

Comment on [Ádám et al. \(2023\)](#): Large fraction of already known systems reported

Zasche, P.

Charles University, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Astronomical Institute, V Holešovičkách 2, CZ-180 00, Praha 8, Czech Republic, e-mail: zasche@sirrah.troja.mff.cuni.cz

Received August 7, 2024; accepted ???

ABSTRACT

In this work, I report that large fraction of stars detected by ([Ádám et al. 2023](#), A&A, 674, A170) and noted in that work as new discoveries are in fact known systems. This is especially true for the dense bulge fields with large blending of nearby sources. Among the published 245 stars determined to be doubly eclipsing (i.e. containing two eclipsing signals), I identified 53 blends. In other words, about a quarter of the systems noted by [Ádám et al.](#) are not actually doubly eclipsing; rather, these are contaminations of known nearby sources that have already been detected by OGLE. Such a high proportion of reported false positives should not be readily ignored and ought to be addressed in future studies.

Key words. stars: binaries: eclipsing

1. Introduction

About one year ago, [Ádám et al. \(2023\)](#) published a study on the OGLE-IV catalogue, with an aim to identify stars with additional signals besides the dominant one. The authors presented altogether 292 such new systems, together with their preliminary characteristics and types (i.e. period and type of variability). According to their statement, they ‘determined whether it is a new variable or just the result of contamination by an already catalogued nearby one’ (abstract in [Ádám et al. 2023](#)). When following up on these results, we came to a very different conclusion. In addition, those authors noted that they had excluded those that had resulted from the ‘contamination by known OGLE variables from our catalogue’. This amounted to 292 new variable stars, which the authors listed in their Table B.1. In this work, I present the stars that had been missed in this step, which led to a sharp artificial increase in the statistics published in the cited work.

2. Known nearby variables

For the detection of known variables in the vicinity of the particular target, we also used the same source as [Ádám et al. \(2023\)](#), namely, is the OGLE-IV catalogue from [Soszyński et al. \(2016\)](#). The area scanned for detections was set to $10''$ around the target, where I tried to identify the source of the signal from [Soszyński et al. \(2016\)](#) with the same period as given by [Ádám et al. \(2023\)](#).

The serious blending problem is usually related to the photometric data obtained on large pixels with poor angular resolution (e.g. TESS with its $21''/\text{px}$, see [Ricker et al. 2015](#)). However, for the OGLE-IV data, this is problematic only in very dense stellar fields in the galactic bulge. In controlling all the presented 245 new systems with two eclipsing periods by [Ádám et al. \(2023\)](#), there were 53 nearby sources of this additional signal identified. Hence, the 53 false positives presented by [Ádám et al. \(2023\)](#) represents almost a quarter of all their reported systems. These




Fig. 1. Typical example of two close stars OGLE-BLG-ECL-85704 and OGLE-BLG-ECL-85710 (separated about $1.07''$) with two different periods. Each of the periods clearly belongs to one particular target and the residual signal is only due to light contamination.

stars are given in Table 1, along with the true identification of the source of additional variation.

One typical example of such a false positive is shown in Figure 1, drawn from the first system in our Table 1. We can clearly see the appropriate period for the particular star. Both signals are present on both stars thanks to their close angular distance (about $1.07''$ only), but identifying which star the period belongs to is straightforward.

As an additional cross-check, we also tried to identify similar periods (or their double and/or half values) from other photometric data. We used the old ASAS-3 database ([Pojmanski 1998, 2002](#)), searching in the $2'$ radius around a star, as well as the ASAS-SN database ([Kochanek et al. 2017; Jayasinghe et al. 2018](#)), also within the same radius. Finally, we used *Gaia* DR3 ([Gaia Collaboration et al. 2023](#)) and stars in the $70''$ radius were scanned. As a result, no other positive detection of both eclips-

Table 1. False positives from [Ádám et al. \(2023\)](#) together with a blending source identification.

