

Atmospheric Parameters of 169 F, G, K and M-type Stars in the *Kepler* Field*

J. Molenda-Żakowicz¹, S.G. Sousa², A. Frasca³, K. Uytterhoeven^{4,5,6}, M. Briquet^{7,8}, H. Van Winckel⁸, D. Drobek¹, E. Niemczura¹, P. Lampens⁹, J. Lykke¹⁰, S. Bloemen⁸, J.F. Gameiro², C. Jean⁸, D. Volpi⁹, N. Gorlova⁸, A. Mortier^{2,11}, M. Tsantaki^{2,11}, G. Raskin⁸

¹ *Instytut Astronomiczny Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, ul. Kopernika 11, 51-622 Wrocław, Poland, E-mail: molenda@astro.uni.wroc.pl*

² *Centro de Astrofísica, Universidade do Porto, Rua das Estrelas, 4150-762 Porto, Portugal*

³ *INAF, Osservatorio Astrofisico di Catania, via S. Sofia, 78, 95123 Catania, Italy*

⁴ *Kiepenheuer-Institut für Sonnenphysik, Schöneckstr. 6, D-79104 Freiburg, Germany*

⁵ *Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, 38200 La Laguna, Tenerife, Spain*

⁶ *Departamento de Astrofísica, Universidad de La Laguna, 38205 La Laguna, Tenerife, Spain*

⁷ *Institut d'Astrophysique et de Géophysique, Université de Liège, Allée du 6 Août 17, Bât B5c, 4000 Liège, Belgium*

⁸ *Instituut voor Sterrenkunde, KU Leuven, Celestijnenlaan 200D, 3001 Leuven, Belgium*

⁹ *Koninklijke Sterrenwacht van België, Ringlaan 3, 1180 Brussel, Belgium*

¹⁰ *Nordic Optical Telescope, 38700 Santa Cruz de La Palma, Spain*

¹¹ *Departamento de Física e Astronomia, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade do Porto, Portugal*

Accepted 1988 December 15. Received 1988 December 14; in original form 1988 October 11

ABSTRACT

Both the asteroseismic and planetary studies need precise and accurate atmospheric parameters of the stars as input. We aim at deriving the effective temperature (T_{eff}), the surface gravity ($\log g$), the metallicity ($[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$), the projected rotational velocity ($v \sin i$) and the MK type for 169 F, G, K, and M-type *Kepler* targets which were observed spectroscopically from the ground with five different instruments. We use two different spectroscopic methods to analyse 189 high-resolution, high-signal-to-noise spectra acquired for those 169 stars. For 69, T_{eff} , $\log g$, $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, $v \sin i$, and the MK type are derived for the first time. KIC 9025370, 9693187 and 11179629 are discovered to be double-lined spectroscopic binary systems. The results obtained for those stars for which independent determinations of the atmospheric parameters are available in the literature are used for a comparative analysis. As a result, we show that for the solar-type stars the accuracy of the present determinations of T_{eff} is ± 150 K, ± 0.15 dex in $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, and ± 0.3 dex in $\log g$. Finally, we confirm that the analysis of the curve-of-growth and the method of the spectral synthesis yield systematically different results when they are applied to stars of T_{eff} ranging from 6,000 to 7,000 K.

Key words: stars: atmospheric parameters – space missions: *Kepler*

* Based on observations acquired at the Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope (CFHT) which is operated by the National Research Council of Canada, the Institut National des Sciences de l'Univers of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique of France, and the University of Hawaii, the Telescope Bernard Lyot (USR5026) operated by the Observatoire Midi-Pyrénées (Université de Toulouse and the Institut National des Sciences de l'Univers of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique of France), the Nordic Optical Telescope, operated jointly by Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden, and with the Mercator telescope,

operated by the Flemish Community, both located on the island of La Palma at the Spanish Observatorio del Roque de los Muchachos of the Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, and the M.G. Fracastoro station of the INAF - Osservatorio Astrofisico di Catania, Italy. The Mercator observations were obtained with the HERMES spectrograph, which is supported by the Fund for Scientific Research of Flanders (FWO), Belgium, the Research Council of K.U.Leuven, Belgium, the Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique (FNRS), Belgium, the Royal Observatory of Belgium,

1 INTRODUCTION

Since March 2009, the 105 deg² field located between the constellations of Cygnus and Lyra has been continuously monitored by the NASA space mission *Kepler* (Borucki et al. 2003; Koch et al. 2010). The T_{eff} , $\log g$, and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ of the stars in the *Kepler* field of view, derived from the Sloan *griz* photometry, are provided in the *Kepler* Input Catalog (KIC, Brown et al. 2011) which was created with the aim of providing the distinction between main-sequence stars and giants in the temperature range from 4,500 to 6,500 K. Within that range, the nominal precision of T_{eff} in the KIC is 200 K and 0.5 dex in $\log g$. Beyond those limits, the T_{eff} and $\log g$ in the KIC become imprecise, while the estimates of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ are poor in general (Brown et al. 2011). Therefore, ground-based follow-up observations are essential information because they provide the precise and accurate atmospheric stellar parameters needed for detailed asteroseismic and planetary studies of the *Kepler* targets.

Systematic observations aiming at deriving the atmospheric parameters of stars in the *Kepler* field were started well before the *Kepler* satellite was launched (see Molenda-Żakowicz et al. 2007). After the successful launch of the mission more programmes of ground-based follow-up observations started. Eventually, in the frame of the *Kepler* Asteroseismic Science Consortium¹ (KASC) it has been decided that the most optimal approach to observing *Kepler* stars from the ground should consist of a series of coordinated proposals for spectroscopic and photometric observations (see Ytterhoeven et al. 2010a,b).

In this paper, we report on the results of those observations. In Sect. 2, we outline the method of selecting targets. In Sect. 3, we provide the information about the instruments and the data acquisition, reduction and calibration. Our methods of the analysis are described in Sect. 4. In Sect. 5, the atmospheric parameters are provided and compared with the other determinations reported in the literature. Sect. 6 contains the discussion of the accuracy of our results and the accuracy of the determinations of the atmospheric parameters of the solar-type stars. Sect. 7 provides the summary.

2 TARGET SELECTION

The stars which were observed with the FRESKO spectrograph at the 91-cm telescope at INAF-OACt (the principal investigator: JM-Ż) were selected from those faint ($V > 8$ mag), mid-F ($B - V > 0.5$ mag), close (the parallax $\pi > 20$ mas) stars in the Tycho catalog (Hog et al. 2000) which have optical counterparts of X-ray sources in the ROSAT All-Sky Survey Catalogue (see Guillout et al. 1999). These stars were proposed for *Kepler* asteroseismic targets and for the follow-up ground-based observations by AF in the first call for proposals announced by KASC.

The selection of stars to be observed with the FIES spectrograph at the NOT (the principal investigator: KU)

and these for the HERMES spectrograph at the Mercator telescope (the principal investigators: MB and EN) was based on the requests of the KASC community which were submitted by the chairs of seven working groups (WGs): Solar-like p-mode Oscillations (WG 1), Oscillations in Clusters (WG 2), Beta Cephei Stars (WG 3), Delta Scuti stars (WG 4), Slowly Pulsating B-stars (WG 6), Cepheids (WG 7), and Gamma Doradus stars (WG-10). In this paper, we report on those stars which are cooler than 7,000 K. The atmospheric parameters derived for the hotter targets will be published by Niemczura et al. (in prep.) and Catanzaro et al. (in prep.)

Our list of the programme stars includes also these *Kepler* targets which were observed with the ESPaDOnS spectrograph at the Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope and the NARVAL spectrograph at the Bernard Lyot Telescope, and for which the data are now public.

