

# Cepheid Period-Radius and Period-Luminosity Relations and the Distance to the LMC

Wolfgang P. Gieren

Universidad de Concepción, Departamento de Física, Casilla 4009, Concepción, Chile;

email: wgieren@coma.cfm.udec.cl

Pascal Fouqué

Observatoire de Paris, Section de Meudon DESPA F-92195 Meudon CEDEX, France;

European Southern Observatory, Casilla 19001, Santiago 19, Chile;

email: pfouque@eso.org

and

Matías Gómez

P. Universidad Católica de Chile, Departamento de Astronomía y Astrofísica,

Casilla 104, Santiago 22, Chile;

email: mgomez@astro.puc.cl

Received \_\_\_\_\_; accepted \_\_\_\_\_

## ABSTRACT

We have used the infrared Barnes-Evans surface brightness technique to derive the radii and distances of 34 Galactic Cepheid variables. Radius and distance results obtained from both versions of the technique are in excellent agreement. The radii of 28 variables are used to determine the period-radius relation. This relation is found to have a smaller dispersion than in previous studies, and is identical to the period-radius relation found by Laney & Stobie from a completely independent method, a fact which provides persuasive evidence that the Cepheid period-radius relation is now determined at a very high confidence level. We use the accurate infrared distances to determine period-luminosity relations in the  $V$ ,  $I$ ,  $J$ ,  $H$  and  $K$  passbands from the Galactic sample of Cepheids. We derive improved slopes of these relations from updated LMC Cepheid samples and adopt these slopes to obtain accurate absolute calibrations of the PL relation. By comparing these relations to the ones defined by the LMC Cepheids, we derive strikingly consistent and precise values for the LMC distance modulus in each of the passbands which yield a mean value of  $\mu_o(\text{LMC}) = 18.46 \pm 0.02$ .

By analyzing the observed dispersions of the PL relations defined by the LMC and Galactic samples of Cepheids, we disentangle the contributions due to uncertainties in the reddenings, in distance measurement and due to metallicity effects, and we estimate the intrinsic dispersion of the PL relation with the Wesenheit function. Assuming that the Galactic Cepheid distances are typically accurate to  $\pm 3\%$  (as shown in a previous Paper), and an intrinsic spread in  $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$  of  $\sim 0.4$  dex among the Cepheids of our sample as obtained by Fry & Carney, the observed dispersion of the Galactic Cepheid PL relation suggests a metallicity dependence of  $\Delta\mu/\Delta[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \approx 0.2$ , about half the value suggested

by Sasselov et al. from EROS data. When we apply this correction, the LMC distance modulus is increased to  $18.52 \pm 0.06$  with most of this uncertainty being due to the adopted metallicity correction.

Our results show that the infrared Barnes-Evans technique is very insensitive to both Cepheid metallicity and adopted reddening, and therefore a very powerful tool to derive accurate distances to nearby galaxies by a direct application of the technique to their Cepheid variables, rather than by comparing PL relations of different galaxies, which introduces much more sensitivity to metallicity and absorption corrections which are usually difficult to determine.

*Subject headings:* Cepheids — Stars: Distances — Stars: Fundamental Parameters — Infrared: Stars — Magellanic Clouds — Distance Scale

## 1. Introduction

The determination of the radii and absolute magnitudes of Galactic Cepheid variables, and the establishment of the corresponding period-radius and period-luminosity relations has occupied researchers for several decades. While the correct measurement of Cepheid radii, and hence a correct knowledge of the period-radius relation obeyed by Cepheid variables is important to determine the masses and other physical parameters of these variables, our ability to measure the distances to these stars critically determines our ability to scale the Universe out to several Megaparsecs and to lay the foundation to determine the Hubble constant. The period-radius relation may also turn out to be very useful for the determination of pulsational parallaxes of Cepheids in galaxies whose distances are too large to allow to observe meaningful radial velocity curves of the variables, but still permit to obtain good light curves and periods.

Significant progress in the determination of Cepheid distances and radii has recently been made by Fouqué & Gieren (1997, hereafter Paper I) who have calibrated an infrared version of the Barnes-Evans (hereafter BE) surface brightness technique using the  $K$ ,  $J-K$  magnitude-color combination, as well as a version using the  $V$ ,  $V-K$  combination which was originally introduced by Welch (1994), with an accurate zero point of the surface brightness-color relations determined from a large set of interferometrically determined angular diameters of cool giants and supergiants which have become available over recent years. This new technique was applied to a sample of 16 Galactic open cluster Cepheids by Gieren, Fouqué & Gómez (1997, hereafter Paper II), and it was demonstrated in this paper that Cepheid radii and distances can be determined with a  $\pm 3\%$  accuracy from both versions of the technique which yield identical results, within these small errors.

In this paper, we extend our Cepheid sample to derive the period-radius relation, and period-absolute magnitude relations in optical ( $V$ ,  $I$ ) and infrared ( $J$ ,  $H$ ,  $K$ ) passbands

from a statistically more significant number of Galactic Cepheid variables. As we will show in the forthcoming sections of this paper, our improved ability to measure the radii and distances of individual Cepheids from our infrared technique, combined with a careful selection of the stars adopted for this study, leads to relations of lower dispersion than those obtained in any previous work.

Since our Galactic Cepheid sample is not large enough to derive the slopes of the PL relations in the different passbands with the highest possible accuracy, we adopt the approach to determine the slopes from the LMC Cepheids and use our Galactic Cepheid sample to set the zero points of the relations. These relations represent our best absolute calibrations of the Cepheid period-luminosity relations and will be derived in Section 5 of this paper. Comparing these Galactic PL relations to the corresponding relations defined by the LMC Cepheids, we finally proceed to derive a new distance to the LMC. We also address the open question of the metallicity dependence of the PL relation in this paper.

## 2. Additional Radius and Distance Solutions

As in Paper II for the cluster Cepheids, we adopted the infrared  $J$ ,  $K$  photometry on the Carter system of Laney & Stobie (1992) for the additional Cepheids selected for this study. However, we have omitted a number of the Cepheids observed by these authors for our analysis, for one or several of the following reasons:

- a) insufficient number of  $J$ ,  $K$  observations ( $N < 20$ )
- b) insufficient number and/or quality of available radial velocity observations
- c) a red companion star present (which affects the observed infrared light curves)
- d) spectroscopic binary Cepheids with unknown orbital velocity curve (i.e. correction of

the pulsational velocity curve for the orbital effect is not possible)

- e) Cepheids with extremely small light and velocity amplitudes (for which our method produces unreliable radius and distance solutions)
- f) double mode Cepheids

EDITOR: PLACE TABLE 1 HERE.

EDITOR: PLACE TABLE 2 HERE.

These selection criteria left us with the additional 18 stars listed in Table 1, and a total of 34 Cepheids adding the 16 Cepheids studied in Paper II. While this sample is obviously smaller than the one studied by Laney & Stobie (1994, 1995), it has the advantage of being a "clean" sample, freed from stars with expected systematic or enhanced random errors in their solutions, while at the same time being still large enough to provide good statistics in the relations we are going to investigate in this paper. As in Paper II, we undertook a literature survey to determine the best available radial velocity and photometric  $V$  data for the adopted Cepheids, where the database of D. Welch (1997) again provided valuable help. In Table 2, the sources of the adopted data are listed. For all variables, we adopted the pulsation periods given by Laney & Stobie (1992). For the color excesses of all stars we adopted the mean values given in the Fernie et al. (1997) Galactic Cepheid database, which are listed with their uncertainties in Table 3. We recall at this point that the BE technique is very insensitive to the values of the color excesses used in the analysis. For the conversion factor from radial to pulsational velocity we adopted the slightly period-dependent values resulting from the formula given by Gieren, Barnes & Moffett (1993), as we did for the Cepheids analyzed in Paper II.

EDITOR: PLACE TABLE 3 HERE.

For each Cepheid variable we obtained two radius and distance solutions, using the  $K$ ,  $J-K$  and the  $V$ ,  $V-K$  versions of the method, in exactly the same way as described in Paper II. We recall that we adopt the inverse fits in all cases for the reasons stated and investigated in Paper II. The resulting radii and distances are listed in Table 1. For most Cepheids, the agreement between the two solutions is very good, but there are a few exceptions. In order to decide on the final radius and distance to adopt for a given Cepheid, we used the plots of the linear and angular diameter variations vs. phase. We found that for the pure infrared  $K$ ,  $J-K$  solutions, the agreement of the two curves is always excellent, while for the  $V$ ,  $V-K$  solutions the agreement is not so good for a fraction of the Cepheids, specially for those with the longest pulsation periods in the sample. We have seen a similar effect in the Cepheids studied in Paper II and identified as the most likely cause a slight phase mismatch between the  $V$  and  $K$  light curves (which were not obtained simultaneously) used in the  $V$ ,  $V-K$  analyses due to an increasing tendency of period variability in the long-period Cepheids, a problem which does not exist in the  $K$ ,  $J-K$  solutions because here all photometric data were obtained contemporaneously. There is also a possibility that the  $V$ ,  $V-K$  infrared BE technique begins to work less well for the very extended, luminous Cepheids while it still works well at pure infrared wavelengths for these stars. For those Cepheids where problems of this kind are clearly visible in their  $V$ ,  $V-K$  solutions, we adopted as the final radius and distance the one coming from the  $K$ ,  $J-K$  solution alone. For the other (and the majority of) Cepheids for which this problem does not exist, the final adopted radii and distances are the weighted means of both solutions. We give the final, adopted radii and distances for all Cepheids, including those studied in Paper II, in Table 4. Note that the uncertainties in these adopted radii and distances are calculated

according to the formulae given in the Appendix of Quintana et al. (1994), i.e. they take into account not only the individual uncertainty of each solution, but also the difference between the two solutions, which may evidence systematic errors. We remark that, had we chosen to adopt the mean values from both solutions for all Cepheids (except the three longest-period stars of the sample which will be discussed later), the conclusions of this paper would not change in any significant way.

