MIT Open Access Articles

The atmospheres of the hot-Jupiters Kepler-5b and Kepler-6b observed during occultations with Warm-Spitzer and Kepler

The MIT Faculty has made this article openly available. **Please share** how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

Citation: Désert, Jean-Michel et al. "The atmospheres of the hot-Jupiters Kepler-5b and Kepler-6b observed during occultations with Warm-Spitzer and Kepler." The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series 197.1 (2011): 11. © 2011 IOP Publishing

As Published: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/197/1/11>

Publisher: IOP Publishing

Persistent URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/74174>

Version: Final published version: final published article, as it appeared in a journal, conference proceedings, or other formally published context

Terms of Use: Article is made available in accordance with the publisher's policy and may be subject to US copyright law. Please refer to the publisher's site for terms of use.

THE ATMOSPHERES OF THE HOT-JUPITERS KEPLER-5b AND KEPLER-6b OBSERVED DURING OCCULTATIONS WITH *WARM-SPITZER* AND *KEPLER*

JEAN-MICHEL DÉSSERT¹, DAVID CHARBONNEAU¹, JONATHAN J. FORTNEY², NIKKU MADHUSUDHAN³, HEATHER A. KNUTSON⁴, FRANÇOIS FRESSIN¹, DRAKE DEMING⁵, WILLIAM J. BORUCKI⁶, TIMOTHY M. BROWN⁷, DOUGLAS CALDWELL⁸, ERIC B. FORD⁹, RONALD L. GILLILAND¹⁰, DAVID W. LATHAM¹, GEOFFREY W. MARCY¹¹, SARA SEAGER¹², AND THE KEPLER SCIENCE TEAM

¹ Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, 60 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA; jdesert@cfa.harvard.edu

² Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA

³ Department of Astrophysical Sciences, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

⁴ Department of Astronomy, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3411, USA

⁵ Solar System Exploration Division, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA

⁶ NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA 94035, USA

⁷ Las Cumbres Observatory Global Telescope, Goleta, CA 93117, USA

⁸ SETI Institute, Mountain View, CA 94043, USA

⁹ Department of Astronomy, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA

¹⁰ Space Telescope Science Institute, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA

¹¹ Berkeley Astronomy Department, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

¹² Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02159, USA

Received 2011 February 3; accepted 2011 October 8; published 2011 November 1

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the detection and the measurements of occultations of the two transiting hot giant exoplanets Kepler-5b and Kepler-6b by their parent stars. The observations are obtained in the near-infrared with *Warm-Spitzer* Space Telescope and at optical wavelengths by combining more than a year of *Kepler* photometry. The investigation consists of constraining the eccentricities of these systems and of obtaining broadband emergent photometric data for individual planets. For both targets, the occultations are detected at the 3σ level at each wavelength with mid-occultation times consistent with circular orbits. The brightness temperatures of these planets are deduced from the infrared observations and reach $T_{\text{Spitzer}} = 1930 \pm 100$ K and $T_{\text{Spitzer}} = 1660 \pm 120$ K for Kepler-5b and Kepler-6b, respectively. We measure optical geometric albedos A_g in the *Kepler* bandpass and find $A_g = 0.12 \pm 0.04$ for Kepler-5b and $A_g = 0.11 \pm 0.04$ for Kepler-6b, leading to upper an limit for the Bond albedo of $A_B \leq 0.17$ in both cases. The observations for both planets are best described by models for which most of the incident energy is redistributed on the dayside, with only less than 10% of the absorbed stellar flux redistributed to the nightside of these planets.

Key words: eclipses – planetary systems – techniques: photometric

Online-only material: color figures

1. INTRODUCTION

The highly irradiated transiting hot-Jupiters (HJs) currently provide the best opportunities for studying exoplanetary atmospheres in emission, during planetary occultations, when the exoplanets pass behind their parent stars. Emission from transiting HJs have been studied theoretically prior to any detection of light from an alien world (Seager et al. 2000; Sudarsky et al. 2000). The first exoplanetary emissions were first detected from space in the infrared wavelengths (Charbonneau et al. 2005; Deming et al. 2005) and more recently in the optical bandpass (Alonso et al. 2009a; Snellen et al. 2009; Borucki et al. 2009; Alonso et al. 2010) using the *CoRoT* and *Kepler* space telescopes. Notably, Rowe et al. (2006, 2008) use the *Microvariability and Oscillations of Stars (MOST)* telescope to place a very stringent upper limit on the optical depth of the occultation of HD 209458b. Recently, ground-based spectrophotometry has also permitted observations of HJs in the near-infrared (e.g., Sing & López-Morales 2009; López-Morales et al. 2010; Gillon et al. 2009; Croll et al. 2010). The planet-to-star flux ratio is on the order of 10 times higher at infrared wavelengths, due to the thermal emission from the planet, compared to optical wavelengths, domain where the starlight is reflected by the planet (Sudarsky et al. 2003; Fortney et al. 2005; Burrows et al. 2005; Seager et al. 2005; Barman et al. 2005). Consequently, only a

few objects can be detected in the visible, those for which we will have enough observations to combine during occultations to improve the signal-to-noise and reveal the eclipse event. However, these objects are very valuable for understanding the energy budget of HJs and, to some extent, for comparative exoplanetology. The HJs detected by *CoRoT* and *Kepler* are particularly interesting since their occultations can be observed in the optical bandpass (Snellen et al. 2009; Borucki et al. 2009).

Obtaining multiple wavelength measurements of the relative depths of planetary occultations is fundamental to understanding the energy budget of these objects (Sudarsky et al. 2003; Burrows et al. 2005). The thermal structure of HJ is likely to be influenced by strong stellar irradiation. For example, high-altitude optical absorbers can lead to atmospheric temperature inversions (Hubeny et al. 2003; Fortney et al. 2008; Burrows et al. 2007, 2008) as observed to a wide range of irradiation levels (e.g., Harrington et al. 2007; Knutson et al. 2008; Machalek et al. 2008; Todorov et al. 2010). Although the nature of the absorber is subject to debate, titanium oxide (TiO) and vanadium oxide (VO) are among the best molecular candidates, since they are expected to be present in these hot atmospheres and they are strong absorbers of the incident visible stellar flux (Fortney et al. 2008). Furthermore, non-equilibrium chemistry, due to photochemistry or vertical mixing, could potentially lead to strong UV or optical absorbers being found in the upper

