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# An Astrometric Observation of Binary Star System WDS 15559-0210 at the Great Basin Observatory 
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#### Abstract

Researchers at Concordia University Irvine measured the position angle and separation of the double star system WDS 15559-0210 using a SBIG STX-16803 CCD camera on the PlaneWave $0.7-\mathrm{m}$ CDK 700 telescope at the Great Basin Observatory. Images of the binary star system were measured using AstroImageJ software. Twenty observations of WDS 155590210 were measured and analyzed. The calculated mean resulted in a position angle of $345.95^{\circ}$ and a separation of 5.94 ". These measurements were consistent with the previous values for this binary system listed in the Washington Double Star Catalog.


## Introduction

Double stars are two stars that appear to be close together from Earth's perspective. Observations can be made over decades to determine whether double stars are gravitationally-bound binaries, (that is, physical pairs travelling together but not in a mutual orbit) or chance optical alignments of separate stars. If the star system is a binary, an orbit can be resolved and, if we know the distance to the system, the total system mass ("dynamical mass") can be computed. Knowing the stellar mass is critical to understanding the life cycle of the star (Genet 2016).

Binary star research is a new endeavor at Concordia University Irvine (CUI) and has great scientific potential and educational merit. In this pilot study, a studentled team at CUI made observations of WDS 155590210 using the remotely-controlled telescope (Figure 2) at the newly constructed Great Basin Observatory (GBO). The purpose of these observations was to introduce the student research team to astrometric data collection and analysis and to use the GBO as a research instrument to gather scientific data for use in double star astrometry. The GBO was constructed through the collaborative efforts of CUI, Southern Utah University, University of Nevada-Reno, Western Nevada College, Great Basin National Park, and the Great Basin Nation-


Figure 1. The Concordia University Irvine Astronomy Research Team after the first in-person meeting. Left to right: Russell Genet, Rachel Freed, Lila Musegades, Mackenzie Graham, Andrew Poore, Michelle Caldwell, Selena Masson, Aludith Mayares, John Kenney, III, and Cole Niebuhr.
al Park Foundation to support a vigorous program of astronomical research, education, and outreach. The observatory is located at Great Basin National Park, high in the mountains ( 6825 ft ), and distant from any major city or population. The altitude, seclusion, and low-humidity of the desert allow for ideal dark-sky (21.32-21.48 mags/arcsecond ${ }^{2}$ ) conditions required for obtaining high-quality observations (Great Basin Na-
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Figure 2. The $0.7 m$ CDK 700 PlaneWaveTelescope at the Great Basin Observatory in eastern Nevada celebrating its "first light" on 25 August 2016.
tional Park, 2016).
The binary system WDS 15559-0210 was selected for study from the Washington Double Star catalog using the following parameters: the system was visible from the Great Basin Observatory, had a proposed period, a separation greater than $5^{\prime \prime}$, magnitude values less than seven, and a magnitude difference less than five. WSD 15559-0210 was selected because it had many previous data points, high-fidelity data gathered by CCD cameras, and it appeared to be veering off the 1973 calculated orbit. Thus a new data point would either contribute to the validation of the original orbit or provide important data for a needed recalculation.

## Equipment

The Great Basin Observatory (GBO) is equipped with a PlaneWave $0.7-\mathrm{m}$ CDK 700 telescope (Great Basin Observatory, 2016). The GBO utilizes a SBIG STX-16803 CCD camera that is attached to the telescope (STX-16803 2017). The images obtained from the observatory were analyzed with the db3.2.1 version of AstroImageJ, a public-domain image processing program, to measure separations and position angles (Collins et. al., 2017). It should be noted that a user account code is needed from nova.astrometry.net in order to use the plate solving capabilities of the program.

## Image Analysis

On 18 June 2017, 20 images were taken by GBO using a 10 -second exposure time and no filter. The im-


Figure 3: Inside of the observatory dome at Great Basin Observatory in Great Basin National Park, Nevada.
ages were then analyzed using AstroImageJ. In the software, the radius parameter under the "Plate Solving with Options" was set to 5 pixels, the "Radius of Object Aperture" setting was decreased from 30 to 6 pixels, and the "Centroid Aperture" feature was left on default. These settings allowed the program to identify the binary stars as two separate objects and orient measurements to the center point of each star.

A difficulty did arise using the "Plate Solve" method when both stars would be initially identified as objects but the secondary would be removed if the process was allowed to finish. This occurred because AstroImageJ would attempt to validate the automatically selected objects through astrometry.net; however, the information for both components were stored under the same entry causing AstroImageJ to only verify the primary star. It is for this reason that measurements were made after the objects were identified but before the validation process finished.

## Results

Table 1 shows the results for position angle and separation for this study. The average position angle from this study was $354.95 \pm 0.09^{\circ}$, and the average separation was $5.94 \pm 0.04{ }^{\prime \prime}$. The observations were made on 18 June 2017 or date 2017.4600.

## Discussion

The 2012 Washington Double Star Catalog reports 205 observations for WDS 15559-0210 and, after the exclusion of incomplete entries and outliers greater than two standard deviations away from best fit, 161 of these past observations were plotted in conjunction with the new point in Figure 4 (Washington Double Star Catalog 2012). A reproduced orbit was provided for comparison by creating a trend line from data points
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Table 1. Position angle and separation measurements made by the Concordia team from GBO data acquired on 18 June 2017.

derived from the WDS orbital plot. The observation from this study appears to fit well with the previous data and, as shown in Figure 4, the cumulative plot shows a deviation from the published orbit.

## Conclusion

The new data generated by this study fits well with previous data and cumulatively show a deviation from the proposed orbit for the binary system WDS 155590210. Moreover, this study, the first of its type using


Figure 4. The new point gathered in this research, shown as an orange triangle, aligns with the path of the previous data points, shown as blue dots, provided by information in the WDS. The compiled data shows a trend away from the published orbit.

## An Astrometric Observation of Binary Star System WDS 15559-0210 at the Great Basin Observatory

the GBO, also serves to verify the capabilities of this new telescope.
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#### Abstract

Astrometric measurements of WDS 13513-3928 were made using the iTelescope network. The position angle and separation of the two-star system were found to be 51.1 degrees and 28.3 arcseconds.


## Introduction

WDS 13513-3928 (HJ 4618) was chosen from the Washington Double Star catalog (WDS) after meeting these specific selection criteria: right ascension between 12 and 18 hours, delta magnitude of 3 or less, separation sufficient to allow for each star to be separate on the image, and large changes in position angle (Theta) and distance between the pair's stars (Rho) as indicated by past observations. Its low declination made telescopes in Australia best suited for CCD imaging.

HJ 4618 was first observed by John Herschel in 1834 and has since been measured a total of ten times. This project added another data point to this set, to assist in future determination of whether the system is gravitationally bound or a visual double star.

## Equipment and Method

HJ 4618 was measured from Australia's T32 wide deep field telescope from the iTelescope Network. T32 has a large CCD chip that allows the telescope to take wide pictures of the sky. The Planewave Ascension 200HR mount's accuracy does not require active guidance, thus decreasing the session setup time when imaging. The $\mathrm{F} /$ Ratio is $\mathrm{f} / 6.8$ and with a CCD 9 um pixel size the resolution is 0.63 arcsecs per pixel.

CCD images were taken by Australia's T32 at epoch 2017.2450. with exposures of 80 ms and 160 ms for luminance and HA filters, 5 images in total. Each image was analyzed in MaximDL, where the PinPoint Astrometry function was used to set the World Coordi-
nate System (WCS) right ascension and declination coordinates in the image for further processing. Mira Pro x64, a robust astrometry program, was used for measuring Theta and Rho of HJ 4618. Averages were found of the measurements.

The A and B stars were located and Mira was used to measure the separation distance from the stars' centroids and the separation angle of the pair. These measurements were recorded into Microsoft Excel to calculate statistics and plot the new data points visually as a graph relative to the previous measurements' points. Figures 1 and 2 show examples of CCD images that were analyzed in Mira, with the A and B stars labeled. Figure 1 is an example of an image taken with a luminance filter while Figure 2 was taken with a hydrogenalpha filter.

Theta and Rho measurements from the CCD images, Table 1, are outlined along with basic statistics. These include the average and standard deviation of the measurements for position angle and separation distance as well as the standard errors for the averages. The historical measurements, including our 2017 measurements, are outlined in Table 2 and plotted in Figure 3.

## Discussion

No measured values were omitted because our CCD images produced consistent values as the separation distances were far enough for the images to portray
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Figure 1. Luminance filter w/ 80s exposure.

Table 1. Theta and Rho for each Measurement

| Image | Position <br> Angle | Separation <br> Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Image 1 | $51.27^{\circ}$ | $28.3^{\prime \prime} \prime$ |
| Image 2 | $51.28^{\circ}$ | $28.34^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Image 3 | $50.66^{\circ}$ | $28.3^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Image 4 | $51.21^{\circ}$ | $28.42^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Image 5 | $51.30^{\circ}$ | $28.11^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Mean | $51.10^{\circ}$ | $28.30^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Standard Deviation | $0.27^{\circ}$ | $0.12^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Std. Error of Mean | $0.054^{\circ}$ | $0.024^{\prime \prime}$ |



Figure 2. H $\alpha$ filter with 160 s exposure.

Table 2. Historical Measurements from the WDS with this Paper's 2017 Measurements Included

| Observation Date <br> (year) | Position <br> Angle | Separation <br> Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1834.48 | $339.6^{\circ}$ | $12.00^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1907.49 | $18.5^{\circ}$ | $16.06^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1913.63 | $22.5^{\circ}$ | $17.67^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1920.17 | $25.4^{\circ}$ | $17.60^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1929.43 | $28.9^{\circ}$ | $18.27^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1959.46 | $38.5^{\circ}$ | $21.30^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1998.523 | $48.1^{\circ}$ | $25.92^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1999.29 | $48.4^{\circ}$ | $26.06^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 2004.36 | $50.1^{\circ}$ | $26.74 \prime \prime$ |
| 2010.5 | $51.1^{\circ}$ | $27.42^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 2017 |  | $28.30^{\prime \prime}$ |
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Figure 3. Plot of the historical measurements from 1834 through 2017 from Table 2. The axis are in arcseconds with the A component at the origin.

## (Continued from page 201)

two distinct stars, not fused together. Figure 3 shows a graph of the historical position angle and distance measurements, converted into X and Y coordinates, from the data recorded in the WDS and the 2017 images. The first data point, labeled 1834, appears to be lacking in accuracy because it is visually spaced far away from the other points on the graph. However, the gap of time between this point and the chronological next point is 73.01 years while the mean gap in time between the next four measurements and their chronological neighbors is 7.313 years. The major difference in time gaps ( $73.01 \gg 7.313$ ) accounts for the visual separation in the graph, therefore reassuring the validity of the first data point. Plus, the 1834 measurement is consistent with the linear trend across the rest of the graph with the trend line $\left(\mathrm{R}^{2}\right)$ close to one indicating a near linear fit.

## Conclusion

Our observed data is consistent with the WDS catalog as our measurements show a clear linear trend line similar to WDS. The data suggest that the pair could be
an optical double.
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#### Abstract

A student-led team of researchers studied double star S 825AB (WDS $23100+3651$ ). Analysis of ten CCD images obtained by the Sierra Research Observatory yielded an average position angle of $318.37^{\circ}$ and an average separation of $67.38^{\prime \prime}$. Comparing these results to published findings in the Washington Double Star Catalog and measurements taken from the European Space Agency's Gaia astrometry satellite, the team concluded that S 825 AB is not a binary system.


## Introduction

The term "double star" refers to any two stars that appear near to each other from the perspective of Earth. Although the stars may appear to be in close proximity, the components of the systems may actually be separated by great distances. The distance and masses of the components in three-dimensional space determines whether the system is a binary system, an optical double, or a common proper motion pair. A true binary system contains two stars that are physically bound and orbit around a common gravitational center. This is in contrast to optical double and common proper motion systems which are chance optical alignments but the component stars are not orbiting one another. Through repeated observations of these systems, taking place over many years, the nature of the stellar relationship can be determined.

A team of students from several institutions studied the suspected binary star system S 825AB (listed as WDS $23100+3651$ in the Washington Double Star Catalog) by collecting new images and combining the data with past observations. S 825 AB has been previously proposed as a binary system due to past findings suggesting the stars are gravitationally bound (Figure 1).

The proposed orbit, however, did not coincide with recent observations. Data collected by the Gaia satellite from the European Space Agency (ESA) provides strong evidence that $S 825 \mathrm{AB}$ is not a binary system. The purpose of this study was to make a new observation to determine the nature of S 825 AB as a binary.

## Procedures and Instrumentation

Previous data was collected on S 825AB from both the Washington Double Star Catalog (WDS) via the United States Naval Observatory and the Gaia Satellite Observations database from the European Space Agency. New data was obtained through Sierra Remote Observatory in California using a PlaneWave Instruments CDK217 Astrograph telescope and Apogee F16 KAF16803 CCD camera. Instrument specifications are listed in Table 1. Ten images were captured and compiled on June 30, 2017 in order to measure current system positions.

The collected images were analyzed using AstroImageJ, a public domain image processing program based on the ImageJ software developed by the National Institutes of Health (Collins et al., 2017). AstroImageJ has the option to use "centroid apertures" within its measuring tools that automatically sets the
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Figure 1. An orbital plot containing 38 previous observations of $S 825 A B$ provided by U.S. Naval Observatory.
cursor to the center of the identified stars. This option reduces the human error involved in measuring the separation and position angle between the component stars. With the Plate Solve feature, the identity of the stars was confirmed and compass directions oriented via the online database astrometry.net, thus further validating the measurements.

## Data and Results

Previous data was collected and compared from both the Washington Double Star Catalog and the Gaia Catalog. Of particular importance is the description of
the proper motions of the individual stars in the double star system from the Gaia Satellite (Table 2). The data collected from Sierra Remote Observatory is displayed with data from each captured image (Table 3) and resulted in a combined position angle of $318.37 \pm 0.005^{\circ}$ and a separation of $67.38 \pm 0.01$ ".

## Discussion

The results of this study combined with previous data demonstrate a nearly linear change in position between the two stars (Figure 2). Possible explanations of
(Text continues on page 207)

Table 1: Summary of Equipment Utilized with Specifications.

| Equipment | Specifications |
| :--- | :--- |
| Telescope | CDK17 OTA, IRF90 integrated rotator/focuser |
| Telescope mount | A200 mount with Sitech controller |
| Camera | Apogee F16M KAF-16803 based camera with filter wheel |
| Software | STI 1.4.2 mount interface, PWI 3.3.3 focuser/rotator interface, PWA 1.09 automation software, MaxIm DL <br> Pro 5 camera interface, TeamViewer 12, Google Drive, db3.2.1 version AstroImageJ |

## Refuting S 825AB System Classification through Astrometry and Gaia Satellite Data

Table 2: Selected data obtained from the ESA's Gaia astrometry satellite describing the location and movements of each component of the double star S 825AB

| Right Ascension <br> (degree) | Declination <br> (degree) | Parallax <br> (milliarcsec) | Proper Motion RA <br> (milliarcsec/year) | Proper Motion DE <br> (milliarcsec /year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 347.5108173664 | +36.8482827887 | 3.26 | 14.712 | -2.267 |
| 347.4952824410 | +36.8622777008 | 1.56 | 4.290 | -0.004 |

Table 3. Separation and position angle measurements from CCD images taken in this study including average value, standard deviation, and standard error of the mean.

| Observation | Position Angle <br> (degrees) | Separation <br> (arc seconds) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 318.36 | 67.42 |
| 2 | 318.39 | 67.40 |
| 3 | 318.38 | 67.41 |
| 4 | 318.37 | 67.30 |
| 5 | 318.36 | 67.46 |
| 6 | 318.35 | 67.37 |
| 7 | 318.39 | 67.33 |
| 8 | 318.39 | 67.36 |
| 9 | 318.38 | 67.38 |
| 10 | 318.35 | 67.41 |
| Mean |  | 67.38 |
| Std. Deviation | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| SE Mean | 0.005 | 0.01 |



Figure 2. A compilation of new and previous data plotted on a Cartesian Coordinate system for comparison (excluding statistical outliers).

## Refuting S 825AB System Classification through Astrometry and Gaia Satellite Data

(Continued from page 205)
these results are that the system exhibits an orbit with a prolonged period or that the components are not gravi-tationally-bound. Large differences in parallax and proper motion are reported in the Gaia catalog data set, suggesting that the components of the system are chance optical alignments rather than a gravitationally bound binary system.

## Conclusion

This student-led study has successfully introduced several undergraduate researchers to the field of astrometry. The results show definitely that the double star S 825 AB is not a binary system but rather an optical motion double star. The component stars move in a similar direction; however, it can be inferred that with the passage of time, the differences in proper motions will cause the pair's separation to widen.
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#### Abstract

A description of the relative rectilinear motion of double stars provides an important clue to the relationship of the components. The aim is to provide an objective method of obtaining Rectilinear Elements. We present a simplified method to calculate relative rectilinear motion, relying on the data obtained from the HIPPARCOS and GAIA DR1 missions, together with their uncertainties. As examples, we present the Rectilinear Elements of RMK 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 17, 20, 25, 27, and 28.


## 1. Introduction

The description of the relative motion of the components of double stars in the form of rectilinear motion is the analysis of the (presumed) perceived linear motion of the secondary star relative to the primary. It is usually visualized as a straight line on a Cartesian plot where the primary star is the origin $(0,0)$ position.

Such descriptions are an important tool in distinguishing between optical doubles and physical binaries, which in turn, have implications for stellar formation models. Relatively slow moving doubles may be either chance alignments of unrelated stars or very long period bound pairs. A comparison of the best-fit rectilinear motion and curved orbital motion should result in a clear distinction between these two types, since it is the variations from linearity that allows a sensitive identification of a Keplerian system.

We present here a portion of a continuing study of the double stars identified nearly two hundred years ago at Sir Thomas Brisbane's observatory at Parramatta, Australia (see paper 1, Letchford, White, and Ernest 2017, and references therein). In this study, and this paper, we present the rectilinear elements of pairs from the double star list of Rümker (Rümker 1832). Section 2 is our revised method for the computation of the elements of rectilear motion, and Section 3 presents the
elements and the diagrammatic results for 14 of the 28 Rümker pairs.

## 2. Derivation of Rectilinear Elements

Rectilinear motion has been studied for many double star pairs, and a Catalog of Rectilinear Elements (CORE) is maintained by the USNO ${ }^{\dagger}$. Utilizing the USNO method as a starting point, we see several ways that the CORE can be improved. Our improvements are designed to address:

1. The present conversion from polar to Cartesian coordinates is non-standard resulting in a plot that is East-West/North-South reversed relative to adopted orientation.
2. The quoted uncertainties for at least one of the computed parameters appear to be underestimated.
3. The weights associated with the individual observations are subjective.
4. The method used to arrive at the Rectilinear Elements (RE) is not stated in easily reproducible form.

We therefore propose an alternate procedure for rectilinear motion that eliminates each of the above inadequacies by (i) applying the convention in converting from polar to cartesian coordinates: $y=\rho \sin \theta$ and
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$x=\rho \cos \theta$ where $\rho$ is the separation of the primary and the secondary in arcseconds and $\theta$ is the precessed (to Equinox J2000.0) position angle, in degrees, initially given at the equinox of date (epoch), (ii) the calculation of the uncertainties following the standard definition,

$$
\sigma_{f\left(x_{i}\right)}= \pm \sqrt{\sum\left(\frac{\partial f\left(x_{i}\right)}{\partial x_{i}} \sigma_{x_{i}}\right)^{2}}
$$

and (iii) further modifications as discussed in section 2.1 below.

### 2.1 Adoption of Space-Based Data

The rectilinear elements in the CORE are the result of assigning weights to each observation (which, despite the best of efforts, always involves an element of subjectiveness), and then calculating the line of best fit based on historical observations. Instead we propose to avoid altogether the need for weighting by using only the positions observed by the HIPPARCOS (HIP) and GAIA (GAIA) space missions. These two positions offer uncertainties far smaller than is currently available with terrestrial measurements. HIPPARCOS positional uncertainties are approximately 5 milliarcseconds (mas) and GAIA are 0.4 mas for the RMK stars in this paper. The line of motion can then be fitted to the two-point astrometric positions in an entirely objective fashion. This utilizes the most powerful data available for astrometric work; relegating the other ground-based and historic measures to a secondary "supportive" role.

The adoption of the HIPPARCOS positions for the individual stars comes, however, with a caveat that the HIPPARCOS mission had technical difficulties handling double stars within specific seperation and magnitude limits. Details of the limitations of the HIPPARCOS mission's handling of double stars are given in Lindegren et al. (1997), and analysis of data from that mission must be treated in light of that paper.

We give here in section 2 full derivations of all elements and their uncertainties.

### 2.2 Input Data

To compute the CORE elements, the following data are needed:

- The Right Ascension (RA) and Declination (DE) of the primary and secondary (1 and 2, respectively) stars from HIPPARCOS, together with their uncertainties.
- The Right Ascension (RA) and Declination (DE) of the primary and secondary (1 and 2, respectively) stars from GAIA DR1 (Gaia Data Release 1) together with their uncertainties.

The above data for the Rümker doubles in this paper are presented in Table 1.

HIPPARCOS and GAIA positions are both given in the International Celestial Reference System (ICRS), with the epoch of HIPPARCOS set at J1991.25 and those of GAIA DR1 at J2015.0. Alignment to the ICRS at epoch J1991.25 is estimated to be within 0.6 mas (Hilton and Hohenkerk, 2004). This is smaller than the uncertainties of positions of our RMK stars in the HIPPARCOS catalogue, and less than those associated with any transformation required for the ground-based observations, and so the differences in the definitions of ICRS can be safely ignored.