EDITOR: PLACE TABLE 4 HERE.

In Fig. 1, we compare the radii determined from the two different infrared BE techniques. All stars having both solutions (32) are included in this Figure. To calculate the mean ratio  $R_{V-K}/R_{J-K}$ , we exclude the three shortest-period stars (unreliable  $K$ ,  $J-K$  solution) and GY Sge, for which the  $V$ ,  $V-K$  solution is obviously unsuccessful. We then find the mean ratio  $R_{V-K}/R_{J-K}$  to be  $0.998 \pm 0.013$  (27 stars). If we compare the radii only for those Cepheids of the sample for which we adopted the mean of both solutions, the corresponding value is again  $1.00 \pm 0.01$ . This very clearly demonstrates that both infrared BE techniques produce identical radius results, within a very small error and independent of pulsation period. We note, however, that there is a tendency in Fig. 1 for the scatter to increase toward longer periods, which we attribute to the problem of the non-simultaneous  $V$ ,  $K$  photometry in the  $V$ ,  $V-K$  solutions, as discussed above.

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 1 HERE.

In Fig. 2, we show the same comparison for the distances. This time, the corresponding ratios are  $0.983 \pm 0.013$  and  $0.98 \pm 0.01$ , respectively, and as in the case of the radii, there is clearly no evidence for this ratio to vary systematically with period. In Paper II we had



found a value of 0.97, so the inclusion of more Cepheids in the comparison has brought the ratio even closer to unity. While one might speculate that the very small offset between the distances derived from the two methods might be real, it is clearly within the possible systematic errors of either method discussed in Paper II, thus justifying as an optimum choice to average the distances, as well as the radii, from both infrared BE techniques, as long as there are no clear reasons in particular cases to exclude one of the solutions.

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 2 HERE.

### 3. The Period-Radius Relation

When we plot in Fig. 3 the period-radius relation from the radius data in Table 4, we note that the three longest-period Cepheids of our sample (SV Vul, GY Sge and S Vul) lie clearly above the very tight relation defined by all the other stars. While we cannot exclude the possibility that the radii of these stars are correct, we prefer to conclude that our radius determinations overestimate the true radii in these cases and eliminate these stars in establishing the period-radius relation. There are several justifications for suspecting a problem with these very long-period stars: first, the pronounced disagreement between the  $K$ ,  $J-K$  and the  $V$ ,  $V-K$  solutions for GY Sge, which might imply that part of the problem is also with the (adopted)  $K$ ,  $J-K$  solution, and not only with the  $V$ ,  $V-K$  solution, for very luminous supergiants with very extended atmospheres; second, there is clearly a problem of a variable period for SV Vul (Bersier et al. 1994; Berdnikov 1997), and GY Sge and S Vul (Berdnikov 1997) which may have caused a systematic error in our solutions. Particularly in the case of GY Sge and S Vul, we were not able to find a single period which represents satisfactorily the different sets of photometric data available in the literature. Finally,

the range of periods for which our infrared BE techniques are calibrated (see Paper I) is up to 40 days, and while there is no particular reason to suspect that the calibration is different for Cepheids of longer periods, it is just these three stars which lie outside of the calibration range. There is clearly less confidence in the radius and distance solutions of these Cepheids, and we therefore feel that it is wise to exclude them from the calibration of the PR relation. We therefore do not think that the curvature in the PR relation (Fig. 3) which may be suggested by these stars is real.

On the other extreme of the period spectrum, there is a possible ambiguity as to the pulsation modes of the three shortest-period stars in our sample, which are EV Sct, SZ Tau and QZ Nor. Evidence for all of these Cepheids to be first overtone pulsators has been brought forward repeatedly in the literature, and is supported by the near-sinusoidal shapes of their light curves, but an uncertainty with regard to the mode identification remains, and we therefore choose to omit these stars from the discussion of the PR relation as well.

From the remaining 28 Cepheids of our sample, we find

$$\log R = 0.750 (\pm 0.024) \log P + 1.075 (\pm 0.007), \quad (1)$$

as the resulting period-radius relation, with a dispersion of  $\sigma = 0.036$  and a correlation coefficient of  $\rho = 0.987$ . This relation is plotted in Fig. 3. It is identical to the one found by Laney & Stobie (1995, hereafter LS95) from an application of the maximum likelihood method to a somewhat larger Cepheid sample which includes the present one, which is

$$\log R = 0.751 (\pm 0.026) \log P + 1.070 (\pm 0.008), \quad (2)$$

with a dispersion of  $\sigma = 0.051$  (we note that LS95 have used a constant p-factor of 1.36 which corresponds to our value for intermediate-period stars. The same choice would have

made the slope of our PR relation steeper, but by a very small amount well within the errors). While many of the data of the individual Cepheids, in particular the infrared photometry, are shared by both studies, the methods to derive the radii are completely independent, and we thus feel that the perfect agreement of our result with LS95 provides extremely persuasive evidence that we have now established the true period-radius relation obeyed by classical Cepheids in our Galaxy, with a very high degree of confidence and within the small errors of the coefficients stated above. We also note that in a direct star-to-star comparison of our radii to those derived by LS95 (both radii normalized to the same p-factor), the radii agree to better than 10 percent in all cases except one (CV Mon), and in most cases to better than 5 percent, without any dependence on period, which reassures that we are now able to measure very accurate radii of individual Cepheid variables using infrared photometry and both, the Barnes-Evans, and the maximum likelihood technique.

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 3 HERE.

Two other recent efforts to calibrate the Cepheid PR relation are the work of Ripepi et al. (1997), and of Krockenberger et al. (1996). While Ripepi et al. use a modified version of the CORS method (Caccin et al. 1981) which makes use of two optical color indices ( $B-V$  and  $V-R$ ), Krockenberger et al. have devised a method of the Baade-Wesselink type which makes use of the Fourier coefficients of the observables and have applied it using again optical photometry (on the Geneva system) in their analysis. In both studies, the resulting slopes of the PR relation are much shallower than our result, close to 0.60. We suspect that in both studies the problem is not with the techniques, but with the use of optical photometry in the application to Cepheid variables which is not able to provide correct estimates of the surface brightness, apparently even in the case of the CORS method which tries to remedy the problems by the introduction of a second color index. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that the period-radius relation derived by Gieren, Barnes

& Moffett (1989) which is based on optical ( $V-R$ ) Barnes-Evans radii of 100 galactic variables is very close to the relation found from infrared photometry. LS95 have tried to explain this as a coincidence in the selection of the variables, but this seems unlikely in view of the large sample used by Gieren et al. . The results in Paper II in which we have also derived the radii from our newly calibrated optical version of the BE method shed some light on this question. They indicate that one can have large systematic errors in individual optical BE radii (up to  $\sim 30$  percent), but since these systematic errors can apparently have either sign it is possible that they cancel out, to a large degree, in the determination of a mean period-radius relation based on a large number of stars. This possibly explains why the Gieren et al. (1989) PR relation is close to the true relation found from infrared photometry, but exhibits a much larger dispersion than the relation found in this paper, due to a strong contribution of observational scatter to the total dispersion.

The dispersion of our infrared-based Cepheid PR relation is smaller than in any previous study and is close to the dispersion expected from the finite width of the Cepheid instability strip, with the mass being the third parameter in the full period-radius-mass relationship. Given that the mass depends sensitively on the radius, approximately as  $M \sim R^{2.5}$ , and that individual radii of Cepheids could not be determined with an accuracy better than  $\sim 10$  percent, it has hitherto not been possible to derive good individual masses for Cepheid variables via the PRM relation (e.g. Gieren 1989). However, the Cepheid radii based on the new infrared BE technique are on average accurate to 3 percent and should therefore allow, for the first time, to derive Cepheid masses from the pulsational PRM relation being accurate to better than 10 percent. This will result in important progress in the determination of this most fundamental stellar parameter for supergiant stars.

#### 4. Optical and Near-Infrared Period-Luminosity Relations

We now turn to the discussion of the Cepheid period-luminosity relation in the optical  $V$ ,  $I$  and in the near-infrared  $J$ ,  $H$  and  $K$  passbands, which we will derive from our new infrared distances to our Galactic Cepheid calibrating sample. In order to convert the distances into absolute magnitudes, we have to adopt mean magnitudes and absorption corrections for the variables. For all variables in our sample, we have adopted the intensity mean magnitudes in  $V$ ,  $J$ ,  $H$  and  $K$  as given by Laney & Stobie (1993). The intensity mean magnitudes in the  $I$  band were derived from Caldwell & Coulson (1987), adding a constant  $-0.03$  mag correction to their magnitude means to convert them into intensity means, a correction which was found appropriate from tests on several Cepheids of different periods and light amplitudes. All these data, together with the adopted color excesses of the stars from the Fernie et al. database and the intensity mean  $B-V$  colors (again from Laney & Stobie 1993) are given in Table 3.

