

Absolute parameters of AE For – a highly active detached binary of late K type[★]

M. Rozyczka,^{1†} P. Pietrukowicz,² J. Kaluzny,¹ W. Pych,¹ R. Angeloni^{3,4}
and I. Dékány^{4,5}

¹Nicolaus Copernicus Astronomical Center, Bartycka 18, PL-00-716 Warszawa, Poland

²Warsaw University Observatory, Al. Ujazdowskie 4, PL-00-478 Warszawa, Poland

³Department of Electrical Engineering, Center for Astro-Engineering, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Av. Vicuña Mackenna 4860, Macul, Santiago, Chile

⁴Department de Astronomía y Astrofísica, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Av. Vicuña Mackenna 4860, Macul, Santiago, Chile

⁵The Milky Way Millennium Nucleus, Av. Vicuña Mackenna 4860, Macul, Santiago, Chile

Accepted 2012 November 21. Received 2012 November 20; in original form 2012 October 16

ABSTRACT

We present photometric and spectroscopic analysis of AE For – a detached eclipsing binary composed of two late K dwarfs. The masses of the components are found to be 0.6314 ± 0.0035 and $0.6197 \pm 0.0034 M_{\odot}$ and the radii to be 0.67 ± 0.03 and $0.63 \pm 0.03 R_{\odot}$ for primary and secondary component, respectively. Both components are significantly oversized compared to theoretical models, which we attribute to their high activity. They show H_{α} , H_{β} , H_{γ} , Ca H and Ca K in emission, and are heavily spotted, causing large variations of the light curve.

Key words: stars: activity – binaries: eclipsing – stars: fundamental parameters – stars: individual: AE For.

1 INTRODUCTION

The 10th magnitude star AE For was first classified by Stephenson (1986) as a K4 dwarf. In the *Hipparcos* catalogue (ESA 1997), it was listed as a new eclipsing variable of Algol type with a period of 0.918 235(8) d and a parallax of 32.10 ± 1.78 mas. The latter was revised in 2007 to the presently adopted 31.8 ± 1.96 mas (van Leeuwen 2007), corresponding to 31.5 ± 1.9 pc.

Gizis, Reid & Hawley (2002) found the star to be a double-lined binary with Balmer lines in emission. Emission in Balmer and Ca II H & K lines was also observed by Gray et al. (2006), who estimated the spectral type of AE For at K9 Ve, and classified it as a very active system. A slightly earlier spectral type (K7 Ve) was assigned to AE For by Torres et al. (2006), who also noted its high activity. According to Zasche, Svoboda & Uhlář (2012; hereafter ZSU), the system contains a brown dwarf with a minimal mass of $\sim 47 M_{\text{Jup}}$ on an eccentric orbit of ~ 7 yr.

In the solar neighbourhood about 7 per cent of detached eclipsing binaries are X-ray emitters (Szczygieł et al. 2008). With its $L_X = 9.4 \times 10^{29} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ (Huensch et al. 1999) and $F_X/F_{\text{opt}} = 0.01$ (Fischer et al. 1999), AE For is a prominent member of this group. In the catalogue of Szczygieł et al. (2008) it is one of the closest X-ray active binaries, whose L_X/L_{opt} ratio reaches 0.01 (Fischer et al. 1999). An X-ray flaring activity of the system was reported

by Fuhrmeister & Schmitt (2003). It is also a bright infrared (IR) source, with Two Micron All Sky Survey (2MASS) magnitudes $J = 7.52$, $H = 6.85$ and $K = 6.66$.

For about a decade it has been known that active dwarfs of K and M type tend to be larger and cooler than the theory predicts. While possible solutions of this problem have been proposed (see e.g. Morales, Ribas & Jordi 2008, and references therein), it is certainly worthwhile to enlarge the relevant observational data bases. The best opportunity for this is offered by detached binaries on the lower main sequence, which allow us to determine masses and radii of their components with an accuracy better than 1 per cent. AE For is clearly one of such systems, however, until very recently neither the light curve nor the velocity curve of this potentially interesting binary has been studied. A preliminary light-curve solution has been derived by ZSU, who concluded that a spectroscopic analysis was needed to confirm the physical parameters of the components to a higher accuracy.

In this paper, we obtain and analyse the velocity curve of AE For and refine the photometric solution of ZSU based on additional observations. The photometric and spectroscopic data are described in Sections 2 and 3. The analysis of the data is detailed in Section 4 and their results are discussed in Section 5.