The total number of spectra which we analyse is 189. However, because 15 stars were observed with two instruments and one star, with three, the number of the individual stars discussed in this paper is 169. The stars with multiple observations are used for an internal check of the consistency of our results. Those for which T_{eff} , $\log g$, and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ have been published by Bruntt et al. (2012) or Thygesen et al. (2012) are included for the sake of analysing possible differences in the results obtained by means of different methods.

3 OBSERVATIONS

Our programme stars were observed with five different instruments. Their names are provided in Table 1 which lists also the names of the telescopes, the acronyms of observatories, the number of acquired spectra (N), the year in which the data were acquired, the spectral range and the resolving power (R) of the spectra, the exposure time, and the typical signal-to-noise ratio (S/N) along with the location in the spectrum where it was measured.

For all the instruments, the bias and the flat field measurements were acquired in the evening and in the morning. The spectra of the calibration lamps were acquired in the same time and occasionally during the night. Only for FIES the calibration lamps were acquired before each science observation. The procedures of the data reduction and calibration included the correction for bias and flat field, extraction of the orders, the wavelength calibration, and the cleaning from the cosmic rays. The normalization of the spectra to the level of unity was done manually with IRAF².

3.1 FIES

FIES (Fiber-fed Echelle Spectrograph) is a cross-dispersed high-resolution échelle spectrograph mounted on the 2.56-m Nordic Optical Telescope (NOT) at the Observatorio Roque de los Muchachos (ORM) on La Palma, Spain. We used the medium-resolution mode ($R = 46,000$) to observe the bright stars ($V < 10$ mag), and the low-resolution mode ($R =$

the Observatoire de Genève, Switzerland and the Thüringer Landessternwarte Tautenburg, Germany.

¹ <http://astro.phys.au.dk/KASC/>

² IRAF is distributed by the National Optical Astronomy Observatory, which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc.

Table 1. The summary of the instruments and the observations.

Instrument	Telescope	Observatory	N	Year of observations	Spectral range [Å]	R	t_{exp} [s]	S/N
FIES	NOT	ORM	4	2010-2011	3700-7300	46,000	420-2050	100 at 4900 Å
FIES	NOT	ORM	4	2010-2011	3700-7300	25,000	1500-2600	100 at 4900 Å
FRESCO	91-cm	INAF-OACt	18	2009-2010	4300-6800	21,000	2700-4200	80 at 6500 Å
HERMES	Mercator	ORM	20	2010-2011	3800-9000	85,000	500-2600	90 at 6500 Å
NARVAL	TBL	Pic du Midi	50	2010	3700-10500	75,000	< 900	100 at 5200 Å
ESPaDOnS	CFHT	CFH	91	2010	3700-10500	80,000	< 900	100 at 5200 Å

25,000), for the faint ($V > 10$ mag). The observations were carried out by EN and JL. The spectra were reduced and calibrated using the dedicated reduction software *FIEStool* (Stempels 2004) that is based on existing standard IRAF reduction procedures.

3.2 FRESCO

FRESCO, now de-commissioned, was a fiber-linked REOSC échelle spectrograph attached to the 91-cm telescope at the INAF-Osservatorio Astrofisico di Catania (INAF-OACt), Italy. The observations were carried out by JM-Ž. The data were reduced and calibrated with IRAF.

3.3 HERMES

HERMES is a fiber-fed échelle spectrograph attached to the Flemish 1.2-m telescope Mercator on La Palma, Canary Islands, Spain. It is optimised for high resolution, stability, and broad wavelength coverage which is achieved primarily by implementing an image slicer, an anti-fringe CCD coating, and a thermal enclosure (Raskin et al. 2011). We used that instrument to observe stars brighter than $V = 10$ mag. The observations were carried out by DD, PL, JG, NG, DV, SB, and CJ. The data reduction and calibration were performed with a dedicated Python-based pipeline (Raskin et al. 2011).

3.4 ESPaDOnS and NARVAL

The ESPaDOnS and the NARVAL spectrographs are very similar instruments. ESPaDOnS is mounted at the 3.6-m Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope in the USA while NARVAL is mounted at the 2-m Bernard Lyot Telescope at the Pic du Midi Observatory in France. Both instruments observed the *Kepler* targets in the service mode. All those data are available at the public archive of the Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope (CFHT) Science Data Archive and the CNRS/INSU CDAB/Bass2000 TBLegacy database. The reduction and calibration of the ESPaDOnS and NARVAL data were performed as part of the service programme by means of the data reduction software Libre-ESPRIT written and provided by J.-F. Donati from IRAP, Observatoire Midi-Pyrénées (Donati et al. 1997).

4 METHODS OF THE ANALYSIS

4.1 ROTFIT

The code ROTFIT which we used for deriving T_{eff} , $\log g$, $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, $v \sin i$, and the MK type of all the 169 stars from our sample was developed by Frasca et al. (2003, 2006). This method is similar to that of Katz et al. (1998) and Soubiran et al. (1998). It consists of comparing the spectra of the programme stars, order by order, with the spectra of the reference stars for which the atmospheric parameters are precisely measured from high-resolution, high- S/N spectra. The MK classification of the target spectrum is inferred by adopting the spectral type and the luminosity class of those reference stars which occur most frequently. For the measure of the agreement of spectra, the value of χ^2 is used. As shown by Frasca et al. (2006), this method allows for simultaneous, fast and accurate determination of T_{eff} , $\log g$, $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, $v \sin i$ and the MK type even from spectra of low signal-to-noise ratio or moderate resolution.

The atmospheric parameters of the programme stars are computed as the weighted means of the astrophysical parameters of the ten reference stars which best reproduce the target spectrum, separately in each order. Therefore, per each order weighted averages and standard errors are computed for each of the atmospheric parameters, so that the values from individual orders can be averaged using $\sigma^{-2}\chi^{-2}f$ for a weight. Here, χ^{-2} accounts for differences between orders due to different S/N and the goodness of the fit, while f is proportional to the total absorption of lines in each individual order. The factor f allows for correction for the different amount of information contained in the blue and the red orders which contain different number of the spectral lines, and it gives more weight to the orders which contain strong and broad lines.

Our library of the reference stars contains 221 high-resolution ($R = 42,000$), high- S/N spectra of slowly rotating stars acquired with the fiber-fed échelle spectrograph ELODIE at the Haute-Provence Observatory which are available from the ELODIE archive (Prugniel & Soubiran 2001). The atmospheric parameters of most of those stars were adopted from the PASTEL catalogue (Soubiran et al. 2010) which provides a literature compilation of stellar atmospheric parameters derived from high-resolution, high- S/N spectra.

4.2 ARES+MOOG

The spectroscopic stellar parameters (T_{eff} , $\log g$, ξ_t , and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$) were derived following the same procedure as that used in the previous works (Santos et al. 2004; Sousa et al. 2006, 2008, 2011a,b). This method is based on the measurement of the equivalent widths (EW s) of the Fe I and Fe II weak absorption lines and then imposing the excitation and the ionization equilibrium assuming the LTE approximation. The 2002 version of the code MOOG (Senden 1973) is used together with the grid of the Kurucz Atlas 9 plane-parallel model atmospheres (Kurucz 1993). In this procedure, $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ is the proxy of metallicity. The equivalent widths are measured automatically with the ARES code (Automatic Routine for line Equivalent widths in stellar Spectra) by Sousa et al. (2007) which successfully reproduces the common manual, interactive determination of EW s.