### 2.3 Computation of Rectilinear Elements <br> Let:

$\triangle R A$ Difference in RA between the primary and secondary
$\triangle D E$ Difference in DE between the primary and secondary
RA1 RA of primary
DE1 DE of primary
RA2 RA of secondary
DE2 DE of secondary
$\theta \quad$ Position angle
$\rho \quad$ Separation
xh x cartesian coordinate of HIP relative position of secondary
y cartesian coordinate of HIP relative position of secondary
$x g \quad \mathrm{x}$ cartesian coordinate of GAIA relative position of secondary
$y g \quad \mathrm{y}$ cartesian coordinate of GAIA relative position of secondary
Uncertainty of quantity
And so:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Delta R A^{r a d}=\left(R A 2^{r a d}-R A 1^{\text {rad }}\right) \cos \left(D E 1^{r a d}\right) \\
& \Delta D E^{r a d}=D E 2^{r a d}-D E 1^{r a d}
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, the position angle is:

$$
\vartheta^{o}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\frac{180}{\pi} \arctan 2\left[\Delta R A^{r a d}, \Delta D E^{r a d}\right] \\
\vartheta^{o}+360^{\circ}, \text { if } \vartheta^{o}<0^{o} \\
\vartheta^{o}-360^{\circ}, \text { if } \vartheta^{o}>360^{\circ}
\end{array}\right.
$$

and the separation is

$$
\rho^{\prime \prime}=\frac{360.180}{\pi} \sqrt{\left(\Delta R A^{\text {rad }}\right)^{2}+\left(\Delta D E^{\text {rad }}\right)^{2}}
$$

(Text continues on page 212)
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Table 1: Data from the HIP (ICRS, epoch J1991.25) and GAIA DR1 (ICRS, epoch J2015.0) catalogues

| RMK | HIP ${ }_{\text {- }}$ | HIP DE | HIP PmRA mas/yr | HIP pmDE mas/yr | GAIA ${ }_{\circ}$ | GAIA $\underset{\circ}{ }$ DE | GAIA PmRA mas/yr | GAIA pmDE mas/yr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\pm$ mas | $\pm$ mas | $\pm$ mas/yr | $\pm$ mas/yr | $\pm$ mas | $\pm$ mas | $\pm$ mas/yr | $\pm$ mas/yr |
| 1 A | $\begin{gathered} 13.10213861 \\ 1.73 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -69.50359643 \\ 1.78 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.81 \\ & 1.84 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -68.87 \\ 2.14 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.10221204 \\ 0.288 \end{gathered}$ | $-69.50404326$ <br> 0.161 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.040 \\ & 0.115 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -67.635 \\ 0.111 \end{array}$ |
| 1 B | 13.11818630 <br> 15.63 | $-69.50273658$ <br> 14.16 | $-2.47$ <br> 11.60 | $\begin{gathered} -59.75 \\ 12.41 \end{gathered}$ | 13.11823831 0.376 | $-69.50321341$ <br> 0.247 | $3.265$ <br> 0.325 | $\begin{array}{r} -72.464 \\ 0.312 \end{array}$ |
| 3 A | $\begin{gathered} 64.41777199 \\ 0.66 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -63.25549171 \\ 0.61 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.48 \\ & 0.51 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35.53 \\ 0.60 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 64.41785704 \\ 0.308 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -63.25526588 \\ 0.454 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.837 \\ & 0.025 \end{aligned}$ | 34.244 <br> 0.030 |
| 3 B | $\begin{gathered} 64.41790229 \\ 4.04 \end{gathered}$ | $-63.25434505$ $4.13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.02 \\ & 1.68 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28.29 \\ 2.17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 64.41795947 \\ 0.113 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -63.25413265 \\ 0.124 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ |
| 4 A | $\begin{gathered} 66.05133135 \\ 0.97 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -57.07115747 \\ 0.94 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -104.32 \\ 1.09 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -73.73 \\ 0.92 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 66.05005359 \\ 0.149 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -57.07164998 \\ 0.306 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -105.265 \\ 0.041 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -74.750 \\ 0.043 \end{array}$ |
| 4 B | $\begin{gathered} 66.04872176 \\ 1.93 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 66.04872176 \\ 1.93 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -99.63 \\ 1.42 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -59.98 \\ 1.28 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 66.04751666 \\ 0.056 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -57.07220024 \\ 0.096 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ |
| 5 A | $\begin{gathered} 107.60195006 \\ 1.27 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -55.58769155 \\ 1.17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.46 \\ 1.16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -9.42 \\ 1.25 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 107.60194970 \\ 0.174 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -55.58776986 \\ 0.230 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.217 \\ & 0.132 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -12.031 \\ 0.117 \end{gathered}$ |
| 5 B | $\begin{gathered} 107.59949405 \\ 2.13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -55.58903491 \\ 2.18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.46 \\ 1.16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -9.42 \\ 1.25 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 107.59949880 \\ 0.058 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -55.58911163 \\ 0.108 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N/A } \\ & \text { N/A } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ |
| 6 A | $\begin{gathered} 110.08940661 \\ 1.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -52.31188250 \\ 0.96 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -35.17 \\ 0.85 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 147.45 \\ 1.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 110.08900990 \\ 0.780 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -52.31091536 \\ 0.614 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -36.881 \\ 0.050 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 146.689 \\ 0.045 \end{gathered}$ |
| 6 B | $\begin{gathered} 110.09119822 \\ 3.46 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -52.30958151 \\ 3.46 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -30.09 \\ 1.79 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 139.97 \\ 2.01 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 110.09085430 \\ 0.635 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -52.30866713 \\ 0.777 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ |
| 8 A | $\begin{gathered} 123.81647486 \\ 0.60 \end{gathered}$ | $-62.91561677$ $0.55$ | $\begin{gathered} -26.87 \\ 0.62 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -10.95 \\ 0.57 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 123.81613060 \\ 0.270 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -62.91569353 \\ 0.327 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ |
| 8 B | $\begin{gathered} 123.81876212 \\ 6.84 \end{gathered}$ | $-62.91520742$ $7.13$ | $\begin{array}{r} -26.87 \\ 0.62 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -10.95 \\ 0.57 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 123.81845950 \\ 0.057 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -62.91530189 \\ 0.084 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ |
| 10 A | $\begin{gathered} 139.47917885 \\ 2.16 \end{gathered}$ | $-69.80468837$ $2.22$ | $\begin{array}{r} -4.17 \\ 2.55 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.71 \\ & 2.08 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 139.47903390 \\ 0.254 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -69.80464588 \\ 0.233 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -7.794 \\ 0.063 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.518 \\ & 0.069 \end{aligned}$ |
| 10 B | $\begin{gathered} 139.48185926 \\ 3.97 \end{gathered}$ | $-69.80195281$ $3.75$ | $\begin{gathered} -12.53 \\ 3.59 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.73 \\ & 2.85 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 139.48171690 \\ 0.245 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -69.80191018 \\ 0.226 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -6.978 \\ 0.085 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.315 \\ & 0.098 \end{aligned}$ |
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Table 1 (conclusion): Data from the HIP (ICRS, epoch J1991.25) and GAIA DR1 (ICRS, epoch J2015.0) catalogues

| RMK | HIP RA | HIP DE | HIP PmRA mas/yr | HIP PmDE mas/yr | GAIA RA | GAIA DE | GAIA PmRA mas/yr | GAIA pmDE mas/yr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\pm$ mas | $\pm$ mas | $\pm$ mas/yr | $\pm$ mas/yr | $\pm$ mas | $\pm$ mas | $\pm$ mas/yr | $\pm$ mas/yr |
| 11 A | $\begin{gathered} 146.77557340 \\ 0.42 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -65.07201888 \\ 0.39 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -11.55 \\ 0.49 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.97 \\ & 0.38 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 146.77536750 \\ 1.200 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -65.07197603 \\ 1.273 \end{gathered}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ |
| 11 B | $\begin{gathered} 146.77819338 \\ 9.06 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -65.07287694 \\ 7.82 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -11.55 \\ 0.49 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.97 \\ & 0.38 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 146.77800690 \\ 0.255 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -65.07283570 \\ 0.210 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ |
| 12 A | $\begin{gathered} 148.77381591 \\ 0.68 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -69.18905000 \\ 0.63 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -67.46 \\ 0.85 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31.29 \\ 0.66 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 148.77258570 \\ 0.341 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -69.18886855 \\ 0.307 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -66.237 \\ 0.033 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27.490 \\ 0.031 \end{gathered}$ |
| 12 B | $148.76989518$ <br> 6.18 | $\begin{gathered} -69.19119668 \\ 5.28 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -67.46 \\ 0.85 \end{gathered}$ | 31.29 <br> 0.66 | $\begin{gathered} 148.76870420 \\ 0.141 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -69.19102761 \\ 0.128 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ |
| 17 A | $203.01630920$ <br> 4.40 | $\begin{gathered} -63.04189266 \\ 3.80 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -1.40 \\ 5.50 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -5.60 \\ 4.10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 203.01623910 \\ 0.189 \end{gathered}$ | $-63.04190578$ <br> 0.219 | $\begin{array}{r} -4.946 \\ 0.298 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -2.433 \\ 0.316 \end{array}$ |
| 17 B | $203.01589640$ <br> 6.10 | $\begin{gathered} -63.03745126 \\ 6.00 \end{gathered}$ | 16.30 <br> 8.20 | $23.90$ <br> 7.50 | $\begin{gathered} 203.01584320 \\ 0.236 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -63.03747152 \\ 0.322 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -4.610 \\ 0.344 \end{array}$ | $-3.541$ <br> 0.378 |
| 20 A | $\begin{gathered} 236.97123090 \\ 1.11 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -65.44218988 \\ 1.20 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -27.98 \\ 1.08 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -41.74 \\ 1.39 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 236.97076230 \\ 0.179 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -65.44244124 \\ 0.349 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -29.371 \\ 0.036 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -38.218 \\ 0.045 \end{array}$ |
| 20 B | $\begin{gathered} 236.97189982 \\ 2.01 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -65.44261411 \\ 2.08 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -28.00 \\ 1.32 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -34.83 \\ 1.59 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 236.97142560 \\ 0.086 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -65.44284167 \\ 0.175 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ |
| 25 A | $303.73387783$ $1.75$ | $\begin{gathered} -56.97624609 \\ 1.46 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38.22 \\ 2.43 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -96.11 \\ 2.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 303.73432470 \\ 0.151 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -56.97686335 \\ 0.194 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36.677 \\ 0.073 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -93.431 \\ 0.062 \end{gathered}$ |
| 25 B | $\begin{gathered} 303.73563959 \\ 3.19 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -56.97448410 \\ 3.37 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38.22 \\ 2.43 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -96.11 \\ 2.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 303.73606750 \\ 0.068 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -56.97513412 \\ 0.070 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ |
| 27 A | $\begin{gathered} 354.86635383 \\ 1.04 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -46.63789839 \\ 0.81 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.44 \\ 0.94 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40.99 \\ 0.65 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 354.86656960 \\ 0.323 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -46.63766756 \\ 0.436 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.353 \\ 0.038 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34.941 \\ 0.033 \end{gathered}$ |
| 27 B | $\begin{gathered} 354.86478545 \\ 3.59 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -46.63777300 \\ 3.24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28.98 \\ 2.07 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36.14 \\ 1.55 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 354.86503090 \\ 0.122 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -46.63752002 \\ 0.123 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N/A } \\ & \text { N/A } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ |
| 28 A | $\begin{gathered} 356.88918210 \\ 7.40 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -60.51913771 \\ 9.50 \end{gathered}$ | $34.80$ <br> 9.60 | $\begin{array}{r} -14.40 \\ 13.10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 356.88942030 \\ 0.214 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -60.51912624 \\ 0.214 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17.492 \\ 0.478 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.075 \\ & 0.438 \end{aligned}$ |
| 28 B | $\begin{gathered} 356.89237990 \\ 9.20 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -60.51941088 \\ 12.40 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.20 \\ & 12.10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.70 \\ & 17.10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 356.89260510 \\ 0.207 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -60.51940647 \\ 0.205 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17.510 \\ 0.472 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.857 \\ & 0.431 \end{aligned}$ |

## The Southern Double Stars of Carl Rümker II: Their Relative Rectilinear Motion

and the above in Cartesian coordinates:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x^{\prime \prime}=\rho^{\prime \prime} \cos \left(\vartheta^{\text {rad }}\right) \\
& y^{\prime \prime}=\rho^{\prime \prime} \sin \left(\vartheta^{\text {rad }}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

This has the effect that increasing $x$ is in the direction of increasing North and increasing $y$ is in the direction of increasing East.

The relative proper motions of the secondary in the $x(x a)$ and $y(y a)$ coordinates are:

$$
\begin{aligned}
x a^{" / y r} & =\frac{x g^{\prime \prime}-x h^{\prime \prime}}{2015.0-1991.25} \\
y a^{\prime \prime / y r} & =\frac{y g^{\prime \prime}-y h^{\prime \prime}}{2015.0-1991.25}
\end{aligned}
$$

The secondary position at $t=0($ not $t 0)$ on the $x$ axis $(x b)$ and $y$ axis $(y b)$ is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x b^{\prime \prime}=x g^{\prime \prime}-x a^{\prime \prime} .2015 .0 \\
& y b^{\prime \prime}=y g^{\prime \prime}-y a^{\prime \prime} .2015 .0
\end{aligned}
$$

So the time of closest approach ( $t 0$ ) and position

$$
\sigma_{x}^{\prime \prime}= \pm \frac{3600.180}{\pi} \sqrt{\left[\cos \left(\vartheta^{r a d}\right) \sigma_{\rho}^{r a d}\right]^{2}+\left[\rho^{r a d} \sin \left(\vartheta^{r a d}\right) \sigma_{\vartheta}^{r a d}\right]^{2}}
$$ $(x 0, y 0)$ of secondary is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& t 0^{y r}=\frac{x a \cdot x b+y a \cdot y b}{x a^{2}+y a^{2}} \\
& x 0^{\prime \prime}=x a^{\prime \prime}(t 0-2015.0)+x g^{\prime \prime} \\
& y 0^{\prime \prime}=y a^{\prime \prime}(t 002015.0)+y g^{\prime \prime} \\
& \vartheta 0=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\frac{180}{\pi} \arctan 2[y 0, x 0] \\
\vartheta^{o}+360^{o} \\
\text { if } \vartheta^{o}<0^{o} \\
\vartheta^{o}-360^{o} \\
\text { if } \vartheta^{o}>360^{o}
\end{array}\right\} \\
& \rho 0 "=\sqrt{x 0^{2}+y 0^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\sigma_{y}^{\prime \prime}= \pm \frac{3600.180}{\pi} \sqrt{\left[\sin \left(\vartheta_{\rho}^{\mathrm{rad}}\right)\right]^{2}+\left[\rho^{\mathrm{rad}} \cos \left(\vartheta^{r a d}\right) \sigma_{\vartheta}^{r a d}\right]^{2}}
$$

$$
\sigma_{x a}^{\prime \prime}= \pm \frac{3600.180}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{x g}^{2}+\sigma_{x h}^{2}}{23.75}}
$$

$$
\sigma_{y a}^{\prime \prime}= \pm \frac{3600.180}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{y g}^{2}+\sigma_{y h}^{2}}{23.75^{2}}}
$$

$$
\sigma_{x b}^{\prime \prime}= \pm \frac{3600.180}{\pi} \sqrt{\sigma_{x g}^{2}+\left(2015.0 \sigma_{x a}\right)^{2}}
$$

$$
\sigma_{y b}^{\prime \prime}= \pm \frac{3600.180}{\pi} \sqrt{\sigma_{y g}^{2}+\left(2015.0 \sigma_{y a}\right)^{2}}
$$

The seven Rectilinear elements $(x 0, x a, y 0, y a, t 0$,

$$
\sigma_{x 0}^{\prime \prime}= \pm \sqrt{\left[(t 0-2015.0) \sigma_{x a}\right]^{2}+\sigma_{x g}^{2}}
$$ $\theta 0, \rho 0)$ thus calculated are defined in Section 3.1.

$$
\sigma_{y 0}^{\prime \prime}= \pm \sqrt{\left[(t 0-2015.0) \sigma_{y a}\right]^{2}+\sigma_{y g}^{2}}
$$

### 2.4 Uncertainties of the Rectilinear Elements

The uncertainties for the RA $\left(\sigma_{\mathrm{RA}}\right)$ and $\mathrm{DE}\left(\sigma_{\mathrm{DE}}\right)$ of the HIP and GAIA positions are presented in the catalogues in milli-arcseconds (mas). Here, they are assumed to be in radians.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sigma_{\Delta R A}^{r a d}= \pm \sqrt{\left(\sigma_{R A 2}^{2}+\sigma_{R A 1}^{2}\right) \cos ^{2}(D E 1)+(R A 2-R A 1)^{2} \sin ^{2}(D E 1) \sigma_{D E 1}^{2}} \\
& \sigma_{\Delta D E}^{r a d}= \pm \sqrt{\sigma_{D E 2}^{2}+\sigma_{D E 1}^{2}} \\
& \sigma_{\vartheta}^{o}= \pm \frac{180}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{\left(\Delta R A \cdot \sigma_{\Delta D E}\right)^{2}+\left(\Delta D E \cdot \sigma_{\Delta R A}\right)^{2}}{\left(\Delta R A^{2}+\Delta D E^{2}\right)^{2}}} \\
& \text { where } \frac{\partial \vartheta}{\partial \Delta R A}=\frac{\Delta D E}{\Delta D E^{2}+\Delta R A^{2}} \text { and } \frac{\partial \vartheta}{\partial \Delta D E}=-\frac{\Delta R A}{\Delta D E^{2}+\Delta R A^{2}} \\
& \text { so, } \sigma_{\vartheta}^{2}=\left(\frac{\partial \vartheta}{\partial \Delta R A} \sigma_{\Delta R A}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\partial \vartheta}{\partial \Delta D E} \sigma_{\Delta D E}\right)^{2}, \text { radians }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sigma_{\vartheta}^{2}=\left(\frac{\partial \vartheta}{\partial \Delta R A} \sigma_{\Delta R A}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\partial \vartheta}{\partial \Delta D E} \sigma_{\Delta D E}\right)^{2}, \text { radians } \\
& \sigma_{\rho}^{\prime \prime}= \pm \frac{3600.180}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{\left(\Delta R A \sigma_{\Delta R A}\right)^{2}+\left(\Delta D E \sigma_{\Delta D E}\right)^{2}}{\Delta R A^{2}+\Delta D E^{2}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\sigma^{\prime \prime}{ }_{\vartheta 0}= \pm \frac{180}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{\left(x 0 \sigma_{y 0}\right)^{2}+\left(y 0 \sigma_{x 0}\right)^{2}}{\left(x 0^{2}+y 0^{2}\right)^{2}}}
$$

$$
\sigma^{\prime \prime}{ }_{\rho 0}= \pm \sqrt{\frac{\left(x 0 \sigma_{x 0}\right)^{2}+\left(y 0 \sigma_{y 0}\right)^{2}}{x 0^{2}+y 0^{2}}}
$$
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The uncertainty for t 0 is much more complicated. Recall that:

$$
t 0^{y r}=\frac{x a x b+y a y b}{x a^{2}+y a^{2}}
$$

Then: $p=x a x b+y a y b$ and $q=x a 2+y a 2$, so that

$$
t 0=\frac{p}{q}
$$

Thus:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sigma_{t 0}^{2}=\left(\frac{\partial t 0}{\partial p} \sigma_{p}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\partial t 0}{\partial q} \sigma_{q}\right)^{2} \\
& \sigma_{t 0}^{2}=\left(\frac{1}{q} \sigma_{p}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{p}{q^{2}} \sigma_{q}\right)^{2} \\
& \sigma_{p}^{2}=\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial x a} \sigma_{x a}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial x b} \sigma_{x b}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial y a} \sigma_{y a}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial y b a} \sigma_{y b}\right)^{2} \\
& \sigma_{p}^{2}=\left(x b \sigma_{x a}\right)^{2}+\left(x a \sigma_{x b}\right)^{2}+\left(y b \sigma_{y a}\right)^{2}+\left(y a \sigma_{y b}\right)^{2} \\
& \sigma_{q}^{2}=\left(\frac{\partial q}{\partial x a} \sigma_{x a}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\partial q}{\partial x b} \sigma_{x b}\right)^{2} \\
& \sigma_{q}^{2}=\left(2 x a \sigma_{x a}\right)^{2}+\left(2 y a \sigma_{y a}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

### 2.5 Ephemeris

With the rectilinear elements (REs) thus calculated, the equations derived can be used to compute the position angle ( $\theta$, PA in degrees) and separation ( $\rho$ in arcseconds) of the components at any epoch ( $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{Eph}}$ ). Such computations can be used to establish positions for calibration pairs to be used in later observations.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x^{\prime \prime}{ }_{E p h}=x a\left(t_{E p h}-2015.0\right)+x g \\
& y^{\prime \prime}{ }_{E p h}=y a\left(t_{E p h}-2015.0\right)+y g \\
& \vartheta_{E p h}^{o}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\frac{180}{\pi} \arctan 2\left(y_{E p h}, x_{E p h}\right) \\
\vartheta_{E p h}^{o}+360^{\circ}, \text { if } \vartheta_{E p h}^{o}<0^{o} \\
\vartheta_{\text {eph }}^{0}-360^{\circ}, \text { if } \vartheta_{E p h}^{0}>360^{\circ}
\end{array}\right. \\
& \rho^{\prime \prime}{ }_{E p h}=\sqrt{x_{E p h}^{2}+y_{E p h}^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

### 2.6 Uncertainties of the Ephemeris

Note first that $\sigma_{t E p h}=0$, i.e. the uncertainty in the ephemeris date is zero.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sigma_{x E p h}^{\prime \prime}= \pm \sqrt{\left(\left(t_{E p h}-2015.0\right) \sigma_{x a}\right)^{2}+\sigma_{x g}^{2}} \\
& \sigma_{y E p h}^{\prime \prime}= \pm \sqrt{\left(\left(t_{E p h}-2015.0\right) \sigma_{x a}\right)^{2}+\sigma_{x g}^{2}} \\
& \sigma_{E p h}^{o}= \pm \frac{180}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{\left(x_{E p h} \sigma_{y E p h}\right)^{2}+\left(y_{E p h} \sigma_{x E p h}\right)^{2}}{\left(x_{E p h}^{2}+y_{E p h}^{2}\right)^{2}}} \\
& \sigma_{\rho E p h}^{\prime \prime}= \pm \sqrt{\frac{\left(x_{E p h} \sigma_{x E p h}\right)^{2}+\left(y_{E p h} \sigma_{y E p h}\right)^{2}}{x_{E p h}^{2}+y_{E p h}^{2}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

## 3. Application to the Rümker Double Stars

As stated in Section 1, this paper is a continuation of a series that retrospectively analyzes the double star observations from the private observatory built by Sir Thomas Brisbane in Parramatta, Australia, in 1822. The three astronomers associated with Parramatta observatory were Brisbane himself, and two employees: Carl Rümker and James Dunlop. This paper builds on our study of the double star catalog of Rümker (WDS designation RMK, see Letchford et al., 2017), and is undertaken with the aim of improving the data sets and our understanding of the quality of the associated historic data.