2 PHOTOMETRIC OBSERVATIONS

The observational material consists of our own *BV* data and *BVR* data of ZSU (see Table 1 for details). Our data were collected during 11 nights between 2009 December 8 and 9, and 18 and 19 with the

[★]Based in part on data obtained at the Las Campanas Observatory.

[†]E-mail: mnrc@camk.edu.pl

Table 1. List of light curves used in this paper for photometric solutions of AE For.

1 st day (HJD-240 0000)	Last day	Filter	Number of data points	Ref.
551 74	551 84	Johnson <i>B</i>	160	1
551 74	551 84	Johnson <i>V</i>	482	1
555 68	555 78	Johnson <i>B</i>	173	2
555 68	555 78	Johnson <i>V</i>	175	2
555 68	555 78	Cousins <i>R</i>	173	2

1: Our own data; 2: ZSU.

1-m Swope telescope at Las Campanas Observatory (LCO), Chile. All the nights were clear, with the seeing between 1.1 and 2.5 arcsec. AE For was monitored with the 2048×3150 pixel SITe3 CCD camera at a scale of $0.435 \text{ arcsec pixel}^{-1}$. We collected 482 frames through the *V* filter with exposure times 5–10 s (depending on the seeing) and 160 frames in the *B* filter with exposure times 8–25 s. All images were debiased and flat-fielded within the IRAF.¹


For photometric measurements the DAOPHOT package (Stetson 1987) was employed, and differential aperture photometry was extracted using two stars in the vicinity of AE For. On every night AE For was observed we also observed NGC 2204. For six red clump stars of the latter we found the offset between instrumental magnitudes and the standard *BV* magnitudes determined by Rozyczka et al. (2007). Using that offset together with the average extinction for LCO ($k_V = 0.14$ and $k_B = 0.24$; see Mininti, Claria & Gomez 1989), and accounting for a 0.04 difference in airmass between AE For and NGC 2204, we transformed the instrumental light curves of the variable to the standard *BV* system. Colour terms of the transformation were accounted for. We estimate the error of this transformation at $\pm 0.02 \text{ mag}$, its main source being the uncertainty of the zero-point for NGC 2204. The formal error of the differential photometry is about 10 times smaller.

The last three rows in Table 1 refer to *BVR* measurements performed by ZSU in 2011 January at the South African Astronomical Observatory, (their data are accessible online at <http://vizier.cfa.harvard.edu/viz-bin/VizieR?-source=J/A+A/537/A109>). Also accessible online were *Hipparcos* (ESA 1997), ASAS (Pojmanski 2002) and Pi of the Sky (Burd et al. 2005) light curves. However, their quality was too poor to use them for photometric solutions.

Based on almost 70 primary and secondary minima observed by various authors, ZSU derived the following ephemeris of AE For:

$$\text{HJD}_{\min} = 245\,2605.970\,70(35) + 0.918\,209\,43(12) \times E. \quad (1)$$

The final light curves obtained from the data collected at LCO and phased with this ephemeris are shown in Fig. 1. Evident is a strong asymmetry, which we attribute to the activity of the system, manifesting itself by large spot(s) on at least one of the components (see also Sections 3 and 4). For the short flat part of the *V* curve which begins right after the secondary eclipse (see Fig. 1) we obtained $V = 10.27 \pm 0.02 \text{ mag}$. To within the errors, our $(B - V)$ index was constant throughout the orbital period, and equal to $1.35 \pm 0.03 \text{ mag}$. For the same part of the light curve the online data of ZSU yield $V = 10.23 \pm 0.01 \text{ mag}$ and $(B - V) = 1.34 \pm 0.02 \text{ mag}$. Marginal differences between our results and theirs may be due to the spot-related variability of at least one component of AE For.

**Figure 1.** Light curves of AE For obtained in 2009 December at LCO. To save the plotting space the *B* curve is shifted upward by 1 mag.

3 SPECTROSCOPIC OBSERVATIONS

The spectroscopic data were collected with the echelle spectrograph on the 2.5-m Irénée du Pont telescope at LCO. The spectrograph, equipped with the SITe2K CCD camera, was working at a slit width of 1.0 arcsec, providing a resolution of $\sim 45\,000$. The observations were performed in two runs: four nights from 2009 November 23 and 24 to November 26 and 27 and five nights from 2010 December 19 and 20 to December 23 and 24. All the nights were clear but half of one night was with thin cirrus clouds. For most (~ 90 per cent) exposures the airmass was smaller than 1.4. During the observations pairs of 480-s exposures of the scientific target were made, interlaced with a 90-s exposure of a ThAr lamp spectrum.