Since both ARES and MOOG are the core codes used in this method, we refer to it as to ARES+MOOG. Nevertheless, we would like to emphasise that these two codes do not fully describe this method. One of its unique characteristics is the list of the iron lines. Although a preliminary large list of nearly 500 lines was compiled from the Vienna Atomic Line Database (Kupka et al. 1999), the final list includes nearly 300 lines that were carefully tested when automatically measured with ARES (Sousa et al. 2008). Another important aspect of that list are the adopted atomic parameters for each line: The oscillator strengths ($\log gf$) of the lines were recomputed through an inverse analysis of the Solar spectrum allowing this way to perform a differential analysis relatively to the Sun.

The errors of the parameters derived with ARES+MOOG were obtained by quadratically adding 60 K, 0.1 and 0.04 dex to the method's intrinsic errors in T_{eff} , $\log g$, and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, respectively. The former values were obtained by measuring the typical standard deviation of the parameters discussed by Sousa et al. (2008). A more complete discussion about the errors derived for this spectroscopic method can be found in Sousa et al. (2011a).

Since we adopt a differential analysis (using the Sun for the reference), this method is expected to work very well for solar-type stars and to be less accurate for the cooler and the hotter stars, and those which are significantly different from the Sun. For this reason, we don't provide results for stars cooler than around 4,500 K. Moreover, since ARES+MOOG requires precise measurements of the EW s, we don't provide results for stars showing $v \sin i > 10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, which causes the line blending and consecutive problems for the precise determination of EW , and those observed with a resolving power $R < 25,000$.

5 ATMOSPHERIC PARAMETERS

The parameter T_{eff} , $\log g$, $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, and $v \sin i$ with their standard deviations, and the MK types derived with the ROTFIT code are listed in columns 2-10 of Table 2. The T_{eff} , $\log g$, $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, and ξ_t with their standard deviations derived with ARES+MOOG are listed in columns 11-18. The KIC numbers of the stars are provided in the first column and the names of the instrument, in the last. We use bold font for the KIC numbers of these stars for which the atmospheric

parameters are derived for the first time. Whenever an instrument name is written in bold font, it indicates that the respective spectrum is first analysed in this paper.

Table 2 does not include KIC 9025370, 9693187 and 11179629 which we detect lines of both components in the spectrum. We classify those stars as double-lined spectroscopic binaries (SB2) and do not compute for them the atmospheric parameters.

For KIC 6370489, 10709834, and 10923629 we do not provide the atmospheric parameters obtained with ARES+MOOG. In the spectrum of the first star we find too few useful spectral lines for ARES+MOOG to converge. For KIC 10709834 and 10923629, ARES+MOOG yields very high $\log g$ which are not confirmed with ROTFIT. Therefore, we suspect that the results produced by ARES+MOOG for those two stars may be spurious.

Below, we discuss the T_{eff} , $\log g$, and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ computed with ARES+MOOG and with ROTFIT. We compare these results with each other and with those obtained by Bruntt et al. (2012) and Thygesen et al. (2012) with the VWA code. We show also how our determinations confront with the temperatures derived with the infra-red flux method (IRFM) by Pinsonneault et al. (2012).

5.1 Effective temperature

As shown in Fig. 1, the differences between T_{eff} derived with ARES+MOOG, ROTFIT, VWA and IRFM show standard deviation ranging from 97 to 179 K, different offsets and trends. The standard deviation is lowest but still significant when the comparisons concern T_{eff} computed with VWA (Fig. 1 *b*, *d*, and *f*). This must be related to the fact that VWA was applied to high- S/N , high-resolution spectra from ESPaDOnS and NARVAL: When the data of high quality are used, all methods yield T_{eff} which are more precise, accurate, and consistent with each other.

For stars with $T_{\text{eff}} > 6,000 \text{ K}$, the effective temperatures derived with ARES+MOOG are systematically hotter than those obtained either with ROTFIT or with VWA (Fig. 1 *a* and *b*.) Between 5,000 K and 6,000 K these three methods agree well but for stars cooler than 5,000 K, ARES+MOOG yields slightly higher T_{eff} which is why for the coolest stars the agreement between ARES+MOOG and ROTFIT or VWA is worse again. The reason for this may be related with the selection of the spectral lines. The original list of lines was optimized for solar-type stars. For cool stars, many of those lines are affected by blending. This effect contributes strongly for the observed offset in temperature. A refinement of the selection of the lines to produce consistent results in this temperature regime will be presented by Tsantaki et al. 2013 (in prep.).

Fig. 1 *a* and *b* show that when ROTFIT and VWA are compared to ARES+MOOG, the differences show similar pattern. This suggest that T_{eff} obtained with ROTFIT and VWA should be close to each other. Indeed, the mean difference between T_{eff} derived by means of those two methods is relatively low, only 70 K. Nevertheless, the standard deviation of the differences between them, 123 K, is still quite high (Fig. 1 *d*.)

When compared with the IRFM-based T_{eff} measured by Pinsonneault et al. (2012), the T_{eff} derived with ARES+MOOG show a negligible offset of 7 K but still a




Figure 1. Comparison of the T_{eff} measured with ROTFIT and ARES+MOOG with each other, and with the T_{eff} obtained with VWA by Bruntt et al. (2012) and Thygesen et al. (2012). The T_{eff} obtained by means of each of these three methods are compared also to the IRFM T_{eff} reported by Pinsonneault et al. (2012). In the insets, we give the mean difference between the compared sets of data, the standard deviation of the mean, and the number of stars in common. For the clarity of the plot, the method ARES+MOOG is abbreviated to 'Sousa'.




Figure 2. Comparison of the $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ measured with ROTFIT and ARES+MOOG with each other, and with the spectroscopic $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ obtained with VWA by Bruntt et al. (2012) and Thygesen et al. (2012). In the insets, we give the mean difference between the compared sets of data, the standard deviation of the mean, and the number of stars in common. For the clarity of the plot, the method ARES+MOOG is abbreviated to 'Sousa'.




Figure 3. The same as in Fig. 2 but for $\log g$.

high standard deviation of 152 K (Fig. 1 *c*). The two other methods, ROTFIT and VWA, show a much higher mean difference, 182 and 149 K, and a similar standard deviation, 179 and 104 K, respectively (Fig. 1 *e* and *f*). Therefore, it is difficult to say which of those methods, if any, agrees with IRFM best.

Since ARES+MOOG is known to be in a very good agreement with the IRFM scale of temperatures (see Sousa et al. 2008), we expected the results shown in Fig. 1 *c* to compare much better. One of the plausible explanations of the observed scatter is the fact that the IRFM-based T_{eff} provided by Pinsonneault et al. (2012) were derived only from one colour index, $(J - K_S)$, and as such are offset from the conventional IRFM temperature scale (see Figs. 9 and 13, and the discussion in Section 3.3 in Pinsonneault et al. 2012). When Fig. 13 in Pinsonneault et al. (2012) is compared to our Fig. 1 *c*, one can see that the trends and the scatter in both figures are similar. We find it to be a confirmation that T_{eff} derived with ARES+MOOG and IRFM are consistent, and that the high standard deviation of the results shown in Fig. 1 *c* is specific to the properties of $(J - K_S)$ colour index, not due to the imperfection of ARES+MOOG.

One should also keep in mind that the IRFM T_{eff} derived by Pinsonneault et al. (2012) may be to some extent affected by the reddening of the stars. These authors do correct the observed magnitudes for the interstellar extinction, however, since there are no individual measurements of $E(B - V)$ for each target, they use the map-based estimates of extinction from the KIC. Those values are not accurate as has been shown by Molenda-Żakowicz et al. (2009) for 29 nearby ($16 < r < 240$ pc), bright ($9.0 < V < 11.2$) *Kepler* targets which were observed photometrically by those authors. Molenda-Żakowicz et al. (2009) did not find any evidence that those stars were reddened while their $E(B - V)$ provided in the KIC were sometimes as high as 0.06 mag. The influence of the inaccurate $E(B - V)$ used by Pinsonneault et al. (2012) on the derived IRFM T_{eff} may be small but should be considered as one of possible sources of the scatter in the differences between T_{eff} derived from IRFM and from spectroscopy.