Again as stated (Section 2), we are working with the milli-arcsecond results from the space missions HIPPARCOS and GAIA, and present all ground-based and historic observations only as a starting point for a later study of the precision of such data.

HIPPARCOS and GAIA positions and proper motions are currently available for only 14 RMK pairs: 1, $3,4,5,6,8,10,11,12,17,20,25,27$, and 28 (i.e. $50 \%$ of the 28 pairs in the Rumker catalog). The Rectilinear Elements and their uncertainties for these pairs are given in Table 2. Following the USNO lead, we leave all digits from the computation rather than round off the elements and the uncertainties in the elements.

In addition, we have also adopted the 'one line' formatting of the CORE elements rather that utilizing the subscripted form (for example we use t0 for the date of closest approach rather than $t_{0}$ ) as seen in current references.

### 3.1 The Rectilinear Elements as defined in the CORE

- x0 - The RA position of the secondary (usually defines as the fainter) star relative to the primary
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(brightest) in the Cartesian frame centered on the primary, in units of arcseconds, at the time of closest approach, t0.

- xa - The RA proper motion of the secondary star relative to the primary in the Cartesian frame centered on the primary, in units of arcseconds per year.
- y0 - The Declination position of the secondary star relative to the primary in the Cartesian frame centered on the primary in units of arcseconds, at the time of closest approach, t 0 .
- ya - The Declination proper motion of the secondary star relative to the primary in the Cartesian frame centered on the primary, in units of arcseconds per year.
- t0 - The date of closest apparent approach of the two stars, in calendar years.
- $\quad \theta 0$ - The Position Angle of the secondary star relative to the primary at time of closest approach, t0, in units of degrees measured from celestial North via East.
- $\quad \rho 0$ - The separation of the two stars in the Cartesian frame at the time of closest approach, t0, in units of arcseconds.


### 3.2 The Rectilinear Motion as a Test for Binary Orbit

The differentiation of an optical pair and a physi-cally-bound binary system is a skill in its own right. For a pair to be bound, the relative motion of the stars as determined by astrometric means should show a curved orbital path (and the two stars should have the same parallax, appropriate radial velocities, and other physical and inferred properties). In contrast, the astrometric paths of the optical pairs will show no deviation from a straight line (although it is conceded that an orbit may present itself as a straight line under rare edge-on alignment of the orbit).

This analysis is, of course, made more difficult for wide, slow moving binary systems of great period. For all work of this type, there is no substitute for good quality (low uncertainty) data made over a long time baseline.

Also, well-defined relative proper motions can allow scale calibration for imaging systems and improvement in the determined proper motions of individual components.

### 3.3 Explanation of Figures

Plots of the Rümker doubles are given in Figures 128, presented in the Appendix. Historical data from the WDS have been incorporated into the figures and their position angles have been precessed from Equinox of date to J2000.0 and then converted to Cartesian coordi-
nates. The WDS data for 1991.25 (HIP) were not precessed because they are already presented at Equinox J2000.0 and not at Equinox of date as the remaining WDS measures are presumed to be. Precessed WDS observations are prepesented in the plots by a ' + '.

The HIP and GAIA positions are represented by a red circle and green square respectively. The dotted ellipses are the uncertainty ellipses for the t0 (unzoomed figure for each RMK pair). If they cannot be seen in the plots, it is because of the plot scale. Uncertainty ellipses for the HIP and GAIA were also plotted but in each case they are too small to see at the scales that are needed to represent all relevant data.

## 4 Notes on Individual Pairs.

RMK 1: Closing, secondary moving $4.69 \pm 0.06$ mas/yr a linear velocity along the line of best fit $\left(=\sqrt{ }\left(x a^{2}+y a^{2}\right)\right)$. Proper motion data from both the HIP and GAIA missions are available. The red line is the rectilinear movement based on only HIP proper motions, the green line based on GAIA. The GAIA relative proper motion is similar to this paper; the HIP very different. The proper motions from the HIP data for RMK 1 is suspect, see note above re the limitation of the HIP data.

RMK 3: Closing, $2.79 \pm 0.05 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$. Primary is RMK 3 AB and secondary is RMK 3 B , between is RMK 3A or $\theta$ Ret. Proper motion available only from HIP and our own calculations.

RMK 4: Closing, $14.80 \pm 0.03 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$. Motion in close agreement with the relative proper motion as determined by HIPPARCOS.

RMK 5: Closing, $0.50 \pm 0.07 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$. Primary is itself a double (HD 55598 and CPD-55 1174B). Rümker secondary is CD-55 1708.

RMK 6: Closing, $9.38 \pm 0.06$ mas/yr. Primary is a spectroscopic binary. Close agreement between the determined rectilinear motion and that inferred by the HIP proper motion.

RMK 8: Widening, $3.93 \pm 0.14 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$.
RMK 10: Widening, $0.14 \pm 0.10 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$. Proper motion data from both the HIP and GAIA missions are available. The large uncertainty in $t 0$ is due to: the extremely slow relative motion (the slowest of our sample); and the large separation ( $\sim 10.4$ arcseconds at J2015.0).

RMK 11: Widening: $1.26 \pm 0.25 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$.
RMK 12: Widening, $2.82 \pm 0.12 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$.
RMK 17: Closing, $1.59 \pm 0.11 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$. Disparate proper motions.

RMK 20: Closing, $3.62 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$. Similar proper motions.
(Text continues on page 217)
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Table 2: Rectilinear Elements and their uncertainties, all ICRS

| RMK | x0 " | $x a \quad$ "/yr | y0 " | уа "/уr | to yr | $\theta 0{ }^{\circ}$ | p0 " |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | +/- | +/- | +/- | +/- | +/- | +/- | +/- |
| 1 | $\begin{array}{r} -4.63768 \\ 0.98846 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.00455 \\ 0.00059 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18.26516 \\ 0.43580 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.00115 \\ 0.00026 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3691.82472 \\ & 1027.75053 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 104.24681 \\ 2.93110 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18.84474 \\ 0.48744 \end{array}$ |
| 3 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.81763 \\ & 0.19615 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.00204 \\ 0.00018 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -1.94640 \\ 0.08739 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.00190 \\ 0.00008 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3126.16037 \\ 380.67083 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 313.04064 \\ 3.34059 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.66313 \\ & 0.14833 \end{aligned}$ |
| 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.51283 \\ & 0.02239 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01353 \\ & 0.00009 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -3.41838 \\ 0.01717 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00599 \\ & 0.00007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2273.13836 \\ 30.87234 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 293.87220 \\ 0.33146 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.73818 \\ & 0.01813 \end{aligned}$ |
| 5 | $\begin{array}{r} -1.60271 \\ 1.13936 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00024 \\ & 0.00009 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.88157 \\ & 1.13873 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00044 \\ & 0.00009 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15407.22262 \\ 5901.71816 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 151.18704 \\ 35.67360 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.82916 \\ & 1.13921 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.01399 \\ & 0.07207 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.00800 \\ 0.00014 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.55690 \\ & 0.06016 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00490 \\ & 0.00012 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2525.12668 \\ 87.91699 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 58.52597 \\ 0.51444 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.68798 \\ & 0.06363 \end{aligned}$ |
| 8 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.65704 \\ & 0.12623 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.00268 \\ 0.00027 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.48239 \\ & 0.08616 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00287 \\ & 0.00019 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1550.42556 \\ 248.17533 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 43.05369 \\ 1.68162 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.63622 \\ & 0.10940 \end{aligned}$ |
| 10 | $\begin{aligned} & 9.10521 \\ & 5.90460 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00002 \\ & 0.00017 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -1.42270 \\ 3.46400 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00014 \\ & 0.00010 \end{aligned}$ | -3012.00720 101342.38340 | $\begin{array}{r} 351.11925 \\ 22.01999 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.21569 \\ & 5.85827 \end{aligned}$ |
| 11 | $\begin{array}{r} -2.22133 \\ 0.95782 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.00024 \\ 0.00027 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.43684 \\ 0.92232 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00124 \\ & 0.00026 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -1564.21086 \\ 908.24950 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 191.12556 \\ 23.37677 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.26388 \\ & 0.95652 \end{aligned}$ |
| 12 | $\begin{array}{r} -6.80683 \\ 0.09344 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.00188 \\ 0.00018 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -6.05101 \\ 0.08306 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00211 \\ & 0.00016 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1500.33914 \\ 301.12882 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 221.63586 \\ 0.55229 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.10756 \\ & 0.08900 \end{aligned}$ |
| 17 | $\begin{aligned} & 8.22116 \\ & 2.13949 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.00108 \\ 0.00030 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.66155 \\ & 1.03391 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00116 \\ & 0.00014 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9168.62396 \\ & 3433.77602 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 42.98211 \\ 8.37729 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11.23774 \\ 1.71658 \end{array}$ |
| 20 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.08279 \\ & 0.03475 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00361 \\ & 0.00008 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.84265 \\ & 0.03093 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.00035 \\ 0.00007 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2437.53812 \\ 131.73156 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 84.38862 \\ 2.34897 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.84671 \\ & 0.03097 \end{aligned}$ |
| 25 | $\begin{array}{r} -0.41727 \\ 0.17939 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.00497 \\ 0.00013 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.32091 \\ & 0.15245 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.00157 \\ 0.00011 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3352.66840 \\ 197.22727 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 107.53102 \\ 7.32583 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.38525 \\ & 0.15509 \end{aligned}$ |
| 27 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.13848 \\ & 0.06756 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00336 \\ & 0.00014 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -2.32489 \\ 0.05244 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00309 \\ & 0.00011 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2493.73377 \\ 164.97803 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 312.60843 \\ 1.10818 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.15883 \\ & 0.05985 \end{aligned}$ |
| 28 | $\begin{array}{r} -3.26241 \\ 1.35100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.00107 \\ 0.00064 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.60044 \\ & 0.59959 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.00097 \\ 0.00028 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4120.86184 \\ & 3203.61894 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 132.18019 \\ 12.72483 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.85865 \\ & 1.01011 \end{aligned}$ |
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Table 3：HIP and GAIA position data and Ephemeris，all ICRS．

| RMK | 1991.25 | （HIP） | 2015.0 | （GAIA） | 2020.0 |  | 2025.0 |  | 2030.0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\theta$－ | $\rho$＂ | $\theta{ }^{\circ}$ | $\rho$＂ | $\theta$ 。 | $\rho$＂ | $\theta$ 。 | $\rho$＂ | $\theta$ 。 | $\rho$＂ |
|  | ＋／－ | ＋／－ | ＋／－ | ＋／－ | ＋／－ | ＋／－ | ＋／－ | ＋／－ | ＋／－ | ＋／－ |
| 1 | 81.29989 | 20.46414 | 81.58779 | 20.42096 | 81.64856 | 20.41193 | 81.70937 | 20.40293 | 81.77025 | 20.39395 |
|  | 0.00069 | 0.00586 | 0.00001 | 0.00017 | 0.00824 | 0.00137 | 0.01643 | 0.00271 | 0.02465 | 0.00406 |
| 3 | 2.92738 | 4.13337 | 2.32927 | 4.08300 | 2.20148 | 4.07246 | 2.07302 | 4.06193 | 1.94389 | 4.05142 |
|  | 0.00045 | 0.00417 | 0.00004 | 0.00047 | 0.00594 | 0.00100 | 0.01132 | 0.00183 | 0.01686 | 0.00269 |
| 4 | 245.73211 | 5.60185 | 248.24731 | 5.34520 | 248.80760 | 5.29255 | 249.37909 | 5.24043 | 249.96200 | 5.18883 |
|  | 0.00038 | 0.00143 | 0.00006 | 0.00014 | 0.00543 | 0.00040 | 0.00971 | 0.00072 | 0.01434 | 0.00106 |
| 5 | 225.93633 | 6.95384 | 225.91055 | 6.94238 | 225.90511 | 6.93997 | 225.89966 | 6.93755 | 225.89422 | 6.93514 |
|  | 0.00029 | 0.00199 | 0.00003 | 0.00019 | 0.00386 | 0.00047 | 0.00720 | 0.00087 | 0.01066 | 0.00129 |
| 6 | 25.45552 | 9.17420 | 26.63652 | 9.05461 | 26.88910 | 9.02992 | 27.14307 | 9.00542 | 27.39842 | 8.98109 |
|  | 0.00027 | 0.00338 | 0.00008 | 0.00093 | 0.00633 | 0.00110 | 0.00929 | 0.00162 | 0.01281 | 0.00222 |
| 8 | 68.54127 | 4.02825 | 69.72832 | 4.06931 | 69.97514 | 4.07818 | 70.22090 | 4.08712 | 70.46557 | 4.09613 |
|  | 0.00168 | 0.00391 | 0.00008 | 0.00017 | 0.01894 | 0.00101 | 0.03714 | 0.00198 | 0.05543 | 0.00296 |
| 10 | 18.68870 | 10.39617 | 18.70465 | 10.39768 | 18.70801 | 10.39800 | 18.71136 | 10.39832 | 18.71472 | 10.39864 |
|  | 0.00020 | 0.00416 | 0.00001 | 0.00031 | 0.00316 | 0.00086 | 0.00605 | 0.00165 | 0.00900 | 0.00246 |
| 11 | 127.84868 | 5.0344 | 127.69577 | 5.06128 | 127.66379 | 5.06693 | 127.63187 | 5.07259 | 127.60003 | 5.07825 |
|  | 0.00131 | 0.00567 | 0.00021 | 0.00089 | 0.01865 | 0.00163 | 0.03184 | 0.00279 | 0.04604 | 0.00404 |
| 12 | 212.97951 | 9.21250 | 212.56752 | 9.22284 | 212.48091 | 9.22507 | 212.39433 | 9.22733 | 212.30780 | 9.22961 |
|  | 0.00037 | 0.00462 | 0.00002 | 0.00029 | 0.00542 | 0.00092 | 0.01051 | 0.00178 | 0.01566 | 0.00265 |
| 17 | 357.58727 | 16.00323 | 357.68222 | 15.97641 | 357.70225 | 15.97077 | 357.72229 | 15.96513 | 357.74235 | 15.95949 |
|  | 0.00021 | 0.00710 | 0.00001 | 0.00039 | 0.00265 | 0.00154 | 0.00522 | 0.00301 | 0.00782 | 0.00450 |
| 20 | 146.76197 | 1.8259 | 145.45490 | 1.75013 | 145.16521 | 1.73429 | 144.87018 | 1.71850 | 144.56969 | 1.70275 |
|  | 0.00084 | 0.00208 | 0.00013 | 0.00032 | 0.01556 | 0.00049 | 0.02706 | 0.00084 | 0.03965 | 0.00122 |
| 25 | 28.58665 | 7.22378 | 28.77798 | 7.10244 | 28.81910 | 7.07690 | 28.86051 | 7.05137 | 28.90223 | 7.02584 |
|  | 0.00034 | 0.00336 | 0.00002 | 0.00019 | 0.00497 | 0.00067 | 0.00974 | 0.00131 | 0.01461 | 0.00195 |
| 27 | 276.64163 | 3.90289 | 277.95003 | 3.84026 | 278.23090 | 3.82733 | 278.51366 | 3.81450 | 278.79833 | 3.80176 |
|  | 0.00085 | 0.00258 | 0.00012 | 0.00024 | 0.01244 | 0.00061 | 0.02213 | 0.00113 | 0.03245 | 0.00168 |
| 28 | 99.84728 | 5.75019 | 100.13696 | 5.73192 | 100.19818 | 5.72809 | 100.25949 | 5.72427 | 100．32087 | 5.72046 |
|  | 0.00268 | 0.00632 | 0.00005 | 0.00015 | 0.03181 | 0.00152 | 0.06346 | 0.00303 | 0.09518 | 0.00454 |
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(Continued from page 214)
RMK 25: Closing, $5.21 \pm 0.03 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$. Component A is a spectroscopic binary. X-ray source at $5.2^{\prime \prime}$ from component Aa.

RMK 27: Closing, $4.56 \pm 0.07 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$.
RMK 28: Closing, $1.44 \pm 0.19 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$.

## 5 Conclusions

Our method of describing the relative Rectilinear motion of double stars produces objective results. It eliminates a number of the problems we believe are associated with the current Catalog of Rectilinear Elements (CORE) maintained by the USNO (see Section 2). We present the Rectilinear Elements of RMK 1, 3, $4,5,6,8,10,11,12,17,20,25,27$, and 28 based on the data obtained from the HIPPARCOS and GAIA missions.

## Acknowledgments

This research has made use of:

- The Aladin sky atlas developed at CDS, Strasbourg Observatory, France.
- The Washington Double Star Catalog maintained by the USNO.
- The Catalog of Rectilinear Elements (CORE) maintained by the USNO. We wish to particularly thank Bill Hartkopf of the UNSO who gave the first author a copy of the fortran program from which data in the CORE is currently generated.
- The HIPPARCOS Catalogue (The Hipparcos and Tycho Catalogues (ESA 1997)) from VizieR ${ }^{\dagger}$.
- The GAIA Catalogue (Gaia DR1 (Gaia Collaboration, 2016)) from VizieR ${ }^{\dagger \dagger}$.


## References

Letchford, Roderick R, Graeme L White, and Allan D Ernest. 2017. "The Southern Double Stars of Carl Rümker I: History, Identification, Accuracy." Jour-
nal of Double Star Observations 13 (2): 220-32.
http://www.jdso.org/volume13/number2/Letchford_220232.pdf.

Lindegren, L, F Mignard, S Söderhjelm, M Badiali, H.H. Bernstein, Patricia Lampens, R Pannunzio, et al. 1997. "Double Star Data in the HIPPARCOS Catalogue." Astronomy and Astrophysics 323: L53-56. http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1997A\&A...323L..53L.

Rümker, Carl. 1832. Preliminary Catalogue of Fixed Stars: Intended for a Prospectus of a Catalogue of the Stars of the Southern Hemisphere Included Within the Tropic of Capricorn : Now Reducing from the Observations Made in the Observatory at Paramatta. Hamburg: Perthes and Besser. http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1833AN.....10..377R.

[^0]††http://vizier.u-strasbg.fr/viz-bin/VizieR-3?-source=I/337/gaia

The Southern Double Stars of Carl Rümker II: Their Relative Rectilinear Motion

## Appendix: Figures



Figure 1. RMK 1


Figure 3. RMK 3


Figure 5. RMK 4


Figure 2. RMK 1 zoom


Figure 4. RMK 3 zoom


Figure 6. RMK 4 zoom

The Southern Double Stars of Carl Rümker II: Their Relative Rectilinear Motion

## Appendix: Figures



Figure 7. RMK 5


Figure 9. RMK 6


Figure 11. RMK 8


Figure 7. RMK 5 zoom


Figure 10. RMK 6 zoom


Figure 12. RMK 8 zoom

The Southern Double Stars of Carl Rümker II: Their Relative Rectilinear Motion

## Appendix: Figures



Figure 13. RMK 10


Figure 15. RMK 11



Figure 14. RMK 10 zoom


Figure 16. RMK 11 zoom


Figure 18. RMK 12 zoom

The Southern Double Stars of Carl Rümker II: Their Relative Rectilinear Motion

## Appendix: Figures



Figure 19. RMK 17


Figure 21. RMK 20


Figure 23 RMK 25


Figure 20. RMK 17 zoom


Figure 22. RMK 20 zoom


Figure 24. RMK 25 zoom

The Southern Double Stars of Carl Rümker II: Their Relative Rectilinear Motion

## Appendix: Figures



Figure 25. RMK 27


Figure 27. RMK 28


Figure 26. RMK 27 zoom


Figure 28. RMK 28 zoom

# Speckle Interferometry with the OCA Kuhn 22" Telescope 

Rick Wasson<br>Murrieta, California<br>ricksshobs@verizon.net


#### Abstract

Speckle interferometry measurements of double stars were made in 2015 and 2016, using the Kuhn 22 -inch classical Cassegrain telescope of the Orange County Astronomers, a Point Grey Blackfly CMOS camera, and three interference filters. 272 observations are reported for 177 systems, with separations ranging from 0.29 " to $2.9^{\prime \prime}$. Data reduction was by means of the REDUC and Speckle Tool Box programs. Equipment, observing procedures, calibration, data reduction, and analysis are described, and unusual results for 11 stars are discussed in detail.


## Introduction

Membership in the Orange County Astronomers (OCA), one of the largest and most active amateur astronomy clubs in the United States, has many privileges, not the least of which is access to the fine Kuhn 22inch ( 0.56 meter) Cassegrain telescope, located at the club's Anza observing site, with fairly dark skies at 4300 feet elevation, in the hills about 15 miles northeast of Mount Palomar Observatory. OCA member William Kuhn led a volunteer effort of many OCA members in designing and building the telescope, named after him. The observatory became operational in 1984, and has been used occasionally for research, particularly discovery of supernovae and asteroids. It is open to all club members and guests every month at new-moon star parties, for viewing all types of celestial wonders.

The combination of my long-time OCA membership, experience in observing double stars (Wasson, 2014), and the convenient Anza site located only 37 miles from my home, seemed a natural fit to attempt a new type of research - Speckle Interferometry - which would benefit greatly from a larger aperture than my own 12-inch telescope.

I was encouraged by a workshop on Speckle Interferometry presented by Russ Genet and Dave Rowe at the Society for Astronomical Sciences (SAS) meeting in June 2015.

From its inception in the 1970s until recently, Speckle Interferometry was practiced only by profes-
sional astronomers and graduate students, using specialized equipment at major observatories. The example shown in Figure 1 demonstrates the potential of Speckle Interferometry to improve measurement accuracy for close binaries, reducing uncertainty and eventually producing a high-quality orbit solution.

The technological revolution in small, sensitive, fast, moderately-priced CMOS cameras, now used extensively by amateurs to make exquisite planetary images, has also opened the Speckle imaging field to amateurs. The last piece of the puzzle, easy-to-use software for processing Speckle images, has only become available since 2010, making amateur Speckle Interferometry practical for the first time.

## Why Observe Double Stars?

Everything we know about stars is based on observing their light with a range of instruments, to measure or derive their basic properties. The most fundamental property of any star is its mass, which determines how rapidly nuclear fusion proceeds in its core, and thus its intrinsic brightness and its life expectancy.