The observations were reduced within the IRAF ECHELLE package. After bias and flat-field correction, each pair of the frames was combined into a single frame, allowing for the rejection of cosmic ray hits. Altogether, 31 reduced spectra were obtained, extending from ~ 4000 to $\sim 7000 \text{ Å}$. All of them showed strong Balmer emission lines, and in nearly all of them the Na I doublet at 5890 and 5896 Å was blended into a very broad ($\sim 15 \text{ Å}$, or $\sim 760 \text{ km s}^{-1}$) absorption feature.

Radial velocities were measured using an implementation of the broadening function (BF) formalism (Rucinski 2002) described by Kaluzny et al. (2006).² Since including emission lines or broad absorption features would decrease the accuracy of velocity measurements, a wavelength range devoid of such features had to be selected. Shortward of H_γ the spectra were too noisy, so that our choice was reduced to four segments limited by H_γ , H_β , Na I doublet, H_α and O₂ b band. We chose the segment between H_β and Na I doublet, extending from 4870 to 5845 Å . It was the longest one of the four, and the only one in which the mean signal-to-noise ratio was larger than 20 for all the spectra. The solar-scaled synthetic spectrum for $T = 4000 \text{ K}$ and $\log g = 5.0$ from the library of Coelho et al. (2005) served as a template.


The observed velocity curve was fitted with a non-linear least-squares solution, using a spectroscopic data solver written and kindly provided by Guillermo Torres. To within observational errors, secondary minima are separated from the primary ones by half the period. Because of that, a circular orbit was assumed, and the eccentricity e was fixed at 0 (the same assumption was adopted by ZSU). The resulting barycentric radial velocities are listed in Table 2 and plotted in the upper panel of Fig. 2 together with the

¹ IRAF is distributed by the National Optical Astronomy Observatories, which are operated by the AURA, Inc., under cooperative agreement with the NSF.

² The software package used in this paper is freely accessible at <http://users.camk.edu.pl/psych/BF/>

Table 2. Barycentric radial velocities of AE For phased according to the ephemeris given by equation (1).

HJD-245 5000	v_p (km s ⁻¹)	v_s (km s ⁻¹)	Phase
159.572 13	9.88	110.40	0.066 44
159.638 62	-28.91	148.95	0.138 85
159.707 75	-52.93	177.94	0.214 14
159.773 89	-53.68	175.07	0.286 17
159.784 16	-51.58	173.19	0.297 36
160.526 30	-14.47	134.61	0.105 60
160.629 88	-53.98	175.83	0.218 41
160.646 99	-56.77	179.20	0.237 04
160.671 58	-57.13	179.58	0.263 82
160.755 99	-30.58	151.97	0.355 75
161.617 38	-52.80	174.11	0.293 87
161.734 43	3.17	117.71	0.421 35
162.532 78	-53.57	174.34	0.290 81
162.549 66	-49.00	170.00	0.309 20
162.607 57	-24.52	145.63	0.372 27
162.641 29	-5.39	126.63	0.408 99
162.812 41	126.34	-7.49	-0.404 65
162.829 22	138.43	-20.31	-0.386 34
550.555 38	143.22	-24.08	-0.123 03
550.572 83	129.29	-10.95	-0.104 02
550.580 45	124.95	-6.27	-0.095 73
551.736 01	-38.74	161.16	0.162 77
551.754 27	-47.05	168.90	0.182 65
552.688 21	-50.75	173.13	0.199 79
552.703 36	-54.04	175.98	0.216 29
552.718 58	-56.71	178.77	0.232 86
553.597 37	-49.76	170.50	0.189 93
553.675 00	-54.54	177.94	0.274 48
553.732 76	-39.80	162.90	0.337 38
554.615 05	-50.65	172.56	0.298 27
554.672 43	-27.41	150.57	0.360 76

**Figure 2.** Velocity curve of AE For based on the data contained in Table 2. The rms residual velocity calculated from all (i.e. primary's and secondary's) residual shown in the bottom panel is equal to 1.13 km s⁻¹. Phase 0 corresponds to the centre of the primary photometric minimum.

fitted velocity curve. The mean error of velocity measurement, estimated from the residual velocities shown in the bottom panel of Fig. 2, is ± 1.13 km s⁻¹. Its rather large value may result from line blending and/or asymmetries (the latter being caused by large spots; see also Sections 2 and 4). We repeated the measurements using a synthetic spectrum for $T = 4250$ K to find that the changes in the observed velocities were much smaller than the scatter of points around the fit. We also tried out the remaining three wavelength

Table 3. Orbital parameters.