5.2 Metallicity

As shown in Fig. 2 *a*, *b*, and *c*, the values of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ derived with ARES+MOOG, ROTFIT and VWA agree with each other to within the error bars for almost all targets. The mean differences between these determinations do not exceed 0.07 dex. Nevertheless, their standard deviation is quite large and equal to the typical uncertainty of the measurements obtained with ROTFIT, and twice as large as the uncertainties found with ARES+MOOG.

For the stars hotter than 6,000 K, $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values computed with ARES+MOOG are slightly higher than those computed with ROTFIT or VWA (Fig. 2 *a* and *b*). However, this trend does not affect the overall consistency of the results. The $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ computed with ROTFIT and VWA agree best (Fig. 2 *c*) showing the mean difference of 0.03 dex and no trends at high temperatures. The high standard deviation is not reduced, though, and it is as high as that in Fig. 2 *a*, where the mean difference is the highest and the trend at the high temperatures, best visible.

5.3 Surface gravity

The surface gravity is the parameter which is least constrained when derived with ARES+MOOG. The reason for that is related to the number of iron lines used in this method. Although we use nearly 300 Fe I lines, which constrain very well the temperature, micro turbulence, and the metal abundance, $\log g$, which comes from the ionization balance, requires the analysis of the Fe II lines. Unfortunately the number of Fe II lines is limited to less than 20. Due to that small number, the results of their analysis are more sensitive to errors and more uncertain.

The differences between $\log g$ computed with ARES+MOOG, ROTFIT, and VWA (the spectroscopic $\log g$) illustrated in Fig. 3 *a* and *b*, are around 0.2 dex, and show the discrepancies increasing for the hot stars. The trends visible in Fig. 3 *a* and *b*, mimic those in Fig. 1 *a* and *b*, which may be a result of strong correlations between T_{eff} and $\log g$. The $\log g$ obtained with ROTFIT and with VWA agree with each other better (Fig. 3 *c*.) The mean difference between them is the lowest, 0.12 dex, and there are no trends for hot stars. Anyhow, the standard deviation of the differences is still high.

6 DISCUSSION

Our analysis shows that deriving precise and accurate atmospheric parameters is not an easy task. While within one method the precision of the computations can be high, when its results are compared to those obtained by means of other methods or from different data, various trends and offsets appear, proving that we are still far from being able to provide accurate T_{eff} , $\log g$, and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ for solar-type stars.

KIC 5184732 is a good example of those difficulties. In Table 2 we give the atmospheric parameters of that star derived independently from the spectra acquired with FRESCO, ESPaDOnS, and NARVAL. The atmospheric parameters computed with ARES+MOOG from the ESPaDOnS and NARVAL data agree with other nicely. The same can be said about the atmospheric parameters computed from those data with ROTFIT. However, the differences between those two sets of determinations amount to around 150 K in T_{eff} , 0.12 dex in $\log g$, and 0.20 dex in $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$. For ROTFIT, there are also less pronounced but still not negligible differences between T_{eff} , $\log g$ and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ derived from the observations acquired with FRESCO and those obtained with ESPaDOnS and NARVAL.

The trends and discrepancies in the atmospheric parameters observed for stars hotter than 6,000 K are another significant but not a new problem. It has been thoroughly discussed, but not solved, by Torres et al. (2012). Those authors compare the atmospheric parameters obtained with SPC and SME, two codes in which the method of spectral synthesis is used, with T_{eff} , $\log g$, and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ computed with MOOG, that uses the curve-of-growth approach. The differences noticed by Torres et al. (2012) are the same as those reported in the present paper. The same trend can be noticed also in Fig. 3 *b*, in Sousa et al. (2008), where T_{eff} computed with ARES+MOOG are compared with those obtained with SME. The origin of those discrepancies is not clear but they seem to reflect real, systematic differences between the atmospheric parameters obtained from the spectral synthesis

and the analysis of the equivalent widths. However, confirming that suspicion would require detailed examination of the input physics used in all the discussed methods which is beyond the scope of this paper.

The comparative analysis which we carried out in this paper showed that the accuracy of the atmospheric parameters of solar-type stars which is currently available is ± 150 K in T_{eff} , ± 0.15 dex in $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ and ± 0.3 dex in $\log g$. That concerns particularly the faint stars and those hotter than 6,000 K. Since $\log g$ is the parameter most difficult to constraint in the spectroscopic analysis, for stars showing solar-like pulsations and those with transits, the seismic $\log g$ or those derived from the transit light curves may be used optionally as an alternative values. The former determinations of $\log g$ have been shown by Gai et al. (2011) to be nearly independent of the input physics used in different evolutionary models. The latter, deriving of which is described in detail by Seager & Mallen-Ornelas (2003), are currently preferred in the investigation of the transiting planets for which the spectroscopic $\log g$ are avoided (c.f. Torres et al. 2012).

7 SUMMARY

In this paper, we provided two determinations of the atmospheric parameters obtained for 169 stars, dwarfs and giants, with T_{eff} ranging from 3,200 to 6,700 K. The first set was computed with ARES+MOOG, a method which is based on the analysis of the equivalent widths of the spectral lines, the other, with ROTFIT, which makes use of the full target spectrum that is compared with a grid of reference star with well-known atmospheric parameters (mainly from spectral synthesis).

For 69 stars, T_{eff} , $\log g$, $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, $v \sin i$, and the spectral type are provided for the first time in this paper.

KIC 9025370, KIC 9693187, and KIC 11179629 are newly discovered double-lined spectroscopic binary systems.

The internal precision of T_{eff} and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ obtained with ARES+MOOG and ROTFIT is high, typically ± 80 K in T_{eff} (depending on the star; ARES+MOOG is slightly more precise than ROTFIT), ± 0.12 dex in $\log g$ for both methods, and ± 0.06 or ± 0.10 dex in $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ for ARES+MOOG and ROTFIT, respectively, as estimated from the standard deviations of the atmospheric parameters in Table 2. Therefore, our determinations can be safely used for the asteroseismic modelling of stars. However, we showed that for the solar-type stars the present accuracy of the determinations of the atmospheric parameters available in the literature is T_{eff} is ± 150 K, ± 0.15 dex in $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, and ± 0.3 dex in $\log g$.

Our results emphasise the importance of collecting high-quality spectra with sufficiently large telescopes equipped with performant spectrographs, and the need of examining the reasons why for the hot stars the spectral synthesis method and the curve-of-growth analysis yield the atmospheric parameters which are systematically different.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Thierry Louge for help in retrieving the data from the CNRS/INSU CDAB/Bass2000 TBLegacy database operated by the University of Toulouse/OMP, Tarbes,

France. We thank the Spanish Night time CAT for awarding the observing time to programs 61-Mercator3/11B, 119-NOT12/11A, and 61-NOT7/10A. J.M.-Z., E.N., and D.D. acknowledge the Polish MNiSW grant NN203 405139. S.G.S., A.M., and M.T. acknowledge the support of the European Research Council/European Community under the FP7 through Starting Grant agreement number 239953. S.G.S. and J.M.-Z. acknowledge the support from Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT) through the grant SFRH/BPD/47611/2008, the projects PTDC/CTE-AST/098528/2008, PTDC/CTE-AST/098754/2008, and the 'Cooperação Científica e Tecnológica FCT/Polonia 2011/2012 (Proc. 441.00 Polonia)', funded by FCT/MCTES, Portugal and POPH/FSE (EC). SB acknowledges funding from the European Research Council under the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013)/ERC grant agreement n°227224 (PROSPERITY). M.B. is F.R.S.-FNRS Postdoctoral Researcher, Belgium.