Target name	RA [J2000.0]	DE [J2000.0]	P_1 [d]	P_2 [d]	Blending information
OGLE-BLG-ECL-085710	17 44 33.76	-34 06 37.17	0.926231	0.274207	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-085704
OGLE-BLG-ECL-162682	17 53 34.00	-31 10 16.82	30.509576	0.497508	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-162685
OGLE-BLG-ECL-164230	17 53 41.69	-29 41 38.27	1.289267	2.990437	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-164216
OGLE-BLG-ECL-175451	17 54 37.17	-29 25 14.23	1.038538	0.407096	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-175469
OGLE-BLG-ECL-175866	17 54 39.13	-29 20 32.21	32.155974	0.364633	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-175879
OGLE-BLG-ECL-176073	17 54 40.08	-29 40 49.79	0.797012	0.351255	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-176113
OGLE-BLG-ECL-180524	17 55 04.07	-31 00 54.09	0.297821	0.433165	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-180509
OGLE-BLG-ECL-183527	17 55 19.39	-29 48 14.56	0.336450	0.415538	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-183500
OGLE-BLG-ECL-184951	17 55 26.18	-31 19 32.01	0.790206	0.389627	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-184961
OGLE-BLG-ECL-186346	17 55 32.94	-30 00 35.04	0.928168	0.497266	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-186348
OGLE-BLG-ECL-195851	17 56 20.90	-28 36 51.08	7.321952	0.374819	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-195827
OGLE-BLG-ECL-197037	17 56 27.23	-29 39 37.86	1.041253	0.336643	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-197030
OGLE-BLG-ECL-200402	17 56 44.16	-29 40 43.64	0.457504	0.402577	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-200397
OGLE-BLG-ECL-202842	17 56 56.39	-30 57 16.88	0.565191	0.435189	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-202865
OGLE-BLG-ECL-204851	17 57 06.19	-27 55 51.46	0.574790	0.430802	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-204861
OGLE-BLG-ECL-207504	17 57 20.89	-29 25 31.96	0.414866	0.403268	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-207517
OGLE-BLG-ECL-207581	17 57 21.32	-29 37 19.21	0.369578	0.334869	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-207599
OGLE-BLG-ECL-209728	17 57 31.88	-28 07 54.57	0.322124	0.336769	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-209712
OGLE-BLG-ECL-212142	17 57 43.88	-29 26 49.89	0.466858	0.313969	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-212135
OGLE-BLG-ECL-213783	17 57 52.34	-29 49 32.35	0.415471	0.379676	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-213786
OGLE-BLG-ECL-213786	17 57 52.49	-29 49 33.31	0.379677	0.415471	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-213783
OGLE-BLG-ECL-216018	17 58 04.54	-30 51 02.93	0.362244	0.432300	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-216008
OGLE-BLG-ECL-216324	17 58 06.17	-28 45 02.19	0.643459	0.392652	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-216341
OGLE-BLG-ECL-227744	17 59 05.02	-28 24 39.04	1.380442	0.419004	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-227750
OGLE-BLG-ECL-227914	17 59 05.80	-28 27 25.82	1.034848	0.489439	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-227903
OGLE-BLG-ECL-229158	17 59 12.02	-29 15 46.01	0.620128	0.303132	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-229160
OGLE-BLG-ECL-229495	17 59 13.75	-28 42 17.60	0.995846	1.288566	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-229478
OGLE-BLG-ECL-233822	17 59 37.95	-28 22 30.38	1.165683	0.389816	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-233847
OGLE-BLG-ECL-235127	17 59 44.39	-29 10 49.55	9.048235	0.500515	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-235154
OGLE-BLG-ECL-235154	17 59 44.39	-29 10 49.55	0.500514	9.047202	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-235127
OGLE-BLG-ECL-235373	17 59 45.46	-28 35 52.78	0.817006	0.339319	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-235353
OGLE-BLG-ECL-236897	17 59 53.62	-28 22 57.27	0.461052	0.382470	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-236873
OGLE-BLG-ECL-240175	18 00 11.58	-30 39 20.85	0.519637	0.575412	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-240177
OGLE-BLG-ECL-240177	18 00 11.58	-30 39 20.85	0.575413	0.519634	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-240175
OGLE-BLG-ECL-245466	18 00 39.89	-28 51 52.88	0.685942	0.450982	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-245476
OGLE-BLG-ECL-246036	18 00 42.76	-28 10 14.37	0.488428	0.718922	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-246041
OGLE-BLG-ECL-246468	18 00 45.10	-29 03 37.43	3.117342	0.205621	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-246473
OGLE-BLG-ECL-251606	18 01 11.87	-28 36 43.44	0.334013	0.327027	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-251626
OGLE-BLG-ECL-253194	18 01 20.92	-28 53 57.98	0.561837	0.324601	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-253185
OGLE-BLG-ECL-258936	18 01 52.69	-28 34 00.49	0.451274	0.423425	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-258953
OGLE-BLG-ECL-259321	18 01 54.86	-27 54 19.18	0.446969	0.380738	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-259296
OGLE-BLG-ECL-260224	18 01 59.88	-28 38 10.61	0.357231	0.197554	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-260240
OGLE-BLG-ECL-260240	18 01 59.88	-28 38 10.61	0.395107	0.178616	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-260224
OGLE-BLG-ECL-266487	18 02 34.68	-27 47 24.50	0.760567	0.360594	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-266498
OGLE-BLG-ECL-269995	18 02 54.52	-26 46 02.65	0.656073	0.511003	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-269991
OGLE-BLG-ECL-270233	18 02 55.86	-27 20 34.68	2.200611	0.431809	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-270203
OGLE-BLG-ECL-272656	18 03 09.46	-28 46 38.54	3.385598	0.362125	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-272668
OGLE-BLG-ECL-274965	18 03 22.32	-28 38 37.58	1.341903	0.387542	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-274953
OGLE-BLG-ECL-279001	18 03 44.10	-28 45 39.15	0.815092	0.241045	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-279020
OGLE-BLG-ECL-280921	18 03 54.55	-28 45 05.97	8.075665	0.356790	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-280936
OGLE-BLG-ECL-285403	18 04 19.59	-27 57 03.77	1.077844	0.157675	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-285426
OGLE-BLG-ECL-286273	18 04 24.13	-29 11 50.39	0.266666	0.408718	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-286294
OGLE-BLG-ECL-293405	18 05 03.12	-29 09 14.25	0.284271	0.423757	blend with close-by OGLE-BLG-ECL-293399