Parameter	Unit	Value
γ	km s ⁻¹	59.95 ± 0.23
K_p	km s ⁻¹	116.92 ± 0.33
K_s	km s ⁻¹	119.12 ± 0.33
e		0.0 ^a
σ_p	km s ⁻¹	1.08
σ_s	km s ⁻¹	1.18
Derived quantities:		
$A \sin i$	R_\odot	4.2820 ± 0.0069
$M_p \sin^3 i$	M_\odot	0.6314 ± 0.0034
$M_s \sin^3 i$	M_\odot	0.6197 ± 0.0033

^a Assumed in fit.

ranges, however, in all cases the fit had a lower quality (i.e. the residual velocities were larger).

The derived orbital parameters are listed in Table 3 together with formal 1σ errors returned by the fitting routine. Note that, despite the rather large residual velocities, the solution is fairly accurate – relative errors in $M \sin^3 i$ and $A \sin i$ amount to 0.5 and 0.15 per cent, respectively.

4 LIGHT CURVE ANALYSIS AND SYSTEM PARAMETERS

The analysis of the light curves was performed with the PHOEBE implementation (Prša & Zwitter 2005) of the Wilson–Devinney (WD) model (Wilson & Devinney 1971; Wilson 1979). The PHOEBE/WD package utilizes the Roche geometry to approximate the shapes of the stars, uses Kurucz model atmospheres, treats reflection effects in detail, and, most importantly, allows for the simultaneous analysis of B and V data. Appropriately for stars with convective envelopes, we adopted gravity darkening coefficients $g_p = g_s = 0.32$ and bolometric albedos $A_p = A_s = 0.5$. The effects of reflection were included, and a logarithmic limb darkening based on tables by van Hamme (1993) was used as implemented in PHOEBE 031a. Following ZSU, full synchronization of both components was assumed.

ZSU fitted the light curves of AE For with the help of the program ROCHE (Pribulla 2004). Keeping in mind that their ROCHE and PHOEBE fits of GK Boo were markedly different (although not at a statistically significant level), we decided to check if our photometric solution of AE For will be compatible with theirs. We fed their photometric data into PHOEBE, and iterated upon inclination i , secondary's temperature T_s , primary's radius R_p and secondary's radius R_s , using values obtained by ZSU as initial values. The mass ratio q was fixed at a value of 0.985 22 calculated from Table 3, and the orbital separation A – at $4.289\,96\,R_\odot$ obtained from $A \sin i$ in Table 3 for the inclination $i = 85^\circ.51$ found by ZSU. Following ZSU, we kept the temperature of the primary T_p fixed at 4100 K. To within the errors, this value agrees with 4055 ± 71 K resulting from the $T_{\text{eff}} - (B - V)$ calibration of Ramirez & Melendez (2005), and marginally agrees with 4005 ± 92 K resulting from the analogous calibration of Worthey & Lee (2011). The latter two values, however, should be treated with some caution, since AE For emits most energy in the near-IR range beyond B and V passbands, at 2MASS magnitudes $J = 7.52$, $H = 6.85$ and $K = 6.66$. An IR calibration would be more appropriate; unfortunately we have not found any such relation extending up to $(J - K) = 0.86$. The problem of the temperature is further discussed in Section 5.

Table 4. Photometric parameters derived from ZSU data. The lower bounds for component masses derived from the orbital solutions are 0.6314 ± 0.0034 and $0.6197 \pm 0.0033 M_{\odot}$, respectively, for the primary and the secondary.

Parameter	Unit	Original ZSU	Our fit	Our fit with spots	Dark pole
1	2	3	4	5	6
i	deg	86.51(31)	86.84	86.71	85.47
T_s	K	4065(48)	4083	4052	4041
R_p	R_{\odot}	0.66(10)	0.71	0.71	0.661
R_s	R_{\odot}	0.52(8)	0.53	0.52	0.605
$(L_p)_V$	per cent	63.1(1.2)	65.4	66.8	57.2
$(L_p)_B$	per cent	63.2(1.3)	65.6	67.3	57.9
σ_V	mmag	17	13	12	13




Figure 3. Residuals of fits listed in columns 3–5 of Table 4. Top: original ZSU, middle: PHOEBE-iterated starting from ZSU parameters, bottom: same as middle, but with spots added on both components (see the text for details).