The absorption corrections were calculated from  $A_\lambda = R_\lambda E(B - V)$  using the following expressions:

$$R_V = 3.07 + 0.28 (B - V)_o + 0.04 E(B - V) \quad (3)$$

$$R_I = 1.82 + 0.205 (B - V)_o + 0.022 E(B - V) \quad (4)$$

$$R_J = 0.764 \quad (5)$$

$$R_H = 0.450 \quad (6)$$

$$R_K = 0.279 \quad (7)$$

The (constant)  $R$  values for the infrared passbands were adopted from the work of Laney & Stobie (1993), while the expressions for the ratios of total to selective absorption in the optical  $V$  and  $I$  bands were adopted from Caldwell & Coulson (1987), and Laney

& Stobie (1993). We then calculated the absolute magnitudes in the different passbands from the absorption-corrected intensity mean magnitudes and the true distance moduli of the stars as determined from their distances given in Table 4. The resulting absolute magnitudes in the optical  $V$  and  $I$  bands, together with their uncertainties due to the combined effect of distance and reddening uncertainty, are given in Table 5, while in Table 6 we give the infrared absolute magnitudes of the stars and their uncertainties. From these data, we derived period-absolute magnitude relations by least-squares fits to the same subset of 28 Cepheids discussed in the previous Section, with the results for slope, zero point and dispersion of the relations as given in Table 7. We display these relations in Figs. 4 to 8. The observed dispersion in the PL relations defined by our Galactic Cepheid sample decreases from 0.21 mag in the  $V$  band to 0.17 mag in  $K$ , and the corresponding observed total widths of the relations decrease from about 0.7 mag in  $V$  to 0.5 mag in  $K$ .

EDITOR: PLACE TABLE 5 HERE.

EDITOR: PLACE TABLE 6 HERE.

EDITOR: PLACE TABLE 7 HERE.

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 4 HERE.

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 5 HERE.

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 6 HERE.

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 7 HERE.

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 8 HERE.

In order to judge the improvement in the accuracy of our measurement of Cepheid distances, it is instructive to compare the present Galactic  $V$  band PL relation to the one derived from the visual surface brightness technique by Gieren et al. (1993). The total width, observed to be  $\sim 1.1$  mag in the Gieren et al. (1993) relation, has now decreased to  $\sim 0.7$  mag, and the dispersion of the relation has decreased from 0.3 to 0.2 mag. This huge improvement is almost exclusively due to the improvement in distance measurement since there has been little change in the adopted absorption corrections.

One very important point which could not yet be properly addressed in Paper II refers to the metallicity sensitivity of our infrared method to measure Cepheid distances. From model atmosphere studies, like the one of Bell & Gustafsson (1989), we can conclude that the effect of a changing metallicity on the infrared colors of Cepheid variables is very small, and thus we expect that the infrared BE technique yields radius and distance results which are very little dependent on the metallicities of the stars. However, it is good to check this prediction empirically, and we can do so. One way to do this is to look at the dispersion of the PL relation. First, it is important to note that our Cepheid sample is by no means homogeneous with respect to metallicity. The excellent study of Fry & Carney (1997) of the chemical abundances of a large fraction of Galactic open cluster Cepheids, many of which are in our present sample as well, has shown that there is clearly a genuine

metallicity spread among these stars, which amounts to  $\sim 0.4$  dex in  $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$  and is roughly bracketing the solar metallicity. While the amount of this spread may be surprisingly large, there has been evidence before (e.g. Giridhar 1986) that Cepheids appear to become, in a systematic way, more metallicity-poor with increasing distance from the Galactic center. However, as shown by Fry & Carney, their very accurate and homogeneous metallicity determinations of the open cluster Cepheids do not support Giridhar’s earlier conclusion; the plot of metallicity versus galactocentric distance turns out to be basically a scatter plot. Thus we do not expect that the galactocentric distances of our Cepheids (as a supposed crude indicator of metallicity) correlate with the residuals of the absolute magnitudes from the mean  $K$  band PL relation (which are the best suited for the problem because they are almost unbiased by possible errors in the color excesses), and effectively this is not the case. It is therefore not possible to detect a metallicity dependence of our distance measuring method in this way. However, the small dispersion of the PL relation itself already tells us that, given the relatively large  $\sim 0.4$  dex spread among the metallicities of the Cepheids of our sample, the distances cannot depend strongly on metallicity, because this would have to show up as an additional, significant observational scatter in the PL relation. While there probably is a contribution to the dispersion which is metallicity-related (see discussion in Section 5), this small effect is almost certainly due to a (slight) metallicity dependence of the Cepheid absolute magnitudes, and not an artefact of the technique we use to measure the distances. The small size of any metallicity-related effect is demonstrated by Fig. 9 where we have plotted the  $M_K$  residuals against the  $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$  values for the eight stars in common with the Fry & Carney open cluster Cepheid sample – clearly, there is no detectable correlation of these residuals with metallicity.

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 9 HERE.



## 5. Improved Absolute Calibration of Cepheid PL Relations and the Distance to the LMC

Since our Galactic Cepheid sample is relatively small, we can obtain a more accurate determination of the slopes of the PL relations in the different passbands by using Magellanic Cloud Cepheids. This assumes, of course, that the slope of the PL relation (in all passbands) is universal, a question which still awaits an exhaustive empirical check, but which has some supportive evidence to the moment (e.g. Musella et al. 1997; Sasselov et al. 1997) and seems to be firmly supported by theoretical expectations (e.g. Stothers 1988). While the LMC has a relatively small intrinsic depth in the line of sight and there is the possibility to correct LMC Cepheid magnitudes for the tilt of the LMC bar (Caldwell & Laney 1991), the situation is more complicated for the SMC Cepheids, and for this reason we will derive PL relations only from the Cepheids in the Large Magellanic Cloud. We will then fit the slopes found from the LMC Cepheid samples to the Galactic relations and this way obtain our best absolute calibrations of the Cepheid PL relations in the  $V$ ,  $I$ ,  $J$ ,  $H$  and  $K$  passbands. Comparison of these relations to the corresponding relations in the LMC will yield a LMC distance value in each of these passbands, from which a best mean LMC distance will be derived. While this distance still bears some dependence on metallicity and the adopted LMC Cepheid reddening corrections, we will present evidence for this having only a small effect (in the order of a few hundredths of a mag) on our adopted LMC distance.

### 5.1. LMC Cepheid period-luminosity relations in $V$ , $I$ , $J$ , $H$ and $K$

A first and very important step is to define the LMC Cepheid samples to adopt for our purpose. This task was greatly facilitated by the LMC Cepheid data base put at our disposal by J.A.R. Caldwell. After inspecting the available data and their quality, we

decided, in the  $V$  and  $I$  bands, to use Tanvir’s (1997) sample of 53 LMC Cepheids with photometry in both bands and  $\log P < 1.8$ . We have improved the periods and intensity means in  $V$  and  $I$  for 9 Cepheids of this sample from new, high-quality light curves obtained for these variables by Moffett et al. (1997). We have also used individual reddenings for 25 Cepheids from the Caldwell data base which were obtained as described by Laney & Stobie (1994). For the remaining Cepheids, we have adopted Caldwell’s average reddening value of  $E(B - V) = 0.07$ , except for the Cepheids in the field of the cluster NGC 1850 for which we adopted 0.15, as recommended by Sebo & Wood (1995). Correction for absorption has been made according to the following equations, where the mean  $R_V$  value appropriate to Cepheid colors was taken from Gieren & Fouqué (1993) and the value  $A_I/A_V = 0.592$  from Tanvir (1997):

$$\langle V_o \rangle = \langle V \rangle - 3.26 E(B - V) \tag{8}$$

$$\langle I_o \rangle = \langle I \rangle - 1.93 E(B - V) \tag{9}$$

The adoption of individual reddenings slightly improves the dispersion about the mean PL relations, from 0.233 to 0.204 in  $V$ , and from 0.164 to 0.150 in  $I$ . Determination of accurate individual reddenings to each Cepheid in the sample should allow to recover the smaller dispersion of the reddening-independent Wesenheit function (see below). Small corrections for the tilt of the LMC against the plane of the sky have not been applied because they did not significantly improve the dispersion. For the sake of clarity, we list in Table 8 the final sample for the LMC Cepheid PL solutions in the  $V$  and  $I$  bands, with the adopted values of the periods, absorption-corrected intensity mean magnitudes and extinctions. The PL relations resulting from least-squares fits to these data are given in Table 10. The slopes we find are undistinguishable from Tanvir’s (1997) values.

EDITOR: PLACE TABLE 8 HERE.

Unfortunately, the  $J$ ,  $H$  and  $K$  band coverage of Tanvir’s sample of Cepheids is far from complete, and we therefore prefer using the Laney & Stobie (1994) sample as a starting point for the infrared bands. This sample contains 19 LMC Cepheids with good infrared light curves and 33 with few-phase IR data, adopted from Welch et al. (1987) and transformed to the Carter system. In fact, 7 other Cepheids have IR data from Welch et al., but have not been retained by Laney & Stobie. As they do not seem to increase the dispersions of the infrared PL relations, we prefer to adopt the complete sample of 59 Cepheids, and transform the Welch et al. data following the Laney & Stobie precepts for system conversion and dereddening. Extinction values for these 7 additional stars have also been provided by Caldwell. Again, no tilt corrections were applied, as they did not improve the dispersions about the PL relations. We list in Table 9 the final sample of LMC Cepheids adopted for the infrared PL solutions with the adopted periods, absorption-corrected intensity mean magnitudes and extinctions. The PL relations in  $J$ ,  $H$  and  $K$  were derived from least-squares fits to these data and are given in Table 10. They significantly differ from the PL relations given in Laney & Stobie (1994), because these authors mixed LMC, SMC and Galactic Cepheid samples in their solutions. Note that the dispersion of the  $K$  band PL relation is about the same as for the  $V - I$  Wesenheit function (see below), which is not surprising since both relations are almost unaffected by reddening corrections.

EDITOR: PLACE TABLE 9 HERE.

EDITOR: PLACE TABLE 10 HERE.