REFERENCES

- Borucki, W. J., Koch, D. G., Lissauer, J. J., et al. 2003, in Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series, Vol. 4854, Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series, ed. J.C. Blades & O.H.W. Siegmund, 129140
- Brown, T.M., Latham, D.W., Everett, M.E., & Esquerdo, G.A. 2011, *AJ*, 142, 112
- Bruntt, H., Basu, S., Smalley, B., Chaplin, W.J., Verner, G.A., et al. 2012, *MNRAS* 423, 122
- Donati, J.-F., Semel, M., Carter, B.D., Rees, D.E., & Collier Cameron, A. 1997, *MNRAS*, 291, 658
- Frasca, A., Alcalà, J. M., Covino, E., et al. 2003, *A&A*, 405, 149
- Frasca, A., Guillout, P., Marilli, E., et al. 2006, *A&A*, 454, 301
- Gai N., Basu S., Chaplin W. J., & Elsworth Y. 2011, *ApJ*, 730, 63
- Guillout, P., Schmitt, J.H.M.M., Egret, D., Voges, W., Motch, C., & Sterzik, M.F. 1999, *A&A* 351, 1003
- Hog E., Fabricius C., Makarov V.V., Urban S., Corbin T., Wycoff G., Bastian U., Schwekendiek P., & Wicenc A. 2000, *A&A*, 355, 27
- Howell, S.B., Rowe, J.F., Bryson, S.T., Quinn, S.N., Marcy, G.W., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 746, 123
- Katz, D., Soubiran, C., Cayrel, R., Adda, M., & Cautain, R. 1998, *A&A*, 338, 151
- Koch, D. G., Borucki, W. J., Basri, G., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 713, L79
- Kupka, F., Piskunov, N., Ryabchikova, T. A., Stempels, H. C., & Weiss, W. W. 1999, *A&AS*, 138, 119
- Kurucz, R. 1993, ATLAS9 Stellar Atmosphere Programs and 2 km/s grid. Kurucz CD-ROM No. 13, Cambridge (Mass.: Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory)
- Molenda-Żakowicz, J., Frasca, A., Latham, D.W., & Jerzykiewicz, M. 2007, *AcA*, 57, 301
- Molenda-Żakowicz, J., Kopacki, G., Stęślicki, M., & Narwid, A. 2009, *AcA*, 59, 193
- Pinsonneault, M.H., An, D., Molenda-Żakowicz, J., Chap-

- lin, W.J., Metcalfe, T.S., & Bruntt, H. 2012, ApJS 199, 30
- Prugniel, Ph., & Soubiran, C. 2001, A&A, 369, 1048
- Raskin, G., Van Winckel, H., Hensberge, H, et al. 2011, A&A, 526, 69
- Santos, N. C., Israelian, G., & Mayor, M. 2004, A&A, 415, 1153
- Seager, S. & Mallen-Ornelas, G. 2003, ApJ, 585, 1038
- Snedden, C. 1973, Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Texas
- Soubiran, C., Katz, D., & Cayrel, R. 1998, A&AS, 133, 221
- Soubiran, C., Le Campion J.-F., Cayrel de Strobel G., & Caillo A. 2010 A&A 515, A111
- Sousa, S.G., Santos, N.C., Israelian, G., Mayor, M., & Monteiro, M.J.P.F.G. 2006, A&A, 458, 873
- Sousa, S.G., Santos, N.C., Israelian, G., Mayor, M., & Monteiro, M.J.P.F.G. 2007, A&A, 469, 783
- Sousa, S.G., Santos, N.C., Israelian, G., Mayor, M., & Udry, S. 2011, A&A, 533, A141
- Sousa, S.G., Santos, N.C., Israelian, G., et al. 2011a, A&A, 526, A99
- Sousa, S.G., Santos, N.C., Israelian, G., Mayor, M., & Udry, S. 2011b, A&A, 533, A141
- Sousa, S.G., Santos, N.C., Mayor, M., Udry, S., Casagrande, L., Israelian, G., Pepe, F., Queloz, D., & Monteiro, M.J.P.F.G. 2008, A&A, 487, 373
- Stempels E. 2004, FIES Automatic Data Reduction Software, <http://www.not.iac.es/instruments/fies/fiestool/FIEStool-manual-1.0.pdf>
- Thygesen, A.O., Frandsen, S., Bruntt, H., Kallinger, T., Andersen, M.F., et al. 2012, A&A, 543, A160
- Torres, G., Fischer, D.A., Sozzetti, A., Buchhave, L.A., Winn, J.N., Holman, M.J., & Carter, J.A. 2012, ApJ, 757, 161
- Uytterhoeven, K., Szabo, R., Southworth, J., et al. 2010a, AN, 331, P30 (arXiv:1003.6089)
- Uytterhoeven, K., Briquet, M., Bruntt, H., et al. 2010b, AN, 331, 993

Table 2. The atmospheric parameters of the programme stars. In bold font, we indicate those stars for which the atmospheric parameters are derived for the first time.