atmosphere of these planets. This can also play a role in inverting the thermal structure (Burrows et al. 2008; Zahnle et al. 2009), although degeneracies between thermal inversions and chemical composition are known to exist in atmospheric models (Madhusudhan & Seager 2009). Interestingly, the presence of high-altitude absorbers in HJ atmospheres can potentially be revealed with transmission spectroscopy (Désert et al. 2008). Emission spectroscopy observations help also to probe the atmosphere of HJs (Grillmair et al. 2008; Knutson et al. 2008; Swain et al. 2009; Machalek et al. 2009). Spiegel et al. (2010a) and Spiegel & Burrows (2010b) demonstrate how the *Kepler*-band optical flux from a hot exoplanet depends on the strength of a possible extra optical absorber in the upper atmosphere. Therefore, multi-wavelength observations are necessary to determine the energy budget of these exoplanets. Measurements of the optical and near-infrared emergent fluxes from the planet allow us to derive the Bond albedo of these objects, to learn about the energy distribution, and to address whether or not an atmospheric thermal inversion can be revealed. In the case of HD 209458b, the *MOST* observations show that the planet has a very low albedo at optical wavelengths (Rowe et al. 2008), which rules out the presence of bright reflective clouds in this exoplanet's atmosphere. In a similar framework, Deming et al. (2011) combine occultations from *CoRoT* and from various space and ground-based infrared measurements of CoRoT-1 and 2 (Gillon et al. 2009, 2010) to probe the atmospheric structures of these HJs. The multi-wavelength observations show that CoRoT-1's spectrum is well reproduced by a 2460 K blackbody to first order, which is interpreted to be due to either a high-altitude layer that strongly absorbs stellar radiance, or an isothermal region in the planetary atmosphere and that the CoRoT-2 spectrum exhibits line emission from CO at 4.5 μm which could be caused by tidal-induced mass loss. The strength of the multi-wavelength approach is that it also allows us to measure or place meaningful upper limits on the geometric albedo of a small set of transiting extrasolar planets. For example, the occultations of HAT-P-7b measured with the *EPOXI*, *Kepler*, and *Spitzer* spacecraft generated a broadband spectrum covering 0.35–8 μm . They have also been used to identify a set of atmospheric models that reproduce the observations (Christiansen et al. 2010). The interpretation of this spectrum shows that it is consistent with an inefficient day–night redistribution as seen from the *Kepler* phase curve (Borucki et al. 2009; Spiegel & Burrows 2010b). However, the *Kepler* phase curve of this planet reveals a high nightside temperature at around 2600 K (Welsh et al. 2010), which appears to be at odds with knowing a priori inefficient redistribution scenario.

In this paper, we combine occultation measurements obtained in the optical with *Kepler* and in the infrared with *Warm-Spitzer* to learn about the atmospheric properties of two HJs, Kepler-5b (Koch et al. 2010b) and Kepler-6b (Dunham et al. 2010), discovered using *Kepler* spacecraft. A search for occultations events was initially done using the two first Kepler quarters secured in long-cadence mode (Kipping & Bakos 2011). In the present study, the photometry of the host stars was nearly continuously monitored by the *Kepler* space telescope allowing us to gather more than a year of observations and combine multiple occultations to improve the signal-to-noise. These two planets have masses and radii common among the known transiting HJs (Latham et al. 2010), as shown in Table 1. Therefore, they may be representative of their class, which make them good candidates to study, especially if we want to generalize our conclusions for comparative exoplanetology. We also ob-

Table 1
System Parameters for Kepler-5b for Kepler-6b Obtained from the Discovery Papers

Parameter	Value
Kepler-5b from Koch et al. (2010b)	
Orbital period P (days)	3.548460 ± 0.000032
Mid-transit time E (HJD)	$2454955.90122 \pm 0.00021$
Scaled semimajor axis a/R_*	6.06 ± 0.14
Scaled planet radius R_p/R_*	$0.08195^{+0.00030}_{-0.00047}$
Impact parameter $b \equiv a \cos i / R_*$	$0.393^{+0.051}_{-0.043}$
Orbital inclination i (deg)	$86^\circ.3 \pm 0.5$
Orbital eccentricity e	<0.024
Stellar parameters	
Effective temperature T_{eff} (K)	6297 ± 60
Mass $M_*(M_\odot)$	$1.374^{+0.040}_{-0.059}$
Radius $R_*(R_\odot)$	$1.793^{+0.043}_{-0.062}$
Planetary parameters	
Mass $M_p (M_J)$	$2.114^{+0.056}_{-0.059}$
Radius $R_p (R_J, \text{equatorial})$	$1.431^{+0.041}_{-0.052}$
Density $\rho_p (\text{g cm}^{-3})$	0.894 ± 0.079
Orbital semimajor axis a (AU)	0.05064 ± 0.00070
Equilibrium temperature T_{eq} (K)	1868 ± 284
Kepler-6b from Dunham et al. (2010)	
Orbital period P (days)	3.234723 ± 0.000017
Mid-transit time E (HJD)	$2454954.48636 \pm 0.00014$
Scaled semimajor axis a/R_*	$7.05^{+0.11}_{-0.06}$
Scaled planet radius R_p/R_*	$0.09829^{+0.00014}_{-0.00050}$
Impact parameter $b \equiv a \cos i / R_*$	$0.398^{+0.020}_{-0.039}$
Orbital inclination i	$86^\circ.8 \pm 0.3$
Orbital eccentricity e	0 (adopted)
Stellar parameters	
Effective temperature T_{eff} (K)	5647 ± 44
Mass $M_*(M_\odot)$	$1.209^{+0.044}_{-0.038}$
Radius $R_*(R_\odot)$	$1.391^{+0.017}_{-0.034}$
Planetary parameters	
Mass $M_p (M_J)$	$0.669^{+0.025}_{-0.030}$
Radius $R_p (R_J, \text{equatorial})$	$1.323^{+0.026}_{-0.029}$
Density $\rho_p (\text{g cm}^{-3})$	$0.352^{+0.018}_{-0.022}$
Orbital semimajor axis a (AU)	$0.04567^{+0.00055}_{-0.00046}$
Equilibrium temperature T_{eq} (K)	1500 ± 200

tained measurements of these targets in the near-infrared with the *Warm-Spitzer* space telescope during occultations. Because of the high temperature of these HJs, our optical measurements are mainly due to thermal radiation rather than purely reflected light.

We first describe the observations, time series, and analysis for *Warm-Spitzer* data in Section 2 and *Kepler* data in Section 3, and finally discuss our results in Section 4.

2. WARM-SPITZER OBSERVATIONS AND PHOTOMETRY

This section describes the *Warm-Spitzer* observations and provides details of our extraction of the time series spanning each individual occultation event.

