence. *Bottom row:* TESS and ZTF-derived stellar rotation periods, with the Pleiades (≈ 112 Myr) and Praesepe (≈ 650 Myr) shown for reference (Rebull et al. 2016; Douglas et al. 2017). The detection efficiency for reliable rotation periods falls off beyond $(G_{BP} - G_{RP})_0 \gtrsim 2.6$.

or a small number of visibility periods. We then corrected for extinction using the [Lallement et al. \(2018\)](#)² dust maps and the extinction coefficients $k_X \equiv A_X/A_0$ from [Gaia Collaboration et al. \(2018a\)](#), assuming that $A_0 = 3.1E(B-V)$. This yielded a mean and standard deviation for the reddening of $E(B-V) = 0.036 \pm 0.002$ for RSG-5, and $E(B-V) = 0.017 \pm 0.001$ for CH-2. By way of comparison, in [Bouma et al. \(2022\)](#) the same query for the δ Lyr cluster yielded $E(B-V) = 0.032 \pm 0.006$. Finally, for the plots we set the $(G_{BP} - G_{RP})_0$ color range to best visualize the region of maximal age information content: the pre-main-sequence.

The CAMDs show that for RSG-5, our membership selection gives stars that photometrically appear to almost all be on a tight pre-main-sequence locus. This implies a false positive rate of at most a few percent. By comparison, our control sample (the δ Lyr candidates) has a false positive rate of $\approx 12\%$, based on the number of stars that photometrically appear to be more consistent with the field population than the bulk cluster population. For CH-2, our membership selection gives 27 objects in the color range displayed, and 23 of them appear to be consistent with being on the pre-main-sequence. This implies a false positive rate of $\approx 15\%$.

In addition, Figure 2 shows that the candidate RSG-5 and CH-2 members overlap with the δ Lyr cluster, and are therefore roughly the same age. To quantify this, we use the empirical method introduced by [Gagné et al. \(2020, see their Section 6.3\)](#). This idea of the method is to fit the pre-main-sequence loci of a set of reference clusters, and to then model the locus of the target cluster as a linear combination of these reference cluster loci. For our reference clusters, we used UCL, IC 2602, and the Pleiades, from the memberships reported by [Damiani et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Cantat-Gaudin et al. \(2018\)](#) respectively. We adopted ages of 16 Myr for UCL ([Pecaut & Mamajek 2016](#)), 38 Myr for IC 2602³, and 112 Myr for the Pleiades ([Dahm 2015](#)). These assumptions and the consequent processing steps taken to exclude field stars as well as photometric and astrometric binaries were identical to those described in [Bouma et al. \(2022\)](#). The mean and standard deviation of the resulting age posterior are 46_{-7}^{+9} Myr for RSG-5, and 36_{-8}^{+10} Myr for CH-2. For comparison, the this procedure yields an age for the δ Lyr cluster of 38_{-5}^{+6} Myr. The slightly older isochronal age of RSG-5 is expected given that its locus is slightly bluer and less luminous in the upper left panel of Figure 2 relative to the δ Lyr cluster.

² <https://stilism.obspm.fr/>

³ Ages for IC 2602 vary from 40 to 46 Myr based on lithium-depletion-boundary (LDB) measurements ([Dobbie et al. 2010](#); [Randich et al. 2018](#)), and from 30 to 46 Myr based on isochronal analyses ([Stauffer et al. 1997](#); [David & Hillenbrand 2015](#); [Bossini et al. 2019](#)).

2.3.2. Stellar Rotation Periods

An independent way to assess the age of the candidate cluster members is to measure their stellar rotation periods using data available from surveys such as TESS ([Ricker et al. 2015](#)) and ZTF ([Bellm et al. 2019](#)). This approach leverages a storied tradition of measuring rotation periods for open clusters of various ages, in order to determine the rate of stellar spin-down (e.g., [Skumanich 1972](#); [Curtis et al. 2020](#)). The TESS data in our case are especially useful, since they provide 3 to 5 lunar months of photometry for all of our candidate CH-2 and RSG-5 members.

We selected stars suitable for gyrochronology by requiring $(G_{BP} - G_{RP})_0 \geq 0.5$ and $G < 16$. The latter cut corresponds to $(G_{BP} - G_{RP})_0 \lesssim 2.6$, at the relevant distances. These cuts gave 19 stars in CH-2 and 42 stars in RSG-5. We extracted light curves from the TESS images for these stars using the unpopular package ([Hattori et al. 2021](#)), and regressed them against systematics with its causal pixel model. **For the ZTF light curves, we used the default photometry?** We then measured candidate rotation periods using a Lomb-Scargle periodogram, and visually inspected them following the methods discussed in [Curtis et al. \(2020\)](#).

