3-18-2019

Long-Period Giant Companions to Three Compact, Multiplanet Systems

Sean M. Mills

California Institute of Technology, sean.martin.mills@gmail.com

Andrew W. Howard

University of Hawaii

Lauren M. Weiss

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Jason H. Steffen

University of Nevada Las Vegas, jason.steffen@unlv.edu

Howard Isaacson

University of California, Berkeley

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/physastr_fac_articles

[next page for additional authors.](#)

Part of the [Stars, Interstellar Medium and the Galaxy Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Mills, S. M., Howard, A. W., Weiss, L. M., Steffen, J. H., Isaacson, H., Fulton, B., Petigura, E. A., Kosiarek, M. R., Hirsch, L. A., Boisvert, J. H. (2019). Long-Period Giant Companions to Three Compact, Multiplanet Systems. *Astronomical Journal*, 157(4), 1-16. American Astronomical Society.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ab0899>

This Article is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Article in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Article has been accepted for inclusion in Physics & Astronomy Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

Authors

Sean M. Mills, Andrew W. Howard, Lauren M. Weiss, Jason H. Steffen, Howard Isaacson, Benjamin Fulton, Erik A. Petigura, Molly R. Kosiarek, Lea A. Hirsch, and John H. Boisvert

Long-period Giant Companions to Three Compact, Multiplanet Systems

Sean M. Mills¹ , Andrew W. Howard¹ , Lauren M. Weiss^{2,8} , Jason H. Steffen³, Howard Isaacson⁴ , Benjamin J. Fulton^{1,5} , Erik A. Petigura¹ , Molly R. Kosiarek^{6,9} , Lea A. Hirsch^{4,7} , and John H. Boisvert³

¹ California Institute of Technology, Department of Astronomy, 1200 East California Boulevard, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA; sean.martin.mills@gmail.com

² Institute for Astronomy, University of Hawaii, 2680 Woodlawn Drive, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA

³ University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Department of Physics and Astronomy, 4505 South Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89155, USA

⁴ Department of Astronomy, University of California, 510 Campbell Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

⁵ IPAC-NASA Exoplanet Science Institute Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

⁶ Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA

⁷ Kavli Institute for Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

Received 2018 December 14; revised 2019 February 6; accepted 2019 February 18; published 2019 March 18

Abstract

Understanding the relationship between long-period giant planets and multiple smaller short-period planets is critical for formulating a complete picture of planet formation. This work characterizes three such systems. We present Kepler-65, a system with an eccentric ($e = 0.28 \pm 0.07$) giant planet companion discovered via radial velocities (RVs) exterior to a compact, multiply transiting system of sub-Neptune planets. We also use precision RVs to improve mass and radius constraints on two other systems with similar architectures, Kepler-25 and Kepler-68. In Kepler-68 we propose a second exterior giant planet candidate. Finally, we consider the implications of these systems for planet formation models, particularly that the moderate eccentricity in Kepler-65's exterior giant planet did not disrupt its inner system.

Key words: planetary systems

Supporting material: machine-readable tables

1. Introduction

Precise photometric monitoring of more than 100,000 stars over a four-year period by the *Kepler* space mission (Borucki et al. 2010) has revealed thousands of planets and planetary candidates (Coughlin et al. 2016; Morton et al. 2016). Approximately half of these planets and candidates are found in systems of two or more transiting planets with orbital periods of $\lesssim 1$ yr. However, the existence of long-period or inclined planetary companions is rarely probed by the *Kepler* data alone (see Nesvorný et al. 2012; Dawson et al. 2014). Therefore, we rely on radial velocity (RV) follow up to probe the full architectures of planetary systems observed by *Kepler*. Here we present results on three systems that have multiple transiting planets discovered by *Kepler* as well as long-period giant planet companions detected via RVs as part of the California Planet Search (CPS; Howard et al. 2010): Kepler-25, Kepler-65, and Kepler-68.

How giant planets exterior to super-Earths and sub-Neptunes (SEASNs) affect their formation and evolution is an open question in planetary science. It is speculated that Jupiter and Saturn prevented the typical short-period SEASNs observed in *Kepler* multiplanet systems from forming in the solar system (Batygin & Laughlin 2015), with similar effects possible in exoplanet systems (Izidoro et al. 2015). This effect remains uncertain and in general it seems that the presence of warm and cool Jupiters (WCJs) does not prevent such compact SEASN architectures, and may even favor them (Bryan et al. 2019; Zhu & Wu 2018). Counterexamples include Kepler-90, a pair of coplanar, $e \approx 0$ giant planets exterior to five SEASNs (Cabrera et al. 2014) and WASP-47, a system with a $e \approx 0.27$, ~ 600 days Jupiter around a mixed system of two SEASNs and an $e \approx 0$ Jupiter at < 10 days—although the latter example may be

atypical due to its relatively short-period Jupiter in addition to its exterior one (Becker et al. 2015; Sinukoff et al. 2017).

WCJs ($P \gtrsim 10$ days and $M \gtrsim 0.5 M_{\text{Jupiter}}$) have a very broad eccentricity distribution (Figure 1). The mean eccentricities ($\bar{e}$) of these Jupiters is ≈ 0.3 , much higher than the solar system planets ($\bar{e} \approx 0.06$) and *Kepler* multiplanet systems as measured via transit duration ratios (Rayleigh $\sigma_e \approx 0.03$; Fabrycky et al. 2014), using asteroseismology derived stellar densities ($\sigma_e \approx 0.05$; Van Eylen & Albrecht 2015), combining transit durations and spectroscopy ($\bar{e} \approx 0.04$; Xie et al. 2016), and via dynamical analyses ($\bar{e} \approx 0.02$; Hadden & Lithwick 2017). However, the WCJ e distribution is perhaps similar to systems with a single transiting warm super-Earth or sub-Neptune ($\bar{e} \sim 0.3$; Xie et al. 2016; Van Eylen et al. 2019).

While data are presently limited, it generally seems that systems with both multiple SEASNs and WCJs have dynamically cool Jupiters (e.g., Kepler-46, Kepler-148, Kepler-30, Kepler-89, Kepler-487, 55 Cnc, GJ 876, HD 34445, WASP-47, and Kepler-90).¹⁰ Figure 1 compares the distribution of measured giant planet eccentricities in different types of multiple planet systems. The low eccentricities of giants in planets with multiple SEASNs is intriguing compared to the general population of WCJs, both in single and multiple planet systems, where high eccentricities are common. Uehara et al. (2016) and Foreman-Mackey et al. (2016) also tentatively suggest that *Kepler* SEASN systems have coplanar (and thus dynamically cold) WCJ companions by showing evidence of potential > 2 yr period Jupiter companions.¹¹ Even if WCJs are

¹⁰ This list is incomplete as it only includes well-characterized Jupiters reported on <http://exoplanets.org>. For instance, Kepler-48, a long-period Jupiter around three SEASNs from Marcy et al. (2014), is not included.

¹¹ We note the Uehara et al. (2016) also present a few candidates of either eccentric long-period Jupiters or possibly warm Jupiters based on transit duration, but this is uncertain.

⁸ Parent Fellow.

⁹ NSF Graduate Research Fellow.

Figure 1. Top: periods and eccentricities of warm and cool Jupiters (planets with $M \sin i > 0.5 M_{\text{Jupiter}}$ and $P > 10$ days that have eccentricity and eccentricity uncertainty data in the Exoplanet Orbit Database¹² as of 2018 October; Han et al. 2014). Bottom: the eccentricities of giant planets in multiplet systems with measured eccentricities are shown in black. The majority are systems of planets with exactly two giant planets. The blue points highlight those planets with multiple small ($M < M_{\text{Saturn}}$ or $R < 8 R_{\oplus}$) planets in the same system. The red points are a subset of those points which are the subject of this study.

not barriers to planet formation, eccentric exterior Jupiters may excite any interior planets’ eccentricities and inclinations causing a reduction in either true planet multiplicity from ejections or observed multiplicity due to increased planet mutual inclinations (Huang et al. 2017; Pu & Lai 2018).

2. Methods

In order to characterize the Kepler-25, Kepler-65, and Kepler-68 systems, we rely on a combination of the transit photometry, RVs, and precise stellar spectra. The photometric signals reveal the ratio of planetary to host star radii. With precise stellar properties derived from combining stellar spectra and parallax measurements (Fulton & Petigura 2018), the physical sizes of the planets can be determined. Additionally the planet–planet gravitational interactions of closely spaced planets results in transit timing variations

(TTVs), which reveal a combination of the mass and eccentricity of the planets (Agol et al. 2005; Lithwick et al. 2012). Modeling these TTVs can give mass constraints on the planets; however, with low signal-to-noise data a mass-eccentricity degeneracy often remains (Lithwick et al. 2012; Deck & Agol 2015). These degeneracies can sometimes be broken by RV data that provide a complementary constraint (e.g., Petigura et al. 2018), or by a strong prior on eccentricity (Hadden & Lithwick 2017). We study Kepler-65 and Kepler-25 with a photodynamical model that produces synthetic RV and photometric data generated by the N -body interactions of simulated planets and compares it to the observed data to extract planetary orbital elements, masses, and radii self-consistently. Kepler-68 does not exhibit detectable TTVs because the planets are not closely spaced or near-resonance (Agol & Deck 2016; Holczer et al. 2016; Ofir et al. 2018), so we model only the RVs for that system.

2.1. HIRES Observations

The RV data for this work were collected using the High Resolution Echelle Spectrometer (HIRES) at the Keck Observatory from 2010 April to 2017 September. The setup used for the RV observations was the same as used by the CPS (Howard et al. 2010), with a resolving power of $R \approx 60,000$ between wavelengths 3600 and 8000 Å (Marcy et al. 2008, 2014).