2.1. Observations

As *Spitzer* exhausted its cryogen of liquid coolant on 2009 May 15, only the first two channels, at 3.6 (channel 1) and 4.5 μm (channel 2), of the Infrared Array Camera (IRAC; Fazio et al. 2004) are available in the post-cryogenic mission. Kepler-5

Table 2
Warm-Spitzer Observations

Target	Visit	Wavelength	Observed Date (UT)	Select. Points	Depth	Weighted Average Depth	Brightness Temperatures (K)
Kepler-5	1	3.6	2009 December 26	2455	$0.091\% \pm 0.022\%$	...	
Kepler-5	3	3.6	2010 June 16	2465	$0.120\% \pm 0.026\%$	$0.103\% \pm 0.017\%$	1900 ± 110
Kepler-5	2	4.5	2010 January 5	2540	$0.102\% \pm 0.023\%$	...	
Kepler-5	4	4.5	2010 July 12	2242	$0.111\% \pm 0.021\%$	$0.107\% \pm 0.015\%$	1770 ± 100
Kepler-6	1	3.6	2009 December 30	2013	$0.108\% \pm 0.048\%$	...	
Kepler-6	4	3.6	2010 June 16	2012	$0.051\% \pm 0.032\%$	$0.069\% \pm 0.027\%$	1320 ± 250
Kepler-6	2	4.5	2010 January 2	2022	$0.123\% \pm 0.027\%$	...	
Kepler-6	3	4.5	2010 January 13	1993	$0.180\% \pm 0.027\%$	$0.151\% \pm 0.019\%$	1700 ± 120

and Kepler-6 were both visited twice at each available IRAC bandpass, leading to a total of eight eclipses being secured as part of the 800 hr allocated to the program PID 60028 (PI: D. Charbonneau). We present here the first observations from this program which contribute to characterizing and vetting *Kepler* candidates. Each visit is secured in full frame mode (256×256) with an exposure time of 10.4 s, at 12 s cadence, leading to 2700 frames per Kepler-5 ($K = 11.77$) 10 hr observations and 2150 frames per Kepler-6 ($K = 11.71$) 8 hr observations. The full set of *Warm-Spitzer* observations is presented in Table 2.

2.2. Photometry

We use the basic calibrated data frames produced by the standard IRAC calibration pipeline for the photometric extraction. These files are corrected for dark current, flat-fielding, and detector non-linearity and converted into flux units.

The first step of the photometric extraction consists of determining the centroid position of the stellar point-spread function (PSF) using DAOPHOT-type Photometry Procedures, CNTRD, from the IDL Astronomy Library.¹³ We use the APER routine to perform an aperture photometry with a circular aperture of variable radius, using radii of 1.5 to 6 pixels, in 0.5 steps. Finally, the propagated uncertainties are derived as a function of the aperture radius, and we adopt the aperture which provides the smallest errors. We find that the eclipse depths vary by less than 1.5σ with the aperture radius for all the light curves analyzed in this project. In the case of Kepler-5, the optimal apertures are around 5 and 2.5 pixels at 3.6 and 4.5 μm , respectively. Kepler-6 has a companion at an angular separation of $4''.1$ and which is 3.8 mag fainter (Dunham et al. 2010). This star is located at 3.5 IRAC pixels from our target of interest. Therefore, we fix our circular aperture at a radius of 2.5 pixels for all the visits of this star in order to minimize the contribution of the companion.

The background level for each frame is determined by two methods. We use APER to measure the median value of the pixels inside an annulus centered on the star with inner and outer radii of 9 and 16 pixels, respectively. We also estimate the background by fitting a Gaussian to the central region of the histogram of counts from the full array. The center of the Gaussian fit is adopted as the residual background intensity. These two methods provide the same background level; therefore, we use the background values determined from an annulus.

The contribution of the background to the total flux from the stars Kepler-5 and Kepler-6 is low in both IRAC bandpasses, from 0.2% to 0.55% depending of the photometric aperture size.

Therefore, photometric errors are not dominated by fluctuations in the background. We note that the background is negative for all channel 1 observations and for one observation secured in channel 2. The 10.4 s exposures yield a typical signal-to-noise ratio of 200 and 150 per individual observation at 3.6 and 4.5 μm , respectively.

After producing the photometric time series, we use a sliding median filter that compares the 20 preceding and 20 following photometric measurements and centroid positioning to identify and trim outliers greater than 5σ . This process removes measurements affected by transient hot pixels and inaccurate centroid determination. In this way, we discarded approximately 2% photometric points from all the observations. We also discarded the first half hour of observations, corresponding to around a hundred frames. These frames exhibit an anomalously large pointing drift, most likely due to settling of the telescope at the new position. The final number of photometric measurements used for each observation is given in Table 2.

2.3. Occultation Amplitudes and Associated Errors

To measure the occultation depths and their uncertainties we model the light curves with four parameters: the occultation depth d , the orbital semimajor axis to stellar radius ratio (system scale) a/R_* , the impact parameter b , and the time of mid transit T_c . We use the IDL transit routine OCCULTSMALL, developed by Mandel & Agol (2002), to model the light curve. Kepler-5b and Kepler-6b have both well-defined transit and stellar parameters constrained by the transits from the *Kepler* light curves (Koch et al. 2010a; Dunham et al. 2010). Thus, we adopt these parameters, in particular the inclination and the scale of the system, by fixing a/R_* and b to their nominal values in our eclipsing model. We also fixed the mid-eclipse times to the values we derived from the *Kepler* light curves (see Section 3 below). Only the depth of the occultations are allowed to vary when fitting the *Warm-Spitzer* observations.

The *Warm-Spitzer*/IRAC photometry is known to be systematically affected by the so-called *pixel-phase effect*, which is due to the combination of pointing jitter and intra-pixel sensitivity (see, e.g., Charbonneau et al. 2005, 2008; Reach et al. 2005; Désert et al. 2009, 2011). This effect corresponds to oscillations in the measured raw light curve with an approximate period of 70 minutes and an amplitude of 2% peak-to-peak. This artifact has to be corrected to properly extract the eclipse depths and errors. To correct the raw light curve for this intra-pixel sensitivity effect, we use the centroid position of the target on the detector and its variations as function of time. We use a quadratic function of the position and a linear function of time $F_{\text{corr}} = F[K_1(x - x_0) + K_2(x - x_0)^2 + K_3(y - y_0) + K_4(y - y_0)^2 + K_5 + K_6 \times t]$, where F and F_{corr} are the fluxes of the star before

¹³ <http://idlastro.gsfc.nasa.gov/homepage.html>

Figure 1. Top panels: *Warm-Spitzer* raw occultation light curves of Kepler-5b (top row) and Kepler-6b (bottom row). These occultations were observed in the two IRAC bandpasses, at 3.6 (left side) and 4.5 μm (right side). The raw data are offset in flux for illustration purposes. The red solid lines correspond to the best-fit models which include the time and position decorrelations as well as the models for the planetary occultations (see details in Section 2.3). Bottom panels: de-correlated, normalized, combined, and binned per 20 minute occultation light curves (black data points with their 1σ error bars). The best fits are overplotted in red solid lines. (A color version of this figure is available in the online journal.)

and after the pixel-phase effect correction, and $(x - x_0)$ and $(y - y_0)$ define the position in pixels of the source centroid on the detector with respect to the pixel pointing position, located at $[x_0, y_0]$, and the constants K_i are the free parameters to adjust.