The lower panels of Figure 2 show the results. In RSG-5, 36/42 stars have rotation consistent with “sub-Pleiades” (86%). Given the nearly perfectly clean photometric CAMD for RSG-5, this probably gives some indication for the fraction of stars for which we should expect to detect rotation periods with TESS (due to e.g., pole-on stars having less detectable starspot modulation).

Consider stars in CH-2 with $0.5 < BP-RP_0$, and $G < 16$. 19 stars meet this criterion – all were observed by TESS. 13/19 (68%) have rotation that is obviously consistent with a 40 Myr age. 4 are M-dwarfs with rotation periods between 10 and 12.5 days, for which the age interpretation is not obvious. L. Rebull for instance have found numerous M-dwarfs with 10-12 day rotation periods at ages of USco (~ 8 Myr); some might exist at ages of LCC (~ 16 Myr) ([Rebull et al. 2020](#); [Rebull et al., in prep](#) – see **Skumanich conf slide deck – though beware TESS stitching systematics**). For the sake of argument, let’s say that this provides an independent verification that at least two thirds of our CH-2 candidates are both photometrically and rotationally consistent with being ≈ 40 Myr.

For RSG-5, 42 stars are in the relevant color and brightness range. 36 have rotation consistent with “sub-Pleiades”, i.e., 86%. Given the nearly perfectly clean photometric CAMD for RSG-5, this probably gives some indication for the fraction of stars for which we should expect to detect rotation periods with TESS (due to e.g., pole-on stars having less detectable starspot modulation).

3. THE STARS

Table 1. Selected system parameters of Kepler-1643, KOI-7368, and KOI-7913.

Parameter	Value	68% Confidence Interval	Comment
<i>Kepler-1643</i>			
<i>Stellar parameters:</i>			
Gaia G [mag]	X	$\pm X$	A
T_{eff} [K]	X	$\pm X$	B
$\log g_*$ [cgs]	X	$\pm 0.X$	B
R_* [R_{\odot}]	X	X	C
M_* [M_{\odot}]	X	X	C
ρ_* [g cm^{-3}]	X	X	C
P_{rot} [days]	X	X	D
Li EW [mÅ]	X	X	B
<i>Transit parameters:</i>			
P [days]	X	X	D
R_p/R_*	$0.X$	$+0.X, -0.X$	D
b	X	X	D
R_p [R_{\oplus}]	X	$\pm 0.X$	D
t_{14} [hours]	X	X	D
<i>KOI-7368</i>			
<i>Stellar parameters:</i>			
Gaia G [mag]	X	$\pm X$	A
T_{eff} [K]	X	$\pm X$	E
$\log g_*$ [cgs]	X	$\pm 0.X$	E
R_* [R_{\odot}]	X	X	C
M_* [M_{\odot}]	X	X	C
ρ_* [g cm^{-3}]	X	X	C
P_{rot} [days]	X	X	D
Li EW [mÅ]	X	X	B
<i>Transit parameters:</i>			
P [days]	X	X	D
R_p/R_*	$0.X$	$+0.X, -0.X$	D
b	X	X	D
R_p [R_{\oplus}]	X	$\pm 0.X$	D
t_{14} [hours]	X	X	D
<i>KOI-7913 A</i>			
<i>Stellar parameters:</i>			
Gaia G [mag]	X	$\pm X$	A
T_{eff} [K]	X	$\pm X$	B
$\log g_*$ [cgs]	X	$\pm 0.X$	B
R_* [R_{\odot}]	X	X	C
M_* [M_{\odot}]	X	X	C
ρ_* [g cm^{-3}]	X	X	C
P_{rot} [days]	X	X	D
Li EW [mÅ]	X	X	B
ΔG_{AB} [mag]	X	X	F
Δr_{AB} [au]	X	X	F
<i>Transit parameters:</i>			
P [days]	X	X	D
R_p/R_*	$0.X$	$+0.X, -0.X$	D
b	X	X	D
R_p [R_{\oplus}]	X	$\pm 0.X$	D
t_{14} [hours]	X	X	D

NOTE— (A) CITE Gaia EDR3. (B) HIRES SM-Synth/Emp CITE CITE (C) Isochrones (values: MIST: uncs MIST/PARSEC). (D) Kepler light curve. The full set of transit parameters is given in CITE APPENDIX TABLE. (E) TRES CITE. (F) Magnitude difference and physical distance between primary and secondary; from Gaia EDR3.