The Doppler analysis is the same as that used by the CPS group (Johnson et al. 2010). Template spectra obtained without the iodine cell were used to forward model the spectra taken with the iodine cell. The wavelength scale, the instrumental profile, and the RV in each of the ~ 700 segments of 80 pixels in length corresponding to ~ 2.0 Å (depending on position along each spectral order) are all solved simultaneously. The internal uncertainty in the final RV measurement for each exposure is the weighted uncertainty in the mean RV of those segments, with weights inversely proportional to the relative RV scatter of each segment (Marcy et al. 2014).

To measure and remove contaminating light from the sky, we used the C2 decker on HIRES which has an $0''.87 \times 14''.0$ field of view on the sky. The C2 decker simultaneously collects both the stellar light and night-sky light, and the sky contamination is recorded along with the stellar spectrum at each wavelength in the regions above and below each spectral order. These sky pixels provide a direct measurement of the sky spectrum at that wavelength and are subtracted from the stellar spectrum to mitigate sky contamination.

2.2. Photometric Modeling

The *Kepler* photometry is prepared for dynamical fits by detrending the simple aperture photometry flux data from the *Kepler* portal on the Mikulski Archive for Space Telescopes (MAST). For long-cadence data, we fit the amplitudes of the first five cotrending basis vectors away from transits to determine a baseline. We discard points whose quality flag had a value greater than or equal to 16. For short-cadence data, cotrending basis vectors are not available. For both cadences, we masked out the expected transit times plus 20% of the full duration of each transit to account for possible timing variations. We then fit a cubic polynomial model with a 1-day width centered within half an hour of each data point to determine its baseline. We divide the flux and uncertainties by this baseline. A small amount of correlated noise was still present in the data likely due to known spurious instrumental

¹² <http://exoplanets.org>

frequencies (García et al. 2011; Van Cleve et al. 2016) and stellar variability. To avoid distorting the transit shapes, we do not attempt to detrend this short timescale noise. We multiplied the normalized uncertainties from the *Kepler* data set by the $\sqrt{\chi_{\text{nom}}^2/N}$, where N is the number of data points in the *Kepler* data, and χ_{nom}^2 is the χ^2 of a nominal best-fit model. Thus the reduced χ^2 of our best-fitting models was 1.00. By increasing our uncertainties, we conservatively widen our posteriors to take into account the scatter introduced by the aforementioned unmodeled noise in the system.

2.3. Fits Only Using RVs

For the RV fits, we use *radvel* (Fulton et al. 2018), a Keplerian multiplanet RV fitting routine. It is coupled to *emcee* (Foreman-Mackey et al. 2013), a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) engine, so that Bayesian posteriors may be found. Each RV fit includes a RV jitter term, σ_{jitter} , to take into account stellar and instrumental noise above the measured uncertainty level (for details, see Fulton et al. 2018). The planets’s orbits were fitted in a basis of $\{K, P, T_0, \sqrt{e} \cos \omega, \sqrt{e} \sin \omega\}$, where K is the RV amplitude, P is the planetary period, T_0 is the time of planet–star conjunction, and e and ω are planetary eccentricity and argument of pericenter, respectively. We use uniform priors on each parameter unless explicitly stated. For each model we run an MCMC to fit the data and determine uncertainties, stopping once all parameters have a Gelman–Rubin statistic of < 1.01 (Gelman & Rubin 1992). We convert the measured RV amplitudes into absolute planet masses by applying the stellar mass constraints from Fulton & Petigura (2018).

2.4. RV-TTV Fits

We use a photodynamic model to produce theoretical light curves for comparison to the *Kepler* photometry. The model takes initial conditions at a specified epoch, and integrates the N -body equations of motion of the planets over the interval of the data. If the integration reaches the time of an RV data point, the stellar RV is computed by summing the effects of all planets at that instant. Every time a planet passes in front of the star, a theoretical light curve is computed at each *Kepler* time-series data point using the model described in Pál (2012). For long-cadence data, we computed the flux value at 15 equally spaced points in time over a cadence’s integration and averaged them together to produce the model value. The model and data are then compared in a χ^2 sense to compute the likelihood of the model, accounting for any priors for the parameters (specified for each system below). We perform a differential evolution MCMC (Ter Braak 2005) in order to understand the uncertainties of the system parameters.

The parameters for each planet in our model are the osculating Jacobian orbital elements $P, T_0, \sqrt{e} \cos \omega, \sqrt{e} \sin \omega, i, \Omega, M/M_*$, and R/R_* , where Ω is the longitude of the ascending node, and M and R are the mass and radius, respectively. We model the star with four free parameters: R_*, M_* , and two quadratic limb-darkening parameters c_1 and c_2 , following Pál (2012). σ_{jitter} is a final free parameter.

3. Kepler-65

Kepler-65 (KOI 85, KIC 5866724) is a system of three transiting planets all with $R < 3 R_{\oplus}$ and orbital periods of < 10 days as originally validated by Chaplin et al. (2013). Chaplin et al. (2013) showed that the inner planets’ orbits are aligned

with the spin of the star. Hadden & Lithwick (2014) marginally detected a TTV signal, which implies a non-zero mass for planet c using the first 12 quarters of long-cadence data (Mazeh et al. 2013). HIRES RV data revealed an additional companion which we denote with the subscript e at an orbital period of $258.7^{+1.5}_{-1.3}$ days and $M \sin i$ of $0.67 \pm 0.06 M_{\text{Jupiter}}$. Below we explore a fit to the RVs alone and to the photometry and RVs simultaneously for higher precision determination of the architecture of the system.

3.1. Kepler-65 RV-only Fit

We perform a Keplerian RV fit with *radvel* (Fulton et al. 2018) on the HIRES RV data set (Table 7). The inner planets have well-determined orbital periods from *Kepler*. Additionally, they are likely to have low eccentricities (Van Eylen & Albrecht 2015), so in this preliminary RV-only fit we fix their eccentricities to 0 to prevent degeneracies with mass. Therefore the only free parameters for the inner three planets are the K amplitudes (i.e., their masses). We allow all parameters of the newly discovered outer planet to vary ($P, T_0, \sqrt{e} \sin \omega, \sqrt{e} \cos \omega, K$). Our best-fit model is shown in Figure 2. None of the inner planets are detected at high significance. However, the non-transiting planet is detected at $>10\sigma$ significance, and the departure from a perfectly sinusoidal shape of the outer planet’s RV signal reveals a significant eccentricity ($e = 0.286 \pm 0.069$). We note that removing the giant planet’s eccentricity in the RV fit results in an increase in the Akaike information criteria by 12.1, which is sufficient to strongly rule out the $e = 0$ model (Akaike 1974; Burnham & Anderson 2003).

We note that a Lomb–Scargle (LS) periodogram (Lomb 1976; Scargle 1982) of the data indicates a unique, well-defined peak at 259 days, eliminating the possibility that the observed periodicity is an alias for a different period of the giant planet induced by the time sampling. We also consider stellar activity as a potential false positive for an apparent planetary signal. A periodogram of the S -values of the HIRES RV data does not show a peak at the period of the putative planet and there is almost no correlation ($\rho = 0.03$) between the S -value stellar activity indicator and the RV signal. $\log(R'_{\text{HK}}) = -5.178 \pm 0.052$, consistent with low stellar activity. We also note that an LS periodogram of the RV data suggests that there is no significant periodicity remaining after subtracting a best fit with the three known planets. We inject additional planets on circular orbits and recover them with an LS periodogram. We find that planets with a K amplitude $> 7 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ are ruled out at the 2σ level with periods from 55 to 1800 days. This corresponds to a $0.5 M_{\text{Jupiter}}$ planet in a 5 yr orbit, with more stringent mass constraints for shorter periods. Any proposed mechanism for the excitation of eccentricity of planet e to its observed value must account for this constraint.

3.2. Photometry and RV Simultaneous Fit

We next perform a photodynamic fit including both the HIRES RV data and all quarters of the *Kepler* photometry data detrended as described in Section 2. We include all 18 quarters of the *Kepler* data including the 15 containing short-cadence (58 second integration) data, which is vital for resolving transit ingress and egress and thus precise transit times. A segment of the long-cadence light curve with transits highlighted is shown in Figure 3. Planets c and d are near a 7:5 resonance with potential TTVs of ~ 5 minutes assuming modest eccentricities ($e \lesssim 0.05$) as calculated using the formalism in Deck & Agol (2016).

Figure 2. Top panels: Kepler-65 RV *radvel* best-fit model and residuals. Lower panels: RV data for each planet phase-folded at the best-fit orbital period with all other planet’s signal removed.

Our model follows that described in Section 2.4. Additionally, we fix $\Omega = 0$ for the inner three planets since their mutual inclinations are not well constrained by the data but the planets are likely nearly coplanar due to the fact that all three transit. We allow Ω_e to vary to test if the data constrain the mutual inclination between the compact inner planets and the outer giant planet. This choice also allows the posteriors of all other fitted parameters to marginalize over the uncertainty in Ω_e . We fix $R_e = 0.01 R_*$ since it is unconstrained by the data, except that the planet does not

Figure 3. Segment of the long-cadence portion of Kepler-65’s detrended light curve (BJD-2454900) with transit events highlighted in blue (planet b), green (planet c), and red (planet d).

produce significant transits. We apply a half Gaussian e prior on the inner three planets with $\sigma_e = 0.05$. This is justified since compact multiply transiting systems of small planets have low eccentricities (Van Eylen & Albrecht 2015; Xie et al. 2016). On the other hand, the giant planet is given a uniform e prior due to the wide range of eccentricities in massive long-period planets. We apply a $\sin i$ geometric prior on the planetary inclinations. Results of a 60-chain differential evolution Markov chain Monte Carlo (DEMC) simulation (Ter Braak 2005) run for 300,000 generations after burn-in are shown in Figures 4–7 and summarized in Table 1. This DEMCMC was stopped when the Gelman–Rubin statistic was < 1.2 for all parameters and the chains remained stationary, indicating no upward or downward trends with time and no spreading (i.e., the parameter distributions for the first 150,000 generations are similar to the final 150,000 generations). Figure 14 illustrates the degeneracies between the derived masses and eccentricities of the planets via a corner plot of the appropriately transformed DEMCMC parameters.