The results of fitting are listed in columns 3 and 4 of Table 4. Column 3 contains the original values obtained by ZSU together with their errors. The corresponding synthetic light curves produced by PHOEBE without any iterations turned out to be fairly well fitted, with a standard deviation of V residuals equal to 17 mmag (similar values were obtained for B and R bands). The iterations improved the quality of the fit (σ_V was reduced to 13 mmag), but the parameters did not change in a statistically significant way (column 4). We performed an additional iteration with the following spots introduced on both components at a latitude of 90° (i.e. at the equator in PHOEBE's convention): one on the primary at a longitude of 180° with a radius of 20° and temperature factor of 0.98; two on the secondary at longitudes $= 125^\circ$ and 330° , both of them with a radius of 30° and temperature factor of 1.02. The residuals became more symmetric (see Fig. 3) and σ_V was reduced to 12 mmag, but no statistically significant corrections to system parameters were obtained (column 5 of Table 4). We note that by ‘spot’ we mean a fairly large region on the surface of a star, whose mean temperature is elevated or reduced due to an excess of genuine stellar spots with much smaller sizes.

For the assumed $M_s = 0.5 M_{\odot}$, ZSU derived $R_s = 0.52 R_{\odot}$ and our PHOEBE iterations confirmed this result. However, while a radius of $0.52 R_{\odot}$ may be compatible with the mass of $M_s = 0.5 M_{\odot}$ assumed by ZSU, it is excluded by our spectroscopic solution, in which $M_s > 0.6 M_{\odot}$. This is because within a broad range of metallicity ($-0.5 \leq [\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \leq 0.5$) and α enhancement ($-0.2 \leq [\alpha/\text{Fe}] \leq 0.4$) a main-sequence star with $M = 0.6 M_{\odot}$ never becomes that small (see Dotter et al. 2008, and the DSED evolutionary tracks at

<http://stellar.dartmouth.edu/models/index.htm>). Another argument in favour of a larger secondary is based on rotational velocity fits which are performed automatically within the BF formalism during radial velocity measurements. Upon averaging velocities fitted in 2009 and 2010 we got $v_{\text{rot},s} = 37.46 \pm 2.40 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ for the primary and $v_{\text{rot},s} = 37.07 \pm 2.20 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ for the secondary. For the assumed synchronous rotation these values imply $R_p = 0.680 \pm 0.044 R_{\odot}$ and $R_s = 0.673 \pm 0.040 R_{\odot}$.

The simplest way to remove this contradiction is to force a smaller inclination i : one may expect that R_s will then increase, so that depths and widths of the minima are preserved. This may be achieved, for example, by placing a dark spot around the uneclipsed pole of the primary. We performed an experiment, in which the circumpolar region of the primary with a radius of 50° had a temperature factor of 0.95. As shown in column 6 of Table 4, the iterations yielded a solution with i smaller by more than 1° and R_s larger by almost $0.1 R_{\odot}$ compared to the model without a darkened pole.

At this point, we faced the problem whether to include clearly unphysical solutions in final estimates of system parameters, and we decided to reject them. Apparently, ZSU collected their data when the system was in a particular state making the analysis very uncertain, and to remain on the safe side we calculated the parameters of AE For based on our photometry only.

Photometric solutions based on our own data are listed in Table 5. Four models are shown, identified by the numbers of hot (h) and cold (c) spots on the primary (p) and the secondary (s). In each spotted model there are three spots centred at a latitude of 90° . The remaining parameters of the spots are listed in Table 6. The fit without spots (P0S0) is poor, as indicated by a large σ_V . Its low quality is clearly seen in Fig. 4, in which the residuals show systematic deviations with an amplitude exceeding 40 mmag. Introducing spots makes the fit nearly ideal. Not surprisingly, however, Table 5 shows that different spot arrangements result in different system parameters. The encouraging finding is that for all models (even for the unspotted

Table 5. Photometric parameters derived from our data.