Many of the relevant stellar parameters can be gleaned by inspecting Figure 2. The known planet-hosting stars in Cep-HER span spectral types of G8V (Kepler-1627) to K8V (KOI-7913 A). The secondary in the KOI-7913 system is only marginally cooler than the primary (SpType \approx M0V). The latter system is 3''501 A Solar-mass star with solar metallicity (CITE CHOI MESA), and so these stars are in the end stages of their pre-main-sequence contraction. Their Gaia EDR3 parallaxes span X.X to Y.Y, corresponding to distances between X.X and Y.Y parsecs.

To derive the spectroscopic parameters (T_{eff} , $\log g_*$, [Fe/H]) and the equivalent width of the Li I from the 6708 Å doublet, we acquired spectra. Specifically, we acquired iodine-free HIRES spectra for Kepler-1643 (YYYY/MM/DD) and KOI-7913 (YYYY/MM/DD and YYYY/MM/DD), where for the latter the two different epochs corresponded to observations of the secondary and primary respectively. The acquisition and analysis followed the standard reduction techniques of the California Planet Survey (Howard et al. 2010). For KOI-7368, we acquired TRES spectra on YYYY/MM/DD and YYYY/MM/DD. CITE METHOD PAPER. The results are given in Table 1.

Table 1 summarizes

3.1. Kepler 1643

3.2. KOI-7368

3.3. KOI-7913

Is a binary.

4. THE PLANETS

5. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

L.G.B. acknowledges support from the TESS GI Program (NASA grants 80NSSC19K0386 and 80NSSC19K1728) and the Heising-Simons Foundation (51 Pegasi b Fellowship). Keck/NIRC2 imaging was acquired by program 2015A/N301N2L (PI: A. Kraus). This paper also includes data collected by the TESS mission, which are publicly available from the Mikulski Archive for Space Telescopes (MAST). Funding for the TESS mission is provided by NASA's Science Mission directorate. We thank the TESS Architects (G. Ricker, R. Vanderspek, D. Latham, S. Seager, J. Jenkins) and the many TESS team members for their efforts to make the mission a continued success. Finally, we also thank the Keck Observatory staff for their support of HIRES and remote observing. We recognize the importance that the summit of Maunakea has within the indigenous Hawaiian community, and are deeply grateful to have the opportunity to conduct observations from this mountain.




Figure 3. Raw and processed light curves for the objects of interest. Top: raw. Bottom: processed. The increased scatter during transit is likely due to starspot crossing events. KOI-7913 is janky, but $P=24$ days.




Figure 4. Radii, orbital periods, and ages of transiting exoplanets. Planets younger than a gigayear with $\tau/\sigma_\tau > 3$ are emphasized, where τ is the age and σ_τ is its uncertainty. Kepler-1627 (+), KOI-7368 (down-triangle), KOI-7913 (X), Kepler-1643 (diamond). The large sizes of the youngest transiting planets could be explained by their primordial atmospheres not yet having evaporated; direct measurements of the atmospheric outflows or planetary masses would help to confirm this expectation. Selection effects may also be important. Parameters are from the NASA Exoplanet Archive (2022 Feb 27).

365 *Software:* `astrobase` (Bhatti et al. 2018), `astropy`
 366 (Astropy Collaboration et al. 2018), `astroquery` (Gins-
 367 burg et al. 2018), `corner` (Foreman-Mackey 2016),
 368 `exoplanet` (Foreman-Mackey et al. 2020), and its depen-
 369 dencies (Agol et al. 2020; Kipping 2013; Luger et al. 2019;
 370 Theano Development Team 2016), `PyMC3` (Salvatier et al.
 371 2016), `scipy` (Jones et al. 2001),

372 *Facilities:* *Astrometry:* Gaia (Gaia Collaboration et al.
 373 2018b, 2021a). *Imaging:* Second Generation Digitized Sky
 374 Survey. Keck:II (NIRC2; www2.keck.hawaii.edu/inst/nirc2).
 375 *Spectroscopy:* Tillinghast:1.5m (TRES; Fűrész et al. 2008).
 376 Keck:I (HIRES; Vogt et al. 1994). *Photometry:* Kepler
 377 (Borucki et al. 2010), TESS (Ricker et al. 2015).