The only direct way to determine the mass of stars is by observing them in binary systems. Orbital velocity (measured by Doppler shift) and period are driven by the stars' masses and distance apart. We need to know the apparent size of the orbit and its distance from us, to find the true physical size of the binary star orbit. Distance is measured most accurately by parallax; the Hip-
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Figure 1. The orbit of STF1196AB, the brightest two components of the well-observed, multiple star system Zeta Cancri ("Tegmen"). These two stars ( $A$ and $B$ ) orbit each other in 59.6 years. The large + symbol represents the primary star. Solid blue dots (speckle interferometry) and small + symbols (visual micrometer) are measurements of the secondary star position. Note the improved precision (reduced scatter) of the speckle points as compared to visual observations. The ellipse is the best current orbit solution, giving extra weight to the speckle data. Lines from data points to the ellipse indicate the time on the orbit at which the data point was taken. The scales are in arc seconds. Two new speckle points from this paper are shown as black circles, added to the plot by the method of Buchheim, 2017.
parcos satellite of the 1990s made great improvements in distance accuracy, and the next-generation Gaia satellite is now in operation. That leaves the apparent orbit ellipse as the last measurement needed to define the stellar masses accurately.

Surprisingly, less than 60 binary star systems have accurately measured (definitive) orbits, so the quality of our models of stellar evolution hangs on this remarkably small sample! Many systems with large orbits are so slow that they have not completed a single orbit since measurements began (about 250 years ago by William Herschel), and many "fast" orbits appear so close together that they can only be resolved by very large telescopes. But many others, some having orbital periods of a few decades, are near enough that their separation can theoretically be resolved and measured by the Kuhn 22 -inch aperture, for which the "Rayleigh limit" resolution is about 0.3 arc-sec; thus, the Kuhn 22 -inch telescope has the potential to help refine the accuracy of stellar masses - among the most fundamental
properties in astronomy!

## The "Seeing" Problem

The theoretical angular resolution of any telescope depends only on the wavelength of light and the telescope aperture - the larger the aperture, the smaller and closer are details which can be resolved. But for telescopes larger than about 4 inches, atmospheric "seeing" begins to limit the resolution that can be achieved. The problem, of course, is that the sharp, diffraction-limited image of a star is continuously chopped up, shifted and smeared in random ways by small atmospheric cells of variable temperature, density and refraction index, creating an image that is blurred into the "seeing disk."

A most remarkable fact was discovered and demonstrated by Anton Labeyrie in 1970: the full-resolution information of a double star image still exists in the scrambled "seeing" disk! If very short exposures are taken to "freeze" the motion, each frame shows a pattern of small "speckles." This is the interference pattern of images formed by many, small, separate atmospheric cells, superimposed upon each other, swirling within the seeing disk. Constructive interference forms a bright speckle. Picture the moving pattern of light "speckles" on the bottom of a swimming pool, created by the wavy surface acting like a bunch of small, moving, tilting lenses.

The power of Speckle Interferometry is to recover almost all the information contained in a diffractionlimited image of a double star formed by the full telescope aperture. Fourier Transform analysis finds dimensional frequency information (spacing and orientation) from the speckle patterns of each frozen image; the information gathered from many images is then averaged. Those speckles related to the diffractionlimited image add together, while randomly positioned speckles do not. Quality is enhanced by observing a single reference star, nearby on the sky and near in time; deconvolution with the reference star helps cancel distortions which are common to both the single and double star images.

## Equipment - Telescope

The Kuhn 22 -inch telescope is an $\mathrm{f} / 8$ classical Cassegrain design on an equatorial fork mount. It has encoders on both axes, and "Go-To" capability using an older version of TheSky software (www.bisque.com). Although it was built decades ago, club members have upgraded and maintained it well. It can find most objects within a few arc minutes, well within a medium power eyepiece field. Tracking errors from frame to frame are usually smaller than the seeing movements caused by the atmosphere, which are stopped anyway by taking short exposures (typically 10 to 40 millisec-
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onds), so the telescope is suitable for high magnification Speckle Interferometry.

## Equipment - Camera

For all the observations in this paper, I used a Point Grey BlackFly 23S6M-C high-speed monochrome camera, having a Sony IMX249 CMOS detector with $5.86 \mu$ square pixels in a $1920 \times 1200$ array, and a global shutter (https://www.ptgrey.com). This camera was chosen because of its fairly large detector ( 11.2 mm x 7.0 mm ), advertised low read noise ( $7 \mathrm{e}-\mathrm{rms}$ ), high Quantum Efficiency ( $82 \%$ peak at 500 nm ), high speed USB3.0 interface (more than 30 fps full frame), and moderate price (\$495). A larger-than-usual CMOS detector was considered important for the following reasons:

1. Prior experience with my 12 -inch Go-To Dobsonian telescope at home had shown that it may be difficult to acquire and track faint stars at high magnification required for speckle work, and the pointing and tracking performance of the 22 " was unknown to me at the time.
2. I planned to investigate the sidereal drift method to calibrate images for orientation and plate scale (discussed in detail below), where a larger field, giving a longer drift, is helpful.

## Equipment - Eyepiece Projection

High magnification is required in Speckle Interferometry, so that details of the distorted star images can be seen; individual speckles, which are comparable in size to the Airy disk, should each cover at least several
pixels. Proper magnification is a balance between magnifying enough for adequate pixel sampling of the image, but not magnifying so much that $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{N}$ is low and fainter stars cannot be detected. I have had success with plate scales of about $0.07 \mathrm{arc}-\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{pixel}$, so that the Airy Disk spans about 8 pixels, a value recommended by Dave Rowe (Rowe, 2016) based on simulation studies. For the Kuhn aperture and detector pixel size, this corresponds to about $\mathrm{f} / 30$. A spreadsheet was developed to estimate the magnification achieved for eyepiece projection or a Barlow lens.

For all the observations presented here, magnification was accomplished by eyepiece projection, using a Baader Hyperion 10 mm eyepiece, T 2 threaded adapters on the eyepiece and camera, and T2 projection tubes. Screw threads helped make a solid, rigid optical assembly. A flip mirror and 23 mm illuminated reticle eyepiece were used to find, identify and center target stars. The cabling is clean and simple: a single 3-meter USB3.0 cable supplied 5VDC power to the camera and carried data to the laptop computer. My setup ready for speckle interferometry is shown in Figure 2.

## Equipment - Filters

In early observations, a red filter was used to minimize color dispersion of the speckles. It was simply screwed into the $1 / 4$-inch threads on the front of the Baader Hyperion eyepiece. After purchasing a ZWO manual filter wheel (https://www.zwo.com), additional filters were also used during each observing run.

Table 1 gives the filter characteristics. The filters are not members of any photometric standard series,


Figure 2. Left: Speckle Interferometry installation on the Kuhn 22 " Telescope. A single blue USB3.0 cable connects the camera to the laptop on the white table at lower right. Right: Close-up of the simple finding and magnification optics: an illuminated reticle eyepiece is at top in the flip mirror; below are the Baader Hyperion 10mm eyepiece, projection tubes, and tiny (30mm cube) camera, attached to the blue USB3.0 cable. No filter wheel was used in this early configuration.
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such as Johnson-Cousins or Sloan. However, these interference filters are similar in bandpass to some of the photometric standard filters, with significant advantages over colored glass: sharper cutoff, symmetric transmission profile, much better durability and lower price. If differential photometry of close binary stars becomes practical in the future, it is believed that the G and R filters, which are part of the Baader LRGB series for CCD imaging, will transform well to the standard photometric systems, because G has $50 \%$ transmission wavelengths very close to Johnson V, and R has the same $50 \%$ transmission width as Cousins R, but shifted about 15 nm farther red. The "IR742" filter is not a good match to any photometric filters, but was used in attempting to observe faint late-type stars. Unfortunately, the QE of the IMX249 CMOS detector is low in the near IR, only about $16 \%$ at 823 nm . However, some recent Sony CMOS detectors have improved QE, even approaching that of back-illuminated CCDs.

## Preparing for a Speckle Run

Double star targets were chosen by searching the Washington Double Star (WDS) Catalog, using the online tool developed by Tom Bryant (2015), by way of his web site. The search parameters generally employed were:

- 3.0 " > Separation < $0.3^{\prime \prime}(0.3$ " is the approximate Rayleigh criterion for 22" aperture)
- Primary star brighter than magnitude 10
- Magnitude difference less than 3
- Declination between $+70^{\circ}$ and $-30^{\circ}$
- Each search limited to a 2-hour RA window.

Within any given RA range, the WDS provides many candidates. Those with at least a preliminary orbit were preferentially selected, with the goal of adding quality speckle points to help refine the orbits. Other target stars included some late spectral types (K0 and later) and Hipparcos discoveries that have shown some movement. For each selected double star, the WDS data line was copied into an EXCEL spreadsheet. Multiple sheets, each containing targets in a 2 -hour RA
window, constituted a Master Target List workbook. Some spreadsheets were printed, to act as both the target list and log for hand-written notes at the telescope.

For some stars, more information was found at the Italian website Stelle-Doppie (Sordiglioni, 2016), including SAO number, orbital period, and current orbit ephemerides for separation and PA. The WDS orbit plots were also copied and hyper-linked into the spreadsheet for quick reference. For observations made after June 2016, the "master" spreadsheet was copied, then used as a computer log during the run, by editing recorded sequence numbers and notes into the spreadsheet in real time, eliminating the paper log.

I have found that the easiest way to identify target stars at the telescope is by SAO catalog number, so the SAO number of each target double star, and a nearby single "reference" star (used for deconvolution during data reduction) were added to the Master Target List spreadsheets. This was a time-consuming process, but saved observing time. Dave Rowe has recently developed a WDS search program WDS1.0 (Rowe, 2017) which searches the WDS catalog for double stars according to user-input parameters, but also has the very useful feature of listing all nearby SAO stars by magnitude, spectral type and distance from the double, thus saving a great deal of manual search time. The general faint limit of about $10^{\text {th }}$ magnitude for SAO stars seems well suited to the 22 " for my camera, magnification and typical 30 -millisecond exposures; fainter stars are often buried in the noise, but there are plenty of suitably bright targets.

## At the Telescope

Observing runs were made only about once per month, for convenience in scheduling, allowing choice of "good" nights, and giving plenty of time for data reduction. After following the checklist for opening the OCA observatory and preparing the Kuhn telescope and control computers, the Speckle Interferometry optical train is screwed together and installed in the Cassegrain 2 -inch focuser. The cable from the camera is plugged into a USB3.0 port on the laptop, and the data acquisi-

Table 1. Filter characteristics. These interference filters typically have a sharp rise and fall of about 10 nm width, and a high, nearly constant transmission plateau (95+\%). The "IR742" filter is a long-pass IR transmission filter; the asterisks indicate convolved characteristics: the filter transmission times the QE of the Sony IMX249 monochrome CMOS detector, as measured by Point Grey (https://www.ptgrey.com).

| Filter | Manufacturer <br> Name | $50 \%$ Band Pass <br> $(\mathrm{nm})$ | Center Wavelength <br> $(\mathrm{nm})$ | Width <br> (nm) | Peak <br> Transition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G | Baader G (CCD) | $495-575$ | 534 | 80 | $96 \%$ |
| R | Baader R (CCD) | $585-690$ | 636 | 105 | $98 \%$ |
| IR742 | Astronomik ProPlanet <br> 742 | $740-1000 *$ | $823 *$ | $250 *$ | $30 \% *$ |
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tion software FireCapture (Edelmann, 2015) is started. This program, designed primarily for planetary imaging, is used because it can handle many types of cameras and can output frames as FITS files, which is a convenient format for Speckle data reduction.

The telescope is slewed to a bright star, the star is centered in the illuminated reticle eyepiece, then focused and centered in the camera display screen, and "synced," to be sure TheSky software knows accurately where the telescope is pointing. The highly-magnified, turbulent image of the moderately bright star is focused until speckles become clearly visible on the laptop screen. Since the telescope truss tube is made of welded steel tubing, and the mirror is about 3 inches thick, focus can change slightly as the telescope cools through the evening. Re-focusing is needed when the speckles gradually become "soft" or smeared, or the star image shape appears distorted in a systematic way. Re-focus movements were very small, and the possible effect on image scale calibration was not investigated.

After selecting a target double star, typing in its SAO number, and clicking the "slew" command, the telescope comes to life, majestically but quietly "humming" its way toward the target, which is almost always seen in the eyepiece of the flip mirror. After centering in the illuminated reticle eyepiece, the star is always close to the center of the camera CMOS chip displayed on the laptop. The double star target is centered and a small "Region of Interest" (ROI) selected in FireCapture, usually a $512 \times 512$ pixel patch (about $40 \times 40$ arc-sec) near the center of the chip. With the filter, exposure and camera settings confirmed, FireCapture is ordered to record 1000 frames, and I watch as the star boils and dances for about 30 seconds, to be sure it doesn't drift too near an edge of the ROI field. Only bright and well-separated double stars (more than about 1 arc-sec) are obviously seen as double on the screen; a tight and/or faint companion is invisible in the seeing mess, but it is still there! 1000 frames are taken as a good sample of the random variations in speckle patterns produced by the atmosphere, to get an accurate average of the speckle spacing and orientation information.

The next target is a "reference" star, which is a nearby single star, used later for deconvolution in data reduction. All the same optical imperfections that affect the double star are captured in the reference star as well, including even focus and some atmospheric effects. By Fourier Transform "deconvolution," these small effects are cancelled from the double star data, greatly improving and sharpening the Autocorrelation end product.

Although only one sequence is required for a
speckle measurement, several sequences may be taken, to provide improved $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{N}$ or statistical samples for defining uncertainty of the final measurement. More frames are generally better, especially for fainter, closer doubles.

Light passing through the atmosphere is affected by atmospheric dispersion: the atmosphere refracts different wavelengths by different amounts, forming a miniature spectrum at focus. This effect may be noticeable at very high magnification, and increases rapidly at large zenith angles. An atmospheric dispersion corrector (ADC) was not used for these observations, but "smearing" was minimized by using filters to restrict the wavelength range, and by usually limiting observations to stars within about 40 degrees of the zenith. Nevertheless, in some results, the "smearing" was noticeable, reducing the measurement accuracy somewhat.

## Calibration

The Drift Calibration method was used to calibrate each night's data for Plate Scale and Camera Orientation on the sky. Multiple drifts were made throughout the night, usually on brighter reference stars, and the average results of all drifts were used to reduce all the speckle data for that night. This method applies only to equatorially-mounted telescopes, and no adjustments can be made which could change the magnification or rotate the camera.

To make a Calibration Drift sequence, a special ROI was used, having full E-W frame width (about $21 / 2$ arc-minutes) but only 300 pixels in N-S height; this ROI speeds up the frame rate and reduces hard drive storage space. A moderately bright star was moved to the east edge of the field, then the recording sequence was started and immediately the circuit breaker powering the telescope RA drive motor was turned off. After the star drifted at the sidereal rate from the eastern to the western edge of the field, the breaker was turned back on. The telescope was driven west with the hand paddle control until the star was again recovered. A drift typically takes about 10 seconds near the equator, and longer at higher declination. A series of several drifts was usually made with the same star. After the drift series was completed, TheSky was "synced" once more to re-establish accurate telescope pointing.

The sidereal drift path of the star describes the true east-west direction, distorted somewhat by the star bouncing around in the seeing disk, or possibly by a breeze moving the telescope, so the more drifts the better. The FireCapture acquisition software writes the computer clock time (to the nearest millisecond) to the FITS header of each frame. The exposures are short enough to stop the sidereal motion in each frame, as
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well as the seeing motion. Thus, the drift sequence records hundreds of star positions (seeing-distorted image centroid, in pixels) at known times. The least-squares slope of the star positions calibrates the rotation angle of the camera relative to the true east-west direction on the sky. Changes in star position versus time, and the known sidereal rate (a function only of star declination) are used to calculate the pixel scale calibration constant (arc-sec / pixel).

This drift analysis was originally done - very laboriously - in a spreadsheet, but is now part of the Speckle Tool Box (STB) data reduction program (Harshaw, Rowe, and Genet, 2017), making it very much easier, faster, and more accurate. Figure 3 is an example of one night's calibration data. Each drift sequence was first edited in REDUC (Losse, 2015) to delete frames having the star not in the field, or overlapping the edge. REDUC then calculated the camera rotation angle on the sky by least-squares fitting the star position from all valid frames. The same set of valid frames was then processed in STB, calculating both the drift angle and pixel scale factor, using the computer clock time written to the FITS header. For each drift, the camera angle results from REDUC and STB usually agree very closely: within a few hundredths of a degree.

Very rarely, a laptop clock "glitch" was found to occur. The cause may be either intensive processing by a program other than the FireCapture image acquisition program, or by an automatic clock update during sequence acquisition. The quad processors of the Intel i7based laptop make such events very rare, but when they occur they are easily identified: there is a large effect on pixel scale, which depends on self-consistent time within the sequence, but no effect on the drift angle, which does not depend on time.


## Data Reduction and Speckle Analysis

Speckle Interferometry data reduction is accomplished by Fourier Transform mathematical analysis of dimensional frequency information - that is, the spacing and orientation of the speckle patterns in every frame. It requires some intense "number crunching!" Processing includes taking Fast Fourier Transforms (FFT) of all 1000 individual frames in the binary star sequence, then averaging the results. The same operations are done for the sequence of single "reference" star frames. In "deconvolution," the average transform of the double is divided by that of the reference, tending to cancel aberrations and distortions that are common to both sets. The cancelling benefit can include optical aberrations (central obstruction, mirror imperfections, coma, focus errors, etc.), and even some atmospheric effects!

In the last step of processing, an inverse Fourier Transform is taken to give an "Auto-correlogram." Although it may look like a picture of the stars, it is no longer a real image. But the auto-correlogram still contains the near-diffraction-limited information from which measurements are made. An example is shown in Figure 4.

Fortunately, the "heavy lifting" of Fourier Transform math for speckle image processing has been implemented already, and is transparent to the user. At least two freeware programs for Speckle data reduction are available on-line to amateur astronomers, by request of the authors: REDUC (Losse, 2015) and Speckle Tool Box (STB) (Harshaw, Rowe, and Genet, 2017). STB1.05 was used for all position angle (PA) and separation measurements presented here.

STB marks the secondary peak chosen to measure PA and separation, with a purple "ship's wheel" symbol, as seen in Figure 4. Measurements are based on

Figure 3. Results of Drift Calibration sequences during a Speckle run in November 2016, using the STB and REDUC programs. Left: Drift Angle. Right: Plate Scale.
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calculation of the centroid of the secondary peak, to a small fraction of a pixel. Because the speckle images, and resulting auto-correlogram peaks, are over-sampled (typically $\sim 8$ pixels across the Airy disk), the centroid location is very accurate, yielding accurate measurements.

The STB default orientation is north down, east right like most reflecting telescopes show, and like the WDS orbit plots. However, I always orient my camera with north up and east left, as though looking at the sky with the pole up - it's just easier for my foggy brain to think about late at night - so my orientation is rotated 180 degrees. Therefore, I always choose the peak in the opposite quadrant, which gives the correct numerical PA value. The observer must be careful to select the peak consistent with actual image orientation. The same convention and care must also be used in interpreting the camera calibration angle from the STB Drift Calibration tool.

## Speckle Measurement Uncertainty and Observation Quality

Quality of the speckle measurements was not rigorously evaluated. Usually only one sequence of 1000 frames was recorded, and no statistical information was calculated. For very faint systems, 2000 to 5000 frames were sometimes recorded, aiming to improve $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{N}$ - but even then, all the frames were processed as one sequence, yielding no statistics.

Standard deviation was calculated for calibration data, since many samples were acquired each night. Standard deviation of the camera drift angle for all
nights ranged from 0.01 degree to 0.72 degree, with an average of 0.26 degree. Standard deviation of pixel scale ranged from $0.25 \%$ to $2.82 \%$, with an average of $0.83 \%$. Therefore, it is assumed that the minimum uncertainty of PA is roughly 0.3 degree, and the minimum uncertainty of separation is roughly $0.8 \%$. The total uncertainty of the measurements, considering unknown error sources besides calibration, must be greater, perhaps more than twice these values. Therefore, the typical uncertainties of the measurements presented here are estimated to be roughly $+/-1$ degree for PA, and $+/-$ 0.01 arc-sec for separation.

A qualitative figure of merit was assigned to each measurement, as shown in Table 2, with values rated from 1 to 7. When measuring PA and separation in STB, the auto-correlograms of most doubles were bright and wide enough to yield very "solid," repeatable solutions. Observations with mild atmospheric dispersion, causing "smeared" auto-correlogram peaks, were assigned quality 2 . For very close and/or faint doubles, the measurements were sometimes difficult. Values of 5 are not considered very accurate, because the secondary peak of the auto-correlogram was not clearly separated from the central peak, making its centroid location uncertain. Values of 6 are also unreliable because the faint secondary peak was distorted by, or not clearly distinguishable from, background noise. A value of 7 indicates that no reasonable measurement was possible. In Table 3, those measurements having poor quality of 5,6 or 7 are flagged in color.


Figure 4. The Auto-correlogram of the binary star BU688AB, WDS magnitudes 8.1 and 8.6, observed with the Kuhn 22 " and R filter on September 1, 2016. The bright central peak corresponds to the Airy disk of the primary star, always centered in the frame. The Fourier Transform process creates two equally valid peaks corresponding to the secondary star; they have the same separation, but are exactly 180 degrees apart. Selection of the correct one (purple "ship's wheel" symbol) is based on prior observation trends or an estimated orbit. Left: The horizontal line is an artifact of line pattern ("read") noise of the CMOS camera. Right: Employing the Interference and High Pass filtering features of STB cleans up the Auto-correlogram beautifully. The measured Separation was 0.406 arc-sec, $P A=195.43 \mathrm{deg}$.
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Table 2. Qualitative Figure of Merit for Speckle Measurements. A Figure of Merit code number is given for each measurement in Table 3.

| Figure of Merit | Notes Related to Quality of the Observations |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Bright, clear Auto-correlogram. Solid measurement. |
| 2 | Some distortion of fringes or peaks, but measurement solid. |
| 3 | Close, but measurement clear, solid. |
| 4 | Companion faint, but measurement clear, solid. |
| 5 | Very close. Measurement uncertain. |
| 6 | Companion very faint. Measurement uncertain. |
| 7 | Companion too close or faint. Measurement NOT valid. |

## Double Star Separation and Position Angle Measurements

Speckle measurements were made from September 2015 through December 2016, observing with the OCA Kuhn 22 -inch telescope approximately one night per month. A total of 177 double stars were observed in up to three filters, with separations ranging from 0.29 to 2.9 arc-seconds, and secondary WDS magnitudes from 5.5 to 9.9. The speckle measurements are presented in Table 3.

## Discussion of Selected Double Stars

Many of the stars observed in Table 3 are binaries with at least a preliminary orbit. Some were found to have large Separation or PA O-C values, relative to the orbit ephemerides. In addition, a few stars had large movement from relatively few prior measures. Some of those, with O-C greater than 0.1 " separation or 10 degrees PA, are discussed below.