3.3. Kepler-65 Discussion

The radii of planets b, c, and d span the observed short-period exoplanet radius gap, a minimum in the planetary radius distribution between that occurs at $\approx 1.8 R_\oplus$ (Fulton et al. 2017). This gap is thought to divide high-density super-Earths and low-density sub-Neptunes due to photoevaporation (Owen & Wu 2013, 2017). Planet c’s relatively large radius ($R = 2.623^{+0.066}_{-0.056} R_\oplus$) combined with its low density ($\rho_c = 1.64^{+0.53}_{-0.51} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$; see Figure 7) suggests that it may have been able to maintain a significant fraction of its primordial gas envelope. The density and uncertainties ($\rho_d = 5.7 \pm 1.2 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$) of planet d are consistent with it either having a rocky composition or possessing an H/He envelope despite its small radius ($R_d = 1.587 \pm 0.04 R_\oplus$). The former is preferred by photoevaporation models, which suggest the planet should be rocky since it receives ~ 400 times the Earth’s incident flux (Lopez & Rice 2018). For comparison, an Earth-composition planet of planet d’s radius is expected to have a density of 7 g cm^{-3} (Dressing et al. 2015). Owen & Wu (2013) demonstrate that for solar-like stars, core masses of $\sim 6\text{--}8 M_\oplus$ at planet’s c and d’s semimajor axes (0.69 au and 0.85 au, respectively) undergo a transition from low-density planets with envelopes to bare cores. Although planet c receives more stellar flux than planet d, it is up to 80% more massive at the 1σ level. If planet c’s mass is indeed on the higher end of the derived posteriors, it is thus consistent with the photoevaporation picture due to the strong $M^{2.4}$ dependence on the necessary flux to erode an atmosphere (Lopez & Fortney 2013). Planet b’s density and composition remain mostly unconstrained. Parameters of the outer giant planet e are somewhat uncertain due to the RV data alone constraining its orbital parameters, however its mass is $\gtrsim 0.6 M_{\text{Jupiter}}$ and its eccentricity is 0.28 ± 0.07 , higher than most planets in multiplanet

Figure 4. Kepler-65’s three transiting planets b, c, and d are shown from top to bottom phase-folded with TTVs removed. The gray points are the individual *Kepler* data, black crosses are the data binned in 10-minute intervals, and the red line is a best-fit transit model.

systems (see Figure 5). We note that no other giant planets ($M > 0.5 M_{\text{Jupiter}}$) within a factor of 5 in the orbital period of planet e are present in the system, determined from the lack of additional periodic RV signals. The mutual inclination between the outer giant planet e and the inner three planets is not meaningfully constrained by the data.

4. Kepler-25

Kepler-25 (KOI-244, KIC 4349452) is a system of two transiting planets between 2 and $5 R_{\oplus}$ and with orbital periods near a 2:1 ratio at 6.2 and 12.7 days (Steffen et al. 2012). Marcy et al. (2014) use RVs to identify an additional non-transiting $\sim 90 M_{\oplus}$ companion on a 123-day orbit. We use additional HIRES RV observations and an extended time baseline to more precisely characterize both the inner transiting planets and the outer non-transiting planet. The inner planets both exhibit TTVs (Steffen et al. 2012; Holczer et al. 2016). The TTVs were used to estimate the planetary masses by Hadden & Lithwick (2017) who found $M_b = 4_{-2}^{+4} M_{\oplus}$ and $M_c = 10_{-2.5}^{+3.5} M_{\oplus}$ subject to a high-mass prior and $M_b = 0.4_{-0.2}^{+1.5} M_{\oplus}$ and $M_c = 1.4_{-0.6}^{+4} M_{\oplus}$ with a less informative prior. By combining the RV data and the photometric data simultaneously, we put more precise mass and density constraints on the inner planets.

Albrecht et al. (2013) demonstrate that planet c’s orbit is nearly aligned with the host star rotation (i.e., it has obliquity $\lesssim 22^\circ$) via a two-night Rossiter–McLaughlin (R–M) measurement. For our RV

Table 1
Kepler-65 MCMC Posteriors

Parameter ^a	Median ^{84thPercentile} 16thPercentile	Unit
<i>Fitted Parameters</i>		
P_b	$2.1549209^{+8.6e-06}_{-7.4e-06}$	days
$T_{0,b}$	$801.32382^{+0.00011}_{-0.00011}$	BJD-2454900
$\sqrt{e} \cos \omega_b$	$-0.03^{+0.16}_{-0.15}$	...
$\sqrt{e} \sin \omega_b$	$-0.02^{+0.12}_{-0.12}$	...
i_b	$92.2^{+1.3}_{-1.4}$	degrees
M_b	$0.0076^{+0.0077}_{-0.0051}$	M_{Jupiter}
R_b/R_*	$0.009215^{+6.2e-05}_{-4.8e-05}$	...
P_c	$5.859697^{+9.3e-05}_{-9.9e-05}$	days
$T_{0,c}$	$803.39284^{+0.00019}_{-0.00019}$	BJD-2454900
$\sqrt{e} \cos \omega_c$	$0.065^{+0.073}_{-0.112}$	...
$\sqrt{e} \sin \omega_c$	$0.082^{+0.079}_{-0.09}$	...
i_c	$92.33^{+0.29}_{-0.26}$	degrees
M_c	$0.017^{+0.0054}_{-0.0052}$	M_{Jupiter}
R_c/R_*	$0.016743^{+7.8e-05}_{-7.1e-05}$	...
P_d	$8.13167^{+0.00024}_{-0.00021}$	Days
$T_{0,d}$	$802.80285^{+0.00042}_{-0.00037}$	BJD-2454900
$\sqrt{e} \cos \omega_d$	$-0.05^{+0.11}_{-0.07}$	...
$\sqrt{e} \sin \omega_d$	$0.01^{+0.1}_{-0.08}$	...
i_d	$92.35^{+0.18}_{-0.16}$	degrees
Ω_d	$-0.13^{+0.76}_{-0.71}$	degrees
M_d	$0.013^{+0.0025}_{-0.0025}$	M_{Jupiter}
P_e	$258.8^{+1.5}_{-1.3}$	days
$T_{0,e}$	$1045.4^{+6.8}_{-8.2}$	BJD-2454900
$\sqrt{e} \cos \omega_e$	$0.492^{+0.067}_{-0.085}$	...
$\sqrt{e} \sin \omega_e$	$0.16^{+0.12}_{-0.13}$	...
i_e	$127.0^{+27.0}_{-25.0}$	degrees
Ω_e	$-10.0^{+130.0}_{-110.0}$	...
M_e	$0.82^{+0.63}_{-0.16}$	M_{Jupiter}
M_*	$1.248^{+0.018}_{-0.021}$	$M_{\odot}$
R_*	$1.437^{+0.032}_{-0.027}$	$R_{\odot}$
c_1	$0.349^{+0.045}_{-0.047}$	...
c_2	$0.227^{+0.067}_{-0.064}$	...
σ_{jitter}	$6.05^{+0.75}_{-0.67}$	m s^{-1}
γ	$0.92^{+0.93}_{-0.92}$	m s^{-1}
<i>Derived Parameters</i>		
$M_{\text{Jup},e} \sin i_e$	$0.653^{+0.056}_{-0.055}$	M_{Jupiter}
M_b	$2.4^{+2.4}_{-1.6}$	$M_{\oplus}$
M_c	$5.4^{+1.7}_{-1.7}$	$M_{\oplus}$
M_d	$4.14^{+0.79}_{-0.8}$	$M_{\oplus}$
M_e	$260.0^{+200.0}_{-50.0}$	$M_{\oplus}$
R_b	$1.444^{+0.037}_{-0.031}$	$R_{\oplus}$
R_c	$2.623^{+0.066}_{-0.056}$	$R_{\oplus}$
R_d	$1.587^{+0.040}_{-0.035}$	$R_{\oplus}$
ρ_b	$4.4^{+4.5}_{-3.0}$	g cm^{-3}
ρ_c	$1.64^{+0.53}_{-0.51}$	g cm^{-3}
ρ_d	$5.7^{+1.2}_{-1.2}$	g cm^{-3}
e_b	$0.028^{+0.031}_{-0.02}$	...
e_c	$0.02^{+0.022}_{-0.013}$	...
e_d	$0.014^{+0.016}_{-0.010}$	...
e_e	$0.283^{+0.064}_{-0.071}$	...

Note.

^a Osculating orbital elements are valid at $T_{\text{epoch}} = 2,455,715$ BJD.

Figure 5. Kepler-65’s best RV fit (red) and the HIRES RV data (crosses with uncertainties including the best-fit RV jitter of 5.3 m s^{-1}) phased at the best-fit orbital period of the long-period giant planet e. The small amplitude variations in the theoretical points are due to the RV contribution of the three inner planets, whose RV signatures are no longer completely periodic in an N -body model. Their low amplitudes agree with the RV-only fit. The deviation of the large-amplitude shape from a sine curve belies the eccentricity in the giant planet.