Parameter	Unit	P0	P0	P1h	P1c	Mean
1	2	S0	S1h2c	S2c	S1h1c	cols 4–6
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
i	deg	85.72	85.75	85.51	85.43	85.6 ± 0.2
T_s	K	4016	4055	4061	4050	4055 ± 6
R_p	R_{\odot}	0.705	0.694	0.665	0.650	0.67 ± 0.03
R_s	R_{\odot}	0.603	0.607	0.640	0.654	0.63 ± 0.03
$(L_p)_V$	per cent	61.6	58.8	53.8	52.1	54.9 ± 4.4
$(L_p)_B$	per cent	62.5	59.4	54.2	52.7	55.4 ± 4.4
σ_V	mmag	20.1	7.0	6.5	6.5	–

Table 6. Parameters of spots for models from Table 5.

Model	Component	Latitude	Radius	Temp. factor
P0S1h2c	S	60	40	0.99
	S	100	30	1.02
	S	230	30	0.95
P1hS2c	P	280	30	1.02
	S	60	40	0.99
P1cS1h1c	S	230	30	0.95
	P	240	40	0.99
	S	100	30	1.02
	S	230	30	0.95




Figure 4. Residuals of fits listed in columns 3 and 4 of Table 5. Top: model POS0 (without spots); bottom: model POS1h2c (three spots on the secondary; see Table 6 for details).

Table 7. Absolute parameters of AE For.

Parameter	Unit	Value
A	R_{\odot}	4.2820 ± 0.0069
i	deg	85.6 ± 0.2^a
e		0^b
M_p	M_{\odot}	0.6314 ± 0.0035
M_s	M_{\odot}	0.6197 ± 0.0034
R_p	R_{\odot}	0.67 ± 0.03^a
R_s	R_{\odot}	0.63 ± 0.03^a
T_p	K	4100^b
T_s	K	4055 ± 6^a
M_p^{bol}	mag	7.15 ± 0.09^a
M_s^{bol}	mag	7.32 ± 0.11^a

^aApproximate errors due to spots (see the text).

^bAssumed in fit.

one) the inclination angle is by about 1° smaller than that obtained from ZSU data, and the radius of the secondary is consistently larger than $0.6 R_{\odot}$. The last column of Table 5 contains averaged values of spotted model parameters together with formally calculated errors. Since the distribution of spot-dependent model parameters is most probably non-Gaussian, these errors should be treated with caution, and we give them only to approximately illustrate the uncertainties resulting from the non-existence of a unique configuration of spots.

Independent of their spot-related uncertainty, the models have Gaussian errors related to non-zero residuals, which we estimated using a Monte Carlo procedure written in PHOEBE scripter. Briefly, the procedure replaces the observed light curves B_{obs} and V_{obs} with the fitted ones B_f and V_f , generates 20 000 Gaussian perturbations δB_f and δV_f such that the standard deviation of each of them is equal to the standard deviation of the residuals $B_f - B_{\text{obs}}$ or $V_f - V_{\text{obs}}$, and for each perturbation performs PHOEBE iterations on $V_f + \delta V_f$ and $B_f + \delta B_f$. In all cases the Gaussian errors turned out to be much smaller than the formal errors of averaged parameters given in column 7 of Table 5.

The final absolute parameters of AE For are given in Table 7 (bolometric magnitudes in the last two rows are averages of the values taken directly from PHOEBE output). The errors of A , M_p and M_s include the inclination uncertainty. As we explained above, the errors of the remaining parameters are but an approximate illustration of the uncertainties related to the presence of spots.

5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The fits described in Section 4 indicate that an unavoidable consequence of spot activity is the degradation of the photometric




Figure 5. Location of our final solution in the $(M-R)$ plane. Solid line: main sequence represented by the 1 Gyr Dartmouth isochrone for solar abundances.

solution: based on the available data, the radii of the components cannot be calculated with an accuracy better than ~ 5 per cent. As we have shown in Section 4, the asymmetric and highly variable light curve of AE For can even generate non-physical solutions in which one of the stars is unrealistically small. The only way to improve the accuracy of system parameters is via collecting more photometric data from various seasons and careful fitting of each light curve with various arrangements of spots (see e.g. Rozyczka et al. 2009). Alternatively, many light curves from various seasons might be averaged in hope that the mean curve would be free from spot-caused irregularities.

Another potential source of uncertainties in our final parameters is the effective temperature of the primary, which we fixed at 4100 K (i.e. a value adopted by ZSU). Luckily, the temperature only weakly affects i , R_s and R_p – we checked that they all change by less than 0.2 per cent for a ± 150 K change in T_p . It is thus possible to compare the derived radii with stellar models, and such a comparison with the synthetic main sequence represented by the 1 Gyr Dartmouth isochrone for $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = 0.0$ and $[\alpha/\text{Fe}] = 0.0$ is shown in Fig. 5. Each component of AE For is clearly oversized versus a main-sequence star of the same mass. This conclusion holds for a broad range of chemical composition parameters ($-0.5 \leq [\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \leq 0.5$; $-0.2 \leq [\alpha/\text{Fe}] \leq 0.4$).