The binary $00022+2705$ BU733AB ( 85 Peg ) has a
very high proper motion ( $+830-989$ ) and short period ( 26.28 years). It was observed in the R filter at a separation of 0.309 ", barely above the Rayleigh criterion of 0.286 ". The night was marginal, with occasional high clouds, and the speckle solution centroid was uncertain (figure of merit 6). The results are shown in Figure 5.

The Hipparcos-Tycho satellite observed 02194 +6616 TDS2201 as double ( $\mathrm{PA}=123.5 \mathrm{deg}$, separation=0.32") in 1991, but this remains the only prior observation. The current measure of Table 3, in the "R" filter, is $P A=94.93 \mathrm{deg}$, separation $=0.462$ ". However, this observation was rated only as quality 6 (Table 2), because the companion was very faint, the secondary peaks were barely above the background noise, as seen in Figure 6, and the secondary peak centroid was uncertain. There was also a second pair of peaks, shown in the speckle auto-correlogram of Figure 6. The peak at 94 degrees was chosen because it was slightly stronger, closer to the Tycho value, and the "smeared" shape of
(Continued on page 236)


Figure 5. Left: BU733AB STB auto-correlogram. Right: Orbit plot from the WDS 6th Orbit Catalog, with the new speckle point

## Speckle Interferometry with the OCA Kuhn 22" Telescope

Table 3. Speckle measurements in 2015 and 2016, using the OCA Kuhn 22-inch telescope, Point Grey BlackFly-U3-23S6M-C
CMOS camera, and interference filters. The columns are: observation date, WDS designation, WDS discovery designation, filter (Table 1), position angle observed (degrees), separation observed (arc-seconds), and qualitative figure of merit (Table 2).

| Obs Date | WDS | Discovery | Filter | ThetaO | Rhoo | Quality |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015.846 | 00014+3937 | HLD60 | R | 166.72 | 1.328 | 4 |
| 2015.934 | $00022+2705$ | BU733AB | R | 12.10 | 0.385 | 6 |
| 2015.846 | 00028+0208 | BU281AB | R | 159.74 | 1.579 | 1 |
| 2015.958 | 00049+3005 | A1250AB | R | 41.22 | 0.885 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | 00063+5826 | STF 3062 | G | 359.36 | 1.528 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $00063+5826$ | STF 3062 | IR742 | 359.41 | 1.503 | 1 |
| 2015.934 | $00063+5826$ | STF3062 | R | 358.08 | 1.548 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $00063+5826$ | STF 3062 | R | 359.40 | 1.509 | 1 |
| 2015.958 | 00065+1250 | TDS1293 | R | 4.91 | 0.430 | 3 |
| 2016.843 | 00118+2825 | BU 255 | G | 66.24 | 0.447 | 4 |
| 2016.843 | $00118+2825$ | BU 255 | IR742 | 71.86 | 0.467 | 4 |
| 2016.843 | $00118+2825$ | BU 255 | R | 67.53 | 0.432 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | 00121+5337 | BU 1026AB | G | 321.12 | 0.355 | 4 |
| 2016.843 | $00121+5337$ | BU 1026AB | IR742 | 329.64 | 0.371 | 3 |
| 2016.843 | $00121+5337$ | BU 1026AB | R | 323.19 | 0.338 | 5 |
| 2016.994 | $00308+4732$ | BU394AB | G | 277.87 | 0.809 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $00308+4732$ | BU394AB | IR742 | 277.62 | 0.789 | 2 |
| 2016.994 | $00308+4732$ | BU394AB | R | 278.13 | 0.811 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | 00550+2338 | STF73AB | G | 331.58 | 1.145 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $00550+2338$ | STF73AB | IR742 | 331.37 | 1.132 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $00550+2338$ | STF73AB | R | 331.44 | 1.144 | 1 |
| 2015.934 | 01006+4719 | MAD1 | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2015.958 | $01006+4719$ | MAD1 | R | 1.27 | 0.836 | 1 |
| 2015.958 | 01014+1155 | BU867 | R | 352.46 | 0.659 | 1 |
| 2015.846 | $01030+4723$ | STT21 | R | 175.23 | 1.294 | 1 |
| 2015.958 | $01097+2348$ | BU303 | R | 293.52 | 0.607 | 1 |
| 2015.846 | 01106+5101 | BU235AaAb | R | 140.41 | 0.835 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | 01234+5809 | STF 115AB | G | 158.45 | 0.403 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | 01234+5809 | STF 115AB | IR742 | 160.43 | 0.448 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | 01234+5809 | STF 115AB | R | 158.82 | 0.405 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | 02037+2556 | STF208AB | G | 344.32 | 1.419 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $02037+2556$ | STF208AB | IR742 | 344.30 | 1.413 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | 02037+2556 | STF208AB | R | 344.24 | 1.410 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | 02140+4729 | STF228 | G | 303.39 | 0.653 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $02140+4729$ | STF228 | IR742 | 304.92 | 0.647 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $02140+4729$ | STF228 | R | 303.77 | 0.654 | 1 |
| 2015.934 | 02186+4017 | EGG2Aa, Ab | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2015.958 | 02194+6616 | TDS2201 | R | 94.93 | 0.462 | 6 |
| 2015.958 | 02211+4246 | STF248 | R | 206.69 | 0.722 | 2 |
| 2015.934 | 02231+7021 | MLR377AB | R | 141.07 | 0.803 | 4 |
| 2016.994 | 02471+3533 | BU9AB | G | 217.19 | 0.925 | 4 |
| 2016.994 | 02471+3533 | BU9AB | IR742 | 216.96 | 0.922 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | 02471+3533 | BU9AB | R | 217.31 | 0.925 | 4 |
| 2016.994 | 02572+0153 | A2413 | G | 164.92 | 0.612 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | 02572+0153 | A2413 | IR742 | 174.36 | 0.495 | 6 |
| 2016.994 | 02572+0153 | A2413 | R | 165.12 | 0.619 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | 02589+2137 | BU525 | G | 274.01 | 0.551 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $02589+2137$ | BU525 | IR742 |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.994 | 02589+2137 | BU525 | R | 274.56 | 0.536 | 1 |

Table 3 continues on next page.

## Speckle Interferometry with the OCA Kuhn 22" Telescope

Table 3 (continued). Speckle measurements in 2015 and 2016, using the OCA Kuhn 22-inch telescope, Point Grey BlackFly-U3-23S6M-C CMOS camera, and interference filters. The columns are: observation date, WDS designation, WDS discovery designation, filter (Table 1), position angle observed (degrees), separation observed (arc-seconds), and qualitative figure of merit (Table 2).

| Obs Date | WDS | Discovery | Filter | ThetaO | Rhoo | Quality |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2016.917 | 03054+2515 | STF346AB | G | 256.32 | 0.464 | 1 |
| 2016.917 | 03054+2515 | STF346AB | G | 256.09 | 0.465 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | 03054+2515 | STF346AB | G | 255.97 | 0.450 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | 03054+2515 | STF346AB | IR742 | 256.22 | 0.472 | 1 |
| 2016.917 | 03054+2515 | STF346AB | R | 257.36 | 0.462 | 1 |
| 2016.917 | 03054+2515 | STF346AB | R | 256.83 | 0.460 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $03054+2515$ | STF346AB | R | 255.97 | 0.445 | 1 |
| 2015.958 | 03101+2145 | BU1030AB | R | 101.93 | 0.833 | 1 |
| 2015.846 | $03122+3713$ | STF360 | R | 125.47 | 2.873 | 4 |
| 2015.846 | 03140+0044 | STF367 | R | 130.71 | 1.240 | 6 |
| 2015.958 | 03158+5057 | HU544 | R | 102.76 | 1.653 | 1 |
| 2015.846 | $03175+6540$ | STT52AB | R | 56.33 | 0.484 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | 03177+3838 | STT53AB | G | 232.47 | 0.575 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | 03177+3838 | STT53AB | IR742 | 232.85 | 0.568 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $03177+3838$ | STT53AB | R | 232.78 | 0.556 | 1 |
| 2015.846 | 03184-0056 | AC2AB | R | 261.84 | 1.190 | 1 |
| 2015.846 | 03212+2109 | COU259 | R | 217.82 | 0.908 | 1 |
| 2015.846 | 03233+2058 | STF381 | R | 108.45 | 1.080 | 1 |
| 2016.033 | 03307-0416 | STF408 | R | 320.21 | 1.165 | 1 |
| 2015.958 | 03344+2428 | STF412AB | R | 351.54 | 0.766 | 1 |
| 2015.958 | 03346-3152 | B53 | R | 228.21 | 1.445 | 6 |
| 2016.994 | 03350+6002 | STF400AB | G | 268.41 | 1.628 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $03350+6002$ | STF400AB | IR742 | 268.63 | 1.603 | 1 |
| 2016.033 | $03350+6002$ | STF400AB | R | 268.49 | 1.703 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $03350+6002$ | STF400AB | R | 268.46 | 1.612 | 1 |
| 2016.033 | 03356+3141 | BU533AB | R | 221.99 | 1.066 | 1 |
| 2015.958 | 03362+4220 | A1535 | R | 346.00 | 0.746 | 1 |
| 2016.033 | $03362+4220$ | A1535 | R | 346.36 | 0.732 | 4 |
| 2016.033 | 03377+4807 | HLD9AB | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2015.846 | $03443+3217$ | BU535 | R | 20.45 | 1.052 | 1 |
| 2015.767 | 03463+2411 | BU536AB | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.994 | 03496-0220 | YR23 | G | 294.77 | 0.355 | 3 |
| 2016.994 | 03496-0220 | YR23 | IR742 | 286.30 | 0.373 | 6 |
| 2016.994 | 03496-0220 | YR23 | R | 295.69 | 0.369 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | 03503+2535 | STT65 | G | 201.94 | 0.442 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | 03503+2535 | STT65 | IR742 | 200.86 | 0.464 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | 03503+2535 | STT65 | R | 201.85 | 0.431 | 1 |
| 2016.917 | 04239+0928 | HU304 | G | 29.54 | 0.325 | 2 |
| 2016.917 | 04239+0928 | HU304 | R | 30.57 | 0.339 | 2 |
| 2016.112 | 04257-0214 | BU 403 | G | 83.35 | 0.921 | 2 |
| 2016.112 | 04275-2427 | I 413 | G | 330.90 | 0.729 | 2 |
| 2016.112 | 04279-2130 | BU 184 | G | 247.89 | 1.917 | 2 |
| 2015.846 | 04301+1538 | STF554 | R | 15.56 | 1.465 | 1 |
| 2015.934 | 04306-2301 | HDS580 | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.112 | 04308+1609 | PAT 11 | G |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.112 | 04316+3739 | BU 789 | G | 323.37 | 0.919 | 1 |
| 2015.846 | 04334-1047 | HDS592 | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.112 | $04349+3908$ | HU 1082 | G | 189.86 | 0.266 | 6 |
| 2016.112 | 05005+0506 | STT 93 | G | 243.28 | 1.636 | 1 |
| 2016.112 | 05043-0602 | A 481AB | G | 281.77 | 0.413 | 3 |
| 2016.112 | 05055+1948 | STT 95 | G | 295.61 | 0.955 | 1 |
| 2016.112 | 05059-1355 | A 3009 | G | 274.09 | 1.226 | 2 |
| 2016.112 | 05079+0830 | STT 98 | G | 288.94 | 0.956 | 1 |
| 2016.205 | 05131+2424 | COU 468 | G | 32.63 | 0.576 | 1 |
| 2016.205 | 05135+0158 | STT 517AB | G | 240.87 | 0.731 | 1 |
| 2016.205 | $05140+5126$ | HU 821 | G | 171.77 | 0.826 | 1 |
| 2016.205 | 05181+0342 | A 2639 | G | 277.24 | 0.942 | 1 |

Table 3 continues on next page.

## Speckle Interferometry with the OCA Kuhn 22" Telescope

Table 3 (continued). Speckle measurements in 2015 and 2016, using the OCA Kuhn 22-inch telescope, Point Grey BlackFly-U3-23S6M-C CMOS camera, and interference filters. The columns are: observation date, WDS designation, WDS discovery designation, filter (Table 1), position angle observed (degrees), separation observed (arc-seconds), and qualitative figure of merit (Table 2).

| Obs Date | WDS | Discovery | Filter | ThetaO | Rhoo | Quality |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2016.205 | 05204-0522 | HDS702AaAb | G | 234.29 | 0.642 | 6 |
| 2016.033 | 05208+3329 | COU1231 | R | 140.96 | 0.373 | 3 |
| 2016.205 | 05213+3529 | COU 1535 | G | 99.52 | 0.359 | 6 |
| 2016.033 | 05219+3934 | COU2037 | R | 141.98 | 0.375 | 3 |
| 2016.033 | 05525+4009 | STF802AB | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2015.958 | 06041+1101 | J335 | R | 270.79 | 1.274 | 1 |
| 2016.112 | $06149+2230$ | BU 1008 | G | 256.56 | 1.847 | 1 |
| 2016.112 | 06221+5922 | STF 881AB | G | 149.29 | 0.638 | 1 |
| 2016.112 | 06256+2227 | STT 139 | G | 257.42 | 0.791 | 1 |
| 2016.205 | 06336-1207 | HU 43 | G | 308.30 | 0.897 | 1 |
| 2016.205 | 06345-1114 | HO 234 | G | 4.49 | 0.617 | 1 |
| 2016.112 | 06364+2717 | STT 149 | G | 279.03 | 0.752 | 1 |
| 2015.958 | $06425+6612$ | MLR318 | R | 309.13 | 1.717 | 1 |
| 2016.112 | $06455+2922$ | A 122 | G | 24.48 | 0.410 | 3 |
| 2016.205 | $06462+5927$ | STF 948AB | G | 67.31 | 1.921 | 1 |
| 2016.112 | $06478+0020$ | STT 157 | G | 162.79 | 0.562 | 2 |
| 2016.205 | 06487+0737 | A 2731AB | G | 67.15 | 1.344 | 1 |
| 2016.205 | $06555+3010$ | STF 981 | G | 299.25 | 0.925 | 1 |
| 2016.033 | 06564+0957 | HDS960 | R | 210.19 | 0.657 | 6 |
| 2015.846 | $06573+5825$ | STT159AB | R | 235.11 | 0.710 | 2 |
| 2016.205 | 07001+4211 | COU 2374 | G | 17.33 | 0.289 | 3 |
| 2016.033 | 07003+6720 | HDS976 | R | 188.35 | 0.382 | 6 |
| 2016.205 | 07008+2716 | BU 1022AB | G | 32.10 | 0.327 | 3 |
| 2016.205 | 07018-1053 | BU 573 | G | 307.55 | 0.880 | 1 |
| 2016.205 | $07028+1305$ | HO 342 | G | 88.54 | 1.201 | 1 |
| 2016.205 | 08005+0955 | A 2954AB | G | 337.54 | 0.647 | 1 |
| 2015.846 | 08010+2335 | STF1171 | R | 325.80 | 2.046 | 4 |
| 2016.205 | 08013-2220 | BU 333AB | G | 43.15 | 1.651 | 2 |
| 2016.205 | 08024+0409 | STF 1175 | G | 287.03 | 1.419 | 1 |
| 2015.846 | 08033+2616 | STT186 | R | 76.23 | 1.077 | 2 |
| 2016.205 | $08044+1217$ | BU 581AB | G | 214.85 | 0.353 | 3 |
| 2015.846 | 08122+1739 | STF1196AB | R | 19.12 | 1.120 | 1 |
| 2015.958 | $08122+1739$ | STF1196AB | R | 18.69 | 1.153 | 1 |
| 2015.958 | 08122+1739 | STF1196AC | R | 61.65 | 6.345 | 1 |
| 2015.958 | 08122+1739 | HUT1CaCb | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.337 | 09006+4147 | KUI 37AB | R | 177.07 | 0.437 | 5 |
| 2016.337 | $09179+2834$ | STF 3121AB | R | 15.90 | 0.412 | 1 |
| 2016.337 | 10279+3642 | HU 879 | R | 226.83 | 0.543 | 3 |
| 2016.337 | $10426+0335$ | A 2768 | R | 243.68 | 0.648 | 1 |
| 2016.337 | $13157+5424$ | HDS 1858 | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.337 | 13166+1948 | HDS1862AaAb | R | 262.39 | 0.416 | 6 |
| 2016.337 | 13189+0341 | HDS 1865 | R | 109.01 | 1.186 | 1 |
| 2016.337 | $13202+1534$ | HDS 1870 AaAb | R | 270.14 | 0.426 | 5 |
| 2016.337 | $14426+1929$ | HU 575AB | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.671 | 15038+4739 | STF1909 | G | 71.27 | 0.739 | 1 |
| 2016.337 | $15038+4739$ | STF1909 | R | 70.56 | 0.779 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $15038+4739$ | STF1909 | R | 71.38 | 0.743 | 1 |
| 2016.337 | $15360+3948$ | STT 298AB | R | 185.40 | 1.194 | 1 |
| 2016.337 | $15371+2646$ | HDS2199 | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.337 | $15404+2123$ | HU 579 | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.337 | 16309+0159 | STF 2055AB | R | 42.20 | 1.373 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | 16413+3136 | STF2084 | G | 125.51 | 1.303 | 1 |
| 2016.337 | $16413+3136$ | STF 2084 | R | 126.28 | 1.252 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $16413+3136$ | STF2084 | R | 125.06 | 1.286 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | 16511+0924 | STF2106AB | G | 171.54 | 0.794 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $16511+0924$ | STF2106AB | R | 170.54 | 0.791 | 1 |
| 2016.337 | 16514+0113 | STT 315 | R | 310.03 | 0.716 | 1 |
| 2016.337 | $16518+2840$ | STF 2107AB | R | 104.93 | 1.436 | 1 |

Table 3 continues on next page.

## Speckle Interferometry with the OCA Kuhn 22" Telescope

Table 3 (continued). Speckle measurements in 2015 and 2016, using the OCA Kuhn 22-inch telescope, Point Grey BlackFly-U3-23S6M-C CMOS camera, and interference filters. The columns are: observation date, WDS designation, WDS discovery designation, filter (Table 1), position angle observed (degrees), separation observed (arc-seconds), and qualitative figure of merit (Table 2).

| Obs Date | WDS | Discovery | Filter | ThetaO | Rhoo | Quality |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2016.337 | 17053+5428 | STF 2130AB | R | 1.58 | 2.510 | 1 |
| 2016.337 | 17066+0039 | BU 823AB | R | 161.86 | 1.065 | 4 |
| 2016.337 | 17082-0105 | A 1145 | R | 340.95 | 0.691 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $17130+0745$ | STT325 | G | 295.54 | 0.364 | 5 |
| 2016.671 | $17130+0745$ | STT325 | R | 291.30 | 0.425 | 5 |
| 2016.337 | 17141+5608 | STT 327 | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.337 | 17166-0027 | A 2984 | R | 21.37 | 0.772 | 4 |
| 2016.761 | 17304-0104 | STF 2173AB | G | 142.33 | 0.646 | 2 |
| 2016.337 | 17304-0104 | STF2173AB | R | 143.42 | 0.661 | 1 |
| 2016.761 | 17304-0104 | STF 2173AB | R | 142.60 | 0.650 | 1 |
| 2016.337 | 17349+1234 | MCY 4 | R | 235.45 | 0.537 | 6 |
| 2016.337 | 17386+5546 | STF 2199 | R | 55.63 | 1.930 | 6 |
| 2016.671 | 17400-0038 | BU631 | G | 82.18 | 0.321 | 5 |
| 2016.671 | 17400-0038 | BU631 | R | 83.68 | 0.351 | 5 |
| 2016.671 | $17471+1742$ | STF2215 | G | 250.20 | 0.451 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $17471+1742$ | STF2215 | R | 252.57 | 0.454 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $17520+1520$ | STT338AB | G | 162.63 | 0.846 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $17520+1520$ | STT338AB | R | 162.50 | 0.825 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $17571+0004$ | STF2244 | G | 100.13 | 0.695 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $17571+0004$ | STF2244 | R | 99.85 | 0.665 | 1 |
| 2016.337 | $18571+3451$ | HDS2685 | R | 199.81 | 0.550 | 6 |
| 2015.728 | 19487+1149 | STF2583AB | R | 105.21 | 1.487 | 1 |
| 2015.767 | 19553-0644 | STF2597AB | R | 99.58 | 0.720 | 6 |
| 2016.843 | 20020+2456 | STT 395 | G | 127.04 | 0.771 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $20020+2456$ | STT 395 | IR742 | 126.75 | 0.773 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $20020+2456$ | STT 395 | R | 127.00 | 0.765 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $20320+2548$ | STF2695 | G | 259.00 | 0.359 | 5 |
| 2016.671 | $20320+2548$ | STF2695 | R | 259.47 | 0.381 | 5 |
| 2016.917 | $20375+1436$ | BU151AB | G | 185.21 | 0.318 | 2 |
| 2016.917 | $20375+1436$ | BU151AB | G | 185.47 | 0.317 | 2 |
| 2016.917 | $20375+1436$ | BU151AB | G | 188.75 | 0.310 | 2 |
| 2016.671 | 20396+0458 | KUI99AB | G | 317.87 | 0.533 | 6 |
| 2016.671 | $20396+0458$ | KUI99AB | R | 321.35 | 0.583 | 6 |
| 2016.761 | $20474+3629$ | STT 413AB | G | 1.37 | 0.931 | 1 |
| 2016.761 | $20474+3629$ | STT 413AB | R | 1.47 | 0.937 | 1 |
| 2016.761 | 20519+0544 | A 613 | G | 319.94 | 0.670 | 4 |
| 2016.761 | 20519+0544 | A 613 | R | 318.15 | 0.671 | 1 |
| 2016.761 | 20524+2008 | HO 144 | G | 350.01 | 0.435 | 1 |
| 2016.761 | 20524+2008 | HO 144 | R | 352.04 | 0.448 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | 21026+2141 | BU 69AB | G | 10.65 | 0.283 | 6 |
| 2016.843 | 21026+2141 | BU 69AB | IR742 |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.843 | $21026+2141$ | BU 69AB | R | 4.98 | 0.382 | 5 |
| 2016.761 | 21135+0713 | BU 270AB | G | 346.54 | 0.490 | 6 |
| 2016.761 | $21135+0713$ | BU 270AB | R | 351.67 | 0.455 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $21137+6424$ | H1-48 | G | 244.15 | 0.684 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $21137+6424$ | H1-48 | R | 244.02 | 0.689 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $21148+3803$ | AGC13 | G | 197.54 | 0.944 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $21148+3803$ | AGC13 | R | 197.21 | 0.938 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $21186+1134$ | BU163AB | G | 257.16 | 0.903 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $21186+1134$ | BU163AB | R | 257.72 | 0.905 | 1 |
| 2015.767 | $21352+2124$ | BU74 | R | 337.73 | 0.979 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | 21395-0003 | BU1212AB | G | 302.30 | 0.314 | 1 |
| 2015.767 | 21395-0003 | BU1212AB | R | 301.17 | 0.336 | 3 |
| 2016.671 | 21395-0003 | BU1212AB | R | 298.07 | 0.371 | 5 |
| 2016.671 | 21426+4103 | BU688AB | G | 197.56 | 0.373 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $21426+4103$ | BU688AB | R | 195.43 | 0.406 | 1 |

Table 3 concludes on next page.