Figure 6. Mass posteriors for all planets in the Kepler-65 system from the joint RV-*Kepler* photometry fit (blue) and from RVs alone (orange). While the inner planet (b) has an upper limit from RVs alone, the addition of the transit timing variations significantly improves the precision of the mass of planet c and d.

fit, we include HIRES RVs made as part of the CPS survey (Howard et al. 2010) and choose to include only two RV measurements of the system on the nights of the R–M observations (before and after each transit). Hence the R–M effect does not bias our fit, and any correlated noise on the ~ 12 hr timescale of the observations does not get unfairly favored by the density of observations on these nights. The complete list of the RV data used for this fit is given in Table 8.

The dynamics of the inner transiting planets of Kepler-25 were also studied in detail by Migaszewski & Goździewski (2018). They stated that the system is consistent with either being in a

Figure 7. Radius and density posteriors of the transiting planets in the Kepler-65 system from the joint RV-*Kepler* photometry fit. The theoretical density of an Earth-composition planet of the observed radius is shown as a solid vertical line (Dressing et al. 2015). A dotted vertical line indicates the density of a 100% water planet, essentially indicating lower bound on the density of a planet without an H/He atmosphere contributing significantly to the observed radius. Since planet c lies entirely below the H_2O density, it must have a significant H/He envelope, while the allowed densities of planet d are consistent with a wider range of compositions.

periodic (resonant) configuration or not within the uncertainties in the planets’ eccentricities. Although somewhat far from resonance with a period ratio of 2.039, the divergence of the resonance width at low eccentricity permits a periodic solution for $e \lesssim 0.002$ and relatively high planetary mass to reproduce the observed TTV amplitudes. The addition of our RV data set reduces the mass-eccentricity degeneracy found in the TTVs alone.

4.1. Kepler-25 RV-only Fit

We first perform a Keplerian fit with *radvel* on the HIRES RV data set alone (Table 8). The two inner planets have well-determined orbital periods and phases from *Kepler*, which we fix at the observed values. As with Kepler-65, we set $e = 0$ and allow all parameters of the newly discovered outer planet to vary. Our best-fit model is shown in Figure 8. All three planets are detected at high significance (Table 2). We also note that eccentricity is not confidently detected in planet d since including e_d is disfavored by the small-sample corrected Akaike information criteria (AICc; Burnham & Anderson 2003), and is constrained to $e_d < 0.28$ at the 1σ level if included.¹³

In addition to the most significant peak at 123 days in an LS periodogram of the RVs, we note a secondary peak at 91 days with less power. A model comparison of a Keplerian RV fit with the outer planet at a 90-day orbital period compared to a 123-day period fit has a Δ Bayesian information criterion (BIC) = 6 (that is, a log likelihood difference of four for seven free parameters), providing substantial evidence against the 91-day period, but not conclusively ruling it out. We emphasize

¹³ This model comparison feature is freely available as part of the *radvel* package (<https://github.com/California-Planet-Search/radvel>).

Table 2
Kepler-25 Model Comparison

AICc Qualitative Comparison	Free Parameters	N_{free}^a	N_{data}	rms	$\ln \mathcal{L}$	BIC	AICc	ΔAICc
AICc favored model	$K_b, K_c, K_d, \sigma_{\text{jitter}}, \gamma$	7	71	6.14	-235.90	501.64	487.58	0.00
Strongly disfavored	$K_b, K_c, e_d, K_d, \sigma_{\text{jitter}}, \gamma$	9	71	6.10	-235.51	509.38	491.97	4.39
	$K_c, K_d, \sigma_{\text{jitter}}, \gamma$	6	71	6.55	-240.51	506.60	494.34	6.76
Ruled out	$K_b, K_d, \sigma_{\text{jitter}}, a, \gamma$	6	71	7.28	-248.42	522.41	510.14	22.56
	$K_b, K_c, \sigma_{\text{jitter}}, \gamma$	4	71	8.65	-260.70	538.44	530.00	42.42

Note.

^a P_d and $T_{0,d}$ are allowed to vary whenever K_d is a free parameter. Each e also encodes two free parameters: $\sqrt{e} \cos \omega$ and $\sqrt{e} \sin \omega$.

Figure 8. Top panel: Kepler-25 RV *radvel* best-fit model and residuals. Lower panels: RV data for each planet phase-folded at the best-fit orbital period with all other planet's signal removed.

that the RV posteriors for planets b and c are statistically similar between fits with the outer giant at 90 days and 123 days—the mass posteriors for both b and c are consistent to $<0.5\sigma$ between

Figure 9. Segment of the long-cadence portion of Kepler-25's detrended light curve (BJD-2454900) with transit events highlighted in blue (planet b) and green (planet c).

the fits. Therefore the interpretation of the inner planets properties would not qualitatively change, even if the outer giant planet is indeed at the disfavored 91-day orbital period.

We also consider stellar activity as a potential false positive for an apparent planetary signal. A periodogram of the S -values of the HIRES RV data does not show a peak at the period of the putative outer planet. $\log(R'_{\text{HK}}) = -5.21 \pm 0.15$, consistent with low stellar activity. We also note that an LS periodogram suggests there is no significant periodicity remaining after subtracting a best fit with the three known planets. We attempt to inject an additional planet on a circular orbit, and recover it with an LS periodogram. We find that planets with a K amplitude $>7 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ are ruled out at the 2σ level with periods from approximately 60 to 3000 days.

4.2. Photometry and RV Simultaneous Fit

The TTVs detected between the two transiting planets (Holczer et al. 2016; Hadden & Lithwick 2017) present a degeneracy between their masses and eccentricities (Lithwick et al. 2012; Migaszewski & Goździewski 2018). Including the RV data may help break this degeneracy as the RVs can put bounds on the allowed masses. Therefore we perform a photodynamic fit including both the HIRES RV data simultaneously and all quarters of *Kepler* photometry data (a segment of which is shown in Figure 9).

We fix $\Omega_b = 0$, but allow Ω_c to vary since we expect the inner two planets to be tightly coupled and therefore have mutual inclination well constrained by the TTVs and lack large duration variations (TDVs). We also fix $R_d = 0.01 R_*$ since it is completely unconstrained by the data and does not affect our fits except that the planet should not produce significant transits since none are observed.

Similar to the Kepler-65 fit, we apply a Gaussian e prior on the inner two planets with $\sigma_e = 0.05$, and also note that Kepler-25's planets must have eccentricities well within that range for any physical masses (Migaszewski & Goździewski 2018). On the other hand, the giant planet has a uniform e prior due to the wide range of

Figure 10. Kepler-25’s planet b (top) and c (bottom) phase-folded with TTVs removed. The gray points are individual *Kepler* data, black crosses are data binned in 10-minute intervals, and the red line is a best-fit transit model.

Figure 11. The best-fit solution’s theoretical RVs (red) and the HIRES RV data (crosses with uncertainties including the best-fit RV jitter of 5.3 m s^{-1}) phased at the best-fit orbital period of the long-period giant planet (planet d) in Kepler-25. The small amplitude variation in theoretical points is due to the RV contribution of the two inner planets. Their low amplitudes and correlation with variations in the data agree with the fit using only RVs.

eccentricities in massive long-period planets. We again apply stellar mass and radius data from Fulton & Petigura (2018) as priors to get the absolute radius and density information for the system. The planetary masses and other parameters are all given a uniform prior.

We consider allowing Ω_d and i_d to vary, but find that our fits slightly favor a highly mutually inclined configuration ($i \gtrsim 30^\circ$)

Figure 12. Mass posteriors for all planets in Kepler-25 from the joint RV-*Kepler* photometry fits (blue) and the RVs alone (orange). The precision of the mass of planet c increases dramatically with the addition of the TTV information, and the RVs indicate that the mass is at the higher end of the distribution allowed by the TTVs alone (Migaszewski & Goździewski 2018).

under a uniform Ω prior and a geometric $\sin i$ prior. However the improvement in the likelihood is small, compared to the introduction of free parameters. We compare the models using the BIC and AICc. Specifically, the $\Delta\text{BIC} = -13$ favors the extra free parameters while the $\Delta\text{AIC} = 12$ disfavors them, suggesting that it is not clear if the addition of the inclination parameters is well founded in our model given the data. Therefore in our final fit reported here, we fix $\Omega_d = \Omega_b = 0$ and $i_d = 92^\circ \approx i_b \approx i_c$, since the data may be insufficient to determine mutual inclination and most known multiplanet systems are nearly coplanar (Fabrycky et al. 2014; Zhu et al. 2018). We expect this choice to have little effect on the posteriors of other parameters in our model and will prevent misleading high mutual inclination fits from dominating the reported posteriors.