ing periods in these databases was found. From the remaining 192 systems for 23 stars, their more prominent periods were also identified in the *Gaia* DR3 variability tables.

3. Conclusions

The blending problem of light contamination from nearby sources is less obvious for the OGLE-IV data (angular resolution of about $0.417''/\text{px}$) than for TESS data. However, in dense stellar fields, this can pose a serious problem to classification procedures. Therefore, it is important to make an effort to identify false positives such as those presented in the paper by [Ádám et al. \(2023\)](#), as a necessary step in any such analysis.

Acknowledgements. We do thank the OGLE team for making all of the observations easily public available. This research has made use of the SIMBAD and VIZIER databases, operated at CDS, Strasbourg,

France and of NASA Astrophysics Data System Bibliographic Services. This work has made use of data from the European Space Agency (ESA) mission *Gaia* (<https://www.cosmos.esa.int/gaia>), processed by the *Gaia* Data Processing and Analysis Consortium (DPAC, <https://www.cosmos.esa.int/web/gaia/dpac/consortium>). Funding for the DPAC has been provided by national institutions, in particular the institutions participating in the *Gaia* Multilateral Agreement.

References

- Ádám, R. Z., Hajdu, T., Bódi, A., et al. 2023, *A&A*, 674, A170
 Gaia Collaboration, Vallenari, A., Brown, A. G. A., et al. 2023, *A&A*, 674, A1
 Jayasinghe, T., Kochanek, C. S., Stanek, K. Z., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 477, 3145
 Kochanek, C. S., Shappee, B. J., Stanek, K. Z., et al. 2017, *PASP*, 129, 104502
 Pojmanski, G. 1998, *Acta Astron.*, 48, 35
 Pojmanski, G. 2002, *Acta Astron.*, 52, 397
 Ricker, G. R., Winn, J. N., Vanderspek, R., et al. 2015, *JATIS*, 1, 014003
 Soszyński, I., Pawlak, M., Pietrukowicz, P., et al. 2016, *Acta Astron.*, 66, 405