## 5.2. The $V - I$ Wesenheit function and the observed PL dispersions

In order to find out the intrinsic dispersion of the PL relation, and the contribution of uncertainties in reddening and distance to the observed, total dispersions in the different passbands, we constructed the  $V - I$  Wesenheit function for the LMC Cepheid sample. In this sample, the contribution of distance errors to the observed dispersion is negligible (since all stars are basically at the same distance), but there will be a contribution due to errors in the adopted absorption corrections. These errors are removed to a large extent if one uses the reddening-independent Wesenheit function defined as

$$W = V_{\circ} - R (\langle V_{\circ} \rangle - \langle I_{\circ} \rangle) = V - R (\langle V \rangle - \langle I \rangle) \quad (10)$$

where  $R$  is defined as  $A_V/(A_V - A_I)$  and is obtained as the slope of the fit of the  $V$  band PL relation residuals to the residuals from a mean  $\langle V_{\circ} \rangle - \langle I_{\circ} \rangle$  period-color relation. Using the data of Table 8, we determined  $R = 2.34 \pm 0.22$ , which is close to the expected value of 2.45 which corresponds to reddening correction. Using this value in the Wesenheit function and plotting  $W$  against  $\log P$ , we find a relation whose dispersion has decreased to 0.113 mag, which we might then interpret as the intrinsic dispersion of the  $V$  band PL relation. A very similar Wesenheit relation is displayed as Fig. 3 in Tanvir (1997). A corresponding plot of the  $K$  band Wesenheit function against  $\log P$  yields a relation whose rms dispersion is 0.114 mag, and there is no gain as compared to the  $K_{\circ}$  PL relation, which is expected since at  $K$  the corrections for absorption for our LMC Cepheid sample are negligible. This finding is consistent with our interpretation of the intrinsic dispersion of the Cepheid PL relation being  $\sim 0.11$  mag, and this value seems to remain much the same as going from  $V$  to  $K$ .

Unlike the LMC Cepheid sample, the dispersions observed in the Galactic Cepheid sample PL relations do contain a significant contribution due to errors in the distance measurements of the individual Galactic Cepheids. Building a  $V - I$  Wesenheit function for the Galactic Cepheid sample in the same way as done above for the LMC sample, the  $W$  versus  $\log P$  relation is found to have a dispersion of 0.17, as compared to the 0.21 mag dispersion shown by the Galactic  $V$  band PL relation, and very similar to the dispersion found in the  $K$  band PL relation where contributions from reddening errors are also negligible. Since we know the intrinsic dispersion of the  $V$  band PL relation from the LMC sample (see above), the remaining dispersion we observe should be due to errors in the distances, and perhaps to a metallicity-related effect. This remaining dispersion is 0.12 mag, and corresponds to an error of  $\pm 5\%$  in the distances if it is completely due to distance uncertainties. From the results of Paper II we know, on the other hand, that the expected uncertainty of a typical distance is  $\sim \pm 3\%$ , so there might be a small, metallicity-related contribution in the same order which is probably not due to a dependence of our technique on metallicity, but rather to a slight systematic dependence of Cepheid absolute magnitudes on metallicity as found by the EROS results (Sasselov et al. 1997) which seems to amount to  $\sim 0.06$  mag in the metallicity range of  $\Delta[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \approx 0.4$  dex covered by the Cepheids of our Galactic sample, and which is small enough to be hidden in Fig. 9 (and smaller than the metallicity dependence of the  $V$  band PL relation suggested by Sasselov et al. 1997). As a note of caution, this (rough) estimate of the metallicity dependence of the PL relation assumes that the intrinsic width of the instability strip is the same in LMC and the Galaxy.

### 5.3. The distance of the LMC and the absolute calibration of the PL relation in $V$ , $I$ , $J$ , $H$ and $K$

The determination of an accurate and reliable distance to the LMC is a fundamental step in the extragalactic distance scale. Recent results from various distance indicators show that the range of values for  $\mu_0$  (LMC) is from about 18.3 from Hipparcos proper motion-based RR Lyrae distances (Fernley et al. 1997) to 18.70 based on Hipparcos trigonometric parallax measurements of a sample of nearby Galactic Cepheids (Feast & Catchpole 1997), with a SN 1987A ring upper limit on the LMC distance modulus of 18.44 lying between these extremes (Gould & Uza 1997). As a consequence, the true LMC distance is still uncertain at the 20% level which is a very unsatisfactory situation. Furthermore, Cepheid-based LMC distance moduli tied to the ZAMS-fitting method and a traditional Pleiades distance modulus of 5.57 have now to be revised in accordance with the new Pleiades distance modulus value of 5.33 obtained from Hipparcos data (Mermilliod et al. 1997; van Leeuwen & Hansen Ruiz 1997) which brings these LMC distance estimates (e.g. Laney & Stobie 1994) close to 18.3, a value similar to the one derived from the RR Lyraes. To make things even worse, the Hipparcos results on several nearby open cluster distances have cast serious doubts on the small intrinsic dispersion among the locations of open cluster main sequences on which this method rests (Mermilliod et al. 1997). In view of this situation a determination of the distance to the LMC from yet another independent method like the one used by us is clearly very important.

Although the slopes of the LMC PL relations in Table 10 differ from the best fit slopes from our 28 Galactic calibrators, we attribute this difference to small number statistics. Indeed, looking at Figs. 4 to 8 where the galactic data are displayed with the LMC relations superimposed, we see that the difference in the slopes may not be significant. As the LMC samples are larger and the dispersion of the LMC relations are smaller than that of their

Galactic counterparts, we force the LMC slopes to the Galactic sample to establish an absolute zero point of the PL relations, and an absolute distance to the LMC in each band.

In order to take account of the variable accuracies of the distances of our Galactic calibrating Cepheids, we have taken a weighted mean of the LMC distance moduli calculated from each Galactic Cepheid, in each band. The uncertainty of this weighted mean is the quadratic sum of the weighted dispersion divided by the square root of the number of Cepheids (28 in all bands except  $I$ , with 27), and of the mean error of the intercept of the corresponding LMC PL relation. Results are given in the last column of Table 10 for each band, and the agreement among the distance moduli derived from the different bands is striking. From a weighted mean of these values, we obtain as the final distance modulus of the LMC

$$\langle \mu_o(\text{LMC}) \rangle = 18.46 \pm 0.02$$

Subtracting this value from the intercept of the LMC PL relation in each band yields our adopted absolute calibrations, which now do not depend on any assumed LMC distance and mean extinction, and may be used to calibrate, for instance, results from HST in external galaxies if the metallicity is not too far from solar or LMC values. The uncertainty of the absolute intercept of our adopted PL relations is the quadratic sum of the corresponding uncertainty in the LMC PL relation intercept, and of the mean error of the LMC distance modulus. With this, our final absolute calibrations of the Cepheid PL relations in the various bands are then:

$$M_V = -2.769 (\pm 0.073) \times (\log P - 1.0) - 4.063 (\pm 0.034), \quad (11)$$

$$M_I = -3.041 (\pm 0.054) \times (\log P - 1.0) - 4.767 (\pm 0.029), \quad (12)$$

$$M_J = -3.129 (\pm 0.052) \times (\log P - 1.0) - 5.240 (\pm 0.028), \quad (13)$$

$$M_H = -3.249 (\pm 0.044) \times (\log P - 1.0) - 5.628 (\pm 0.026), \quad (14)$$

$$M_K = -3.267 (\pm 0.042) \times (\log P - 1.0) - 5.701 (\pm 0.025). \quad (15)$$

Comparison of these relations to the multiwavelength PL solutions of Madore & Freedman (1991) shows that the slopes of the  $V$  and  $I$  band relations are almost identical, but that the present zero points are 0.10 mag fainter in both bands. The dispersions of the present relations are significantly smaller, and so are the uncertainties on the coefficients of Eqs. 11 and 12. The  $J$ ,  $H$  and  $K$  band relations of Madore & Freedman yield almost identical absolute magnitudes at  $\log P = 1.0$ , but their slopes are significantly larger than ours, as are the dispersions of their relations. We attribute this difference to the larger number of stars and improved photometry we have been able to use in our solutions.

As noted before, our way of deriving the LMC distance modulus assumes that there is no metallicity effect on the PL relation. To correct for the mean metallicity difference between the Galactic and the LMC Cepheid samples of  $\sim 0.3$  dex, we might adopt the small 0.02 mag shift found by Laney & Stobie (1994), or the larger 0.14 mag shift following from the results of Sasselov et al. (1997). On the other hand, since the metallicity spread in our Galactic sample which is close to the systematic metallicity difference between the Galaxy and LMC seems to introduce a  $\sim 0.06$  mag shift in the absolute magnitudes, we prefer to adopt this value to allow for the metallicity dependence of our LMC distance modulus. Doing so, we obtain as a metallicity-corrected distance modulus of the LMC

$$\mu_o(\text{LMC}) = 18.52 \pm 0.06$$

where a  $\pm 0.06$  mag uncertainty on the metallicity-induced shift has been assumed which determines almost completely the total uncertainty of the LMC distance modulus. Obviously, one would like to reduce the uncertainty of the metallicity correction to the LMC distance modulus, and a very promising way of doing this is to apply the infrared



Barnes-Evans method directly to LMC Cepheids, taking advantage of the fact that distances measured with this method are almost completely independent of both absorption and metallicities of the target Cepheids. Such a program is currently underway and should yield the true distance modulus of the LMC with an accuracy of  $\sim 0.02$  mag.