KIC	T_{eff} [K]	σ	$\log g$ [cm s^{-2}]	ROTFIT			$v \sin i$ [km s^{-1}]	σ	MK	T_{eff} [K]	σ	$\log g$ [cm s^{-2}]	ARES+MOOG			ξ_t [km s^{-1}]	σ	Instrument
				[Fe/H]	σ	[Fe/H]							σ	[Fe/H]	σ			
1430163	6412	99	3.97	0.10	-0.25	0.11	8.1	0.9	F5IV	6833	87	4.70	0.11	0.02	0.06	2.12	0.10	NARVAL
1435467	6169	108	3.95	0.11	-0.04	0.12	9.0	1.0	F8IV	6485	92	4.53	0.13	0.08	0.07	2.02	0.09	NARVAL
2837475	6462	102	3.95	0.13	-0.06	0.11	18.3	1.0	F5IV-V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOnS
3335176	3225	110	1.23	1.24	-0.22	0.11	9.3	2.5	M7II	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FIES
3424541	6165	80	3.90	0.10	0.13	0.11	24.6	0.8	G0IV	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	NARVAL
3427720	5949	66	4.26	0.11	0.00	0.11	2.0	0.7	F9IV-V	6111	68	4.51	0.11	0.04	0.06	1.25	0.04	ESPaDOnS
3430868	4969	71	2.91	0.13	-0.01	0.10	2.6	0.4	G8III	5208	67	3.24	0.12	0.13	0.06	1.46	0.03	ESPaDOnS
3443483	4856	58	3.05	0.11	0.04	0.10	11.1	0.2	K1IV	5043	82	3.43	0.18	0.09	0.06	1.63	0.06	FIES
3456181	6290	84	3.94	0.10	-0.24	0.10	5.0	1.0	F5IV-V	6584	91	4.43	0.11	-0.02	0.07	2.01	0.11	NARVAL
3632418	6148	84	3.94	0.11	-0.19	0.11	6.3	0.5	F6IV	6409	74	4.43	0.12	-0.03	0.06	1.86	0.06	NARVAL
3643774	5928	63	4.26	0.12	0.17	0.11	1.4	1.4	G2IV	6125	75	4.39	0.12	0.25	0.06	1.39	0.05	HERMES
3644223	4918	59	3.11	0.16	-0.22	0.11	2.8	0.8	G8III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FRESCO
3656476	5586	80	4.07	0.11	0.20	0.10	1.4	0.4	G5IV	5719	64	4.26	0.11	0.28	0.05	1.11	0.03	ESPaDOnS
3733735	6548	138	3.99	0.12	-0.12	0.11	13.0	1.4	F5IV-V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOnS
3747220	6668	128	4.18	0.11	0.00	0.10	50.8	12.4	F3V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOnS
4072740	4847	60	3.08	0.14	0.09	0.10	1.6	0.3	K1IV	4960	77	3.49	0.13	0.19	0.06	1.13	0.06	NARVAL
4346201	6154	81	3.98	0.12	-0.25	0.11	2.8	1.0	F8V	6239	91	4.28	0.12	-0.17	0.07	1.64	0.10	HERMES
4586099	6304	81	3.92	0.10	-0.20	0.11	2.3	0.7	F5IV-V	6533	80	4.37	0.11	-0.04	0.06	1.84	0.08	ESPaDOnS
4638884	6286	100	3.91	0.10	-0.17	0.11	4.6	0.8	F5IV-V	6684	98	4.58	0.17	-0.05	0.08	3.39	0.28	NARVAL
4859338	6013	109	4.09	0.13	0.19	0.11	34.3	1.5	G0IV	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	HERMES
4914923	5808	56	4.28	0.10	0.13	0.10	2.3	0.8	G1.5V	5948	65	4.34	0.12	0.18	0.05	1.26	0.03	ESPaDOnS
4931363	7045	106	4.07	0.12	-0.05	0.11	65.9	8.0	F0III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOnS
4931390	6410	143	3.97	0.11	-0.25	0.11	3.2	1.2	F5IV-V	6862	80	4.55	0.11	-0.02	0.06	1.93	0.09	ESPaDOnS
5021689	6141	79	3.94	0.11	-0.16	0.12	7.0	0.6	F8IV	6378	80	4.55	0.13	-0.02	0.06	1.90	0.08	ESPaDOnS
5024851	4046	56	1.77	0.10	-0.18	0.10	1.9	0.7	K4III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOnS
5080290	5157	153	3.60	0.30	-0.06	0.12	4.6	0.9	K0III-IV	5072	77	3.31	0.16	-0.10	0.07	0.69	0.07	HERMES
...	5261	167	4.21	0.18	0.01	0.13	6.1	0.5	K0III-IV	5064	78	3.28	0.13	-0.14	0.06	0.79	0.06	ESPaDOnS
5112786	4207	57	1.99	0.11	-0.17	0.10	2.5	0.9	K3III	4477	114	2.21	0.22	-0.13	0.07	1.83	0.08	ESPaDOnS
5184732	5669	65	4.07	0.11	0.24	0.10	2.8	0.3	G4V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FRESCO
...	5723	73	4.18	0.14	0.21	0.10	2.2	0.6	G4V	5894	68	4.31	0.12	0.43	0.06	1.18	0.03	ESPaDOnS*
...	5740	89	4.22	0.12	0.18	0.10	2.4	0.5	G1V	5877	68	4.34	0.11	0.40	0.06	1.14	0.03	NARVAL*
5199859	3722	112	1.63	0.30	-0.07	0.11	10.8	1.3	M0III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FIES
5371516	6138	54	3.98	0.12	0.10	0.10	9.7	1.2	F8IV	6526	107	4.49	0.15	0.11	0.08	2.35	0.14	ESPaDOnS
5450445	6099	68	4.13	0.11	0.05	0.11	5.4	0.6	F8V	6396	75	4.49	0.11	0.23	0.06	1.75	0.06	NARVAL
5512589	5764	61	4.22	0.11	0.06	0.11	1.6	0.4	G3V	5812	66	4.05	0.11	0.12	0.06	1.20	0.03	NARVAL
5557932	5936	69	4.37	0.11	0.00	0.10	13.7	0.3	G1.5V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOnS
5596656	5375	86	3.99	0.16	-0.18	0.11	3.8	0.4	G5IV	5188	69	3.75	0.13	-0.44	0.06	1.05	0.05	ESPaDOnS
5620305	5190	129	3.49	0.26	-0.01	0.11	4.2	1.1	K0III-IV	5040	70	2.95	0.12	-0.01	0.06	0.51	0.05	HERMES
5701829	4927	74	3.19	0.12	-0.24	0.10	2.3	0.5	K0IV	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FRESCO
...	4914	56	3.18	0.12	-0.13	0.11	2.4	0.7	K0IV	4962	69	3.39	0.13	-0.17	0.06	1.13	0.04	ESPaDOnS
5737655	5163	71	2.88	0.17	-0.44	0.11	3.8	0.6	G4III-IV	5121	63	2.83	0.10	-0.56	0.05	1.68	0.02	ESPaDOnS
5773345	6007	86	4.17	0.11	0.13	0.10	3.4	1.1	G0.5IV	6399	71	4.36	0.11	0.30	0.06	1.92	0.05	ESPaDOnS

Table 1. continuation.