We use the MPFIT package¹⁴ to perform a Levenberg–Marquardt least-squares fit of the transit model to observations. The best-fit model is computed over the whole parameter space (d, K_i) . The baseline function described above is combined with the transit light curve function so that the fit is constrained by eight parameters (two for the transit model, two for the linear baseline, and four for the pixel phase effect).

We use four methods to determine the centroid position of a stellar PSF and test the its impact on the final results. In the first method, we fit Gaussians to the marginal x and y sums using GCNTRD. The second method we apply consists of computing the centroid of the stars using a derivative search with CNTRD also part of the standard IDL Astronomy Library. As for the third method, we calculate the center-of-light of the star within a circular aperture with a radius of 3.0 pixels to approximate the

center of the star. Finally, the fourth method uses a symmetric two-dimensional Gaussian fit with a fixed width to a 3×3 pixel sub-array to approximate the center of the star, as suggested by Agol et al. (2010).

All these methods allow us to measure the centroid position of a stellar image with a different level of accuracy and precision as previously noted by Agol et al. (2010). For all the methods tested, we find that the centroid position varies by less than 20% of a pixel during a complete observation and that can be determined to a precision of a hundredth of a pixel. We measure the eclipse depths and associated errors for all the four methods following the algorithm we describe below. Although each method provides slightly different results for the centroid determination, it yields an eclipse depth consistent to within 1σ and similar errors. In this paper, we use the CNTRD program as it produces the smallest reduced χ^2 .

As shown by Pont et al. (2006), the existence of low-frequency correlated noise (red noise) between different exposures must be considered to obtain a realistic estimation of the uncertainties. To obtain an estimate of the systematic errors in our observations we use the permutation of the residuals method, known

¹⁴ <http://cow.physics.wisc.edu/~craigm/idl/idl.html>

as “prayer-bead” (Moutou et al. 2004; Gillon et al. 2006, 2007) and derived the covariance from the residuals of the light curve. In this method, the residuals of the initial fit are shifted systematically and sequentially by one frame, and then added to the transit light curve model before fitting again. The error on each photometric point is the same and is set to the rms of the residuals of the first best fit obtained. We find that the final rms values are 5% to 20% larger than the predicted photon noise depending on the target and the bandpass.

We produce as many shifts and fits of transit light curves as the number of photometric measurements to determine the statistical and systematic errors for the adjusted parameters. We set our uncertainties equal to the range of values containing 68% of the points in the distribution in a symmetric range about the median for a given parameter. We check that these values are close to the standard deviation of each nearly Gaussian distribution. We fit for the eclipse depth, fixing the mid-eclipses time to the values we derived from the *Kepler* observations as describe in the following section. The transit light curves are presented in Figure 1 and the best fits of the occultation depths and their error bars are listed in Table 2.

3. ANALYSIS OF THE *KEPLER* LIGHT CURVES

This section describes the *Kepler* observations gathered almost continuously during nearly 14 months and provides details on the analysis of the different occultations.

The *Kepler* passband spans 437 to 897 nm, with a central wavelength roughly equivalent to the *R*-band (Koch et al. 2010a; Batalha et al. 2010; Bryson et al. 2010). The stars Kepler-5 and Kepler-6 have *Kepler* magnitudes (*Kp*) of 13.37 and 13.30 (Koch et al. 2010b; Dunham et al. 2010). The light of the close-by companion star Kepler-6 as discussed above in Section 2 is included in the *Kepler* aperture. This has the effect of diluting the depth of the eclipse signal by only a few percent as shown by Dunham et al. (2010), well below the precision we obtain (see below).

We use the *Kepler* science data of Kepler-5 and Kepler-6 from Quarters 0 to 5 (Q0–Q5). These observations have been reduced and detrended by the *Kepler* pipeline (Jenkins et al. 2010b). The pipeline produces both calibrated light curves (photometric analysis data) for individual analysis and corrected light curves (pre-search data conditioning (PDC)) which are used to search for transits. We used both data sets and checked that the occultation depths and errors we derived from these two data sets remain the same. This paper presents results that are measured from PDC data. They consist of a long-cadence integration time (30 minutes) for Quarters 0 and 1 (Caldwell et al. 2010; Jenkins et al. 2010a) and short cadence (1 minute) for Quarters 2 to 4 (Gilliland et al. 2010). We acquired the data in a uniform manner at short cadence between BJD 2,454,998 and 2,455,371 (UT 2009 June 15–2010 June 23) during 373 days of observations (Q2–Q5). The pipeline provides the time series with times in barycentric corrected Julian days, and flux in electrons.

The quality of the photometric time series around each expected eclipse event is checked visually in a first step. This step allows us to flag and remove eclipses that we consider to be not satisfactory for various reasons (artifacts, spacecraft-related events occasionally resulting in loss and subsequent reacquisition of fine guidance, etc.). We reject 20 of the 103 occultation events observed for Kepler-5, and 12 of these events among the 113 for Kepler-6. The numbers of occultations that we keep per target and per observing mode are presented in

Figure 2. Phase-folded normalized *Kepler* occultation light curves. Plot for Kepler-5b is on top and Kepler-6b is on the bottom. The observations are the black points with their 1σ error bars. The data are binned by approximately 40 minutes (0.01 in phase). The best fits are overplotted with the red solid line.

(A color version of this figure is available in the online journal.)

Table 3. We then identify and trim outliers greater than 5σ using a sliding median filter that compares the 20 preceding and 20 following photometric measurements. This process rejects a very small number of photometric measurements (less than 0.01%) compared to the total measurement number (102,300 for Kepler-5 and 114,000 for Kepler-6). At this point we check that the rms scatter is constant over the whole observational period. We fit each individual eclipse between the planetary orbital phases 0.38 to 0.62 using the occultation model (see description in Section 2.3) assuming constant ephemerides and null limb darkening coefficients. All the transit parameters except for the occultation depths and the mid-occultation times are set to fix values. A linear function of time represents the baseline. Each individual fitted light curves is then normalized to its local baseline in order to produce a set of normalized eclipse light curves. We finally phase fold and combine all the normalize light curves to produce four photometric time series, one for each observing mode (cadence) and target. We present the normalized, folded, and combined light curves obtained at short cadence for both targets in Figure 2 from which we measure the occultation depths as described in the following paragraphs.