Results of a 40-chain DEMCMC (Ter Braak 2005) run for 220,000 generations after burn-in are shown in Figures 10–12 and summarized in Table 3. This MCMC was stopped when the Gelman–Rubin statistic was < 1.2 for all parameters and the chains remained stationary, indicating no upward or downward trends with time and no spreading (i.e., the parameter distributions for the first 110,000 generations are similar to the final 110,000

Table 3
Kepler-25 MCMC Posteriors

Parameter ^a	Median ^{84thPercentile} _{16thPercentile}	Unit
<i>Fitted Parameters</i>		
P_b	$6.238297^{+1.7e-05}_{-1.7e-05}$	days
$T_{0,b}$	$803.42004^{+0.00012}_{-0.00011}$	BJD-2454900
$\sqrt{e} \cos \omega_b$	$0.042^{+0.017}_{-0.036}$	...
$\sqrt{e} \sin \omega_b$	$0.007^{+0.038}_{-0.035}$	...
i_b	$92.827^{+0.084}_{-0.083}$	degrees
M_b	$0.0275^{+0.0079}_{-0.0073}$	M_{Jupiter}
R_p/R_{*b}	$0.01916^{+5.1e-05}_{-4.8e-05}$	...
P_c	$12.7207^{+0.00011}_{-0.0001}$	days
$T_{0,c}$	$811.15013^{+0.00014}_{-0.00014}$	BJD-2454900
$\sqrt{e} \cos \omega_c$	$-0.024^{+0.067}_{-0.053}$	...
$\sqrt{e} \sin \omega_c$	$0.004^{+0.065}_{-0.062}$	...
i_c	$92.764^{+0.042}_{-0.039}$	degrees
Ω_c	$-0.45^{+0.19}_{-0.25}$	degrees
M_c	$0.0479^{+0.0041}_{-0.0051}$	M_{Jupiter}
R_p/R_{*c}	$0.03637^{+0.00012}_{-0.00012}$	...
P_d	$122.4^{+0.8}_{-0.71}$	days
$T_{0,d}$	$815.0^{+6.8}_{-7.2}$	BJD-2454900
$\sqrt{e} \cos \omega_d$	$0.07^{+0.27}_{-0.29}$	...
$\sqrt{e} \sin \omega_d$	$0.16^{+0.23}_{-0.28}$	...
M_d	$0.226^{+0.031}_{-0.031}$	M_{Jupiter}
M_*	$1.165^{+0.027}_{-0.029}$	$M_{\odot}$
R_*	$1.316^{+0.016}_{-0.015}$	$R_{\odot}$
c_1	$0.351^{+0.049}_{-0.051}$	...
c_2	$0.198^{+0.056}_{-0.055}$	...
σ_{jitter}	$5.44^{+0.74}_{-0.65}$	m s^{-1}
γ	$1.67^{+0.85}_{-0.88}$	m s^{-1}
<i>Derived Parameters</i>		
i_c/i_b	$0.99932^{+0.0005}_{-0.00048}$	...
M_b	$8.7^{+2.5}_{-2.3}$	$M_{\oplus}$
M_c	$15.2^{+1.3}_{-1.6}$	$M_{\oplus}$
M_d	$71.9^{+9.8}_{-9.8}$	$M_{\oplus}$
$M_d \sin i_d$	$0.226^{+0.031}_{-0.031}$	M_{Jupiter}
R_b	$2.748^{+0.07}_{-0.035}$	$R_{\oplus}$
R_c	$5.217^{+0.07}_{-0.065}$	$R_{\oplus}$
ρ_b	$2.32^{+0.67}_{-0.61}$	g cm^{-3}
ρ_c	$0.588^{+0.053}_{-0.061}$	g cm^{-3}
e_b	$0.0029^{+0.0023}_{-0.0017}$	...
e_c	$0.0061^{+0.0049}_{-0.0041}$	...
e_d	$0.13^{+0.13}_{-0.09}$	...

Note.^a Osculating orbital elements are valid at $T_{\text{epoch}} = 2,455,700$ BJD.

generations). Figure 15 illustrates the degeneracies between the derived masses and eccentricities of the planets via a corner plot of the appropriately transformed DEMCMC parameters.

4.3. Kepler-25 Discussion

Our RV-TTV combined results favor high masses and low eccentricities (see Figure 12) compared to the range of possible values as explored in Migaszewski & Goździewski (2018). This is primarily due to the RV signal, whose relatively large amplitudes partially break the TTV mass-eccentricity degeneracy. Our results are within 1–2 σ of the Hadden & Lithwick (2017) result when a high-mass prior was used. The low eccentricities found

Table 4
Kepler-68 *radvel* MCMC Posteriors

Parameter	Credible Interval	Units
<i>Orbital Parameters</i>		
P_b	$\equiv 5.3988$	days
$T_{0,b}$	$\equiv 803.2978$	BJD-2454900
e_b	$\equiv 0.0$	...
ω_b	$\equiv 0.0$	radians
K_b	$2.7^{+0.48}_{-0.46}$	m s^{-1}
P_c	$\equiv 9.6051$	Days
$T_{0,c}$	$\equiv 808.9682$	BJD-2454900
e_c	$\equiv 0.0$	...
ω_c	$\equiv 0.0$	radians
K_c	$0.59^{+0.50}_{-0.52}$	m s^{-1}
P_d	$634.6^{+4.1}_{-3.7}$	days
$T_{0,d}$	978 ± 11	BJD-2454900
e_d	$0.112^{+0.035}_{-0.034}$	...
ω_d	$-1.13^{+0.36}_{-0.45}$	radians
K_d	$17.75^{+0.50}_{-0.49}$	m s^{-1}
<i>Other Parameters^a</i>		
γ_{HIRES}	$1.85^{+0.74}_{-0.72}$	...
$\dot{\gamma}$	$-0.00319^{+0.00075}_{-0.00078}$	$\text{m s}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$
$\ddot{\gamma}$	$-3.23e-06^{+8.6e-07}_{-8.3e-07}$	$\text{m s}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-2}$
σ_{jitter}	$2.93^{+0.32}_{-0.29}$	m s^{-1}
<i>Derived Parameters^b</i>		
$M_b \sin i$	$7.65^{+1.37}_{-1.32}$	$M_{\oplus}$
$M_c \sin i$	$2.04^{+1.72}_{-1.78}$	$M_{\oplus}$
$M_d \sin i$	$0.77^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	M_{Jupiter}

Notes.^a Reference epoch for γ , $\dot{\gamma}$, $\ddot{\gamma}$: 2000.^b With the system scale set using stellar data from Fulton & Petigura (2018).

are consistent with the low-eccentricity resonant state that Migaszewski & Goździewski (2018) speculate Kepler-25 occupies; however, our results do not strictly demand resonance.

5. Kepler-68

The two transiting planets detected by *Kepler* and one non-transiting planet detected via RVs in Kepler-68 (KOI-246, KIC 11295426) were validated by Gilliland et al. (2013). The non-transiting outer planet was found by Marcy et al. (2014), who report $P_d = 625 \pm 16$ days and $M_d \sin i = 0.84 \pm 0.05 M_{\text{Jupiter}}$. Here we provide improved constraints from additional RV data and a longer time baseline. Since the transiting planets exhibit no TTVs, we only fit the RV data (shown in full in Table 9). We again run a *radvel* fit with the inner planets' periods and phases fixed based on the *Kepler* data. The results of an MCMC are summarized in Table 4, with the best fit shown in Figure 13. We note that the mass posteriors are symmetric, Gaussian, and have no apparent correlation with any other parameters.

We consider several different models of the RV data with and without terms for a linear trend, quadratic curvature, and eccentricity for the outer planet and compare their relative likelihoods via BIC and AICc. Our results in Table 5 show that the inclusion of both the long-timescale curvature terms (linear and quadratic) and planet d's eccentricity are both strongly preferred. The presence of curvature in the RVs indicates the presence of another body in the system at a period of $\gtrsim 10$ yr and uncertain mass. This could either be a planetary or stellar companion. At the ~ 10 -year period lower limit, the signal would correspond to

Table 5
Kepler-68 Model Comparisons

AICc Qualitative Comparison	Free Parameters	N_{free}^a	N_{data}	rms	$\ln \mathcal{L}$	BIC	AICc	ΔAICc
AICc favored model	$K_b, e_d, K_d, \dot{\gamma}, \ddot{\gamma}, \sigma_{\text{jitter}}, \gamma$	10	82	3.05	-224.92	493.91	472.94	0.00
Nearly indistinguishable	$K_b, K_c, e_d, K_d, \dot{\gamma}, \ddot{\gamma}, \sigma_{\text{jitter}}, \gamma$	11	82	3.03	-224.19	496.86	474.16	1.22
Strongly disfavored	$K_b, K_d, \dot{\gamma}, \ddot{\gamma}, \sigma_{\text{jitter}}, \gamma$	8	82	3.29	-231.15	497.55	480.27	7.33
	$K_b, K_c, K_d, \dot{\gamma}, \ddot{\gamma}, \sigma_{\text{jitter}}, \gamma$	9	82	3.27	-230.60	500.86	481.70	8.76
Ruled out	$K_b, e_d, K_d, \dot{\gamma}, \sigma_{\text{jitter}}, \gamma$	9	82	3.33	-231.99	503.64	484.48	11.54
	$K_b, K_c, e_d, K_d, \dot{\gamma}, \sigma_{\text{jitter}}, \gamma$	10	82	3.32	-231.68	507.43	486.46	13.52
	$K_b, e_d, K_d, \sigma_{\text{jitter}}, \gamma$	8	82	3.44	-234.90	505.06	487.78	14.84
	$K_b, K_c, e_d, K_d, \sigma_{\text{jitter}}, \gamma$	9	82	3.44	-234.73	509.13	489.97	17.03

Note.^a P_d and $T_{0,d}$ are allowed to vary whenever K_d is a free parameter. Each e also encodes two free parameters: $\sqrt{e} \cos \omega$ and $\sqrt{e} \sin \omega$. **Figure 13.** Top panel: Kepler-68 RV radvel best-fit model and residuals. Lower panels: RV data for each planet phase-folded at the best-fit orbital period with all other planet's signals removed.**Table 6**
System Summaries