While active components of eclipsing binaries appear to be larger and cooler than inactive single stars of the same mass, they have a similar luminosity (Morales et al. 2008). To check if this holds for our binary, we calculated absolute magnitudes of the components in V band from the observed magnitude and parallax of the system, using the contribution of the primary to the total light from Table 7. The location of the components in the $(M-M_V)$ plane is shown in Fig. 6 together with the main sequence represented as before by the 1 Gyr Dartmouth isochrone for solar abundances. As one can see, to within the errors both stars do indeed belong to the main sequence. In the following, we assume that they have main-sequence luminosities, and based on that assumption we estimate their temperatures.

Fig. 7 indicates that the solution with $T_p = 4100$ K is significantly too luminous. Only at $T_p = 3900$ K (for which $T_s = 3860$ K) do both stars align with the main sequence, suggesting that the temperature assumed by ZSU and the temperatures derived from the calibrations of Ramirez & Melendez (2005) and Worthey & Lee (2011) are overestimated. Of course, this finding should be verified, preferably by using disentangling software (see e.g. Hadrava 2009). Further spectroscopic observations are needed for that purpose,




Figure 6. Location of AE For components in the $(M-M_V)$ plane. The magnitudes are derived from the observational data. Solid line: the same isochrone as in Fig. 5.




Figure 7. Location of our solutions in the $(M-L)$ plane. Models with $T_p = 4100$ and 3900 K are identified by filled and open circles, respectively. Solid line: the same isochrone as in Fig. 5.

collected during low-activity periods. When the system is active, all temperature estimates, whether based on spectral fitting or photometric calibrations, are likely to be flawed because of large spotted areas present on both components.

We have thus proved the consistency of the assumption that the components of AE For are main-sequence stars. However, given the large errors of M_V , a possibility that they have not yet settled on the main sequence should also be explored. If they were indeed in the contraction phase, their large sizes could be at least partly caused by evolutionary effects. Such a possibility is indicated by the Li 6708 Å line identified in the spectrum of AE For by Torres et al. (2006). With an equivalent width of 80 mÅ it falls right in the middle of the range observed for Pleiades members with the same $(V-D)$, suggesting that the system is rather young. Unfortunately, our efforts to repeat the measurement of Torres et al. (2006) were unsuccessful. We do not claim that the line is not there: our spectra may be too noisy, or the broadening is too strong, or both. It is worth mentioning, however, that based on kinematic criteria, Eggen (1990) assigned AE For to the Hyades supercluster whose age is estimated at ~ 0.6 Gyr (Montes et al. 2001). If this assignment is correct, then both components of the binary must have ended their pre-main-sequence evolutionary phase long ago. Again, high-quality spectra, collected preferably during eclipses, are needed to resolve the Lithium (and age) problem.

Yet another explanation for the oversized components involves the third body discovered by ZSU. In a triple system consisting of a binary orbited by a distant companion both the eccentricity of the

binary e_b and the inclination of the third body's orbit execute periodic Kozai oscillations. If at some phase of the oscillation cycle e_b becomes sufficiently large for tidal friction to dissipate the orbital energy of the binary, then the binary gradually tightens its orbit (see e.g. Fabrycky & Tremaine 2007, and references therein). The associated tidal heating could temporarily inflate the components; however, since nearly all close binaries are members of triple systems (Tokovinin et al. 2006), and the inflation effect is limited to low-mass stars of K and M type (Morales et al. 2008), we consider this explanation much less likely than the remaining two (especially than that related to stellar activity).

The above discussion indicates that AE For is a truly interesting object which clearly deserves closer attention. A systematic study of this system would certainly bring valuable information concerning the activity of late-type stars.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to the anonymous referee for the detailed and helpful report. Support for RA is provided by Proyecto GEMINI CONICYT #32100022 and via a Postdoctoral Fellowship by the School of Engineering at Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. Support for ID is provided by the Chilean Ministry for the Economy, Development and Tourism's Programa Inicativa Científica Milenio through grant P07-021-F, awarded to The Milky Way Millennium Nucleus and by Proyecto FONDECYT Regular #1110326. We thank Guillermo Torres for providing the spectroscopic data solver. This research has made use of the SIMBAD data base, operated at CDS, Strasbourg, France.