We first search for the occultation events in the combined and normalized occultation light curves. This is done by evaluating the depths of Levenberg–Marquardt fits to models with the same overall shape as the planetary transits (same impact parameters

Table 3
Kepler Observations

Target	Quarters	Number of Eclipses	Observing Mode	Fp/F_* (ppm)	Weighted Average Fp/F_* (ppm)	A_g
Kepler-5	0–1	11	Long cadence	25 ± 19		
Kepler-5	2–4	83	Short cadence	21^{+5}_{-7}	21 ± 6	0.12 ± 0.04
Kepler-6	0–1	12	Long cadence	27 ± 19		
Kepler-6	2–4	101	Short cadence	21^{+8}_{-6}	22 ± 7	0.11 ± 0.04

Figure 3. Delta χ^2 from the best fit of the depth of a model as a function of the mid-occultation time from zero (phase 0.5). Plot for Kepler-5b is on top and Kepler-6b is on the bottom. The shape and duration of the occultation model are set by the transiting parameters. The vertical dashed lines show the transit durations and around zeros which are highlighted with vertical dotted lines. Mid-occultations are expected at phase 0.5 for non-eccentric orbits. The horizontal dotted lines indicate the limits of 1σ , 2σ , and 3σ from the best fit. The maximum occultation depth is centered near phase 0.5 which confirms the detection of the occultations event.

and system scales), but at different phases of the orbital period. The best fits as a function of the orbital phases are plotted in Figure 3, and the maximum depths and best fits are found very close to the orbital phase of 0.5 as expected for a circular orbit. This suggests that we detect the occultations for both targets in the *Kepler* observations.

We now estimate the significance of these detections by measuring the occultations depths, ephemerides, and associated

Figure 4. χ^2 spaces for mid-occultation time as function of the occultation depth, and the 1σ , 2σ , and 3σ confidence limits. Plot for Kepler-5b is on top and Kepler-6b is on the bottom.

errors for each observing cadence mode and targets. We estimate the parameter values and errors using a bootstrap Monte Carlo analysis. In this method, we first find the best fit to the occultation curves and produce a set of photometric residuals. We compute the rms of the residuals and create a new simulated data set by adding the errors, chosen randomly from a Gaussian distribution having the rms for its FWHM, to the best fit. We fit the new simulated data set and repeat this process for 10^5 trials. We compute the median value and the standard deviation of the Gaussian distributions to derive the occultation depth and the central phase errors. The mid-occultation times as a function of the eclipse depths are plotted in Figure 4 and the measurement significances are plotted in Figure 5 and presented in Table 3. We weighted average the best-fitted depths and times to obtain one single value per target. We find that both planet have similar occultation depths of 21 ± 6 and 22 ± 7 ppm for Kepler-5b and Kepler-6b, respectively.

Figure 5. Measured distributions of the occultation depths obtained from the bootstrap trials. Distribution for Kepler-5b is on top and Kepler-6b is on the bottom. Vertical red continuous lines correspond to the median of the distribution. Vertical red dashed lines correspond to $\pm 68\%$ of the distribution. (A color version of this figure is available in the online journal.)

4. RESULTS

We have shown that decreases in the fluxes of the *Kepler* and *Warm-Spitzer* light curves correlated with the expected phases of occultations are detected in all bandpasses at 3σ level. We thus interpreted these signals as planetary occultations detected in the optical and in the near-infrared wavelengths.

4.1. Constraining the Orbital Eccentricity

The current upper limit on the orbital eccentricity e from radial velocity measurements is consistent with zero for both targets (Koch et al. 2010a; Dunham et al. 2010). An independent analysis of the two first *Kepler* quarters (Q0 and Q1) have already been applied (Kipping & Bakos 2011). It uses the transits, eclipses, and radial velocity measurements to confirm that no eccentricity is found for Kepler-5 and to report a marginal eccentricity at 2σ level for Kepler-6.

We measure the mid-occultation timing offset from both *Kepler* and *Warm-Spitzer* observations. The determination of the timing of the secondary eclipse constrains the planet's orbital eccentricity. A non-zero value of e could produce a measurable shift in mid-eclipse times. The *Warm-Spitzer* observations are affected by systematics (correlated noise) which prevent us from deriving timing measurements with a better precision than

Figure 6. *Kepler* and *Warm-Spitzer* occultations measured for Kepler-5b and Kepler-6b compared to hot-Jupiter atmospheric models (Madhusudhan & Seager 2009). The black points associated with their 1σ error bars are the measurements. The solid lines correspond to the best-fit models. The green and red points (without error bars) are the bandpass-integrated model values. The dashed line show blackbody ratios for *Warm-Spitzer* measurements at various temperatures (see details in Section 4.2). The insets are magnifications of the spectra to reveal the *Kepler* measurements. (A color version of this figure is available in the online journal.)

the precision we derive from *Kepler* measurements. Indeed, we measure the mid-occultation timing offset from *Kepler* with uncertainties of nearly 8 minutes for both targets. Our estimate for the best-fit timing offset translates to a constraint on e and the argument of pericenter ω . The timing is used to constrain the $e \cos(\omega)$ at the 3σ level. For Kepler-5b we find $e \cos(\omega) = -0.025 \pm 0.005$, and $|e \cos(\omega)| < 0.06$ to 3σ . For Kepler-6b we find $e \cos(\omega) = -0.01 \pm 0.005$, and $|e \cos(\omega)| < 0.035$ to 3σ . These upper limits imply that the orbits of these objects are nearly circular unless the line of sight is aligned with the planet's major axes, i.e., the argument of periape ω is close to 90° or 270° . Assuming that both planets are on a circular orbit and accounting for the time taken by the light to cross the entire orbits, we would expect that the mid-secondary eclipses are delayed by 50 s and 45 s for Kepler-5 and Kepler-6, respectively, which translate into orbital phase of 0.50016 for both targets.

4.2. Atmospheric Considerations

The occultation depths measured in each bandpass are combined and are turned into an emergent spectrum for each planet.

The observed flux of the planet in each bandpass corresponds to the sum of the reflected light, the thermal emission of the incident stellar flux, and the interior flux from the planet itself (e.g., internal heat or emission due to tidal forces). As a first step, we assume that the thermal emission from the planet itself is negligible. We use the chromatic information to distinguish among the different components of the observed planetary flux.

If we were to explain the occultation detections in the *Kepler* bandpass as reflected light for both objects, it would imply that we are indeed measuring their geometric albedos. One can estimate the reflected light by the planet as $F_p/F_\star = A_g(R_p/a)^2$, where A_g is the geometric albedo in the *Kepler* bandpass. With this assumption in mind, and with the occultation depths of 21 ± 6 ppm and 22 ± 7 ppm for Kepler-5b and Kepler-6b, respectively (see Table 3), we find that both planets have low geometric albedos in the *Kepler* bandpass. Thus, we obtain $A_g = 0.12 \pm 0.04$ and $A_g = 0.11 \pm 0.04$ for Kepler-5b and Kepler-6b, respectively. Interestingly, we can infer the Bond albedo A_B from A_g . The Bond albedo is the fraction of the bolometric incident radiation that is scattered back out into space at all phase angle. Since we have no phase curve information for both objects, we assume a Lambertian criteria where $A_B \leq 1.5 \times A_g$, which leads to $A_B \leq 0.17$ at the 1σ level for both object.