Parameter	Credible Interval	Units
<i>Kepler-25</i>		
P_b	$6.238297^{+1.7e-05}_{-1.7e-05}$	days
P_c	$12.7207^{+0.00011}_{-0.00011}$	days
P_d	$122.4^{+0.80}_{-0.71}$	days
M_b	$8.7^{+2.5}_{-2.3}$	$M_{\oplus}$
M_c	$15.2^{+1.3}_{-1.6}$	$M_{\oplus}$
$M_d \sin i_d$	$0.226^{+0.031}_{-0.031}$	M_{Jupiter}
R_b	$2.748^{+0.038}_{-0.035}$	$R_{\oplus}$
R_c	$5.217^{+0.07}_{-0.065}$	$R_{\oplus}$
ρ_b	$2.32^{+0.67}_{-0.61}$	g cm^{-3}
ρ_c	$0.588^{+0.053}_{-0.061}$	g cm^{-3}
e_b	$0.0029^{+0.0023}_{-0.0017}$	...
e_c	$0.0061^{+0.0049}_{-0.0041}$	...
e_d	$0.13^{+0.13}_{-0.09}$	...
<i>Kepler-65</i>		
P_b	$2.1549209^{+8.6e-06}_{-7.4e-06}$	days
P_c	$5.859697^{+9.3e-05}_{-9.9e-05}$	days
P_d	$8.13167^{+0.00024}_{-0.00021}$	days
P_e	$258.8^{+1.3}_{-1.3}$	days
M_b	$2.4^{+2.4}_{-1.6}$	$M_{\oplus}$
M_c	$5.4^{+1.7}_{-1.7}$	$M_{\oplus}$
M_d	$4.14^{+0.79}_{-0.8}$	$M_{\oplus}$
$M_e \sin i_e$	$0.653^{+0.056}_{-0.055}$	M_{Jupiter}
R_b	$1.444^{+0.037}_{-0.031}$	$R_{\oplus}$
R_c	$2.623^{+0.066}_{-0.056}$	$R_{\oplus}$
R_d	$1.587^{+0.04}_{-0.035}$	$R_{\oplus}$
ρ_b	$4.4^{+4.5}_{-3.0}$	g cm^{-3}
ρ_c	$1.64^{+0.53}_{-0.51}$	g cm^{-3}
ρ_d	$5.7^{+1.2}_{-1.2}$	g cm^{-3}
e_b	$0.028^{+0.031}_{-0.02}$	...
e_c	$0.02^{+0.022}_{-0.013}$	...
e_d	$0.014^{+0.016}_{-0.01}$	...
e_e	$0.283^{+0.064}_{-0.071}$	...
<i>Kepler-68</i>		
P_b	$\equiv 5.3988$	days
P_c	$\equiv 9.6051$	days
P_d	$634.6^{+4.1}_{-3.7}$	days
M_b	$7.65^{+1.37}_{-1.32}$	$M_{\oplus}$
M_c	$2.04^{+1.72}_{-1.78}$	$M_{\oplus}$
$M_d \sin i$	$0.77^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	M_{Jupiter}
e_d	$0.112^{+0.035}_{-0.034}$	...

a planetary $M \sin i$ of $\sim 0.6 M_{\text{Jupiter}}$, however the period and mass of this body are not bounded by the measurements and could be much greater. Ginski et al. (2016) report a nearby star in a lucky imaging survey for companions at a distance of $11''$. They conclude that the companion is likely bound to Kepler-68; however, this star is at such a great distance from Kepler-68 (≈ 1600 au sky-projected; Gaia Collaboration et al. 2018) that it is not likely the cause of the observed curvature in the RVs. A circular orbit with the sky-projected distance as the semimajor axis would have $P \sim 50,000$ yr, which would not be detectable over our ~ 7 -year baseline.

A periodogram of the S -values of the HIRES RV data does not show a peak at the period of the putative planet or its harmonics. The presence of some additional weak peaks in the S -value periodogram are taken into account by the model’s stellar jitter term which appropriately broadens the posteriors of the derived planetary properties. There is only weak correlation between the stellar activity indicator and the RV signal ($\rho = -0.2$). This correlation is driven in part by a single point with an anomalously low S -value which provides a large lever when fitting a linear correlation, which we suspect is due to sky background contamination, so we do not expect our results to be significantly biased by stellar activity. Additionally, $\log(R'_{\text{HK}}) = -5.153 \pm 0.037$, consistent with low stellar activity.

6. Summary and Discussion

In this paper we expand the sample of known long-period giant planet companions to compact, coplanar, multiply transiting systems with the introduction of the $M \sin i = 0.65 \pm 0.06 M_{\text{Jupiter}}$ Kepler-65 e. Additionally, we provide improved mass and orbital element constraints on the long-period Jupiters in Kepler-25 and Kepler-68, while also tentatively suggesting the presence of a second long-period companion in Kepler-68 with $P \gtrsim 10$ yr. Important system parameters are summarized in Table 6. The non-transiting giant planets in all three systems are dynamically separated from the inner SEASNs due to their large orbital period ratios (approximately 9.6, 32, and 66 in Kepler-25, Kepler-65, and Kepler-68, respectively). Our joint RV-TTV analysis also points to high masses and density for the transiting planets of Kepler-25, consistent with previous work suggesting that they may be in a low-eccentricity, periodic configuration (Migaszewski & Goździewski 2018).

We also consider the possibility that the observed long-period, eccentric giant planets are actually a pair of giant planets near a 2:1 mean motion resonance (Anglada-Escudé et al. 2010; Wittenmyer et al. 2013; Kürster et al. 2015). We perform a model comparison between a single, eccentric giant planet model and two giant planets on circular orbits for each system following Boisvert et al. (2018). Kepler-65 shows no support for a two-giant-planet model, strengthening our earlier finding of a single, moderately eccentric giant planet in the system. However, the model comparisons between a single giant and a pair of giants in the Kepler-25 and Kepler-68 systems are inconclusive but suggestive of a pair of giants just outside the 2:1 resonance. We therefore urge further RV monitoring of both systems to definitively rule out (or confirm) near-resonant giant planet pairs.

Kepler-65 e ($e = 0.28 \pm 0.07$) is one of the highest eccentricity giant planets discovered to date exterior to a system of compact SEASNs. The relatively high eccentricities of Kepler-65 e and Kepler-68 d ($e = 0.11 \pm 0.03$) compared to the low ($e < 0.1$)

eccentricities found in most multiplanet systems suggest that the processes that generate moderate giant planet eccentricity are not necessarily barriers to maintaining coplanar multiplanet systems at short orbital periods. In fact, these relatively high eccentricities may help reconcile the broad distribution of eccentricities seen in RV-detected giant planets with the low eccentricities seen in transiting compact multis (Figure 1). However, they still do not reach the very high eccentricities (0.7–0.9) of some long-period planets detected with RVs, as such orbits may directly destabilize inner planets.

Mustill et al. (2015) point out that giant planets with $P \lesssim 1$ yr and moderate eccentricities can be produced by high-eccentricity migration channels; however, this evolutionary pathway destroys any compact interior planetary system. On the other hand, Chatterjee et al. (2008) show that giant planets processed via scattering yields a broad range of eccentricities, including producing moderate eccentricity giant planets down to semimajor axes of a few tenths of an astronomical unit. We thus tentatively suggest that these systems experienced giant planet scattering events that did not disrupt the dynamically well-separated interior planets after their formation, rather than high-eccentricity migration.

Since we expect giant planets to form rapidly to allow sufficient time for runaway gas accretion before the protoplanetary disk dissipates (Lissauer 1987; Pollack et al. 1996; Lissauer et al. 2009), we note that pebble accretion theories of SEASN formation (e.g., Johansen & Lambrechts 2017; Ormel 2017) could be disfavored in systems such as these with exterior giant planets on a wide range of radii that may halt pebble inflow (Lin & Papaloizou 1986; Lambrechts et al. 2014; Morbidelli et al. 2016). However, the influence on giant planets in pebble accretion theories remains uncertain (see Hasegawa & Pudritz 2011; Morbidelli & Nesvorný 2012). The discovery of giant planets exterior to compact multiplanet systems may also disfavor large-scale migration of the inner bodies, despite the near-resonance observed in Kepler-25 (Izidoro et al. 2015).

Overall, measuring the prevalence and eccentricities of giant planets exterior to compact SEASN systems puts constraints on the formation channels of the inner planets. Additional long-term monitoring of SEASN systems is needed to increase the number of detected outer companions and the number of systems with strong limits on the non-existence of giant planets. An increase in our understanding of the statistical distribution of exterior giants will provide further insight into both the giant planets’ own dynamical histories and their influence on compact SEASN systems.

We thank the *Kepler* and *Gaia* teams for years of work making these precious data sets possible. This research has made use of NASA’s Astrophysics Data System, the Exoplanet Orbit Database, and the Exoplanet Data Explorer at <http://exoplanets.org>. M.R.K. acknowledges support from the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship, grant No. DGE 1339067. L.M.W. acknowledges support from the Beatrice Watson Parrent Fellowship, the Trottier Family Foundation, and the Levy family. The authors wish to recognize and acknowledge the very significant cultural role and reverence that the summit of Maunakea has long had within the indigenous Hawaiian community. We are most fortunate to have the opportunity to conduct observations from this mountain.

Facilities: Keck (HIRES), *Kepler*.

Software: *radvel* (Fulton et al. 2018).

Appendix

Figure 14. Mass and derived eccentricity posteriors of Kepler-65’s planets from a joint RV-*Kepler* photometry fit. A significant TTV detection by the photodynamic model, combined with the low-eccentricity prior results in mass constraints weakly degenerate with eccentricity.

Figure 15. Mass and derived eccentricity posteriors from a joint RV-*Kepler* photometry fit of Kepler-25. A significant TTV detection by the photodynamic model, combined with the low-eccentricity prior results in mass constraints weakly degenerate with eccentricity.