## 6. Conclusions

We have determined the radii and distances of 34 Galactic Cepheid variables from the infrared Barnes-Evans surface brightness technique of Fouqué & Gieren (1997). We find that the two versions of the technique produce radii which agree to better than 1% and distances which agree at the 2% level, which is within the total uncertainty of both versions of the method. The radius data are used to construct a period-radius relation which shows a dispersion of only  $\pm 0.036$  in  $\log R$  about the mean relation, smaller than in any previous determination. We use the infrared distances of the variables to determine the period-luminosity relations in the optical  $V$  and  $I$ , and in the near-infrared  $J$ ,  $H$  and  $K$  passbands, and again find smaller dispersions in any of these relations than in previous studies. In order to obtain absolute calibrations of the PL relation in each of the passbands which are as accurate as possible, we determine the slopes from larger LMC Cepheid samples which show PL relations of smaller dispersions, due to a negligible contribution of distance uncertainties to the observed dispersions. Adopting the slopes defined by the LMC samples, we then use the Galactic Cepheid sample to determine the absolute zero point of the PL relation in each passband. Comparing the Galactic PL relations to the ones defined by the LMC samples, we find values of the true, absorption-corrected distance modulus of the LMC in each band which show remarkable agreement among themselves and are very close to the "classical" value of the LMC distance modulus of 18.50 adopted by the HST Distance Scale Key Project team (e.g. Madore & Freedman 1997).

We use Wesenheit functions to disentangle the effects of reddening and distance uncertainty, and of the intrinsic dispersion (due to the finite width of the Cepheid instability strip) on the total observed dispersions in the LMC and Galactic Cepheid samples. From this, we conclude that the intrinsic dispersion of the PL relation is 0.11 mag, without a significant variation between the  $V$  and  $K$  bands, and we are able to estimate the contribution of the combined effect of distance uncertainty and a possible systematic effect of metallicity on the observed dispersion of the Galactic sample. From this, and from the knowledge that the  $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$  spread of our sample is  $\sim 0.4$  dex, we estimate that the metallicity effect on the distance modulus is  $\Delta\mu/\Delta[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \approx 0.2$ , about half the value suggested by the analysis of Sasselov et al. based on the EROS data. We note that this estimate relies on the excellent spectroscopic metallicity determinations of Galactic Cepheids of Fry & Carney (1997), and on the  $\pm 3\%$  accuracy figure in distance measurement with the infrared Barnes-Evans technique found in Paper II. A larger uncertainty in the distance measurement would imply a lower metallicity sensitivity of Cepheid absolute magnitudes. The infrared surface brightness technique itself appears to yield distances which are almost metallicity-independent, in agreement with model atmosphere predictions; this feature, together with the insensitivity of the method to adopted absorption corrections, makes it an almost ideal instrument to determine the true distances to several nearby galaxies with a high accuracy, and thus make a very important contribution toward an improved calibration of the local extragalactic distance scale.

WPG was supported by research grant Fondecyt No. 1971076 which is gratefully acknowledged. We are grateful to J.A.R. Caldwell and N. Tanvir for making their LMC Cepheid databases available to us, and we appreciate useful correspondence with C. Turon who sent us important preprints on the Hipparcos results.

## REFERENCES

- Bell, R. A., & Gustafsson, B. 1989, MNRAS, 236, 653
- Berdnikov, L. N. 1997, in “<http://www.physics.mcmaster.ca/Cepheid/>”
- Berdnikov, L. N. 1997, in Proc. of A Half Century of Stellar Pulsation Interpretations: A Tribute to Arthur N. Cox, (Los Alamos: ASP Conf. Ser.), in press
- Berdnikov, L. N., & Turner, D. G. 1995, Astronomy Letters, Vol. 21, No. 6, 717
- Bersier, D., Burki, G., Mayor, M., & Duquennoy, A. 1994, A&AS, 108, 25
- Caccin, B., Onnembo, A., Russo, G., & Sollazzo, C. 1981, A&A, 97, 104
- Caldwell, J. A. R., & Coulson, I. M. 1987, AJ, 93, 1090
- Caldwell, J. A. R., & Laney, C. D. 1991, in IAU Symp. 148, The Magellanic Clouds, ed. R. Haynes & D. Milne, (Dordrecht: Kluwer), 249
- Coulson, I. M., & Caldwell, J. A. R. 1985, SAAO Circ., 9, 5
- Coulson, I. M., Caldwell, J. A. R., & Gieren, W. P. 1985, ApJS, 57, 595
- Feast, M. W., & Catchpole, R. M. 1997, MNRAS, 286, L1
- Fernie, J. D., Beattie, B., Evans, N. R., & Seager, S. 1997, “<http://ddo.astro.utoronto.ca/cepheids.html>”
- Fernley, J., Barnes, T. G., Skillen, I., Hawley, S. L., Hanley, C. J., Evans, D. W., Solano, E., & Garrido, R. 1997, in Proc. of A Half Century of Stellar Pulsation Interpretations: A Tribute to Arthur N. Cox, (Los Alamos: ASP Conf. Ser.), in press
- Fouqué, P., & Gieren, W. P. 1997, A&A, 320, 799 (Paper I)
- Fry, A. M., & Carney, B. W. 1997, AJ, 113, 1073
- Gieren, W. P. 1981a, ApJS, 46, 287
- Gieren, W. P. 1981b, ApJS, 47, 315

- Gieren, W. P. 1985, *ApJ*, 295, 507
- Gieren, W. P. 1989, *A&A*, 225, 381
- Gieren, W. P., Barnes, T. G., & Moffett, T. J. 1989, *ApJ*, 342, 467
- Gieren, W. P., Barnes, T. G., & Moffett, T. J. 1993, *ApJ*, 418, 135
- Gieren, W. P., & Fouqué, P. 1993, *AJ*, 106, 734
- Gieren, W. P., Fouqué, P., & Gómez, M. 1997, *ApJ*, in press (Paper II)
- Giridhar, S. 1986, *J. Astrophys. Astron.*, 7, 83
- Gorynya, N. A., Irsambetowa, T. R., Rastorgouev, A. S., & Samus, N. N. 1992, *Astronomy Letters*, Vol. 18, 5
- Gorynya, N. A., Samus, N. N., Rastorgouev, A. S., & Sachkov, M.E. 1996, *Astronomy Letters*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 175
- Gould, A., & Uza, O. 1997, *ApJ*, in press (astro-ph/9705051)
- Krockenberger, M., Sasselov, D. D., & Noyes, R. W. 1996, *ApJ*, in press (astro-ph/9611123)
- Laney, C. D., & Stobie, R. S. 1992, *A&AS*, 93, 93
- Laney, C. D., & Stobie, R. S. 1993, *MNRAS*, 263, 921
- Laney, C. D., & Stobie, R. S. 1994, *MNRAS*, 266, 441
- Laney, C. D., & Stobie, R. S. 1995, *MNRAS*, 274, 337
- Lloyd Evans, T. 1980, *SAAO Circ.*, Vol. 1, No. 5, 257
- Madore, B. F., & Freedman, W. L. 1991, *PASP*, 103, 933
- Madore, B. F., & Freedman, W. L. 1997, *ApJ*, in press (astro-ph/9707091)
- Mermilliod, J.-C., Mayor, M., & Burki, G. 1987, *A&AS*, 70, 389

- Mermilliod, J.-C., Turon, C., Robichon, N., Arenou, F., & Lebreton, Y., in Proceedings of the Hipparcos, Venice 1997 Symposium, ESA-SP 402, ed. , (: European Space Agency), in press
- Metzger, M. R., Caldwell, J. A. R., McCarthy, J. K., & Schechter, P. L. 1991, *ApJS*, 76, 803
- Metzger, M. R., Caldwell, J. A. R., & Schechter, P. L. 1992, *AJ*, 103, 529
- Moffett, T. J., & Barnes, T. G. 1984, *ApJS*, 55, 389
- Moffett, T. J., Gieren, W. P., Barnes, T. G., & Gómez, M. 1997, *ApJS*, submitted
- Musella, I., Piotto, G., & Capaccioli, M. 1997, *A&A*, in press (astro-ph/9706285)
- Pel, J. W. 1976, *A&AS*, 24, 413
- Pont, F., Burki, G., & Mayor, M. 1994, *A&AS*, 105, 165
- Quintana, H., Fouqué, P., & Way, M. J. 1994, *A&A*, 283, 722
- Ripepi, V., Barone, F., Milano, L., & Russo, G. 1997, *A&A*, 318, 797
- Sasselov, D. D., Beaulieu, J.-P., Renault, C., Grison, P., Ferlet, R., Vidal-Madjar, A., Maurice, E., Prévot, L., Aubourg, E., Bareyre, P., Brehin, S., Coutures, C., Palanque, N., de Kat, J., Gros, M., Laurent, B., Lachière-Rey, M., Lesquoy, E., Magneville, C., Milsztajn, A., Moscoso, L., Queinnec, F., Rich, J., Spiro, M., Vigroux, L., Zylberajch, S., Ansari, R., Cavalier, F., Moniez, M., Gry, C., Guibert, J., Moreau, O., Tajhmady, F., 1997, *A&A*, 324, 471
- Sebo, K. M., & Wood, P. R. 1995, *ApJ*, 449, 164
- Stothers, R. B. 1988, *ApJ*, 329, 712
- Tanvir, N. R. 1997, in *STScI Symp. Series, Vol. 10, The Extragalactic Distance Scale*, ed. M. Livio, M. Donahue, & N. Panagia, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 91
- van Leeuwen, F., & Hansen Ruiz, C. S. 1997, in Proceedings of the Hipparcos, Venice 1997 Symposium, ESA-SP 402, ed. , (: European Space Agency), in press

Welch, D. L. 1994, *AJ*, 108, 1421

Welch, D. L. 1997, “<http://www.physics.mcmaster.ca/Cepheid/>”

Welch, D. L., McLaren, R. A., Madore, B. F., & McAlary, C. W. 1987, *ApJ*, 321, 162

Fig. 1.— The ratio of the radii obtained from the  $V$ ,  $V - K$  version of our technique to those obtained from the pure infrared  $K$ ,  $J - K$  version, plotted against the pulsation period. The mean ratio is 1.00 with a very low uncertainty, and there is no dependence on period.