The equilibrium temperature is derived from

$$T_{\text{eq}} = T_\star(R_\star/a)^{1/2}[f(1 - A_B)]^{1/4} \quad (1)$$

which depends on the Bond albedo A_B and the re-distribution factor f which accounts for the efficiency of the transport of energy from the day to the nightside of the planet. f can vary between $1/4$ for an extremely efficient redistribution (isothermal emission at every location of the planet) and higher values for an inefficient redistribution, implying big differences in the temperatures between the day and the nightsides of the planet. Nevertheless, the detection of the occultations in the *Kepler* bandpass may indicate that we measure the thermal emission of these planets at these wavelengths, as expected for the temperature regime of HJs. Therefore, the Bond albedo could be indeed well below 0.17 . Notably, as *Kepler* spacecraft continues to monitor the photometry of Kepler-5b and Kepler-6b, the observations will provide better constraints on occultations and may reveal the phase curves which would allow to fully constrain the Bond albedo of these planets.

We estimate the thermal component of the planet's emission in the two *Warm-Spitzer* bandpasses from the occultation depths measured at 3.6 and $4.5 \mu\text{m}$ (see Table 2). To do so, we assume that the planetary emission is well reproduced by a blackbody spectrum and translate the measured depth of the secondary eclipse into brightness temperatures. We use the PHOENIX atmospheric code (Hauschildt et al. 1999) to produce theoretical stellar models for the star, with stellar temperature of $T_{\text{eff}} = 6297 \pm 60$ for Kepler-5b (Koch et al. 2010b) and $T_{\text{eff}} = 5647 \pm 44$ for Kepler-6b (Dunham et al. 2010). Taking the *Warm-Spitzer* spectral response function into account, the ratio of areas of the star and the planet and the stellar spectra, we derive the brightness temperatures that best fit the observed eclipse depths measured in the two IRAC bandpasses. The brightness temperature calculated this way resulted in $T_{\text{Spitzer}} = 1930 \pm 100$ K and $T_{\text{Spitzer}} = 1660 \pm 120$ K for Kepler-5b and Kepler-6b, respectively. If we further assume that the planet is in thermal equilibrium and has a zero Bond albedo, these temperatures favor low values of the re-distribution factor

f , i.e., the planet dayside efficiently re-radiates the incoming stellar energy flux.

The brightness temperatures we derive using the *Warm-Spitzer* bandpasses are larger than the equilibrium temperatures for both targets (see Table 1). This may indicate that our assumption that these planets behave as blackbodies is most probably incorrect, similar to the giant planets of our solar system. Furthermore, a more robust determination of A_B requires detailed model computation because of the wide range of parameter space (Seager et al. 2005). We discuss below our results from two different types of atmospheric models.

In the first approach, we use the atmospheric retrieval method of Madhusudhan & Seager (2009) to derive the temperature structure and composition of each system, given the data. The model involves one-dimensional line-by-line radiative transfer, with parametric temperature structure and composition, and includes the major molecular and continuum opacity sources, along with constraints of LTE, hydrostatic equilibrium, and global energy balance. This modeling approach allows one to compute large ensembles of models ($\sim 10^6$) and explore the parameter space of molecular compositions and temperature structure in search of the best-fitting models. In the present work, the dominant sources of opacity included are H_2O , CO , CH_4 , CO_2 , NH_3 , and H_2 - H_2 collision induced absorption in the infrared, and TiO , VO , Na , K , and Rayleigh scattering in the visible. In the present context, the number of model parameters is $N = 10$ – 15 (Madhusudhan & Seager 2009). Thus, the limited number of available observations ($N_{\text{obs}} = 3$) imply a substantial degeneracy in solutions. Consequently, our goal with the present data is to find a nominal set of solutions, as opposed to finding unique fits.

Models fitting the observations of Kepler-5b and Kepler-6b are shown in Figures 6 and 7. We find that observations of Kepler-5b can be explained to good precision by a wide range in composition, including models with equilibrium chemistry assuming solar abundances. However, current observations tentatively rule out a thermal inversion in this system. At the temperatures of Kepler-5b, the atmosphere is expected to be abundant in CO (Burrows & Sharp 1999), which has a strong feature in the $4.5 \mu\text{m}$ bandpass. A thermal inversion would therefore naturally predict a high flux in this channel over the $3.6 \mu\text{m}$ channel, as opposed to the observed fluxes which are similar between the two channels. Instead, the CO absorption feature caused by the lack of a thermal inversion explains the observations very well. Additionally, the *Warm-Spitzer* and *Kepler* data together require that the incident energy is mostly re-radiated on the dayside, with a low albedo and a small fraction (f) of dayside energy redistributed to the night side. Assuming zero albedo, the model shown has $f = 0.12$.

The observations of Kepler-6b allow for the possibility of a thermal inversion in its atmosphere. As shown in Figure 7, the data can be explained to within the 1σ errors by models with and without thermal inversions. As explained above, the higher flux in the $4.5 \mu\text{m}$ channel over the $3.6 \mu\text{m}$ channel can be interpreted as a sign of an inversion. However, given the degrees of freedom allowed by the molecular abundances, the limited data can be fit just as well without inversions (see, e.g., Madhusudhan & Seager 2011). A wide range of abundances can fit the data, including those close (within a factor of 10) to equilibrium chemistry assuming solar abundances. However, as with Kepler-5b, the *Warm-Spitzer* and *Kepler* data together place stringent constraints on the energy budget on the dayside.

Figure 7. Temperature–pressure profiles for Kepler-5b and Kepler-6b corresponding to the model presented in Figure 7. The profile with a thermal inversion is overplotted in red. Both profiles fit the Kepler-6b observations well.

(A color version of this figure is available in the online journal.)

Our findings require low albedos and low redistribution to the nightside of this planet.

The second model we consider to compare our data to is the HJ atmospheric model of Fortney et al. (2008). Our motivation here is that, given our limited wavelength coverage, it is important to compare our best-fit planetary-to-star flux ratio values with physically motivated models. We aim at broadly distinguishing these atmospheres between different classes of models, given that there are no prior constraints on the basic composition and structure.