## Speckle Interferometry with the OCA Kuhn 22" Telescope

Table 3 (conclusion). Speckle measurements in 2015 and 2016, using the OCA Kuhn 22-inch telescope, Point Grey BlackFly-U3-23S6M-C CMOS camera, and interference filters. The columns are: observation date, WDS designation, WDS discovery designation, filter (Table 1), position angle observed (degrees), separation observed (arc-seconds), and qualitative figure of merit (Table 2).

| Obs Date | WDS | Discovery | Filter | ThetaO | Rhoo | Quality |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2016.671 | 21555+1053 | BU75AB | G | 25.80 | 1.052 | 1 |
| 2016.671 | $21555+1053$ | BU75AB | R | 25.38 | 1.066 | 1 |
| 2015.767 | 22029+4439 | BU694AB | R | 5.95 | 1.018 | 1 |
| 2015.767 | $22044+1339$ | STF2854 | R | 83.71 | 1.601 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $22057+3521$ | PRU 2 | G |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.843 | $22057+3521$ | PRU 2 | IR742 | 4.05 | 0.453 | 6 |
| 2015.767 | $22057+3521$ | PRU2 | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2015.958 | $22057+3521$ | PRU 2 | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.843 | $22057+3521$ | PRU 2 | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2015.934 | $22365+5826$ | PRU3 | R | 5.14 | 0.365 | 5 |
| 2016.843 | $22388+4419$ | HO 295AB | G | 336.10 | 0.318 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $22388+4419$ | HO 295AB | IR742 | 336.12 | 0.360 | 5 |
| 2016.843 | $22388+4419$ | HO 295AB | R | 336.29 | 0.325 | 3 |
| 2015.846 | $22400+0113$ | A2099 | R | 164.92 | 0.840 | 4 |
| 2016.843 | $22402+3732$ | HO 188 | G | 230.64 | 0.361 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $22402+3732$ | HO 188 | IR742 |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.843 | $22402+3732$ | НО 188 | R | 228.39 | 0.351 | 3 |
| 2015.846 | $22409+1433$ | HO296AB | R | 51.59 | 0.465 | 1 |
| 2015.934 | $22437+4725$ | HDS3224 | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2015.846 | 22478-0414 | STF2944AB | R | 304.65 | 1.866 | 1 |
| 2015.958 | $22514+2623$ | HO482AB | R | 13.36 | 0.518 | 2 |
| 2015.846 | $22514+6142$ | STF2950AB | R | 275.20 | 1.182 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $22520+5743$ | A 632 | G | 110.12 | 0.359 | 2 |
| 2016.843 | $22520+5743$ | A 632 | IR742 | 108.31 | 0.378 | 5 |
| 2016.843 | $22520+5743$ | A 632 | R | 109.31 | 0.379 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $22537+4445$ | BU 382AB | G | 244.92 | 0.676 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $22537+4445$ | BU 382AB | IR742 | 245.98 | 0.638 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $22537+4445$ | BU 382AB | R | 244.80 | 0.685 | 1 |
| 2015.934 | 23029+0738 | HDS3282 | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.843 | $23072+6050$ | BU 180AB | G | 133.02 | 0.544 | 4 |
| 2016.843 | $23072+6050$ | BU 180AB | IR742 |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.843 | $23072+6050$ | BU 180AB | R | 134.06 | 0.541 | 4 |
| 2016.994 | $23176+1818$ | HU400 | G | 70.26 | 0.344 | 6 |
| 2016.994 | $23176+1818$ | HU400 | IR742 |  |  | 7 |
| 2016.994 | $23176+1818$ | HU400 | R | 67.52 | 0.349 | 6 |
| 2016.761 | 23241+5732 | STT 495 | G | 120.43 | 0.404 | 1 |
| 2016.761 | $23241+5732$ | STT 495 | R | 120.14 | 0.407 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $23375+4426$ | STT 500AB | G | 13.83 | 0.439 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $23375+4426$ | STT 500AB | IR742 | 12.83 | 0.462 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $23375+4426$ | STT 500AB | R | 12.71 | 0.423 | 1 |
| 2015.728 | $23413+3234$ | BU858AB | R |  |  | 7 |
| 2015.728 | $23420+2018$ | STT503AB | R | 134.50 | 1.233 | 1 |
| 2015.846 | $23440+2922$ | AGC14 | R | 283.95 | 0.857 | 4 |
| 2016.843 | 23516+4205 | STT 510AB | G | 300.81 | 0.609 | 1 |
| 2016.843 | $23516+4205$ | STT 510AB | IR742 | 295.27 | 0.619 | 2 |
| 2016.843 | $23516+4205$ | STT 510AB | R | 300.29 | 0.619 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $23595+3343$ | STF3050AB | G | 340.17 | 2.469 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $23595+3343$ | STF3050AB | R | 340.22 | 2.452 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $23595+3343$ | STF3050AB | IR742 | 340.24 | 2.439 | 1 |
| 2016.994 | $\underline{23595+3343}$ | STF3050AD? | G | 38.67 | 4.280 | 4 |
| 2016.994 | $23595+3343$ | STF3050AD? | R | 38.27 | 4.292 | 4 |
| 2016.994 | $23595+3343$ | STF3050AD? | IR742 | 37.85 | 4.315 | 4 |
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the primary peak may indicate that the peaks above and below are artifacts of atmospheric dispersion, due to the zenith angle greater than 30 degrees. Additional observations are needed.

The Table 3 observation of $\mathbf{0 2 2 3 1 + 7 0 2 1}$ MLR377AB is uncertain at best (figure of merit 6). The STB auto-correlogram in Figure 7 had the weakest secondary peaks of all the stars observed. Although these measured peaks were the brightest in the field, there are numerous other possible candidates which are likely just noise and not faint stars. In the orbit plot, even though the current observation continues the trend diverging from the premature orbit, it seems too far from the other points. The proper motions of the two components are the same, although they are small.


Figure 6. The STB auto-correlogram of TDS2201. The secondary peaks are barely above the background noise.



Figure 7. Top: The STB auto-correlogram of MLR377AB. Bottom: The position of the current uncertain measure (red circle) generally continues the diverging trend of earlier speckle points.
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The binary $\mathbf{0 3 1 7 5 + 6 5 4 0}$ STT52AB has a Grade 4 orbital period of 350 years, but most of the recent speckle points are diverging from that orbit, shown in Figure 8, including the observation of Table 3. The speckle points show a roughly linear trend of increasing separation, so the period is likely much longer, but the earliest micrometer points (green + ), and the same proper motion of both components, still demand that this is a binary.


Figure 8. The orbit of binary star STT52AB, from the Washington Double Star $6^{\text {th }}$ Orbit Catalog. The point from Table 3 is indicated by the red circle.
$\mathbf{0 5 2 0 8}+3329$ COU1231 was discovered visually by Paul Couteau in 1975 (Couteau, 1976). There are very few observations in the WDS archives, all of which are plotted in Figure 9. There were no observations from 1975 to 2000, then four speckle observations from 2000 to 2010 . No other observations were available in the WDS. The current observation of Table 3 was in early 2016.

In the top-left part of Figure 9, all the points are plotted as given in WDS. However, the distribution of points seems peculiar - the discovery point ( + ) of Couteau, a very experienced observer, seems out of place, and the general trend shows little movement in the first 25 years, but fast closure in the most recent 6 years. For these reasons, all the speckle points from 2000 to 2016 were plotted with 180 degrees added to the PA, as shown in the top-right part of Figure 9. This distribution, which assumed that the observation of Couteau had the only correct PA quadrant because it was obtained visually, looks reasonable, suggesting a highinclination orbit with a period on the order of only five or six decades.

To help clarify the situation, a request was made to Dave Rowe, who is developing a new bi-spectral tool for his Speckle Tool Box program, to do bi-spectral


Figure 9. Upper Left: All observations of COU1231 from the WDS are plotted, together with the new point from Table 3, indicated by the solid red circle. (Note: north up, east left, as on the sky). Upper Right: Speckle points are plotted with 180 degrees added to the PA values from WDS and Table 3. Lower Left: The current auto-correlogram. Lower Right: The bispectrum image of COU1231, courtesy of Dave Rowe, clearly shows that the PA of the companion is in the second (southeast) quadrant.
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analysis of my speckle images. The result (Rowe, 2017), shown at lower-right of Figure 9, confirms that the speckle PA observations are properly located in the second quadrant, as given in WDS.
$\mathbf{0 6 1 4 9}+\mathbf{2 2 3 0}$ BU1008 is a very bright semiregular variable ( $\mathrm{V}=3.3-3.9$ ) red giant (Eta Gem, M3.5I-II), 2.6 magnitudes brighter than its companion. All speckle points are diverging from the grade 5 preliminary orbit, including the Hipparcos/Tycho measures. The Table 3 measure continues that trend, as seen in Figure 10. Therefore, the period is likely longer than the 474-year orbit. However, since the motion so far seems roughly linear, the pair may also be only optical.
$06256+2227$ STT139: This pair was observed in February 2016 with the G filter, but the measured separation was larger than the WDS last observation and much larger than the orbit ephemerides. Figure 11 shows the WDS orbital plot, with the current point added. Only one other speckle point is available since the Hipparcos/Tycho observations. However, since emerging from periastron, the trend is clearly diverging into a wider orbit, just as the early micrometer points indicated before periastron. Perhaps the observations merit an updated orbit solution.

The class 2 orbit of $\mathbf{0 8 0 4 4}+\mathbf{1 2 1 7}$ BU581AB, with a period of 45 years, is now approaching a full revolution


Figure 10. Left: The STB auto-correlogram of BU1008. Right: The position of the current measure (red circle) continues the generally diverging trend of the other speckle points.


Figure 11. Left: STB auto-correlogram of STT139. Right: The current measure (red circle) supports a clear trend toward a larger orbit, based on the other speckle point, Hipparcos, Tycho, and early micrometer points.
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of speckle measurements. The Table 3 measure, shown in Figure 12, is a little inside the orbit solution, but helps fill in the gap since the last WDS plotted speckle point in 2006. Two other recent speckle points from 2008 and 2010, are available in the WDS observation database, but not yet shown on its orbit plot. These were added to Figure 12 as blue circles. Additionally, an observation taken with the same OCA 22 -inch telescope early in 2017, but with a different camera, is slightly outside the orbit line (black circle), and will be published later. This pair deserves more frequent speckle observations.
$\mathbf{2 2 3 6 5}+5826$ PRU3 is the very luminous variable supergiant star W Cephei, which pulsates from orange to red in color and has the strange spectral type K0Iapev. It has very small proper motion ( $-3,-2$ ) and the huge distance, based on Hipparcos measurements, is over 100,000 light years. Although it is a spectroscopic binary, the visible companion, only 1.3 magnitudes fainter, is unlikely to be gravitationally bound, but is almost certainly a much nearer star. Therefore, the rel-
ative motion should be linear. Only two prior measures have been made, one by Hipparcos (1991) and one by speckle (1997). There were also two unresolved speckle observations on 2 -meter telescopes (closer than 0.05 ") within 2 years of the successful speckle observation. It is possible that these may have failed because the primary variability increased the delta magnitude. The current observation in Table 3 is uncertain, but the PA which is more consistent with linear motion - moving farther apart in roughly the same direction - was selected for Table 3. If this trend is true, a few further observations should confirm it.

The binary 22409+1433 HO296AB was observed in November 2015, chosen as a bright double with a well-known orbit, but challengingly close for the 22inch. HO296AB, whose orbit it shown in Figure 13, is one of the few binaries which has a Grade 1 "definitive" orbit solution, meaning it has numerous accurate measurements over at least one full orbit. The period is 20.83 years, so the orbit has been fully covered by speckle measurements, begun in 1979 by Dr.


Figure 12. Left: STB autocorrelogram of BU581AB. Right: The measure of Table 3 (red circle) helps fill in the gap in speckle observations. Two additional speckle points which are in the WDS archive but not yet plotted, are shown as blue circles, while the black circle is a 2017 observation by the author.

Figure 13. Left: STB autocorrelogram of HO296AB. Right: The point in Table 3 is the red circle at lower right, in reasonably good agreement with the Class 1 orbit.
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Harold McAlister on the Kitt Peak 4-meter Mayall telescope. Almost all the other speckle observations were also made by professional astronomers with telescopes including the Kitt Peak 2.1m, WIYN 3.5m, Mt. Wilson $2.5 \mathrm{~m}\left(100^{\prime \prime}\right)$, and the Discovery Channel 4.3 m . In addition, near periastron, where the separation is less than 0.1 arc-second, measurements have been made with the Russian 6m telescope (speckle in 1983) and with the Palomar Test Bed Interferometer (2003 through 2008). Not until after I reduced the data and compared my measurement with the historical data of others, did I realize what distinguished company I had inadvertently joined.

The auto-correlograms of 23595+3343 STF3050 are shown in Figure 14, in all three filters of Table 1. The top row shows the AB components. However, the bottom row has been over-exposed to show an additional faint star at about 4.3" separation and 38 degrees PA, as given in Table 3. Of course, the PA of this object may be actually 180 degrees from Table 3.

This object cannot be the faint C component (magnitude 12.8), because WDS lists it about 80 arcsec distant from A; therefore, this could be a new "D" component. However, this system has been very well observed in the past, with more than 600 published ob-
servations in the WDS archives. Therefore, it is extremely unlikely that this star, which is probably brighter than the C component, has been overlooked by all previous observers.

Indeed, a plot of the three measurements of Table 3, Figure 15, shows small but roughly linear motion, consistent with the order in which the exposure sequences were made: G, R, IR742. All sequences were 1000 exposures of 0.030 sec each. The mid-time of the R sequence was 50.4 sec after the mid-time of the G sequence, while the IR742 sequence was 45.2 sec after the R sequence. Therefore, the "new" component was moving about 0.044 arc-sec per minute toward the north-west (or south-east).

The faint object shows up in the double star autocorrelations, with and without using the reference star for deconvolution, and it does not appear in the reference autocorrelation alone; therefore, it is not an artifact from a faint companion near the reference star, as may sometimes occur. Although it was about 33 degrees north of the ecliptic, which is near zero declination at RA $\sim 24$ hours, this object may be an interloping asteroid.

However, a cursory search found no asteroid with a well-known orbit near the double star at the time. Two


Figure 14. Top Row: STB auto-correlograms of STF3050AB in all three filters of Table 1: $G$ (left), $R$ (middle) and IR742-pass (right). Bottom Row: The same auto-correlograms, shown over-exposed to reveal an additional faint star. The vertical and horizontal streaks are artifacts probably caused by CMOS line pattern ("read") noise related to the bright $B$ component. The STB interference filter can suppress line pattern noise related to the primary star, because it is always at the center of the field after FFT processing.
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other remote possibilities may be a small, near-earth asteroid, or an old geosynchronous satellite, out of fuel and drifting far from the original equatorial region. Unfortunately, this object remains a mystery.
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#### Abstract

Research team PRSM reports astrometric measurements of the double star system WDS 15379+3006 (STF 1963AB, STF 1963AC) obtained using the iTelescope Network. By performing CCD astrometry, the team determined a position angle of $298.4^{\circ} \pm 0.1^{\circ}$ with an angular separation of $05.28 " \pm 0.1^{\prime \prime}$ for STF 1963AB, and a position angle of $116.1^{\circ} \pm 0.1^{\circ}$ with an angular separation of $32.35^{\prime \prime} \pm 0.1^{\prime \prime}$ for STF 1963AC. The angular separation and position angle have changed from previous measurements.


## Introduction

The purpose of this paper was to select a double star system from the Washington Double Star Catalog (WDS) and observe it using CCD imaging. From the images, we could determine the position angle and separation between stars in the double system. The goal was to determine, based on the orbital plot, if the stars belong to the gravitationally bound system or they are not physically connected and just appear close together.

The star system was selected using the following criteria: a difference in magnitude of no more than 6 , with both stars being brighter than 12 magnitudes. A minimum angular separation of 6 arc seconds was also required. In addition, the system must be observable in the spring. Enough historical data on the double star system must exist and will be combined with our measurements to determine if the system is a physical double or visual double star system. Despite the secondary star having a magnitude of 13.58 , the triple star system STF1963AB/STF1963AC adhered to the rest of the requirements and the system was selected for observation, Figure 1.

STF1963AC is in the constellation of Corona Borealis and was first observed by Sherburne Wesley Burnham in 1908 (Mason 2017). There have been three more observations made since; the most recent was made in 2009. The separation in 1908 was 31 arc seconds ( 31 "), and 32 " in 2009. The position angle has remained virtually unchanged from $116^{\circ}$ (Mason 2017).


Figure 1. WDS 15379+3006 composite image of $A B$ and $C$ components serves to illustrate the relative positions of each; (WCS). This does not represent relative apparent luminance. The horizontal axis is right ascension (hours). Vertical axis is declination (degrees). Created with SAOImage DS9 (SAOImage, 2016).

The relative proper motion ( rPM ) is 0.19 arcseconds per year ("/yr)-a good indication that this system has potential to be a gravitationally linked binary star system (Stelle 2017).

The AB component of this system is also very in-
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teresting because the rPM is 0.43 "/yr which could indicate no gravitational link. The primary star has a magnitude of 8.54 and the secondary star, a magnitude of 8.85. The first separation was $4.2^{\prime \prime}$ and the last separation was 5.1" (Mason 2017). The first position angle was $291^{\circ}$ and the last position angle was $298^{\circ}$. One journal listing in particular mentions STF1963AB by an alternate identifier, HD 139569 in their Table 2, which listed stars with the following attributes:

The results for the most interesting objects... [their team] found a signature of periodic variations (rotational periods of activity cycles) in 19 stars. Whereas 10 stars show a clear overall trend in Ha with time. (Sissa, E., Gratton, R., Desidera, S., et al.).

The spectral class of primary star is F and the secondary star is a G class star (Stelle 2017). No orbital solutions had been made to date for either AB or AC relative motion. In the Table 1 we present some of the historical measurements of position angle $(\theta)$ and separation distance $(\rho)$ as well as the technique codes for the method used to obtain them.

## Equipment, Observations, And Data Analysis Procedures

The iTelescope Network's telescope T18 was used to take CCD images of STF 1963AB and STF 1963AC. This 0.32 -meter $\mathrm{f} / 8.0$ reflector telescope is located at the AstroCamp Observatory in Nerpio, Spain ( $38^{\circ} 09^{\prime}$ North, $002^{\circ} 19^{\prime}$ West) and has a resolution of 0.72 arcseconds per pixel (Moore 2017). Four images were ordered. Two images made use of luminance filterswith exposure times of 30 and 60 seconds-and two used hydrogen-alpha filters-with exposure times of 30 and 90 seconds. All of these images were preprocessed (dark and flat subtraction) by the iTelescope data reduc-

## Table 1. Historical and present measurements for STF

 1963 AC (WDS 15370+3006). The WDS (Mason 2017) technique Codes for Table 1 are as follows: Ma, Micrometer with refractor telescope; E2, 2MASS; Eu, UCAC3 or UCAC4; C, CCD image.| WDS 15379+3006 AC |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date of <br> Observation | Angle ( $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ ) | Separation ( $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ ) | Technique <br> Code |
| 1908.31 | 115.9 | 31.0 | Ma |
| 1998.25 | 116.3 | 32.09 | E 2 |
| 2002.154 | 116.0 | 31.85 | Eu |
| 2009.448 | 116.4 | 31.98 | C |
| 2017.333 | 116.09 | 32.35 | C |



Figure 2. WDS 15379+3006 A B and C components. The purpose of this image is to show the relative apparent luminance of all system components with respect to each other and to demonstrate the difficulties that arose in determining the centroid of component-A when measuring $\rho$ and $\theta$ of STF1963AB/ STF1963AC. This necessitated developing a way to double check measurements made in Mira64 that utilized automatic centroid detection (Mira, 2016).
tion pipeline. Optimal system altitude and time of observation were determined by the use of SkyX Pro software. Images were scheduled through Boyce-Astro, and taken 2017.229798.

Each image was received as a FITS file. Astrometry of images was performed using MaxImDL v6 software. In its astrometric measurements, MaxImDL finds all the stars in the image and matches them against cataloged positions for stars in that vicinity (by referencing the UCAC4 catalogue). The calculated mapping is stored as standardized World Coordinate System (WCS) values in the FITS header of each image file.

To analyze the separation $(\theta)$ and position angle $(\rho)$ of the components in our triple system Mira64 was used. Due to STF1963AB having such a small $\Delta$ magnitude, and STF1963AC $\Delta$ magnitude being relatively large, see Figure 2, a process coined 'manual centroid detection' was developed by the team and used for measuring the position angle and separation in addition to the automatic centroid technique provided by Mira64.

The manual centroid detection was carried out as follows: The location of the primary star's (component A) centroid was determined by visual analysis of each pixel in the image, and the RA and Dec of the manually determined centroid was then recorded as shown in Mira64, Figure 3. The secondary star's centroid could then be determined, through the same methodology, while being able to adjust qualitative attributes of each

Astrometric Measurements of Triple Star System15379+3006 STF 1963AB, STF 1963AC


Figure 3. Resolved image of STF1963AB used to determine the coordinates (right ascension and declination) of the primary component-A centroid for use in our manual centroid detection and to measure separation distance ( $\rho$ ) and position angle ( $\theta$ ) for the STF1963AB component. Differences in accuracy are highlighted in Table 3. This image is created with Mira64 (Mira, 2016).
image to optimally suit the luminance of the secondary star. Mira64's measurement tool was used by dragging the cursor from the previously determined coordinates of component A to the previously determined coordinates of the secondary star. This was done to acquire data points that were not biased by bleed from the nearby A and B components of the system, which the team believed may be biasing the auto centroid centering feature. This process was repeated in each image for all components. Mira64's auto centroid centering feature was also used for measuring separation distances and
position angles.
Regarding the STF1963AC component measurements, both automatic and manual centroid detection, Figure 4, techniques had no significant difference between reported data. Both sets of data were, therefore, taken into account, Table 3, for statistical analysis to provide accurate resultant measurements. For STF 1963AB, however, measurements made using manual centroid detection were selected for analysis, and this will be discussed in results section.