Table 7
Kepler-65 HIRES RVs

Time [BJD-2454900]	RV (m s ⁻¹)	σ (m s ⁻¹)	S-value
797.9785	-1.46	3.03	0.1330
798.9780	0.13	2.76	0.1340
800.0428	-5.06	2.92	0.1350
835.9620	-6.07	2.64	0.1300
839.0158	-13.93	3.09	0.1330
1950.0654	-13.73	3.60	0.1333
1962.0654	-7.68	3.90	0.1340
1965.0787	-5.94	3.70	0.1372
1965.7623	-7.32	3.69	0.1329
1966.9672	-4.24	3.75	0.1306
1972.9521	5.86	3.60	0.1290
1980.9310	-4.06	3.12	0.1360
1991.8251	13.12	3.14	0.1361
1993.0213	1.71	3.20	0.1349
1994.9791	5.55	3.20	0.1354
2006.9404	12.55	3.57	0.1350
2010.8677	4.34	3.69	0.1375
2012.9413	8.11	3.59	0.1290
2101.7114	1.92	3.72	0.1305
2251.0331	18.43	3.40	0.1338
2279.9614	18.66	3.43	0.1288
2298.0195	25.93	3.20	0.1312
2303.0104	31.70	3.55	0.1331
2311.0792	20.51	3.57	0.1344
2316.0349	15.53	3.36	0.1331
2322.0992	11.10	3.44	0.1356
2323.1172	22.54	3.18	0.1339
2329.0174	9.84	3.37	0.1350
2329.9147	5.22	3.31	0.1360
2330.7927	19.60	3.41	0.1369
2332.0814	16.24	3.29	0.1355
2332.8916	12.18	3.53	0.1355
2334.1023	8.54	3.31	0.1323
2335.9536	2.34	3.20	0.1357
2336.8389	14.48	3.22	0.1367
2340.0231	8.16	2.92	0.1361
2344.8161	8.01	3.12	0.1383
2345.9187	-9.75	3.04	0.1380
2347.0604	-14.91	3.38	0.1359
2353.9886	5.19	3.01	0.1373
2354.9137	-6.50	3.17	0.1351
2356.0186	-1.05	3.48	0.1188
2362.8601	-22.99	3.38	0.1377
2364.9807	-9.91	3.21	0.1378
2385.7684	-19.79	3.4	0.1335
2390.8331	-9.75	3.41	0.1337
2390.9402	-5.77	3.85	0.1226
2394.8182	-5.33	3.04	0.1364
2396.9131	-22.19	3.32	0.1321
2398.7801	-13.78	3.18	0.1334
2426.7046	-4.02	3.38	0.1330
2426.8396	-10.35	3.63	0.1340
2453.6800	-6.67	3.15	0.1374
2453.7663	-17.74	3.56	0.1347
2454.6923	-0.05	3.18	0.1584
2454.7650	-7.60	3.49	0.1357
2455.6847	-7.21	3.45	0.1352
2455.7584	-7.93	3.29	0.1346
2478.6966	-10.71	3.75	0.1214
2540.1678	21.70	3.28	0.1312
2578.1258	16.72	3.70	0.1340
2620.9898	9.11	3.28	0.1350
2662.0773	-7.37	3.14	0.1324

Table 7
(Continued)

Time [BJD-2454900]	RV (m s ⁻¹)	σ (m s ⁻¹)	S-value
2669.9411	-17.18	4.17	0.1335
2680.0415	-3.02	3.59	0.1336
2684.0287	-26.03	3.77	0.1326
2697.0877	-19.14	4.43	0.1359
2772.8783	11.25	3.17	0.1352
2988.0677	-7.14	3.56	0.1332
3027.0476	2.71	3.37	0.1337

(This table is available in its entirety in machine-readable form.)

Table 8
Kepler-25 HIRES RVs

Time [BJD-2454900]	RV (m s ⁻¹)	σ (m s ⁻¹)	S-value
467.103	-7.25	3.84	0.133
476.963	3.64	3.27	0.132
477.950	-2.84	3.17	0.134
533.942	14.53	3.65	0.127
796.949	13.33	3.42	0.131
797.952	2.34	3.67	0.130
798.949	-4.09	3.46	0.130
800.028	10.93	3.55	0.131
834.053	-0.47	3.06	0.132
834.942	-2.08	2.92	0.131
835.987	-13.09	3.24	0.132
839.050	-2.54	4.08	0.132
851.936	-15.48	3.34	0.133
852.794	-18.31	2.96	0.132
859.966	6.28	2.94	0.133
860.810	-4.88	3.10	0.133
861.103	-3.76	2.98	0.133
861.775	-0.48	3.61	0.130
862.110	2.11	3.35	0.131
862.891	-2.22	2.56	0.132
863.841	-6.79	2.96	0.130
868.853	-8.20	3.26	0.096
869.944	9.28	3.54	0.124
882.065	-5.56	4.07	0.129
887.763	-0.92	3.71	0.130
888.938	-4.86	3.29	0.128
889.798	1.53	3.60	0.128
889.805	4.00	4.06	0.129
890.756	-2.39	3.27	0.129
891.933	-0.20	3.31	0.128
892.767	3.39	3.15	0.128
894.926	17.73	3.71	0.126
896.893	16.41	3.38	0.128
898.759	4.48	3.38	0.127
906.789	15.13	3.49	0.126
908.797	20.58	3.12	0.127
910.735	7.32	3.49	0.127
914.927	15.07	3.57	0.126
1003.699	10.62	3.48	0.127
1179.873	-0.50	3.93	0.122
1180.110	4.38	3.55	0.131
1214.852	4.21	3.84	0.135
1234.930	-11.01	3.27	0.130
1239.028	-2.79	3.54	0.131
1245.944	-1.82	4.20	0.131
1247.807	-5.27	3.46	0.130
1248.840	-6.27	3.87	0.129

Table 8
(Continued)

Time [BJD-2454900]	RV (m s ⁻¹)	σ (m s ⁻¹)	S-value
1252.963	15.96	3.70	0.128
1263.794	23.03	3.54	0.129
1294.822	7.34	4.06	0.127
1575.858	-12.85	3.69	0.133
1619.908	17.03	3.91	0.129
1946.047	-1.94	3.33	0.131
1946.900	-21.44	3.50	0.132
1966.904	-10.92	3.84	0.122
1984.002	3.68	3.92	0.127
2010.879	1.79	3.91	0.127
2280.055	14.22	3.69	0.128
2301.960	-11.52	3.73	0.133
2303.050	-20.87	3.61	0.132
2308.083	-4.48	3.87	0.125
2311.917	4.81	3.68	0.134
2318.056	-5.55	3.62	0.128
2329.923	6.56	3.85	0.133
2332.886	-0.78	4.21	0.131
2342.971	-9.59	3.98	0.130
2345.851	2.25	4.09	0.131
2696.075	-10.85	3.85	0.128
2778.791	1.93	4.21	0.117
3046.032	5.98	3.44	0.133
3427.758	2.79	3.76	0.135

(This table is available in its entirety in machine-readable form.)

Table 9
Kepler-68 HIRES RVs

Time [BJD-2454900]	RV (m s ⁻¹)	σ (m s ⁻¹)	S-value
413.082	-6.16	1.47	0.140
419.109	-9.77	1.72	0.135
422.051	-12.09	1.26	0.138
472.983	-11.05	1.18	0.138
477.929	-9.73	1.21	0.139
481.000	-17.54	1.27	0.138
496.963	-14.63	1.52	0.140
512.923	-18.64	1.19	0.137
526.913	-16.56	1.20	0.143
531.784	-10.77	1.19	0.140
534.870	-23.21	1.21	0.144
534.876	-24.48	1.20	0.144
535.931	-19.72	1.33	0.138
536.968	-15.75	1.69	0.135
536.975	-21.13	1.76	0.131
537.940	-15.08	1.32	0.143
537.950	-14.53	1.28	0.145
538.991	-15.84	1.27	0.139
539.003	-16.08	1.39	0.141
539.924	-19.47	1.19	0.144
539.932	-21.57	1.31	0.142
540.971	-18.38	1.21	0.143
540.980	-21.99	1.24	0.141
555.810	-22.84	1.28	0.148
590.830	-18.38	1.36	0.147

Table 9
(Continued)

Time [BJD-2454900]	RV (m s ⁻¹)	σ (m s ⁻¹)	S-value
772.026	17.17	1.12	0.138
772.998	14.20	1.29	0.137
773.996	18.22	1.37	0.139
796.974	21.13	1.30	0.140
797.964	23.13	1.43	0.140
798.962	16.30	1.28	0.139
822.995	21.99	1.40	0.137
824.034	27.13	1.47	0.137
828.901	22.75	1.51	0.125
834.064	24.72	1.35	0.137
834.951	25.41	1.31	0.138
835.975	24.25	1.32	0.138
839.034	23.77	1.41	0.137
851.797	18.56	1.44	0.138
852.105	17.53	1.33	0.134
852.779	15.36	1.36	0.138
859.975	18.30	1.32	0.139
861.076	21.53	1.18	0.139
861.842	15.24	1.23	0.134
863.033	18.81	1.29	0.132
863.851	14.05	1.26	0.139
882.908	15.18	1.35	0.137
895.024	7.12	1.53	0.139
914.736	12.55	1.19	0.146
1177.045	-16.44	1.34	0.136
1198.094	-12.64	1.44	0.137
1198.829	-13.56	1.42	0.140
1202.008	-6.61	1.30	0.138
1214.872	-15.53	1.30	0.139
1245.875	-10.22	1.39	0.141
1248.929	-4.14	1.17	0.144
1251.061	-11.05	1.31	0.142
1253.983	-9.76	1.21	0.146
1274.827	-1.96	1.40	0.147
1445.155	17.07	1.36	0.138
1575.844	9.71	1.42	0.139
1598.070	2.62	1.36	0.138
1613.044	-2.67	1.36	0.141
1619.920	-0.83	1.27	0.143
1946.882	10.49	1.36	0.137
1992.760	7.75	1.28	0.146
1992.766	8.52	1.25	0.145
1992.772	10.66	1.26	0.145
2006.735	11.57	1.24	0.145
2006.741	14.37	1.31	0.145
2006.747	14.08	1.27	0.144
2303.075	-2.44	1.27	0.136
2303.083	-2.39	1.27	0.134
2318.103	-2.05	1.36	0.140
2333.059	-15.79	1.38	0.138
2333.066	-10.99	1.44	0.139
2721.887	14.31	1.21	0.146
2721.895	8.94	1.27	0.146
2751.902	12.20	1.40	0.146
3045.018	-22.38	1.30	0.140
3102.985	-19.95	1.39	0.144
3427.765	5.31	1.35	0.143

(This table is available in its entirety in machine-readable form.)