The atmospheric spectrum calculations are performed for one-dimensional atmospheric pressure–temperature (P – T) profiles and use the equilibrium chemical abundances, at solar metallicity, described in Lodders (2002) and Lodders & Fegley (2006). This is a self-consistent treatment of radiative transfer and chemical equilibrium of neutral species. The opacity database is described in Freedman et al. (2008). So far, this

Figure 8. Dayside planet-to-star flux ratios as a function of the wavelength for three atmospheric models (Fortney et al. 2008) per target. The orange diamonds and their error bars correspond to the *Kepler* and *Warm-Spitzer* observations. The blue models represent non-inverted atmospheres (no TiO) and no redistribution of the energy to the planetary nightside. The green models represent inverted atmospheres (with TiO) and no redistribution of the energy to the planetary nightside. The red models represent inverted atmospheres (with TiO) and with full redistribution of the energy to the planetary nightside. The temperature–pressure profiles corresponding to the models are presented in the encapsulated windows. Both targets are best fitted with non-inverted models which include dayside redistribution, also with an equivalent good fit for an inverted atmosphere for Kepler-6b.

(A color version of this figure is available in the online journal.)

model has been used to generate P – T profiles for a variety of close-in planets (Fortney et al. 2005, 2006, 2008). The models are calculated for various dayside-to-nightside energy redistribution parameters (f) and allow for the presence of TiO at high altitude, playing the role of absorber, which likely leads to an inversion of the T – P profile.

We compare the data to model predictions and select models with the best reduced χ^2 . We note that this is not a fit involving adjustable parameters. All models for both targets show that the dayside is re-radiating the stellar flux efficiently, favoring low values for f . Since our observations are weakly constraining, model comparisons for Kepler-6b (Figure 8) suggest that both inverted and non-inverted atmospheric temperature profiles can reproduce the data. However, this is not the case for Kepler-5b where the models show no inversions. Nevertheless, the measurements in the visible are obtained by averaging approximately one year of *Kepler* data. During this time the

planet emission and longitudinal temperature structure may change as suggested by several relevant theoretical studies (e.g., Cho et al. 2003; Showman et al. 2008; Rauscher & Menou 2010).

For HJs such as Kepler-5 and Kepler-6, both scattered stellar light and planetary thermal emission could contribute to the planet emergent flux in the *Kepler* bandpass (López-Morales & Seager 2007). The ratio of scattered starlight to thermal emission depends on the atmospheric composition. These objects could be too hot for condensates. Without a reflective condensate layer, photons in the *Kepler* bandpass are absorbed before being scattered. Therefore, the albedo of Kepler-5 and Kepler-6 are likely to be low, as observed here.

Knutson et al. (2010) shows that there could be a correlation between the host star activity level and the thermal inversion of the planetary atmosphere. Effectively, the strong XEUV irradiation from the active stellar host of HJs could deplete the atmosphere of chemical species responsible for producing inversions. The Ca II H & K line strengths are a good indicator of the stellar activity. We obtain Keck High Resolution Echelle Spectrometer spectra for Kepler-5 and Kepler-6, and estimate the line strengths of $S_{\text{HK}} = 0.14$ and $\log R'_{\text{HK}} = -4.97$ for Kepler-5 and $S_{\text{HK}} = 0.16$ and $\log R'_{\text{HK}} = -4.98$ for Kepler-6. Both stars are moderately quiet sub-giants, with $\log R'_{\text{HK}}$ falling in between cases for thermal inversion or no inversion (see discussion in Knutson et al. 2010). We also evaluate the empirical index defined by Knutson et al. (2010), which provides a way to distinguish between the different HJ atmospheres. Knutson et al. (2010) proposes an index value that could be correlated with the presence on a thermal inversion. Using the same definition, we find that the index $= -0.023 \pm 0.023$ and index $= 0.040 \pm 0.033$ for Kepler-5 and Kepler-6, respectively. These values suggest that the atmosphere of Kepler-6b is consistent with a weak thermal inversion and the one of Kepler-5b with a non-inverted profile, which are both in agreement with the results of our present study.

As the *Kepler* spacecraft continues to monitor the photometry of Kepler-5b and Kepler-6b, the future quarters of observations will be used to improve the signal-to-noise. This will provide better constraints on the occultations and may reveal the phase curves which would allow us to derive a more accurate Bond albedo and thus provide better constraints on the energy budget of these planetary atmospheres.

We would like to thank Jessie Christiansen, Brice-Olivier Demory, and Pavel Machalek for discussions about *Kepler* photometry, light curves analysis, and interpretation. Thank you to the Spitzer staff at IPAC and in particular to Nancy Silbermann for scheduling the observations of this large program. We would like to thank Jacob Bean for a variety of useful discussions. This work is based on observations made with the *Spitzer Space Telescope*, which is operated by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology under a contract with NASA. Support for this work was provided by NASA through an award issued by JPL/Caltech. This work is also based on observations made with *Kepler* which was competitively selected as the tenth Discovery mission. Funding for this mission is provided by NASA's Science Mission Directorate. The authors would like to thank the many people who generously gave so much their time to make this Mission a success. Some of the data presented herein were obtained at the W. M. Keck Observatory, which is operated as a scientific partnership among the California Institute of

Technology, the University of California, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Observatory was made possible by the generous financial support of the W. M. Keck Foundation.