Fig. 2.— As Fig. 1, but for the distances. The mean ratio is  $0.98 \pm 0.02$ , and there is no dependence on period. The slightly increased scatter toward the longer periods is probably due to increased problems with the correct phase alignment between the  $V$  and  $K$  light curves for the longest-period stars in the sample, which show an enhanced tendency for period variability.

Fig. 3.— The period-radius relation defined by 28 Galactic Cepheid variables. The plotted line is a least-squares fit to the data. For the sake of completeness, excluded stars at short and long periods (see text) are added with a different symbol (cross).

Fig. 4.— The  $V$  band period-luminosity relation defined by the infrared Barnes-Evans distances of 28 Galactic Cepheids. The error bars correspond to the combined effect of distance and absorption uncertainties on the absolute magnitudes. The plotted line has the slope obtained from a sample of LMC Cepheids (see text and Table 10). Excluded stars at short and long periods (see text) are added with a different symbol (cross).


Fig. 5.— As Fig. 4, for the  $I$  (Cousins system) passband.

Fig. 6.— As Fig. 4, for the  $J$  (Carter system) passband.


Fig. 7.— As Fig. 4, for the  $H$  (Carter system) passband.


Fig. 8.— As Fig. 4, for the  $K$  (Carter system) passband.


Fig. 9.— The residuals of the  $K$  band absolute magnitudes from a least-squares fit to the Galactic Cepheid  $K$  band PL relation, plotted against the metallicities as determined by Fry & Carney, for 8 Cepheids common to both samples. There is no correlation.




























TABLE 1  
NEAR-INFRARED BARNES-EVANS RADII AND DISTANCES OF ADDITIONAL GALACTIC CEPHEIDS.

Cepheid	$K, J - K$ radius ( $R_{\odot}$ )	$V, V - K$ radius ( $R_{\odot}$ )	$K, J - K$ distance (pc)	$V, V - K$ distance (pc)
WZ Car	$118.8 \pm 1.5$	$110.0 \pm 2.0$	$4087 \pm 54$	$3732 \pm 66$
l Car	$195.2 \pm 4.6$	$162.3 \pm 2.9$	$614 \pm 15$	$501 \pm 9$
VW Cen	$96.1 \pm 2.4$	$96.4 \pm 3.1$	$4016 \pm 99$	$3994 \pm 122$
XX Cen	$60.8 \pm 1.8$	$59.8 \pm 1.0$	$1477 \pm 44$	$1430 \pm 23$
KN Cen	$179.8 \pm 5.2$	$189.4 \pm 4.0$	$3821 \pm 106$	$4007 \pm 80$
UU Mus	$65.4 \pm 1.1$	$62.5 \pm 1.1$	$2923 \pm 51$	$2753 \pm 47$
U Nor	$83.7 \pm 2.1$	$80.5 \pm 1.9$	$1478 \pm 37$	$1388 \pm 31$
BF Oph	$31.9 \pm 1.4$	$36.3 \pm 0.5$	$718 \pm 32$	$804 \pm 12$
VZ Pup	$122.0 \pm 2.3$	$128.5 \pm 3.8$	$5077 \pm 92$	$5267 \pm 145$
AQ Pup	$167.0 \pm 2.9$	$195.1 \pm 8.0$	$3548 \pm 62$	$4075 \pm 160$
BN Pup	$83.6 \pm 1.2$	$80.5 \pm 2.1$	$3897 \pm 55$	$3689 \pm 95$
LS Pup	$97.6 \pm 1.9$	$102.8 \pm 2.3$	$5480 \pm 108$	$5701 \pm 121$
GY Sge	$279.1 \pm 9.3$	$195.7 \pm 4.1$	$3871 \pm 127$	$2507 \pm 55$
RY Sco	$103.8 \pm 3.0$	$101.1 \pm 1.5$	$1287 \pm 37$	$1229 \pm 19$
T Vel	$38.3 \pm 0.8$	$39.0 \pm 0.4$	$1039 \pm 19$	$1046 \pm 13$
RY Vel	$144.8 \pm 3.2$	$153.8 \pm 5.5$	$2630 \pm 61$	$2705 \pm 94$
CS Vel	$46.5 \pm 3.0$		$3488 \pm 231$	
S Vul	$381.9 \pm 17.2$		$5575 \pm 243$	

TABLE 2  
SOURCES OF ADOPTED RADIAL VELOCITY AND  $V$  DATA.

Cepheid	Radial Velocity Data Reference	N	$V$ data Reference	N
WZ Car	Coulson & Caldwell 1985	44	Coulson & Caldwell 1985 Berdnikov & Turner 1995	65
l Car	Lloyd Evans 1980	23	Pel 1976	37
VW Cen	Coulson & Caldwell 1985	33	Coulson & Caldwell 1985	37
XX Cen	Coulson et al. 1985	46	Coulson et al. 1985	67
KN Cen	Coulson & Caldwell 1985 Pont 1994	38	Coulson & Caldwell 1985 Berdnikov & Turner 1995	77
UU Mus	Coulson & Caldwell 1985	31	Coulson & Caldwell 1985	38
U Nor	Coulson & Caldwell 1985 Pont 1994	33	Coulson & Caldwell 1985	40
BF Oph	Gieren 1981a Lloyd Evans 1980	34	Gieren 1981b Moffett & Barnes 1984	72
VZ Pup	Coulson & Caldwell 1985	45	Coulson & Caldwell 1985 Berdnikov & Turner 1995	67
AQ Pup	Coulson & Caldwell 1985	47	Coulson & Caldwell 1985 Moffett & Barnes 1984 Berdnikov & Turner 1995	80
BN Pup	Coulson & Caldwell 1985 Pont 1994	39	Coulson & Caldwell 1985	45
LS Pup	Coulson & Caldwell 1985	33	Coulson & Caldwell 1985 Berdnikov & Turner 1995	73
GY Sge	Metzger et al. 1991 Gorynya et al. 1996	33	Berdnikov 1997	46
RY Sco	Coulson & Caldwell 1985	35	Coulson & Caldwell 1985 Moffett & Barnes 1984	67

TABLE 2—*Continued*

Cepheid	Radial Velocity Data Reference	N	V data Reference	N
T Vel	Gieren 1985 Lloyd Evans 1980	26	Gieren 1985 Pel 1976	63
RY Vel	Coulson & Caldwell 1985 Pont 1994	59	Coulson & Caldwell 1985 Berdnikov & Turner 1995	70
CS Vel	Mermilliod et al. 1987 Bersier et al. 1994 Metzger et al. 1992	25		
S Vul	Gorynya et al. 1992 Gorynya et al. 1996	69	Berdnikov 1997	84

TABLE 3  
ADOPTED CEPHEID MEAN MAGNITUDES AND COLOUR EXCESSES.

Cepheid	$\langle V \rangle$	$\langle B \rangle - \langle V \rangle$	$\langle I \rangle$	$\langle J \rangle$	$\langle H \rangle$	$\langle K \rangle$	$E_{B-V}$	$\sigma(E_{B-V})$
EV Sct	10.131	1.182	8.694	7.666	7.170	7.028	0.663	0.016
SZ Tau	6.530	0.852	5.564	4.831	4.408	4.311	0.326	0.013
QZ Nor	8.866	0.908	7.893	7.137	6.734	6.622	0.307	0.021
BF Oph	7.332	0.856	6.411	5.699	5.284	5.176	0.278	0.017
T Vel	8.032	0.934	7.010	6.225	5.768	5.642	0.300	0.019
CV Mon	10.306	1.337	8.684	7.402	6.791	6.576	0.750	0.019
V Cen	6.823	0.872	5.810	5.074	4.628	4.508	0.282	0.017
CS Vel	11.688	1.345		8.838	8.232	8.018	0.762	0.029
BB Sgr	6.932	0.985	5.840	5.100	4.639	4.510	0.303	0.012
U Sgr	6.685	1.091	5.455	4.585	4.091	3.952	0.434	0.007
S Nor	6.426	0.945	5.414	4.729	4.274	4.161	0.194	0.008
XX Cen	7.818	0.982	6.750	5.992	5.530	5.407	0.261	0.013
V340 Nor	8.375	1.151	7.151	6.271	5.731	5.586	0.332	0.010
UU Mus	9.783	1.147	8.489	7.530	6.990	6.828	0.458	0.044
U Nor	9.229	1.622	7.358	5.930	5.237	4.990	0.923	0.040
BN Pup	9.889	1.194	8.549	7.624	7.076	6.922	0.449	0.018
LS Pup	10.447	1.230	9.064	8.093	7.517	7.354	0.481	0.010
VW Cen	10.242	1.347	8.766	7.655	7.014	6.819	0.451	0.023
VY Car	7.460	1.164	6.275	5.463	4.944	4.804	0.287	0.020
RY Sco	8.016	1.480	6.300	4.998	4.365	4.143	0.696	0.047
RZ Vel	7.089	1.129	5.852	4.979	4.460	4.308	0.320	0.012
WZ Sgr	8.023	1.404	6.530	5.402	4.763	4.565	0.486	0.027
WZ Car	9.255	1.149	7.946	7.008	6.456	6.290	0.379	0.007
VZ Pup	9.631	1.158	8.280	7.370	6.828	6.668	0.461	0.019
SW Vel	8.121	1.151	6.834	5.934	5.393	5.233	0.360	0.010
T Mon	6.123	1.168	4.978	4.185	3.653	3.525	0.221	0.016
RY Vel	8.372	1.367	6.841	5.702	5.122	4.928	0.573	0.013
AQ Pup	8.669	1.337	7.119	6.099	5.481	5.297	0.565	0.018
KN Cen	9.855	1.622	7.992	6.515	5.755	5.489	0.775	0.043
l Car	3.735	1.260	2.593	1.766	1.211	1.092	0.163	0.017
U Car	6.281	1.178	5.045	4.193	3.669	3.521	0.294	0.014
SV Vul	7.243	1.465	5.746	4.668	4.077	3.920	0.504	0.026
GY Sge	10.208	2.215		5.722	4.889	4.597	1.258	0.118
S Vul	8.968	1.898		5.534	4.830	4.599	0.782	0.051