REFERENCES

- Agol, E., Luger, R., & Foreman-Mackey, D. 2020, *AJ*, **159**, 123
- Arevalo, R. T., Tamayo, D., & Cranmer, M. 2022, [arXiv:2203.02805 \[astro-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.02805), arXiv: 2203.02805
- Astropy Collaboration, Price-Whelan, A. M., Sipőcz, B. M., et al. 2018, *AJ*, **156**, 123
- Bellm, E. C., Kulkarni, S. R., Graham, M. J., et al. 2019, *PASP*, **131**, 018002
- Bhatti, W., Bouma, L. G., & Wallace, J. 2018, *astrobase*, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1469822>
- Borucki, W. J., Koch, D., Basri, G., et al. 2010, *Science*, **327**, 977
- Bossini, D., Vallenari, A., Bragaglia, A., et al. 2019, *A&A*, **623**, A108
- Bouma, L. G., Curtis, J. L., Hartman, J. D., Winn, J. N., & Bakos, G. A. 2021, [arXiv:2107.08050 \[astro-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.08050)
- Bouma, L. G., Hartman, J. D., Brahm, R., et al. 2020, *AJ*, **160**, 239
- Bouma, L. G., Curtis, J. L., Masuda, K., et al. 2022, *AJ*, **163**, 121
- Campello, R. J. G. B., Moulavi, D., Zimek, A., & Sander, J. 2015, *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data*, **10**, 5:1
- Cantat-Gaudin, T., Jordi, C., Vallenari, A., et al. 2018, *A&A*, **618**, A93
- Curtis, J. L., Agüeros, M. A., Mamajek, E. E., Wright, J. T., & Cummings, J. D. 2019, *AJ*, **158**, 77
- Curtis, J. L., Agüeros, M. A., Matt, S. P., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, **904**, 140
- Dahm, S. E. 2015, *ApJ*, **813**, 108
- Damiani, F., Prisinzano, L., Pillitteri, I., Micela, G., & Sciortino, S. 2019, *A&A*, **623**, A112
- David, T. J., & Hillenbrand, L. A. 2015, *ApJ*, **804**, 146
- David, T. J., Petigura, E. A., Luger, R., et al. 2019, *ApJL*, **885**, L12
- Dawson, R. I., & Johnson, J. A. 2018, *ARA&A*, **56**, 175
- Dinnbier, F., & Kroupa, P. 2020, *a*, **640**, A85
- Dobbie, P. D., Lodieu, N., & Sharp, R. G. 2010, *MNRAS*, **409**, 1002
- Douglas, S. T., Agüeros, M. A., Covey, K. R., & Kraus, A. 2017, *ApJ*, **842**, 83
- Fűrész, G., Szentgyorgyi, A. H., & Meibom, S. 2008, **287**
- Foreman-Mackey, D. 2016, *Journal of Open Source Software*, **1**, 24
- Foreman-Mackey, D., Czekala, I., Luger, R., et al. 2020, *exoplanet-dev/exoplanet* v0.2.6
- Fulton, B. J., Petigura, E. A., Howard, A. W., et al. 2017, *AJ*, **154**, 109
- Gagné, J., David, T. J., Mamajek, E. E., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, **903**, 96
- Gagné, J., Faherty, J. K., Moranta, L., & Popinchalk, M. 2021, [arXiv:2106.11873 \[astro-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.11873), arXiv: 2106.11873
- Gaia Collaboration, Babusiaux, C., van Leeuwen, F., et al. 2018a, *A&A*, **616**, A10
- Gaia Collaboration, Brown, A. G. A., Vallenari, A., et al. 2018b, *A&A*, **616**, A1
- . 2021a, *A&A*, **649**, A1
- Gaia Collaboration, Smart, R. L., Sarro, L. M., et al. 2021b, *A&A*, **649**, A6
- Ginsburg, A., Sipocz, B., Madhura Parikh, et al. 2018, *Astropy/Astroquery: V0.3.7 Release*
- Ginzburg, S., Schlichting, H. E., & Sari, R. 2018, *MNRAS*, **476**, 759
- Goldberg, M., & Batygin, K. 2022, [arXiv:2203.00801 \[astro-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.00801), arXiv: 2203.00801
- Hattori, S., Foreman-Mackey, D., Hogg, D. W., et al. 2021, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2106.15063
- Hawkins, K., Lucey, M., & Curtis, J. 2020, *MNRAS*, **496**, 2422
- Hedges, C., Hughes, A., Zhou, G., et al. 2021, *AJ*, **162**, 54
- Howard, A. W., Johnson, J. A., Marcy, G. W., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **721**, 1467
- Jerabkova, T., Boffin, H. M. J., Beccari, G., et al. 2021, *a*, **647**, A137
- Jones, E., Oliphant, T., Peterson, P., et al. 2001, *Open source scientific tools for Python*
- Kerr, R. M. P., Rizzuto, A. C., Kraus, A. L., & Offner, S. S. R. 2021, *ApJ*, **917**, 23, aDS Bibcode: 2021ApJ...917...23K
- Kipping, D. M. 2013, *MNRAS*, **435**, 2152
- Kounkel, M., & Covey, K. 2019, *AJ*, **158**, 122
- Lallement, R., Babusiaux, C., Vergely, J. L., et al. 2019, *a*, **625**, A135
- Lallement, R., Capitanio, L., Ruiz-Dern, L., et al. 2018, *A&A*, **616**, A132
- Lee, E. J., & Connors, N. J. 2021, *ApJ*, **908**, 32, aDS Bibcode: 2021ApJ...908...32L
- Lopez, E. D., Fortney, J. J., & Miller, N. 2012, *ApJ*, **761**, 59
- Luger, R., Agol, E., Foreman-Mackey, D., et al. 2019, *AJ*, **157**, 64
- Mann, A. W., Gaidos, E., Vanderburg, A., et al. 2017, *AJ*, **153**, 64
- McInnes, L., Healy, J., & Astels, S. 2017, *The Journal of Open Source Software*, **2**, 205
- Meingast, S., Alves, J., & Fürnkranz, V. 2019, *A&A*, **622**, L13
- Meingast, S., Alves, J., & Rottensteiner, A. 2021, *A&A*, **645**, A84
- Nardiello, D., Piatto, G., Deleuil, M., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, **495**, 4924
- Newton, E. R., Mann, A. W., Tofflemire, B. M., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, **880**, L17
- Owen, J. E., & Wu, Y. 2013, *ApJ*, **775**, 105
- Pecaut, M. J., & Mamajek, E. E. 2016, *MNRAS*, **461**, 794
- Randich, S., Tognelli, E., Jackson, R., et al. 2018, *A&A*, **612**, A99
- Rebull, L. M., Stauffer, J. R., Cody, A. M., et al. 2020, **2020**
- Rebull, L. M., Stauffer, J. R., Bouvier, J., et al. 2016, *AJ*, **152**, 113
- Ricker, G. R., Winn, J. N., Vanderspek, R., et al. 2015, *JATIS*, **1**, 014003
- Rizzuto, A. C., Newton, E. R., Mann, A. W., et al. 2020, *AJ*, **160**, 33
- Röser, S., Schilbach, E., & Goldman, B. 2016, *a*, **595**, A22