REFERENCES

- Agol, E., Cowan, N. B., Knutson, H. A., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **721**, 1861
 Alonso, R., Deeg, H. J., Kabath, P., & Rabus, M. 2010, *AJ*, **139**, 1481
 Alonso, R., Guillot, T., Mazeh, T., et al. 2009, *A&A*, **501**, L23
 Alonso, R., Alapini, A., Aigrain, S., et al. 2009, *A&A*, **506**, 353
 Barman, T. S., Hauschildt, P. H., & Allard, F. 2005, *ApJ*, **632**, 1132
 Batalha, N. M., Borucki, W. J., Koch, D. G., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **713**, L109
 Borucki, W. J., Koch, D., Jenkins, J., et al. 2009, *Science*, **325**, 709
 Borucki, W. J., Koch, D. G., Brown, T. M., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **713**, L126
 Burrows, A., Budaj, J., & Hubeny, I. 2008, *ApJ*, **678**, 1436
 Burrows, A., Hubeny, I., Budaj, J., Knutson, H. A., & Charbonneau, D. 2007, *ApJ*, **668**, L171
 Burrows, A., Hubeny, I., & Sudarsky, D. 2005, *ApJ*, **625**, L135
 Burrows, A., & Sharp, C. M. 1999, *ApJ*, **512**, 843
 Bryson, S. T., Tenenbaum, P., Jenkins, J. M., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **713**, L97
 Caldwell, D. A., Kolodziejczak, J. J., Van Cleve, J. E., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **713**, L92
 Charbonneau, D., Allen, L. E., Megeath, S. T., et al. 2005, *ApJ*, **626**, 523
 Charbonneau, D., et al. 2008, *ApJ*, **686**, 1436
 Cho, J. Y.-K., Menou, K., Hansen, B. M. S., & Seager, S. 2003, *ApJ*, **587**, L117
 Christiansen, J. L., Ballard, S., Charbonneau, D., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **710**, 97
 Coll, B., Albert, L., Lafreniere, D., Jayawardhana, R., & Fortney, J. J. 2010, *ApJ*, **717**, 1084
 Deming, D., Knutson, H., Agol, E., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, **726**, 95
 Deming, D., Seager, S., & Richardson, L. J. 2005, *Nature*, **434**, 740
 Désert, J.-M., Lecavelier des Etangs, A., Hébrard, G., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, **699**, 478
 Désert, J.-M., Sing, D., Vidal-Madjar, A., et al. 2011, *A&A*, **526**, A12
 Désert, J.-M., Vidal-Madjar, A., Lecavelier Des Etangs, A., et al. 2008, *A&A*, **492**, 585
 Dunham, E. W., Borucki, W. J., Koch, D. G., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **713**, L136
 Fortney, J. J., Cooper, C. S., Showman, A. P., Marley, M. S., & Freedman, R. S. 2006, *ApJ*, **652**, 746
 Fortney, J. J., Lodders, K., Marley, M. S., & Freedman, R. S. 2008, *ApJ*, **678**, 1419
 Fortney, J. J., Marley, M. S., Lodders, K., Saumon, D., & Freedman, R. 2005, *ApJ*, **627**, L69
 Freedman, R. S., Marley, M. S., & Lodders, K. 2008, *ApJS*, **174**, 504
 Fazio, G. G., Hora, J. L., Allen, L. E., et al. 2004, *ApJS*, **154**, 10
 Gilliland, R. L., Jenkins, J. M., Borucki, W. J., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **713**, L160
 Gillon, M., Demory, B.-O., Barman, T., et al. 2007, *A&A*, **471**, L51
 Gillon, M., Demory, B.-O., Triaud, A. H. M. J., et al. 2009, *A&A*, **506**, 359
 Gillon, M., Lanotte, A. A., Barman, T., et al. 2010, *A&A*, **511**, A3
 Gillon, M., Pont, F., Moutou, C., et al. 2006, *A&A*, **459**, 249
 Grillmair, C. J., Burrows, A., Charbonneau, D., et al. 2008, *Nature*, **456**, 767
 Harrington, J., Luszcz, S., Seager, S., et al. 2007, *Nature*, **447**, 691
 Hauschildt, P. H., Allard, F., & Baron, E. 1999, *ApJ*, **512**, 377
 Hubeny, I., Burrows, A., & Sudarsky, D. 2003, *ApJ*, **594**, 1011
 Jenkins, J. M., Caldwell, D. A., Chandrasekaran, H., et al. 2010a, *ApJ*, **713**, L120
 Jenkins, J. M., Caldwell, D. A., Chandrasekaran, H., et al. 2010b, *ApJ*, **713**, L87
 Kipping, D. M., & Bakos, G. Á. 2011, *ApJ*, **730**, 50
 Knutson, H. A., Charbonneau, D., Allen, L. E., Burrows, A., & Megeath, S. T. 2008, *ApJ*, **673**, 526
 Knutson, H. A., Howard, A. W., & Isaacson, H. 2010, *ApJ*, **720**, 1569
 Koch, D. G., Borucki, W. J., Basri, G., et al. 2010a, *ApJ*, **713**, L79
 Koch, D. G., Borucki, W. J., Rowe, J. F., et al. 2010b, *ApJ*, **713**, L131
 Latham, D. W., Borucki, W. J., Koch, D. G., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **713**, L140
 Lodders, K. 2002, *ApJ*, **577**, 974
 Lodders, K., & Fegley, B., Jr. 2006, *Astrophysics Update 2* ed. J. W. Mason (Germany: Springer), **1**
 López-Morales, M., Coughlin, J. L., Sing, D. K., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **716**, L36
 López-Morales, M., & Seager, S. 2007, *ApJ*, **667**, L191
 Machalek, P., McCullough, P. R., Burke, C. J., et al. 2008, *ApJ*, **684**, 1427
 Machalek, P., McCullough, P. R., Burrows, A., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, **701**, 514
 Madhusudhan, N., & Seager, S. 2009, *ApJ*, **707**, 24
 Madhusudhan, N., & Seager, S. 2011, *ApJ*, **729**, 41
 Mandel, K., & Agol, E. 2002, *ApJ*, **580**, L171
 Moutou, C., Pont, F., Bouchy, F., & Mayor, M. 2004, *A&A*, **424**, L31
 Pont, F., Zucker, S., & Queloz, D. 2006, *MNRAS*, **373**, 231

- Rauscher, E., & Menou, K. 2010, [ApJ](#), **714**, 1334
- Reach, W. T., Megeath, S. T., Cohen, M., et al. 2005, [PASP](#), **117**, 978
- Rowe, J. F., Matthews, J. M., Seager, S., et al. 2006, [ApJ](#), **646**, 1241
- Rowe, J. F., Matthews, J. M., Seager, S., et al. 2008, [ApJ](#), **689**, 1345
- Seager, S., Richardson, L. J., Hansen, B. M. S., et al. 2005, [ApJ](#), **632**, 1122
- Seager, S., Whitney, B. A., & Sasselov, D. D. 2000, [ApJ](#), **540**, 504
- Showman, A. P., Cooper, C. S., Fortney, J. J., & Marley, M. S. 2008, [ApJ](#), **682**, 559
- Sing, D. K., & López-Morales, M. 2009, [A&A](#), **493**, L31
- Snellen, I. A. G., de Mooij, E. J. W., & Albrecht, S. 2009, [Nature](#), **459**, 543
- Spiegel, D. S., & Burrows, A. 2010, [ApJ](#), **722**, 871
- Spiegel, D. S., Burrows, A., Ibgui, L., Hubeny, I., & Milsom, J. A. 2010, [ApJ](#), **709**, 149
- Swain, M. R., Vasisht, G., Tinetti, G., et al. 2009, [ApJ](#), **690**, L114
- Sudarsky, D., Burrows, A., & Hubeny, I. 2003, [ApJ](#), **588**, 1121
- Sudarsky, D., Burrows, A., & Pinto, P. 2000, [ApJ](#), **538**, 885
- Todorov, K., Deming, D., Harrington, J., et al. 2010, [ApJ](#), **708**, 498
- Welsh, W. F., Orosz, J. A., Seager, S., et al. 2010, [ApJ](#), **713**, L145
- Zahnle, K., Marley, M. S., Freedman, R. S., Lodders, K., & Fortney, J. J. 2009, [ApJ](#), **701**, L20