TABLE 4  
ADOPTED INFRARED RADII AND DISTANCES OF GALACTIC CEPHEIDS

Cepheid	$\log P$ (days)	$R_{\text{ad}}$ ( $R_{\odot}$ )	$\log R_{\text{ad}}$	$d_{\text{ad}}$ (pc)
EV Sct	0.4901	$32.5 \pm 0.5$	1.512	$1634 \pm 25$
SZ Tau	0.4981	$27.7 \pm 0.5$	1.442	$415 \pm 8$
QZ Nor	0.5783	$38.5 \pm 0.5$	1.585	$1656 \pm 24$
BF Oph	0.6094	$35.8 \pm 2.0$	1.554	$793 \pm 40$
T Vel	0.6665	$38.9 \pm 0.4$	1.590	$1044 \pm 11$
CV Mon	0.7307	$40.2 \pm 0.7$	1.604	$1514 \pm 32$
V Cen	0.7399	$45.0 \pm 0.5$	1.653	$725 \pm 8$
CS Vel	0.7712	$46.5 \pm 3.0$	1.667	$3488 \pm 231$
BB Sgr	0.8220	$44.4 \pm 0.4$	1.647	$704 \pm 7$
U Sgr	0.8290	$48.8 \pm 0.3$	1.688	$594 \pm 4$
S Nor	0.9892	$70.9 \pm 0.9$	1.851	$963 \pm 11$
XX Cen	1.0395	$60.8 \pm 1.8$	1.784	$1477 \pm 44$
V340 Nor	1.0526	$79.7 \pm 4.7$	1.901	$1993 \pm 119$
UU Mus	1.0658	$64.0 \pm 1.4$	1.806	$2831 \pm 120$
U Nor	1.1019	$81.9 \pm 1.6$	1.913	$1425 \pm 44$
BN Pup	1.1358	$82.8 \pm 1.3$	1.918	$3845 \pm 90$
LS Pup	1.1506	$99.7 \pm 2.6$	1.999	$5578 \pm 110$
VW Cen	1.1771	$96.2 \pm 1.9$	1.983	$4007 \pm 77$
VY Car	1.2766	$109.4 \pm 1.5$	2.039	$1922 \pm 38$
RY Sco	1.3079	$101.6 \pm 1.3$	2.007	$1241 \pm 24$
RZ Vel	1.3097	$121.8 \pm 2.3$	2.086	$1713 \pm 20$
WZ Sgr	1.3394	$122.2 \pm 1.2$	2.087	$1788 \pm 17$
WZ Car	1.3620	$115.6 \pm 6.0$	2.063	$3945 \pm 246$
VZ Pup	1.3650	$123.7 \pm 2.9$	2.092	$5132 \pm 86$
SW Vel	1.3698	$117.7 \pm 2.1$	2.071	$2499 \pm 65$
T Mon	1.4318	$133.4 \pm 4.1$	2.125	$1304 \pm 40$
RY Vel	1.4489	$144.8 \pm 3.2$	2.161	$2630 \pm 61$
AQ Pup	1.4787	$167.0 \pm 2.9$	2.223	$3548 \pm 62$
KN Cen	1.5319	$179.8 \pm 5.2$	2.255	$3821 \pm 106$
l Car	1.5507	$195.2 \pm 4.6$	2.290	$614 \pm 15$
U Car	1.5889	$167.5 \pm 3.1$	2.224	$1636 \pm 29$
SV Vul	1.6536	$250.7 \pm 8.2$	2.399	$2918 \pm 97$
GY Sge	1.7134	$279.1 \pm 9.3$	2.446	$3871 \pm 127$
S Vul	1.8378	$381.9 \pm 17.2$	2.582	$5575 \pm 243$

TABLE 5  
 CEPHEID DISTANCE MODULI AND ABSOLUTE MAGNITUDES IN  $V$  AND  $I$ .

Cepheid	$\log P$ (days)	$\mu_o$ (mag)	$\sigma(\mu_o)$ (mag)	$M_V$ (mag)	$\sigma(M_V)$ (mag)	$M_I$ (mag)	$\sigma(M_I)$ (mag)
EV Sct	0.4901	11.066	0.033	-3.084	0.062	-3.694	0.045
SZ Tau	0.4981	8.090	0.042	-2.613	0.059	-3.187	0.049
QZ Nor	0.5783	11.095	0.031	-3.227	0.075	-3.831	0.051
BF Oph	0.6094	9.496	0.110	-3.066	0.123	-3.684	0.115
T Vel	0.6665	10.094	0.023	-3.040	0.066	-3.701	0.044
CV Mon	0.7307	10.901	0.046	-3.043	0.077	-3.743	0.059
V Cen	0.7399	9.302	0.024	-3.395	0.060	-4.064	0.041
CS Vel	0.7712	12.713	0.144	-3.512	0.173		
BB Sgr	0.8220	9.238	0.022	-3.298	0.045	-4.018	0.033
U Sgr	0.8290	8.869	0.015	-3.604	0.027	-4.304	0.021
S Nor	0.9892	9.918	0.025	-4.130	0.036	-4.906	0.030
XX Cen	1.0395	10.847	0.065	-3.886	0.078	-4.642	0.070
V340 Nor	1.0526	11.498	0.130	-4.223	0.134	-5.034	0.132
UU Mus	1.0658	12.260	0.092	-3.980	0.171	-4.704	0.127
U Nor	1.1019	10.769	0.067	-4.588	0.148	-5.272	0.104
BN Pup	1.1358	12.924	0.051	-4.515	0.078	-5.295	0.062
LS Pup	1.1506	13.732	0.043	-4.872	0.054	-5.652	0.047
VW Cen	1.1771	13.014	0.042	-4.278	0.088	-5.186	0.062
VY Car	1.2766	11.419	0.043	-4.914	0.080	-5.750	0.059
RY Sco	1.3079	10.469	0.042	-4.762	0.162	-5.588	0.103
RZ Vel	1.3097	11.169	0.025	-5.139	0.047	-5.985	0.035
WZ Sgr	1.3394	11.262	0.021	-4.865	0.092	-5.743	0.059
WZ Car	1.3620	12.980	0.135	-4.976	0.137	-5.817	0.136
VZ Pup	1.3650	13.551	0.036	-5.434	0.072	-6.211	0.052
SW Vel	1.3698	11.989	0.056	-5.058	0.065	-5.901	0.059
T Mon	1.4318	10.576	0.067	-5.192	0.086	-6.074	0.074
RY Vel	1.4489	12.100	0.050	-5.628	0.066	-6.433	0.056
AQ Pup	1.4787	12.750	0.038	-5.950	0.071	-6.786	0.052
KN Cen	1.5319	12.911	0.060	-5.643	0.156	-6.508	0.105
l Car	1.5507	8.941	0.053	-5.758	0.079	-6.700	0.064
U Car	1.5889	11.069	0.038	-5.767	0.060	-6.644	0.047
SV Vul	1.6536	12.325	0.072	-6.775	0.113	-7.631	0.089
GY Sge	1.7134	12.939	0.071	-6.993	0.406		
S Vul	1.8378	13.731	0.095	-7.433	0.198		

TABLE 6  
 INFRARED ABSOLUTE MAGNITUDES OF GALACTIC CEPHEIDS IN  $J$ ,  $H$  AND  $K$  (CARTER SYSTEM).

Cepheid	$\log P$ (days)	$M_J$ (mag)	$\sigma(M_J)$ (mag)	$M_H$ (mag)	$\sigma(M_H)$ (mag)	$M_K$ (mag)	$\sigma(M_K)$ (mag)
EV Sct	0.4901	-3.907	0.035	-4.194	0.034	-4.223	0.033
SZ Tau	0.4981	-3.508	0.043	-3.829	0.042	-3.870	0.042
QZ Nor	0.5783	-4.193	0.035	-4.499	0.032	-4.559	0.032
BF Oph	0.6094	-4.009	0.111	-4.337	0.110	-4.398	0.110
T Vel	0.6665	-4.098	0.027	-4.461	0.025	-4.536	0.024
CV Mon	0.7307	-4.072	0.048	-4.448	0.047	-4.534	0.046
V Cen	0.7399	-4.443	0.027	-4.801	0.025	-4.873	0.025
CS Vel	0.7712	-4.457	0.146	-4.824	0.145	-4.908	0.144
BB Sgr	0.8220	-4.369	0.024	-4.735	0.023	-4.813	0.022
U Sgr	0.8290	-4.616	0.016	-4.973	0.015	-5.038	0.015
S Nor	0.9892	-5.337	0.026	-5.731	0.025	-5.811	0.025
XX Cen	1.0395	-5.054	0.066	-5.434	0.065	-5.513	0.065
V340 Nor	1.0526	-5.481	0.130	-5.916	0.130	-6.005	0.130
UU Mus	1.0658	-5.080	0.098	-5.476	0.094	-5.560	0.093
U Nor	1.1019	-5.544	0.074	-5.947	0.069	-6.037	0.068
BN Pup	1.1358	-5.643	0.053	-6.050	0.052	-6.127	0.051
LS Pup	1.1506	-6.006	0.044	-6.431	0.043	-6.512	0.043
VW Cen	1.1771	-5.704	0.046	-6.203	0.043	-6.321	0.042
VY Car	1.2766	-6.175	0.046	-6.604	0.044	-6.695	0.043
RY Sco	1.3079	-6.003	0.055	-6.417	0.047	-6.520	0.044
RZ Vel	1.3097	-6.434	0.027	-6.853	0.025	-6.950	0.025
WZ Sgr	1.3394	-6.231	0.030	-6.718	0.024	-6.833	0.022
WZ Car	1.3620	-6.262	0.135	-6.695	0.135	-6.796	0.135
VZ Pup	1.3650	-6.533	0.039	-6.930	0.037	-7.012	0.036
SW Vel	1.3698	-6.330	0.057	-6.758	0.056	-6.856	0.056
T Mon	1.4318	-6.560	0.068	-7.022	0.067	-7.113	0.067
RY Vel	1.4489	-6.836	0.051	-7.236	0.050	-7.332	0.050
AQ Pup	1.4787	-7.083	0.040	-7.523	0.039	-7.611	0.038
KN Cen	1.5319	-6.988	0.068	-7.505	0.063	-7.638	0.061
l Car	1.5507	-7.300	0.055	-7.803	0.054	-7.894	0.053
U Car	1.5889	-7.101	0.040	-7.532	0.038	-7.630	0.038
SV Vul	1.6536	-8.042	0.075	-8.475	0.073	-8.546	0.072
GY Sge	1.7134	-8.178	0.115	-8.616	0.089	-8.693	0.078
S Vul	1.8378	-8.794	0.103	-9.253	0.098	-9.350	0.096