KIC	T_{eff} [K]	σ	$\log g$ [cm s^{-2}]	ROTFIT			$v \sin i$ [km s^{-1}]	σ	MK	T_{eff} [K]	σ	ARES+MOOG			ξ_t [km s^{-1}]	σ	Instrument	
				[Fe/H]	σ	$\log g$ [cm s^{-2}]						[Fe/H]	σ	$\log g$ [cm s^{-2}]				
5774694	5804	55	4.34	0.10	0.08	0.10	3.6	0.5	G2V	5923	65	4.56	0.10	0.10	0.05	1.17	0.03	ESPaDOmS*
...	5801	66	4.34	0.11	0.06	0.10	3.6	0.6	G3V	5950	64	4.58	0.10	0.09	0.05	1.19	0.03	NARVAL*
5952403	5058	77	2.99	0.19	0.01	0.10	13.6	0.1	G8III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FIES
5955122	5952	69	4.13	0.11	-0.05	0.12	4.5	0.6	F9IV-V	6092	69	4.26	0.12	-0.06	0.06	1.66	0.05	ESPaDOmS
6116048	5991	101	4.09	0.12	-0.24	0.13	2.9	0.6	F9IV-V	6152	66	4.53	0.10	-0.14	0.05	1.36	0.04	ESPaDOmS
6225718	6138	78	3.96	0.11	-0.23	0.12	2.4	0.5	F8V	6366	70	4.61	0.11	-0.07	0.06	1.50	0.05	NARVAL
6285677	5849	64	4.32	0.12	0.06	0.12	7.6	1.0	G2V	6205	73	4.48	0.11	0.23	0.06	1.48	0.05	HERMES
...	5907	60	4.18	0.11	0.02	0.10	7.8	0.9	G0.5IV	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FRESCO
6370489	6241	90	3.98	0.10	-0.35	0.11	4.4	0.8	F8V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FIES
6442183	5736	63	4.26	0.11	-0.07	0.11	1.7	0.5	G1V	5738	62	4.14	0.10	-0.12	0.05	1.15	0.02	NARVAL
6508366	6332	92	3.91	0.11	-0.07	0.11	18.0	1.0	F6IV	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOmS
6590668	4463	58	2.02	0.12	-0.22	0.10	4.0	1.1	K1III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FRESCO
6603624	5471	105	4.02	0.14	0.17	0.11	1.4	0.7	G8IV-V	5718	78	4.44	0.13	0.28	0.06	1.16	0.06	ESPaDOmS
6679371	6344	109	3.92	0.11	-0.10	0.11	11.0	1.0	F5IV-V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	NARVAL
6766118	4892	58	2.73	0.10	0.05	0.10	2.7	0.6	K0III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FRESCO
6933899	5837	65	4.21	0.12	0.04	0.10	2.0	0.6	G0.5IV	5921	65	4.12	0.11	0.04	0.06	1.29	0.03	NARVAL
7103006	6180	96	3.92	0.11	-0.07	0.12	8.9	0.6	F8V	6685	86	4.50	0.11	0.19	0.06	1.98	0.08	NARVAL
7206837	6142	85	4.05	0.11	0.05	0.11	6.7	0.5	F8IV	6573	80	4.61	0.11	0.22	0.06	1.93	0.06	NARVAL
7282890	6207	64	3.89	0.12	0.02	0.11	21.0	1.0	F6IV	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOmS
7510397	6120	64	3.94	0.11	-0.26	0.12	2.2	0.8	F6IV	6362	80	4.54	0.12	-0.08	0.06	1.66	0.07	ESPaDOmS
7529180	6470	106	4.03	0.11	-0.06	0.11	27.0	1.7	F5IV-V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	NARVAL
7662428	6143	64	4.03	0.11	0.10	0.10	9.3	0.8	F8V	6504	141	4.93	0.19	-0.09	0.10	1.58	0.22	ESPaDOmS
7668623	6159	76	3.94	0.11	-0.10	0.13	7.6	0.7	F8V	6580	112	4.56	0.15	0.03	0.08	2.54	0.21	ESPaDOmS
7680114	5799	55	4.25	0.11	0.08	0.10	1.4	0.8	G0V	5955	68	4.41	0.11	0.12	0.06	1.30	0.04	NARVAL
7730305	6060	74	4.25	0.12	0.09	0.11	12.6	1.1	F8V	6304	81	4.67	0.11	0.17	0.06	1.69	0.07	HERMES
...	6030	75	4.17	0.10	0.01	0.11	15.0	0.8	F8V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FRESCO
7747078	5994	87	4.04	0.13	-0.19	0.13	3.8	0.8	F9IV-V	6114	78	4.37	0.12	-0.11	0.06	1.65	0.07	ESPaDOmS
7799349	4954	57	3.33	0.12	0.14	0.10	1.1	0.4	K1IV	5175	84	3.81	0.15	0.24	0.07	1.31	0.07	NARVAL
7799575	3941	56	1.69	0.10	-0.17	0.10	2.2	0.7	K5III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOmS
7800289	6398	112	3.96	0.11	-0.17	0.10	18.6	1.1	F5IV	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	NARVAL
7871531	5498	92	4.31	0.10	-0.12	0.11	2.2	0.8	G5V	5461	67	4.40	0.12	-0.26	0.06	0.87	0.05	ESPaDOmS
7940546	6243	70	3.92	0.10	-0.25	0.10	6.6	0.8	F6IV	6427	82	4.52	0.12	-0.11	0.06	2.09	0.09	ESPaDOmS*
...	6226	94	3.94	0.10	-0.24	0.11	7.0	0.7	F6IV	6472	84	4.59	0.12	-0.11	0.06	2.32	0.12	NARVAL*
7970740	5354	84	4.36	0.11	-0.31	0.11	2.4	0.5	G9V	5287	68	4.49	0.11	-0.52	0.05	0.59	0.08	ESPaDOmS
7976303	6119	77	3.97	0.10	-0.38	0.10	3.1	0.5	F8V	6203	76	4.15	0.11	-0.41	0.06	1.62	0.07	ESPaDOmS
7985370	5836	73	4.39	0.11	0.02	0.11	16.4	0.3	G1.5V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	HERMES
...	5849	54	4.28	0.11	-0.10	0.11	17.3	0.4	G1.5V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FRESCO
8006161	5258	65	4.13	0.17	0.23	0.11	2.0	0.5	G8V	5431	82	4.45	0.13	0.30	0.06	0.95	0.10	ESPaDOmS*
...	5211	71	4.05	0.16	0.20	0.11	1.9	0.3	G8V	5468	77	4.41	0.13	0.29	0.06	1.07	0.07	NARVAL*
8026226	6276	60	3.90	0.10	-0.20	0.11	7.4	0.5	F5IV-V	6469	78	4.32	0.13	-0.13	0.06	2.72	0.18	ESPaDOmS
8179536	6160	86	3.98	0.11	-0.16	0.11	8.1	0.6	F6IV	6536	74	4.64	0.11	0.13	0.06	1.61	0.05	NARVAL

Table 1. continuation.