- 475 Salvatier, J., Wieckiâ, T. V., & Fonnesbeck, C. 2016, PyMC3:
476 Python probabilistic programming framework
- 477 Schönrich, R., Binney, J., & Dehnen, W. 2010, *MNRAS*, **403**, 1829
- 478 Skumanich, A. 1972, *ApJ*, **171**, 565
- 479 Stauffer, J. R., Hartmann, L. W., Prosser, C. F., et al. 1997, *ApJ*,
480 **479**, 776
- 481 Stephenson, C. B. 1959, *PASP*, **71**, 145
- 482 Theano Development Team. 2016, [arXiv e-prints](#), [abs/1605.02688](#)
- 483 Thompson, S. E., Coughlin, J. L., Hoffman, K., et al. 2018, *ApJS*,
484 **235**, 38
- 485 Vogt, S. S., Allen, S. L., Bigelow, B. C., et al. 1994, SPIE
486 Conference Series, ed. D. L. Crawford & E. R. Craine, Vol. 2198
- 487 Zari, E., Hashemi, H., Brown, A. G. A., Jardine, K., & de Zeeuw,
488 P. T. 2018, *A&A*, **620**, A172
- 489 Zhou, G., Quinn, S. N., Irwin, J., et al. 2021, *AJ*, **161**, 2