TABLE 7

GALACTIC CEPHEID  $V$ ,  $I$ ,  $J$ ,  $H$  AND  $K$  PERIOD-LUMINOSITY RELATIONS CALIBRATED FROM THE NEAR-INFRARED BARNES-EVANS TECHNIQUE.

Band	Slope	ZP ( $\log P = 1$ )	rms (mag)	correlation coefficient	N
$V$	$-3.037 \pm 0.138$	$-4.058 \pm 0.040$	0.209	0.974	28
$I$ (Cousins)	$-3.329 \pm 0.132$	$-4.764 \pm 0.037$	0.194	0.981	27
$J$ (Carter)	$-3.436 \pm 0.114$	$-5.185 \pm 0.033$	0.173	0.986	28
$H$ (Carter)	$-3.562 \pm 0.115$	$-5.580 \pm 0.033$	0.175	0.987	28
$K$ (Carter)	$-3.598 \pm 0.114$	$-5.664 \pm 0.033$	0.173	0.987	28



TABLE 8  
 LMC CEPHEIDS USED FOR FITTING PL RELATIONS IN THE  $V$  AND  $I$  BANDS.

HV	$\log P$	$\langle V_o \rangle$	$\langle I_o \rangle$	$E_{B-V}$
2369	1.685	12.30	11.45	0.10
953	1.683	12.07	11.24	0.07
900	1.677	12.538	11.684	0.07
877	1.655	12.97	11.97	0.12
2338	1.625	12.629	11.753	0.04
2257	1.595	12.835	11.941	0.06
909	1.575	12.546	11.793	0.07
879	1.566	13.136	12.197	0.06
2294	1.563	12.46	11.70	0.07
881	1.553	13.01	12.23	0.03
873	1.537	13.06	12.07	0.13
899	1.492	13.074	12.274	0.11
1002	1.484	12.93	12.15	0.00
904	1.483	13.030	12.207	0.15
2251	1.446	12.91	12.16	0.07
1023	1.424	13.53	12.58	0.07
12815	1.417	13.278	12.399	0.07
1013	1.383	13.46	12.62	0.11
886	1.380	13.08	12.32	0.07
2793	1.284	13.76	12.89	0.10
SW 17	1.271	13.410	12.742	0.15
2836	1.244	14.03	13.19	0.18
2580	1.229	13.64	12.94	0.09
2324	1.160	14.19	13.36	0.05
2352	1.134	13.82	13.14	0.10
997	1.119	14.22	13.43	0.10
2260	1.114	14.50	13.71	0.13
874	1.103	14.25	13.48	0.07
2662	1.082	14.27	13.52	0.07
905	1.074	13.986	13.334	0.15
2864	1.041	14.423	13.684	0.07

TABLE 8—*Continued*

HV	$\log P$	$\langle V_{\circ} \rangle$	$\langle I_{\circ} \rangle$	$E_{B-V}$
2510	0.973	14.61	13.92	0.07
12816	0.960	14.272	13.695	0.07
2733	0.941	14.32	13.74	0.11
2854	0.937	14.58	13.85	0.02
SW 58	0.932	14.228	13.657	0.15
2738	0.921	14.50	13.90	0.07
12700	0.911	14.88	14.09	-0.01
12581	0.904	14.93	14.18	0.07
6104	0.903	14.61	13.88	0.07
5730	0.898	14.90	14.18	0.07
1000	0.859	14.80	14.14	0.07
935	0.849	14.79	14.12	0.07
SW 269	0.846	14.703	14.026	0.15
SW 341	0.555	15.463	14.911	0.15
12198	0.547	15.72	15.08	0.07
12204	0.537	15.46	15.04	0.07
12197	0.497	15.84	15.22	0.07
12202	0.491	15.83	15.28	0.07
12203	0.470	15.88	15.34	0.07
12200	0.436	15.93	15.40	0.07
SW 679	0.433	15.924	15.351	0.15
12199	0.422	16.03	15.44	0.07

TABLE 9  
 LMC CEPHEIDS USED FOR FITTING PL RELATIONS IN THE  $J$ ,  $H$  AND  $K$  BANDS.

HV	$\log P$	$\langle J_{\circ} \rangle$	$\langle H_{\circ} \rangle$	$\langle K_{\circ} \rangle$	$E_{B-V}$
5497	1.997	10.023	9.547	9.448	0.095
2827	1.897	10.420	9.908	9.823	0.08
G 458	1.872	10.288	9.878	9.791	0.058
2369	1.684	10.911	10.469	10.397	0.095
953	1.680	10.75	10.34	10.27	0.07
900	1.677	11.17	10.72	10.64	0.058
877	1.654	11.401	10.880	10.786	0.12
2338	1.625	11.208	10.759	10.679	0.04
2257	1.592	11.37	10.91	10.82	0.06
909	1.575	11.37	10.97	10.89	0.058
879	1.566	11.646	11.132	11.055	0.06
2294	1.563	11.243	10.825	10.754	0.07
881	1.553	11.59	11.11	11.00	0.03
873	1.536	11.52	11.02	10.94	0.13
882	1.503	11.73	11.28	11.16	0.07
899	1.492	11.77	11.48	11.38	0.11
1002	1.484	11.57	11.14	11.05	0.00
8036	1.453	11.97	11.52	11.44	0.058
2251	1.447	11.68	11.24	11.17	0.058
1023	1.425	12.040	11.562	11.468	0.07
902	1.421	11.87	11.45	11.29	0.07
12815	1.417	11.840	11.378	11.307	0.07
889	1.412	12.05	11.56	11.46	0.058
1003	1.388	11.80	11.41	11.34	0.058
1013	1.382	12.004	11.509	11.431	0.11
886	1.380	11.96	11.57	11.50	0.058
878	1.367	12.19	11.77	11.71	0.058
2749	1.364	12.41	11.86	11.70	0.07
2793	1.283	12.304	11.843	11.774	0.10
2836	1.244	12.641	12.153	12.057	0.18
2580	1.228	12.448	12.011	11.934	0.09
2549	1.209	12.62	12.23	12.16	0.058
12471	1.200	12.92	12.40	12.30	0.058

TABLE 9—*Continued*

HV	$\log P$	$\langle J_{\odot} \rangle$	$\langle H_{\odot} \rangle$	$\langle K_{\odot} \rangle$	$E_{B-V}$
955	1.138	12.72	12.32	12.25	0.058
2352	1.134	12.709	12.348	12.254	0.10
997	1.119	12.927	12.474	12.389	0.10
2260	1.112	13.167	12.745	12.692	0.13
2527	1.112	13.07	12.63	12.54	0.07
2864	1.041	13.252	12.843	12.788	0.07
971	0.968	13.15	12.75	12.70	0.058
12816	0.960	13.344	13.004	12.942	0.07
12717	0.947	13.37	12.92	12.94	0.058
12452	0.941	13.39	12.90	12.86	0.058
2733	0.941	13.45	13.04	13.03	0.11
2854	0.936	13.35	12.94	12.91	0.02
12823	0.919	13.29	13.06	13.04	0.058
12700	0.911	13.57	13.19	13.14	-0.01
2694	0.841	13.57	13.28	13.21	0.07
2405	0.840	13.82	13.46	13.45	0.07
914	0.838	13.61	13.27	13.24	0.07
2337	0.837	13.75	13.38	13.27	0.07
13048	0.836	13.56	13.21	13.17	0.07
6065	0.835	13.85	13.46	13.40	0.07
12797	0.834	13.55	13.14	13.13	0.07
6093	0.680	14.18	13.85	13.71	0.058
12226	0.569	14.56	14.20	14.10	0.07
12747	0.556	14.57	14.25	14.17	0.058
12225	0.478	14.98	14.62	14.52	0.058
5541	0.415	14.89	14.73	14.55	0.058

TABLE 10  
 LMC CEPHEID PERIOD-LUMINOSITY RELATIONS AND LMC DISTANCE MODULI.

Band	Slope	ZP ( $\log P = 1$ )	rms	correlation coefficient	N	$\mu_0$ (LMC)
<i>V</i>	-2.769	14.397	0.204	0.983	53	$18.478 \pm 0.049$
<i>I<sub>C</sub></i>	-3.041	13.693	0.150	0.992	53	$18.482 \pm 0.044$
<i>J</i>	-3.129	13.220	0.146	0.992	59	$18.433 \pm 0.039$
<i>H</i>	-3.249	12.832	0.124	0.995	59	$18.443 \pm 0.039$
<i>K</i>	-3.267	12.759	0.118	0.995	59	$18.457 \pm 0.039$