REFERENCES

- Burd A. et al., 2005, *New Astron.*, 10, 409
- Coelho P., Barbuy B. J., Meléndez J., Schiavon R. P., Castilho B. V., 2005, *A&A*, 443, 735
- Dotter A., Chaboyer B., Jevremović D., Kostov V., Baron E., Ferguson J. W., 2008, *ApJS*, 178, 89
- Eggen O. J., 1990, *PASP*, 102, 166
- ESA, 1997, in Battrock B., ed., *ESA SP-1200: The Hipparcos and Tycho Catalogues*. ESA, Noordwijk
- Fabrycky D., Tremaine S., 2007, *ApJ*, 669, 1298
- Fischer J.-U., Hasinger G., Schwope A. D., Brunner H., Boller T., Trümper J., Voges W., Neizvestnyj S., 1998, *Astron. Nachr.*, 319, 347
- Fuhrmeister B., Schmitt J. H. M. M., 2003, *A&A*, 403, 247
- Gizis J. E., Reid I. N., Hawley S. L., 2002, *AJ*, 123, 3356
- Gray R. O., Corbally C. J., Garrison R. F., McFadden M. T., Bubar E. J., McGahee C. E., O'Donoghue A. A., Knox E. R., 2006, *AJ*, 132, 161
- Hadrava P., 2009, *A&A*, 494, 399
- Huensch M., Schmidt J. H. M. M., Sterzik F. F., Voges W., 1999, *A&AS*, 135, 319
- Kaluzny J., Pych W., Rucinski S. M., Thompson I. B., 2006, *Acta Astron.*, 56, 237
- Minniti D., Claria J. J., Gomez M. N., 1989, *Ap&SS*, 158, 9
- Montes D., López-Santiago J., Gálvez M. C., Fernández-Figueroa M. J., De Castro E., Cornide M., 2001, *MNRAS*, 328, 45
- Morales J. C., Ribas I., Jordi C., 2008, *A&A*, 478, 507
- Pojmanski G., 2002, *Acta Astron.*, 52, 397
- Pribulla T., 2004, in Hilditch R. W., Hensberge H., Pavlovski K., eds, *ASP Conf. Ser. Vol. 318, Spectroscopically and Spatially Resolving the Components of the Close Binary Stars*. Astron. Soc. Pac., San Francisco, p. 117
- Prša A., Zwitter T., 2005, *ApJ*, 628, 426
- Ramírez I., Meléndez J., 2005, *ApJ*, 626, 465
- Rozyczka M., Kaluzny J., Krzemiński W., Mazur B., 2007, *Acta Astron.*, 57, 323

- Rozyczka M., Kaluzny J., Pietrukowicz P., Pych W., Mazur B., Catelan M., Thompson I. B., 2009, *Acta Astron.*, 59, 385
- Rucinski S. M., 2002, *AJ*, 124, 1746
- Stephenson C. B., 1986, *AJ*, 92, 139
- Stetson P. B., 1987, *PASP*, 99, 191
- Szczygieł D. M., Socrates A., Paczyński B., Pojmanski G., Pilecki B., 2008, *Acta Astron.*, 58, 405
- Tokovinin A., Thomas S., Sterzik M., Udry S., 2006, *A&A*, 450, 681
- Torres C. A. O., Quast G. R., da Silva L., de La Reza R., Melo C. H. F., Sterzik M., 2006, *A&A*, 460, 695
- van Hamme W., 1993, *AJ*, 106, 2096
- van Leeuwen F., 2007, *Hipparcos, the New Reduction of the Raw Data*, ASSL 350, Springer-Verlag, Berlin
- Wilson R. E., 1971, *ApJ*, 234, 1054
- Wilson R. E., Devinney E. J., 1971, *AJ*, 166, 605
- Worthey G., Lee H-C., 1971, *AJ*, 166, 605
- Zasche P., Svoboda P., Uhlář R., 2012, *A&A*, 537, A109 (ZSU)

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

Table 8. The *B* light curve of AE For.

Table 9. The *V* light curve of AE For (<http://mnras.oxfordjournals.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1093/mnras/sts473/-/DC1>).

Please note: Oxford University Press are not responsible for the content or functionality of any supporting materials supplied by the authors. Any queries (other than missing material) should be directed to the corresponding author for the article.

This paper has been typeset from a $\text{\TeX}/\text{\LaTeX}$ file prepared by the author.