Using SAOImage DS9 (SAOImage 2016) we were


Figure 4. The same image as in Figure 3 after being adjusted to measure separation distance ( $\rho$ ) and position angle ( $\theta$ ) of STF1963AC. The coordinates (right ascension and declination) of the primary componentA centroid, found using manual centroid technique, were used to ensure that our results would not be skewed by lack of resolution of STF1963AB once STF1963AC was made visible. This image is created with Mira64 (Mira, 2016).
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able to check that detection of all three stars were significant with high signal-to-noise ratio using Luminance filter with both 30 and 60 and $\mathrm{H} \alpha 90$ seconds exposure times. We have failed to detect C component in $\mathrm{H} \alpha$ image with 30 seconds exposure. Table 2 summarizes these findings and Figures 5 and 6 show relative quality of the data taken with these two different filters.

## Results

The results of our measurements using both manual centroid and auto centroid techniques are summarized in Table 3. Filter and exposure times are noted as well.

## AC Component

Standard deviation of the mean was 0.14 and 0.18 in position angle and separation distance respectively. Precision in the astrometric measurements taken were excellent, as evidenced by 0.07 and 0.05 standard deviation from the mean in separation distance and position

Table 2. Table of all images taken for PRSM and the signal-tonoise ratio for each component. Determined by using DS9 software to compare the average pixel intensity across the star with average pixel intensity of surrounding pixels (SAOImage, 2016).

| WDS $15379+3006$ Signal : Noise Ratio |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Image | C | B | A |
| Lum 30 sec | 58.511 | 69.739 | 105.818 |
| Lum 60 sec | 106.293 | 92.597 | 145.188 |
| Ha 30 sec | NaN | 65.600 | 87.836 |
| Ha 90 sec | 28.832 | 199.681 | 289.217 |

angle respectively. Thus the major uncertainty in our data comes from the telescopic resolution of 0.72 arc$\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{pixel}$.

With respect to the AC component of WDS $15379+3006$, PRSM measurement appears reasonable


Figure 5. WDS 15379+3006, STF1963AB resolved (left) and STF1963AC resolved (right). These images were obtained using Luminance filter with an exposure of 60 seconds (Mira 2016).


Figure 6. WDS 15379+3006, STF1963AB resolved (left) and STF1963AC (right). These images were obtained using Ha filter with an exposure of 90 seconds (Mira, 2016). As one can see, the $A$ and $B$ components readily bled into one another, necessitating the development of techniques other than automatic centroid detection for our measurements (detailed below).
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Table 3. Data table of all measurements taken of STF 1963 (AC and AB components). All measurements were used to tabulate average, median, standard deviation, and standard deviation of the mean, except those with labeled with a "*" which were omitted. These measurements were found to lie demonstrably outside of the trends outlined by previous measurements and those that used the Manual Centroid Detection techniques. Measurements of Separation ( $\rho$ ) in STF1963AB were found to be significant when compared to trends (see Figure 11) and therefore the Automatic Centroid Measurements were omitted. Average values were used as results and plotted below.

| WDS 15379+3006 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| * omitted from statistics and plots |  | AC component |  | $A B$ component |  |
|  | Image filter (exposure time) | Separation (Rho) | Angle (Theta) | Separation (Rho) | Angle (Theta) |
| Auto <br> Centroid | Luminance (30 sec) | 32.5615 | 116.2550 | 4.2853* | 298.0100 |
|  | Luminance (60 sec) | 32.4889 | 116.1980 | 4.1497* | 299.0020 |
|  | Hydrogen Alpha (30 sec) | NaN | NaN | 4.2320* | 299.2580 |
|  | Hydrogen Alpha (90 sec) | 32.4194 | 115.9810 | 4.2540* | 297.7390 |
| Manual <br> Centroid | Luminance (30 sec) | 32.1691 | 116.1450 | 5.1491 | 299.7040 |
|  | Luminance (60 sec) | 32.3999 | 115.8320 | 5.2204 | 298.3200 |
|  | Hydrogen Alpha (30 sec) | NaN | NaN | 5.3799 | 297.2150 |
|  | Hydrogen Alpha (90 sec) | 32.0435 | 116.1130 | 5.3677 | 297.6860 |
| Statistical <br> Analysis | Average: | 32.3471 | 116.0873 | 5.2793 | 298.3668 |
|  | Median: | 32.3999 | 116.1130 | 5.2204 | 298.0100 |
|  | Std Deviation: | 0.1816 | 0.1419 | 0.0979 | 0.8139 |
|  | Std Deviation of the Mean: | 0.0687 | 0.0536 | 0.0438 | 0.2713 |

when compared with historical measurements (see Figures 8 and 9) that will be explored in greater detail in the discussion section.

## AB Component

With respect to the AB component of WDS $15379+3006$, the astrometric measurement appears reasonable when compared with historical measurements, Figures 10 and 11. Standard deviation of the mean between all manual centroid measurements of this system


Figure 8. Graphical depiction of all measurements of position angle (to date) of STF1963AC with respect to time (epoch).
were 0.8 and 0.1 in position angle and separation distance respectively, Table 3. Precision in the astrometric measurements taken were also excellent, as evidenced by 0.3 and 0.04 standard deviation from the mean in position angle and separation distance respectively.

While there was no significant difference in position angle determination between automatic versus manual centroid detection methods, Figure 11 demonstrates that a separation distance near four arc-seconds


Figure 9. Graphical depiction of all measurements of separation distance (to date) of STF1963AC with respect to time (epoch).
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Figure 10. Graphical depiction of all historical measurements of position angle (to date) of STF1963AB with respect to time (epoch). One can see a linear trend, not indicative of an orbital binary. Outliers omitted.
clearly does not follow the historic trend outlined therein. Manual centroid detection methods, however, did yield precise measurements which fit this trend nicely. Furthermore, a significant difference between measurements which used manual centroid detection and those that used automatic centroid detection did occur, and the measurements which utilized manual centroid detection techniques had a high degree of precision with respect to one another between images (Table 3). For this reason, measurements of separation ascertained by utilizing automatic centroid detection were omitted from AB considerations.

## Discussion

## AC Component

When compared with historical observational data half a degree variation in position angle between measurements of 1908 and 2009 is seen. Somewhat zigzagged pattern in position angle changes is observed, Figure 8. The 2017 angular separation measurement shows 1.4 arc second change compared to the first historic measurement. Within the last twenty years of measuring the overall change in the separation angle is within our resolution limit, Figure 9. Thus, no reasonable trend could be ascertained by careful analysis of the position angle or separation distance with respect to their epoch.

Orbital plots of C component's position relative to A, Figure 12, does not yield any further evidence of a gravitational relationship between the two components either (Genet 2016). Although only five astrometric


Figure 11. Graphical depiction of all measurements of separation distance (to date) of STF1963AB with respect to time (epoch). Again, one can see a linear trend, not indicative of an orbital binary. Outliers omitted.
measurements have been contributed to-date they all show very good overall agreement, Figure 12 right panel, leading us to conclude that C component doesn't appear to move significantly with respect to the A component, Figure 12, left panel.

## AB Component

When compared with historical observational data, this system shows consistency, Figures 10 and 11. Since the first measurements were taken in early 1800s the position angle has changes by eight degrees and the separation has changed by only one arc-second. This indicated that the distance between A and B stars has not change significantly in the last two hundred years while they did change position with respect to each other.

In the Figure 13, we have attempted to present orbital motion of component B with respect to the component A. In the left panel, the A component is found in the origin and all historic data for the motion of component B are plotted including our measurement. In the right panel we averaged measurements in 60 -year bins to clarify any trends in motion. Although no elliptical orbit has yet been made available, more observations of this system, over some time, may be able to provide enough data to establish one. This statement is justified by an apparent curvature toward the north-northeast in the motion of component B with respect to the component A. A determination as to whether or not STF 1963AB is an optical double or long-period gravi-
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Figure 12. Graphical depiction of historical measurements (C component) and present measurement of STF1963AC. Team PRSM measurement appears in red, and by italicized text. In the left panel STF 1963's A component is at the coordinate system origin. In the right panel we zoom into the motion of $C$ component to capture the positions relative to one another.


Figure 13. Graphical depiction of historical measurements and present measurement of STF1963AB. A component positioned at the origin (left panel). Team PRSM measurement appears as a red square, and indicated by an arrow. On the right panel graphical depiction of historical measurements, averaged in 60 -year swaths of measurements to clarify any trends in motion. Team PRSM measurement appears and encircled by a red square, and italicized text.
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(Continued from page 247)
tational binary is difficult to make as both of these can exhibit this overall linear behavior (Heintz 1978).

## Conclusion

Precise measurements of WDS 15379+3006 (STF1963AB and STF1963AC) were obtained successfully from four CCD images taken by iTelescope networks T-18 telescope located in Nerpio, Spain. These measurements shall contribute to a large body of historical astrometric measurements of STF1963AB, and to the very few historical astrometric measurements of STF1963AC. STF 1963AC shows no reasonable trends and it is the opinion of the authors that it is a visual double star system, and not a physical double star system as suggested by its low rPM.

Measurements of the STF1963AB component of WDS $15379+3006$ show a linear trend, although there may be some reason to argue that a seemingly curved path of B with respect to the A exists and therefore is evidence for a long period gravitationally bound system, no orbital relationship was able to be ascertained at the time of this study.
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#### Abstract

The iTelescope network was used to obtain astrometric measurements of double star systems WDS 12202-1408 (STF 1631) and WDS 12339+5522 (STI 2286). Through astrometric measurement softwares SAOImage DS9 and Mira Pro x64, a mean position angle for STF 1631 of_304. $8^{\circ} \pm 0.9^{\circ}$ and a mean separation $14.7^{\prime \prime} \pm 0.2^{\prime \prime}$ was measured. For STI 2286, a newly measured mean position angle of $85.9^{\circ} \pm 0.9^{\circ}$ and mean separation $11.5^{\prime \prime} \pm 0.3^{\prime \prime}$ were obtained. The relative proper motion of 1631 shows that the system could be demonstrating a linear path or an approximately circular orbit with a period of $\sim 1400$ years. Parallax measurements of the secondary star will aid in classifying if this system is a physical or a visual pair. The proper motion of STI 2286 indicates that it could be a physical pair, featuring an orbit nearing a turning point. Follow-up observations in three to four year intervals will further validate or refute this claim and constrain the shape of a possible orbit.


## Introduction

The Astronomy Research Seminar is a project offered by San Diego Miramar Community College for students to gain insight on how research is performed in the real world. This program allows students to learn about binary stars and the basics of astronomy. This project was supervised by Jae Calanog at Miramar College and was supported by the Boyce Research Initiatives and Education Foundation (BRIEF).

Double stars consist of any two stars in the sky within close proximity when viewed from Earth. Some double stars are physically associated or gravitationally bound to each other, commonly referred to as binary stars. However, it is also possible that some double stars are aligned by chance along our line of sight, appearing close to each other when observed but are actually hundreds or thousands of light years apart (Buchheim, 2015). A straightforward method of gathering evidence in order to classify a double star as a visual or a physical pair is to track their positions over time. If the position of each star is determined, the double star's position angle, $\theta$, and separation distance, $\rho$, can
be measured and one can effectively visualize the relative proper motion when compared with historical data.

For this research, the Washington Double Star Catalog (WDS) by Brian Mason (2012) was used to select two double star systems, WDS 12202-1408 (hereafter referred to as STF 1631) and WDS 12339+5522 (hereafter referred to as STI 2286). The double star systems were selected based on their visibility in the Northern Hemisphere during the spring semester (January - June). The WDS catalog was used to search for systems with a right ascension between 12 and 18 hours. In addition, a minimum separation of 6 arc seconds and a magnitude difference no greater than 6 was preferred. Both double star systems met the criteria and had less than 15 observations making them favorable to study because our research would provide valuable information for their classification.

The first star system was selected because it was labeled as a linear system yet the data presented did not seem to support that statement. This star system was discovered in 1831 by John Frederick Herschel, son of astronomer William Herschel. In 1816 Herschel was
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Table 1. Historical measurements for STF 1631. Position angle is measured in degrees and separation distance in arcseconds.

| WDS 12202-1408 (STF 1631) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Epoch | $\left.\boldsymbol{\theta} \mathbf{( ⿳ ㇒}^{\circ}\right)$ | $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ (") |
| 1831.35 | 268.0 | 21.0 |
| 1900.34 | 278.3 | 15.63 |
| 1905.35 | 276.0 | 15.753 |
| 1906.32 | 277.5 | 15.926 |
| 1909.34 | 278.3 | 15.63 |
| 1930.42 | 283.0 | 15.29 |
| 1991.25 | 298.08 | 14.681 |
| 1991.25 | 292.7 | 14.665 |
| 1991.69 | 298.0 | 14.984 |
| 1998.29 | 300.0 | 14.73 |
| 2000.085 | 299.9 | 14.625 |

directed to continue his father's work and in 1820 became a member of the Astronomical Society. In addition to astronomy, John Herschel is known for many of his accomplishments in mathematics, chemistry, and photography (Lankford, 1997). The star system's observation history and data can be viewed in Table 1.

The second star system, STI 2286, had a noticeable difference in its position angle as well as its separation, which indicated significant movement away from the primary star. It was first observed in 1917 by astronomers at the Vatican Observatory Foundation (20152016), a few years after Pope Leo XIII re-founded the institution in 1891. He wanted to demonstrate that the Church was not against science, but instead, promoted it. Based on the information from the WDS catalog and the historical data, these systems seemed to be appropriate candidates to be binary systems. Observation history and data is outlined in Table 2.

The goal of this study was to measure the current separation distances and position angles from the selected double star systems. In obtaining these measurements, we can provide supporting evidence whether or not these systems are either physically associated or just aligned by chance along our line of sight.

## Equipment, Observations, and Data Analysis Procedures

## Equipment

iTelescope Network's T18 (Figure 1) is located at

Table 2. Historical data for STI 2286. Position angle is measured in degrees and separation distance in arcseconds.

| WDS $12339+5522$ (STI 2286) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Epoch | $\theta\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $\rho\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ |
| 1917.28 | 176.7 | 5.7 |
| 1917.28 | 176.7 | 5.685 |
| 2000.26 | 80.0 | 10.18 |
| 2003.16 | 81.1 | 10.472 |
| 2006.408 | 82.3 | 10.84 |
| 2010.5 | 84.0 | 11.25 |



Figure 1. The iTelescope Network's T18 used for the astrometric measurements of STF 1631 and STI 2286.
the AstroCamp Observatory in Nerpio, Spain. The attached charged coupled device (CCD) has a 100,000enon anti-blooming gate and uses a Planewave CDK optical tube assembly on a Paramount PME externally guided mount. This telescope provides 0.73 "/pixel resolution, and images were taken using an Astrodon Series E LRGB (Luminance, Red, Green, Blue) filters (Jenkins, 2003).

## Observations

The date of observation was chosen to align as closely as possible to a new moon phase in order to have the lowest luminosity from the moon as determined by the Staralt visibility tool (Sorensen, 2002). The first date of observation was in late March and the
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Figure 2. Three color image of STF 1631 with combined filters red, green and blue. Field of view is 2 arcmin $x 2$ arcmin.
second date of observation in early May.
Four images were taken in total of STF 1631 at 60 seconds exposures each, using a luminance, red, green and blue filter. Five images of STI 2286 were taken in total, two using a luminance filter for unbiased viewing at 60 and 120 second exposures, and one of each red, green, and blue filters, each with 60 second exposures. See Figures 2 and 3.

## Analysis Procedures

All images were preprocessed (flat-fielded and dark subtracted) by the iTelescope network. The pixels that contained our double star systems were checked for counts to make sure that none of the images were oversaturated. After assessing the quality of the images, they were imported to MaximDL in order to assign World Coordinate System (WCS) positions using the Pinpoint Astrometry feature, which compares the image to the Naval Observatory's Catalog (UCAC4). The UCAC4 catalog matched 110 out of 148 catalog stars with an average residual of .1 arcseconds for STF 1631 and 104 out of 174 image stars with an average residual of . 1 arcseconds for STI 2286.

The image analysis software SAOImage DS9 (referred to henceforth as DS9) was used to consistently measure the position angle $(\theta)$ and separation distance ( $\rho$ ) for each image. First, a 7 " circle was created using the Regions feature and placed over the A star, followed by a circle of the same radius around the B star. DS9's auto-centroiding feature was used to find the


Figure 3. Three color image of STI 2286 with combined filters red, green and blue. Field of view is 1 arcmin $x 1$ arcmin.
center of each star, which effectively calculates the weighted mean position of all the counts per pixel enclosed in the circle. The coordinates for the centroid of each star were recorded and then placed as endpoints of a line segment. The length of the line segment provided the separation distance in arcseconds and its orientation relative to some reference provided the position angle.

To further validate the measurements taken by SAOImage DS9, images were cross referenced with Mira Pro x64. Both results provided considerable overlap in each measurement, verifying the precision of each software.

## Results

We list our astrometric measurements in Table 3 and Table 4 for STF 1631 and STI 2286, respectively. For the epoch, 2017.33, we measure STF 1631 at a mean position angle of $304.8^{\circ} \pm 0.9^{\circ}$ and separation distance of $14.7^{\prime \prime} \pm 0.2^{\prime \prime}$. For STI 2286, we measure a position angle of $85.9^{\circ} \pm 0.9^{\circ}$ and separation distance, $11.5^{\prime \prime} \pm 0.3^{\prime \prime}$. Assuming that the $1-\sigma$ uncertainties associated with the last measurement for STF 1631 (Hartkopf et al. 2013) and STI 2286 (Cutrie et al. 2012) are of the magnitude of the smallest significant figure listed, then one can conclude that both systems have exhibited a significant change in position between the primary and the secondary.

## Discussion

Figure 4 shows an increasing trend in the position
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Table 3. Position angle, separation distance, and uncertainties for STF 1631

| WDS 12202-1408 STF 1631 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Epoch | Number of Images | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean } \theta \\ \left({ }^{\circ}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\sigma_{\theta}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Mean } \\ (\text { ") } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} \sigma_{\rho} \\ \left({ }^{\prime \prime}\right) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2017.33 | 4 | 304.8 | 0.9 | 14.7 | 0.2 |
| 2000.085 | Last Measurement (Hartkopf, et al 2013) | 299.9 | 0.5 | 14.6 | 0.1 |

angle for STF 1631. It is difficult to determine whether the trend over the past $\sim 200$ years has been approximately linear, since we do not have knowledge of the uncertainties associated with the first measurement in 1831. We reach a similar conclusion when examining the longitudinal data associated with the separation distance (Figure 5). All subsequent measurements after the first observation show the separation distance to be slowly decreasing at a steady rate. Figure 6 shows the relative proper motion of STF 1631. If we treat the 1831 measurements as an outlier, then the subsequent data shows two possibilities: First, STF 1631 is a visual pair, with the primary and secondary exhibiting a high degree of relative proper motion. Second, STF 1631 is a binary system in an elliptical orbit, and the current set of data points are only a fraction of the orbital path. This could be indicative of a special case in which a circular orbit with a period of $\sim 1400$ years (determined assuming a constant rate of change in theta and estimating the time for the secondary star to complete 360 degrees around the primary), as explained by the separation remaining statistically constant since its last measurement, and a constant increase in position angle. In


Figure 4. Position angle in degrees and epoch in years for STF 1631, including historical data and new measurement (large diamond). Since its observation, the position angle has steadily increased, which could indicate a constant angular velocity.

Table 4. Position angle, separation distance, and uncertainties for STI 2286

| WDS 12339+5522 STI 2286 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Epoch | Number of Images | $\underset{\left({ }^{\circ}\right)}{\text { Mean }} \theta$ | $\sigma_{\theta}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | Mean (") | $\begin{gathered} \sigma_{\rho} \\ \left({ }^{\prime \prime}\right) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2017.33 | 5 | 85.9 | 0.9 | 11.5 | 0.3 |
| 2010.5 | Last Measurement (Cutrie et al 2012) | 84.0 | 0.8 | 11.3 | 0.2 |

addition, we also note that the recent data release from the GAIA satellite (Arenou et al. 2017) provides a parallax measurement of the primary star and has an estimated distance of $109 \pm 3$ parsecs ( $\sim 350$ light years). If STF 1631 is indeed a binary system, then we would expect the secondary star to have a similar distance, therefore highlighting the importance of the secondary star's parallax measurement for future observations.

Figure 7 shows a peculiar measurement in STI 2286's initial position angle, measured by the Vatican Observatory in 1917. It is significantly larger and does not fit the trend of measurements in later years. We have explored different possibilities on how this measurement could have been so different, such as a NorthSouth switch, a nearby star that could have been mistaken for the secondary, or an initial observation that was taken at the end of a period and subsequent observations were measured once the position angle had reset back to zero. None of these scenarios were able to reproduce the initial measured position angle. In addition, the initial separation distance measured also adds complexity to the issue (of disregarding the 1917 meas-
(Text continues on page 255)


Figure 5. Graph of separation distance in arcseconds and epoch in years for STF 1631, including historical data and new measurement (large diamond). Aside from the first observation, the separation distance appears to be steadily decreasing but could also be statistically constant if the uncertainties from previous measurements overlap with the more recent measurements.
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Figure 6. Relative proper motion plot of STF 1631, expressed as $\triangle R A$ vs. $\triangle D E C$ relative to the primary, placed at the origin. Subsequent measurements from Herschel show two possibilities: a linear solution, which would classify the system as a visual pair or a binary system with an approximately circular orbit, indicated by the steadily changing position angle and an approximately constant separation distance.


Figure 7. Graph of position angle in degrees and epoch for STI 2286, including historical data and new measurements (large diamond). The first observation in 1917 does not fit the trend displayed by subsequent measurements and is likely an outlier.