KIC	T_{eff} [K]	σ	$\log g$ [cm s^{-2}]	ROTFIT			$v \sin i$ [km s^{-1}]	σ	MK	T_{eff} [K]	σ	$\log g$ [cm s^{-2}]	ARES+MOOG			σ	ξ_t [km s^{-1}]	σ	Instrument
				[Fe/H]	σ	[Fe/H]							σ	[Fe/H]	σ				
8211551	4812	59	2.83	0.13	-0.12	0.10	1.9	0.5	G9III	4882	68	2.76	0.12	-0.15	0.06	1.54	0.03	ESPaDOmS*	
...	4820	59	2.83	0.12	-0.10	0.10	2.0	0.3	G9III	4887	70	2.69	0.13	-0.17	0.06	1.56	0.03	NARVAL*	
8228742	6061	80	4.02	0.12	-0.12	0.11	3.3	1.1	F9IV-V	6295	76	4.42	0.11	0.00	0.06	1.71	0.06	ESPaDOmS	
8343931	6506	102	4.09	0.12	-0.03	0.10	43.2	4.0	F5IV-V	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.87	0.15	ESPaDOmS	
8346342	6141	94	3.93	0.11	-0.05	0.12	6.9	0.8	F8IV	6573	139	4.59	0.12	0.21	0.10	—	—	ESPaDOmS	
8352528	3972	51	1.69	0.11	-0.18	0.10	2.2	0.9	K5III	—	—	—	—	—	—	3.45	0.37	ESPaDOmS	
8360349	6176	55	3.92	0.11	0.07	0.10	10.6	0.7	F8IV	6762	156	4.92	0.15	0.07	0.10	—	—	ESPaDOmS	
8367710	6227	90	3.92	0.10	0.02	0.11	15.0	1.1	F6IV	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOmS	
8379927	5998	80	4.25	0.11	-0.03	0.12	8.8	0.8	F9IV-V	6225	95	4.76	0.13	-0.23	0.07	2.01	0.13	ESPaDOmS*	
...	6000	86	4.12	0.12	-0.05	0.13	13.0	2.0	F9IV-V	6202	73	4.47	0.12	-0.20	0.06	0.95	0.05	NARVAL*	
8394589	6111	90	3.98	0.11	-0.37	0.11	4.4	0.8	F8V	6231	75	4.54	0.11	-0.24	0.06	1.36	0.07	NARVAL	
8429280	5029	73	4.35	0.10	-0.04	0.11	34.8	0.6	K2V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FRESKO	
...	5108	88	4.56	0.13	0.06	0.11	33.2	1.0	K1V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	HERMES	
8491147	5007	61	2.92	0.15	-0.24	0.11	2.5	0.6	G8III	5065	65	2.75	0.12	-0.31	0.06	1.57	0.02	ESPaDOmS	
8524425	5671	76	4.17	0.12	0.12	0.11	1.1	0.5	G2.5V	5664	65	4.09	0.11	0.13	0.05	1.16	0.03	NARVAL	
8542853	5594	68	4.34	0.10	-0.09	0.11	2.1	0.6	G6V	5580	68	4.54	0.12	-0.20	0.06	0.85	0.06	ESPaDOmS	
8547390	4732	53	2.80	0.11	-0.01	0.10	3.0	0.3	K0III	4870	74	2.86	0.15	0.12	0.06	1.60	0.04	ESPaDOmS	
8561221	5290	89	3.76	0.13	-0.04	0.10	1.9	0.6	G9.5IV	5352	68	3.80	0.11	-0.04	0.06	1.14	0.04	NARVAL	
8579578	6297	125	3.91	0.11	-0.06	0.11	19.3	1.0	F6IV	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	NARVAL	
8677933	5946	144	3.92	0.23	0.15	0.12	49.6	0.7	G0IV	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOmS	
8694723	6258	92	3.97	0.11	-0.42	0.11	4.6	1.0	G0IV	6445	80	4.55	0.11	-0.39	0.06	1.91	0.11	NARVAL	
...	6287	90	4.00	0.10	-0.38	0.12	3.8	0.7	G0V	6489	85	4.50	0.13	-0.35	0.06	1.98	0.13	FIES	
8702606	5621	78	4.08	0.11	0.00	0.11	0.7	0.7	G5IV-V	5578	62	3.89	0.10	-0.06	0.05	1.16	0.02	ESPaDOmS	
8738809	6039	74	4.19	0.11	0.07	0.11	2.2	0.9	G0.5IV	6207	68	4.17	0.11	0.12	0.06	1.65	0.03	NARVAL	
8751420	5281	89	3.86	0.16	-0.11	0.11	1.1	0.5	G8IV	5330	62	3.84	0.10	-0.14	0.05	1.07	0.02	NARVAL	
8760414	5850	149	3.94	0.19	-0.90	0.22	3.4	2.3	G0IV	5924	77	4.53	0.11	-1.00	0.06	1.38	0.11	NARVAL	
8816903	7063	122	4.12	0.10	-0.05	0.10	57.6	5.0	F0V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOmS	
8831759	3877	79	1.66	0.16	-0.11	0.10	2.4	0.7	MIII	4920	209	3.94	0.34	-0.14	0.10	3.65	0.58	ESPaDOmS	
8866102	6195	113	3.95	0.10	-0.16	0.11	11.0	0.8	F6IV	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOmS	
8938364	5702	70	4.25	0.11	-0.16	0.12	2.0	0.9	G3V	5808	71	4.31	0.12	-0.10	0.06	1.10	0.05	NARVAL	
9098294	5766	63	4.27	0.10	-0.22	0.12	2.6	0.6	G3V	5959	80	4.56	0.12	-0.04	0.06	1.13	0.07	NARVAL	
9116461	6358	80	3.95	0.10	-0.14	0.11	14.1	0.6	F5IV-V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOmS	
9139151	6004	60	4.26	0.10	0.07	0.10	3.2	0.5	G0.5IV	6213	67	4.64	0.11	0.17	0.06	1.24	0.04	ESPaDOmS	
9139163	6175	100	3.99	0.12	0.00	0.11	2.0	1.0	F8IV	6577	69	4.44	0.10	0.21	0.06	1.68	0.04	ESPaDOmS*	
...	6151	106	3.98	0.11	-0.05	0.12	1.9	0.8	F8IV	6584	67	4.47	0.11	0.19	0.05	1.70	0.03	NARVAL*	
9206432	6204	122	3.95	0.11	-0.02	0.12	1.7	1.2	F8IV	6772	73	4.61	0.11	0.28	0.06	1.92	0.05	ESPaDOmS	
9226926	6580	122	4.12	0.11	-0.15	0.12	30.8	3.0	F5V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	NARVAL	
9289275	5931	73	4.25	0.12	0.07	0.12	2.7	1.5	G0.5IV	6208	77	4.40	0.12	0.20	0.06	1.51	0.06	HERMES	
9414417	6242	74	3.92	0.10	-0.19	0.11	6.0	1.1	F6IV	6496	124	4.66	0.13	-0.07	0.09	2.55	0.26	HERMES	
9512063	5882	85	4.14	0.12	-0.19	0.16	2.5	1.3	F9IV-V	5842	72	3.87	0.11	-0.15	0.06	1.12	0.04	HERMES	
9514879	5971	57	4.31	0.11	0.02	0.10	10.1	0.3	G1.5V	6190	79	4.70	0.12	0.12	0.06	1.60	0.07	FIES	
9532030	4472	56	2.35	0.12	-0.11	0.10	3.6	0.5	G9III	4596	85	2.53	0.17	-0.06	0.06	1.74	0.06	ESPaDOmS	
9534041	5061	63	3.10	0.14	0.02	0.10	3.2	0.6	G8III	5278	72	3.28	0.12	-0.01	0.06	1.49	0.04	ESPaDOmS	

Table 1. continuation.

KIC	T_{eff} [K]	σ	$\log g$ [cm s^{-2}]	σ	ROTFIT			$v \sin i$ [km s^{-1}]	σ	MK	T_{eff} [K]	σ	$\log g$ [cm s^{-2}]	σ	ARES+MOOG			ξ_t [km s^{-1}]	σ	Instrument
					[Fe/H]	σ	[Fe/H]								[Fe/H]	σ	[Fe/H]			
11396108	6330	153	3.97	0.12	-0.03	0.11	20.1	1.9	F6IV	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FRESCO		
11414712	5731	58	4.16	0.11	0.02	0.10	2.3	0.9	G3V	5725	61	3.99	0.10	-0.02	0.05	1.27	0.01	NARVAL		
11495120	4864	54	2.70	0.10	-0.09	0.11	2.9	0.5	G8III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FRESCO		
11498538	6453	100	4.07	0.12	-0.01	0.10	33.2	1.3	F2V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOnS		
11551430	5649	121	4.01	0.12	-0.07	0.12	24.3	0.5	G5IV	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FRESCO		
11559263	5633	159	4.02	0.18	0.08	0.11	5.3	0.6	G5III	5284	66	3.03	0.11	-0.02	0.06	0.77	0.03	HERMES		
11708170	6872	101	4.21	0.12	-0.04	0.10	32.9	2.3	F1V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOnS		
11709006	5852	75	4.38	0.10	0.01	0.11	10.2	0.2	G1.5V	6047	79	4.66	0.11	0.05	0.06	1.40	0.07	HERMES		
11717120	5155	74	3.76	0.20	-0.17	0.11	3.76	0.3	G9.5IV	5118	67	3.80	0.12	-0.27	0.06	0.89	0.04	FIES		
...	5222	82	3.82	0.16	-0.17	0.10	1.1	0.4	G8IV	5137	65	3.87	0.12	-0.28	0.05	0.83	0.04	NARVAL		
11754082	4742	60	2.77	0.13	-0.10	0.10	11.5	2.7	G9III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	FRESCO		
11772920	5209	97	4.34	0.14	-0.07	0.10	1.4	0.8	K1V	5341	80	4.44	0.13	-0.10	0.06	0.73	0.10	HERMES		
12009504	6099	102	4.00	0.11	-0.14	0.12	5.9	0.7	F9IV-V	6267	71	4.37	0.11	-0.03	0.06	1.59	0.06	ESPaDOnS		
12155015	3937	55	1.68	0.11	-0.16	0.10	2.8	0.9	K5III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOnS		
12258514	5952	60	4.23	0.11	0.06	0.10	1.7	0.6	G0.5IV	6099	66	4.32	0.10	0.10	0.05	1.36	0.03	ESPaDOnS		
12453925	6514	135	4.14	0.12	-0.02	0.10	75.2	2.9	F3V	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	ESPaDOnS		
12455203	4919	59	2.89	0.12	-0.02	0.10	2.3	0.3	G8III	5104	69	3.14	0.13	0.07	0.06	1.49	0.03	ESPaDOnS		
12508433	5134	97	3.50	0.21	0.08	0.12	0.6	0.4	K0III-IV	5281	76	3.85	0.13	0.21	0.06	0.98	0.06	HERMES		

* We use an asterisk to indicate stars listed by Bruntt et al. (2012) or Thygesen et al. (2012) who do not provide the information whether they used the ESPaDOnS or the NARVAL spectrographs in their analysis.