ORCID iDs

Sean M. Mills <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4535-6241>

Andrew W. Howard <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8638-0320>

Lauren M. Weiss <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3725-3058>

Howard Isaacson <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0531-1073>

Benjamin J. Fulton <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3504-5316>

Erik A. Petigura <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0967-2893>

Molly R. Kosiarek <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6115-4359>

Lea A. Hirsch <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8058-7443>

References

- Agol, E., & Deck, K. 2016, *ApJ*, **818**, 177
- Agol, E., Steffen, J., Sari, R., & Clarkson, W. 2005, *MNRAS*, **359**, 567
- Akaike, H. 1974, *ITAC*, **19**, 716
- Albrecht, S., Winn, J. N., Marcy, G. W., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, **771**, 11
- Anglada-Escudé, G., López-Morales, M., & Chambers, J. E. 2010, *ApJ*, **709**, 168
- Batygin, K., & Laughlin, G. 2015, *PNAS*, **112**, 4214
- Becker, J. C., Vanderburg, A., Adams, F. C., Rappaport, S. A., & Schwengel, H. M. 2015, *ApJL*, **812**, L18
- Boisvert, J. H., Nelson, B. E., & Steffen, J. H. 2018, *MNRAS*, **480**, 2846
- Borucki, W. J., Koch, D., Basri, G., et al. 2010, *Sci*, **327**, 977
- Bryan, M. L., Knutson, H. A., Fulton, B., et al. 2019, *AJ*, **157**, 52
- Burnham, K. P., & Anderson, D. R. 2003, *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: A Practical Information-theoretic Approach* (New York: Springer-Verlag)
- Cabrera, J., Csizmadia, S., Lehmann, H., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, **781**, 18
- Chaplin, W. J., Sanchis-Ojeda, R., Campante, T. L., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, **766**, 101
- Chatterjee, S., Ford, E. B., Matsumura, S., & Rasio, F. A. 2008, *ApJ*, **686**, 580
- Coughlin, J. L., Mullally, F., Thompson, S. E., et al. 2016, *ApJS*, **224**, 12
- Dawson, R. I., Johnson, J. A., Fabrycky, D. C., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, **791**, 89
- Deck, K. M., & Agol, E. 2015, *ApJ*, **802**, 116
- Deck, K. M., & Agol, E. 2016, *ApJ*, **821**, 96
- Dressing, C. D., Charbonneau, D., Dumusque, X., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, **800**, 135
- Fabrycky, D. C., Lissauer, J. J., Ragozzine, D., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, **790**, 146
- Foreman-Mackey, D., Hogg, D. W., Lang, D., & Goodman, J. 2013, *PASP*, **125**, 306
- Foreman-Mackey, D., Morton, T. D., Hogg, D. W., Agol, E., & Schölkopf, B. 2016, *AJ*, **152**, 206
- Fulton, B. J., & Petigura, E. A. 2018, *AJ*, **156**, 264
- Fulton, B. J., Petigura, E. A., Blunt, S., & Sinukoff, E. 2018, *PASP*, **130**, 044504
- Fulton, B. J., Petigura, E. A., Howard, A. W., et al. 2017, *AJ*, **154**, 109
- Gaia Collaboration, Brown, A. G. A., Vallenari, A., et al. 2018, *A&A*, **616**, A1
- García, R. A., Hekker, S., Stello, D., et al. 2011, *MNRAS*, **414**, L6
- Gelman, A., & Rubin, D. B. 1992, *StaSc*, **7**, 457
- Gilliland, R. L., Marcy, G. W., Rowe, J. F., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, **766**, 40
- Ginski, C., Mugrauer, M., Seeliger, M., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, **457**, 2173
- Hadden, S., & Lithwick, Y. 2014, *ApJ*, **787**, 80
- Hadden, S., & Lithwick, Y. 2017, *AJ*, **154**, 5
- Han, E., Wang, S. X., Wright, J. T., et al. 2014, *PASP*, **126**, 827
- Hasegawa, Y., & Pudritz, R. E. 2011, *MNRAS*, **417**, 1236
- Holczer, T., Mazeh, T., Nachmani, G., et al. 2016, *ApJS*, **225**, 9
- Howard, A. W., Johnson, J. A., Marcy, G. W., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **721**, 1467
- Huang, C. X., Petrovich, C., & Deibert, E. 2017, *AJ*, **153**, 210
- Izidoro, A., Raymond, S. N., Morbidelli, A., Hersant, F., & Pierens, A. 2015, *ApJL*, **800**, L22
- Johansen, A., & Lambrechts, M. 2017, *AREPS*, **45**, 359
- Johnson, J. A., Howard, A. W., Bowler, B. P., et al. 2010, *PASP*, **122**, 701
- Kürster, M., Trifonov, T., Reffert, S., Kostogryz, N. M., & Rodler, F. 2015, *A&A*, **577**, A103
- Lambrechts, M., Johansen, A., & Morbidelli, A. 2014, *A&A*, **572**, A35
- Lin, D. N. C., & Papaloizou, J. 1986, *ApJ*, **309**, 846
- Lissauer, J. J. 1987, *Icar*, **69**, 249
- Lissauer, J. J., Hubickyj, O., D'Angelo, G., & Bodenheimer, P. 2009, *Icar*, **199**, 338
- Lithwick, Y., Xie, J., & Wu, Y. 2012, *ApJ*, **761**, 122
- Lomb, N. R. 1976, *Ap&SS*, **39**, 447
- Lopez, E. D., & Fortney, J. J. 2013, *ApJ*, **776**, 2
- Lopez, E. D., & Rice, K. 2018, *MNRAS*, **479**, 5303
- Marcy, G. W., Butler, R. P., Vogt, S. S., et al. 2008, *PhST*, **130**, 014001
- Marcy, G. W., Isaacson, H., Howard, A. W., et al. 2014, *ApJS*, **210**, 20
- Mazeh, T., Nachmani, G., Holczer, T., et al. 2013, *ApJS*, **208**, 16
- Migaszewski, C., & Goździewski, K. 2018, *MNRAS*, **480**, 1767
- Morbidelli, A., Bitsch, B., Crida, A., et al. 2016, *Icar*, **267**, 368
- Morbidelli, A., & Nesvorný, D. 2012, *A&A*, **546**, A18
- Morton, T. D., Bryson, S. T., Coughlin, J. L., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, **822**, 86
- Mustill, A. J., Davies, M. B., & Johansen, A. 2015, *ApJ*, **808**, 14
- Nesvorný, D., Kipping, D. M., Buchhave, L. A., et al. 2012, *Sci*, **336**, 1133
- Ofir, A., Xie, J.-W., Jiang, C.-F., Sari, R., & Aharonson, O. 2018, *ApJS*, **234**, 9
- Ormel, C. W. 2017, in *Formation, Evolution, and Dynamics of Young Solar Systems*, Astrophysics and Space Science Library, ed. M. Pessah & O. Gressel, Vol. 445 (Switzerland: Springer International), 197
- Owen, J. E., & Wu, Y. 2013, *ApJ*, **775**, 105
- Owen, J. E., & Wu, Y. 2017, *ApJ*, **847**, 29
- Pál, A. 2012, *MNRAS*, **420**, 1630
- Petigura, E. A., Benneke, B., Batygin, K., et al. 2018, *AJ*, **156**, 89
- Pollack, J. B., Hubickyj, O., Bodenheimer, P., et al. 1996, *Icar*, **124**, 62
- Pu, B., & Lai, D. 2018, *MNRAS*, **478**, 197
- Scargle, J. D. 1982, *ApJ*, **263**, 835
- Sinukoff, E., Howard, A. W., Petigura, E. A., et al. 2017, *AJ*, **153**, 70
- Steffen, J. H., Fabrycky, D. C., Ford, E. B., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, **421**, 2342
- Ter Braak, C. J. F. 2005, *Biometris Report, Genetic Algorithms and Markov Chain Monte Carlo: Differential Evolution Markov Chain Makes Bayesian Computing Easy*, 010404, 556, <http://edepot.wur.nl/39477>
- Uehara, S., Kawahara, H., Masuda, K., Yamada, S., & Aizawa, M. 2016, *ApJ*, **822**, 2
- Van Cleve, J. E., Christiansen, J. L., Jenkins, J. M. et al. 2016, *Kepler Data Characteristics Handbook*, Kepler Science Document, **KSCI-19040-005**
- Van Eylen, V., & Albrecht, S. 2015, *ApJ*, **808**, 126
- Van Eylen, V., Albrecht, S., Huang, X., et al. 2019, *AJ*, **157**, 61
- Wittenmyer, R. A., Wang, S., Horner, J., et al. 2013, *ApJS*, **208**, 2
- Xie, J.-W., Dong, S., Zhu, Z., et al. 2016, *PNAS*, **113**, 11431
- Zhu, W., Petrovich, C., Wu, Y., Dong, S., & Xie, J. 2018, *ApJ*, **860**, 101
- Zhu, W., & Wu, Y. 2018, *AJ*, **156**, 92