Figure 8. Graph of separation distance in arcseconds and epoch for STI 2286, including historical data and new measurements (large diamond). Subsequent measurements after 1917 show a steadily increasing separation distance.
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Figure 9. Relative proper motion plot of STI 2286, expressed as $\triangle R A$ vs. $\triangle D E C$ relative to the primary, placed at the origin. Excluding its first observation in 1917 (likely an outlier), STI 2286 follows a curved path that could indicate an orbit around the primary star.
(Continued from page 253)
urements) since it could be consistent with a nonlinear, increasing trend (Figure 8). If we choose to omit the 1917 measurements, then Figure 9 shows that the secondary's relative proper motion is exhibiting some curvature, consistent with an orbit around the primary. Furthermore, from the shape of the secondary's curved path, it looks to be that it might be nearing a turning point. Given that the historical data for STI 2286 listed in Table 2 shows that the position angle has been changing at a rate of $1-2^{\circ}$ per every $3-4$ years and its possible current stage in an elliptical orbit, follow-up observations of this double star system in those time intervals will provide critical longitudinal information in classifying whether or not this system is a physical or a visual double.

## Conclusion

We have successfully measured the position angles and separation distances of the star systems, WDS

12202-1408 (STF 1631) and WDS 12339+5522 (STI 2286), using observations from iTelescope's T18 telescope. Both measurements showed a significant change in position from their last measurements. Our conclusions for each system are as follows:

1. The current set of data for STF 1631 currently shows a proper motion that could be linear or part of orbit with a small degree of eccentricity and a period of $\sim 1400$ years.
2. The first set of measurements for STF 2286 is likely an outlier. If we make this assumption, STF 2286 could represent a physical double star system with the secondary nearing a turning point. Observations every 3-4 years will prove very beneficial in constraining a possible orbit for this system.
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#### Abstract

In the winter and spring of 2017, an aggressive observing program of measuring close double stars with speckle interferometry and CCD imaging was undertaken at Brilliant Sky Observatory, my observing site in Cave Creek, Arizona. A total of 596 stars were observed, 8 of which were rejected for various reasons, leaving 588 pairs. Of these, 427 were observed and measured with speckle interferometry, while the remaining 161 were measured with a CCD. This paper reports the results of the observations of the 161 CCD cases. A separate paper in this issue will report the speckle measurements of the 427 other pairs.


## 1. Introduction

The winter and spring of 2017 marks the start of the third observing season at Brilliant Sky Observatory using high-speed CCD imaging. Previous measurements have been reported in this journal by this author (Harshaw, A through G). This paper will continue the reports in that tradition.

## 2. Equipment Used

Brilliant Sky Observatory is equipped with a Celestron C-11 11-inch SCT telescope mounted on a Celestron CGEM-DX mount atop a PierTech adjustable pier. (See Figure 1.) The mount is controlled by a Lenovo desktop computer running TheSky 6.0.

The optical train consists of a Crayford focuser (locked in place so as not to affect focal length between observing sessions) which feeds into an Orion 1.25inch flip mirror. One leg of the flip mirror unit-the acquisition leg-feeds a $25 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{f} / 1$ illuminated reticle eyepiece with a single crosshair illuminated by a dimmable LED. The mount always places the target star within 5 arc minutes of the cross hair, so acquisition is fast and easy. The camera leg of the flip mirror unit feeds into a ZWO ASI290MM monochrome camera,


Figure 1: The setup at Brilliant Sky Observatory known for its low read noise and excellent performance
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as a speckle camera. The camera has a 2 x "Shorty Barlow" from Orion affixed to its mounting ring. Because only the lens and its mounting barrel from the Shorty Barlow are used, the actual multiplication of the Barlow is 1.5 , resulting in a system focal ratio of 14.98 resulting in 7 pixels per arc second.

The focal length of the system, as well as pixel scale and camera orientation with respect to north, are all determined by multiple drifts ( 20 or more drifts per session) of a star near declination $45^{\circ}$. The drift star is edged to the east edge of the camera's field of view, the drive motor then turned off, and the star allowed to drift across the camera's field of view while the computer is recording the file as a series of FITS frames. These files are then analyzed in The Speckle ToolBox (STB) using the Drift Analysis function of STB.

Focus is achieved and maintained by a Feathertouch focuser controlled by a MicroTouch temperaturecompensated focus controller, both obtained from Starizona, a telescope supply and service center located in Tucson, Arizona.

When doing CCD measurements, 1,000 frames are made of each star at as short an integration time as possible given the magnitudes of the two stars. Usually five such files are made of each star, but for fainter pairs, there may be fewer files made due to the longer exposure times required to accumulate 1,000 frames. For close CCD pairs (pairs that require more than 40 ms of integration time, even if rho is under the 5 " criterion for speckle), a single star is also shot for deconvolution purposes.

Files are written to a 2 TB portable USB3 hard drive, which is then taken into my office for analysis the next day using STB for data reduction and measurements.

Final results are then saved to a 5TB USB3 hard drive with a backup made to a second 5TB USB3 hard drive. The backup drive undergoes an incremental backup once a week.

## 3. Methodology

## 3a. Speckle or CCD?

The decision to make a file as a speckle interferometry case or a CCD case depends on two factors: the separation (rho) of the two stars and the magnitudes of the two stars.

To qualify for speckle interferometry, the pair must have a rho value of $5^{\prime \prime}$ or less (but on nights of very good seeing, this can be pushed up a bit, perhaps to 6 "). Also, the stars must be bright enough to register in 40 ms or less.

Any pair wider than $5^{\prime \prime}$ and/or requiring integration times over 40 ms is then recorded and processed as a

CCD file.

## 3b. Using The Speckle Toolbox in Manual Mode.

Some of the stars in this report are described as "Manual solution with STB." When a pair is wide enough to produce three distinct star images in the autocorellogram (the primary flanked by symmetric images of the companion's power spectrum), STB has no difficulty in automatically locating and selecting the companion star (although sometimes, the observer must use the complementary image $180^{\circ}$ from the one chosen by STB if theta is greater than $180^{\circ}$ ). But in cases where the power spectrum images of the stars are not distinct, or the frame is noisy, STB may not be able to automatically find the companion's image. In such cases, STB allows the user to manually select the companion's image by right clicking on it. In this report, all the pairs measured with "Manual solution" had distinct companion power spectrum images to select, but noise near the primary misled STB's automatic selection process.

## 3c. A New Method Code.

In the spring of 2017, I entered into correspondence with Brian Mason of the U. S. Naval Observatory (the curators of the Washington Double Star Catalog, or WDS) regarding the Su and Cu codes used in the WDS datarequest files. I was able to verify that the Su and Cu codes employed by the USNO were the same procedure I was doing with CCD cases using STB-that is, a pair too wide for speckle (or one requiring integration times over 40 ms ) is measured with the autocorellogram generated by speckle reduction software, such as STB. In my experience, this yields slightly better results than lucky imaging alone and has become my method of choice for analyzing CCD images.

To accommodate this process, Mason agreed to a new code, "Cv", which means that the observer made the measurement of a CCD image using speckle reduction software. The official USNO description for Cv reads, "CCD imaging (speckle-style reduction)".

## 3d. Using the Most Accurate Proper Motions Available.

Until recently, the most accurate data sources for parallax and proper motion were rather limited in depth and scope. Also, the WDS often reports proper motions for one or both of the stars in a system without referencing the source of the measurement (See Harshaw $2017 \mathrm{H})$. When reporting proper motions in this paper, I will indicate the source of the data by following the proper motion numbers with a letter - G for Gaia, U for UCAC5, or W for a proper motion listed in the WDS but for which the source is not known.

In Harshaw 2017 H , I reported how the resultant of two proper motion vectors could be computed. I use
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that method in this paper to indicate when the proper motion vectors do not seem to agree with the observations of the pair.

For example, a pair with widely differing proper motions would be expected to exhibit a linear or nearlylinear track over time, and there are many examples of this in the WDS. However, there are also cases where pairs with widely differing proper motions show no apparent trend in the measurements at all - all of the data points tend to clump around a central point much like the random scattering of buckshot from a shotgun. When widely differing proper motion vectors are listed for a pair with a tight pattern of measurements like this, we may assume that one (or both) of the proper motion vectors is incorrect.

In correspondence with Norbert Zacharias, team leader for the UCAC5 catalog, I learned that Zacharias suggests that where data is available in both Gaia and UCAC5 that we use Gaia: "I recommend to use Gaia DR1 data, i.e. for those stars which are in the TGAS... keep in mind the UCAC data still has issues with poor charge transfer efficiency of the detector leading to magnitude (and field) dependent systematic errors at the about 2000 epoch. This could translate into about 1 to $2 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$ systematic errors for individual stars. But if the UCAC5 random errors on proper motions are small (order 1-2 mas $/ \mathrm{yr}$ ) while the TGAS proper motions are larger, you might want to take UCAC5 or a mean between TGAS and UCAC5... For stars not in TGAS, UCAC5 is a good option, although there are several other attempts to get proper motions with Gaia data and some other earlier data. See for example HSOY (update of PPMXL) or the GPS1 (derived from PanSTARRS, SDSS and 2MASS). Then there is also the PMA (proper motion absolute) catalog based on 2MASS. They all have their pros and cons and are on about the same level of formal errors - nobody knows which is better in an absolute sense."

In many cases, Gaia has good proper motion data on only one of the stars in a double star system. Since the UCAC5 catalog has a much larger sampling of proper motions, it is common for a star without a proper motion value in Gaia to be listed in the UCAC5 data. When this was the case, I looked at the proper motion data in both catalogs for the star that was listed in both catalogs. If the UCAC5 proper motion vector was within 5 milli-arc seconds (mas) of the Gaia value, I assumed that the UCAC5 data for the second star would be on a par with Gaia (had Gaia listed it). However, if the difference in proper motions exceeded 5 mas, the UCAC5 data for the second star was not used.
3e. Using the Most Accurate Parallax Data Available.
Like the proper motion data, parallax data will be
listed with attribution to its source. The format will be XX.XX $\pm 0 . \mathrm{XX} \mathrm{S}$, where the X's are the numbers of the parallax value (with $\pm 0 . \mathrm{XX}$ being the stated error estimate of the parallax) and S the source- H for Hipparcos, G for Gaia.

Most of the time, we only have parallax data on one of the stars in a double star system. In this report, only 34 of the 417 speckle measurements ( $8 \%$ ) have parallax on both stars. For thESE CCD cases, the situation is slightly better - 22 out of 158 pairs ( $14 \%$ ) have parallax on both stars.

Determining if two stars are close enough to be physical on the basis of parallax data alone is a bit tricky. Let's consider two of the stars in this report.

WDS 09371-1350 (BRT1909) has parallaxes for both stars shown in Gaia. For the primary, Gaia shows $1.76 \pm 0.40$ mas, while for the companion it shows 2.19 $\pm 0.93$ mas. Thus the primary could have a parallax ranging from 1.36 up to 2.16 mas while the companion could range from 1.26 to 3.12 mas. So there is a considerable range of parallaxes for the stars that could be at the same distance from the earth. If we draw a diagram showing the parallaxes with their error estimates, we get a picture like Figure 2.

Whereas the two stars could clearly be at the same distance (as shown by the Region of Overlap), they


Figure 2: Parallax overlap of BRT1909
could also be at quite different distances. The Region of Overlap is 0.80 mas whereas the entire parallax range is $3.12-1.26$ or 1.86 mas. So the range of overlap is equivalent to $0.80 / 1.86$ or $43 \%$ of the total parallax space. Does this mean the stars have $43 \%$ chance of being at the same distance?

Unfortunately, no. The reason is that the probability of a star being at any given parallax value is not a linear function around the mean parallax value but rather a Gaussian distribution around the mean. The reported error estimate is one standard deviation. In a normal distribution, the first standard deviation from the mean contains $34.13 \%$ of the possible values, so there is a $68.26 \%$ chance that a star will be within its given parallax window. The actual math to compute a precise probability of two stars being at the same distance given their parallaxes is quite complicated. For our purposes, the percentage of overlap will serve as a reasonable indicator of a pair's likelihood of being at the same dis-
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tance.
Let us consider a case where the stars clearly have no overlap in their parallaxes values. Let us look at WDS 10258+3237 (ES 432), a pair with given parallaxes of $4.00 \pm 0.36$ and $2.74 \pm 0.49$. Here is a diagram of


Figure 3: Parallax range of ES 432
the parallax data (Figure 3).
Clearly, there is no overlap between the parallax values of the stars in the system, so they are probably too far apart to be captured by their mutual gravitational forces.

In doing parallax calculations, if the error estimate of the parallax was $25 \%$ or more of the mean, the parallax was rejected as being unreliable.

Also, at the suggestion of William Hartkopf at the US Naval Observatory, I decided to use a weighted average of the parallax values for stars whose parallaxes could place them close enough in physical proximity to

$$
\begin{equation*}
P X_{w}=\frac{[(1-\text { PxA err } \%) * \text { PxA }]+[(1-\text { PxB err } \%) * \text { PxB }]}{[(1-\text { PxA err } \%)+(1-\text { PxB err } \%)]} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

be physical. In such cases, the weighted parallax was computed as (Equation 1)
$P X_{w}$ is the weighted parallax. PxA err\% is the error in parallax for the primary star expressed as a percentage (Error / Parallax). Likewise for $\operatorname{PxB}$ err $\%$.

Let's take an example. Consider the case of WDS $11272+1908$ (KU 38), a pair for which Gaia lists parallax for both stars. For the primary, Gaia shows $6.18 \pm$

$$
\begin{aligned}
P X_{w} & =\frac{[(1-0.38 / 6.18) * 6.18+(1-0.42 / 6.23) * 6.23]}{[(1-0.38 / 6.18)+(1-0.42 / 6.23)]} \\
& =6.20
\end{aligned}
$$

0.38 mas and for the companion, $6.23 \pm 0.42$ mas. The weighted parallax then works out to

Knowing the weighted parallax, it is a simple matter to divide 1 by the parallax in arc seconds (converting mas to arc seconds by multiplying the mas by 0.001 ). In this case, the distance would be $1 / 0.0062$
$=161$ parsecs.

## 3f. Estimating the minimum separation between the two stars.

When we have a parallax for each star, we can then compute the minimum separation between the two stars once we have the distance in parsecs. This is found by simply multiplying the distance (in parsecs) by the latest value for rho (in arc seconds). In the case of KU 38, the last value for rho in the WDS was listed as $5.90^{\prime \prime}$. Hence, the minimum separation between the two stars is $5.90 * 161$ or 950 astronomical units (AU)-roughly 32 times the distance from the Sun to Neptune. This is a vast distance to be sure, but well within the realm of possibility for a binary star system.

This method will yield only the minimum separation in the two stars since we do not know the orientation of the stars relative to our line of sight. We are only seeing a projection of their distance on the sky's plane, and in all likelihood, one of the stars lies closer to earth than the other. As a result, we see one leg of a right triangle, while the stars are truly separated by the hypotenuse of that triangle.

A survey of the Sixth Orbit Catalog shows, that where we have the distance to a pair and can therefore compute the true separation of a binary system in AU, the true separations of stars (based on the semi-major axis of the orbit) run a range from 4.1 AU at the low end to $1,707 \mathrm{AU}$ at the high end, with a mean of 281 AU. (These data are based on an analysis of 887 systems in the $6^{\text {th }}$ Orbit Catalog.)

The data available to date suggests that true separations in binary stars will be, at most, in the low thousands of astronomical units. Of course, this is not to say that a true binary could not have a separation of 30,000 astronomical units or more, but only that our research so far makes such a wide pair highly unlikely. Obviously, the $6^{\text {th }}$ Orbit Catalog represents a selection bias due to the fact that we only have good distance data and orbits on binary stars that are relatively close to us. Nonetheless, I would be highly suspicious of a given pair's odds of being a true binary if the separation between the two stars exceeds 3 or 4 thousand astronomical units.

## 4. Results

## 4a. The Results Tables.

The results of the winter and spring 2017 observing season at Brilliant Sky Observatory are presented in 11 tables as shown in Table 1. (The numbers indicate the number of pairs listed under each section.)

In Table 1, the number before the colon indicates the table number. CPM means common proper motion pairs (pairs where the proper motion vectors are both
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Table 1: Results by Type of System

| Type | CCD |
| :---: | :---: |
| CPM | $3: 105$ |
| DPM | $4: 21$ |
| LIN | $5: 5$ |
| ORB | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| SAB | $7: 26$ |

Table 2: Annual Differences in $\theta$ and $\rho$

within 5 mas of each other, except where the proper motions are large, in which case the differences can be extended). DPM means the pair has different proper motions (more than 5 mas difference in both vector values). LIN means the pair is showing a linear pattern. ORB are pairs that have known orbits. SAB signifies short arc binaries, pairs that are showing an arc but for which there are not yet orbital solutions. And UNK stands for unknown - cases that do not fit any of the other categories.

## 4b. A Quick Check of Measurement Consistency.

A quick way to check consistency of one's measurements has traditionally been to compare the observer's measurement to the last measurement listed in the WDS (and obtained by a datarequest email to the USNO). The problem with this method is that if the last measurement was of uncertain value, the residual (difference between the observer's measurement and the last measurement on record) may be large, suggesting a poor measurement. Of course, the large residual may be due to a poor prior measurement. This will be seen in several cases in the tables that follow.

A more consistent method is to compute the average annual difference between the values of theta and rho from the last measurement on record to the observer's measurement, and then add all of the differences. The closer to zero each sum would be (theta and rho), the more consistent the measurements of the observer.

The reasoning is that for any large sample (and 578 pairs is probably a large enough sample), one would expect the changes in theta to be evenly divided between increasing theta ( $a+$ value for the difference) and decreasing theta ( a - value); likewise for rho. In other
words, there is a $50 / 50$ chance that for any given pair, theta will increase over time or decrease, as will be the case for rho.

By computing the average annual change in theta and rho, one gets around those cases where the last measurement was made, say, 20 years ago and the residual seems very large. But if one computes the change in theta and rho per year over the 20 year window, the residuals become much smaller.

In computing annualized changes in theta and rho, I took the date of the observation minus the year of the last observation plus 0.5 (assuming an average measurement would be made mid-year), resulting in the number of years that have elapsed since the last measurement on file and the one I made. I then divided the raw residuals by this number of years to get the annual change.

I do this procedure for each night I observe and if the average annual change in theta exceeds $0.5^{\circ}$ or rho exceeds 0.100 ", I assume there is a problem with the measurements that night (more than likely a calibration issue). If the cause of the error can be determined (for example, doing a drift calibration the next night without moving the camera from the night before), the correction will be applied to the measurements obtained and results reported. If the cause cannot be determined, or if even after finding the cause, the errors still lie outside the parameters I have set, I reject all the work for that night and try to get the measurements on a later night.

For all of the pairs in this report, the annual differences came to the values shown in Table 2. I also report in this table the average standard error of the mean and average raw residual.
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## 4c. Format of the Tables.

The table column headings are as follows:
Date: date of the observation (Julian)
WDS No: the WDS number of the pair
Disc/Comp: discoverer and components
PM A: proper motion of the primary in mas per year. Source indicated by W for WDS, G for Gaia, or U for UCAC5
PM B: proper motion of the companion as for A
Last Yr: last year of measurement on file with the WDS
Last $\theta$ : the last value for $\theta$ reported
Last $\rho$ : the last value for $\rho$ reported
Msrs: Number of measures made on the night of observation
Measured $\theta \pm \operatorname{err}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ : the measured value of $\theta$ that night with the standard error of the mean, expressed in degrees
Measured $\rho \pm$ err ("): the measured value of $\rho$ that night with the standard error of the mean, expressed in arc seconds
Resid $\theta$ : the difference between the observed value of $\theta$ and the last value on record

Resid $\rho$ : the difference between the observed value of $\rho$ and the last value on record

In the plot diagrams that accompany the notes, the historical data has been corrected for precession and the axis values are expressed in arc seconds.

Every pair that I measure has a plot of its measurements made from a WDS data request. Any measurement I make that lies far from the mean of the historical data is not reported, as there may be problems with calibration or even the measurement of the wrong star (surprisingly easy to do in a rich star field!).

In addition, some of the plots of the measurements presented in the "Notes" tables that follow each table of results contain a heavy orange line. This line is the PM vector that the stars should have followed if the displacement over its observed history is due only to a difference in proper motions. In some cases, the fit of the orange line to the data is so good as to virtually confirm the pair is linear. In other cases, the orange line is displayed on a small and dense packing of measurements, which would indicate a problem with one (or both) of the proper motion vectors.
(Text continues on page 274)

Table 3: Common Proper Motion Pairs Measured With the Cv Method

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \text { Yr } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | Last $\rho$ | Msrs | Measured $\theta \pm \operatorname{err}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Measured } \\ \rho \pm \text { err } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Resid } \\ \theta \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Resid $\rho$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.3288 | 09036-0225 | $\mathrm{HO} \quad 41 \mathrm{AB}$ | $-024+002 \mathrm{G}$ | $-024+001 \mathrm{U}$ | 2011 | 71.8 | 3.90 | 5 | $71.7 \pm 0.1$ | $3.935 \pm 0.001$ | -0.1 | 0.035 | * |
| 2017.3288 | 09042-1152 | BRT3209 | -020-012 U | -019-012 U | 2000 | 173.7 | 4.07 | 5 | $174.8 \pm 0.5$ | $4.115 \pm 0.039$ | 1.1 | 0.045 |  |
| 2017.3342 | 09319-1202 | BRT2720 | $-009+009 \mathrm{U}$ | $-009+009 \mathrm{U}$ | 2010 | 64.1 | 3.70 | 2 | $63.7 \pm 1.7$ | $3.862 \pm 0.001$ | -0.4 | 0.162 |  |
| 2017.3342 | 09330-1411 | BRT1908 | -020-017 G | -022-015 W | 2000 | 249.2 | 3.60 | 2 | $250.4 \pm 0.6$ | $3.632 \pm 0.036$ | 1.2 | 0.031 | * |
| 2017.3096 | 09357+5318 | STF1366 | -045-037 U | -046-038 U | 2006 | 321.8 | 8.34 | 5 | $321.0 \pm 0.0$ | $8.262 \pm 0.012$ | -0.8 | -0.078 | * |
| 2017.3342 | 09371-1350 | BRT1909 | -000-006G | +002-007 G | 2010 | 252.1 | 3.65 | 2 | $252.2 \pm 0.0$ | $3.746 \pm 0.031$ | 0.1 | 0.096 | * |
| 2017.3342 | 09405-1509 | J 1555 | $-015+001 \mathrm{G}$ | $-011+002 \mathrm{U}$ | 2010 | 292.8 | 8.18 | 4 | $292.8 \pm 0.0$ | $8.601 \pm 0.002$ | 0.0 | 0.421 | * |
| 2017.3397 | 09469-1121 | BRT3211 | -019-013 U | -019-012 U | 2000 | 301.9 | 3.33 | 3 | $298.1 \pm 0.6$ | $3.378 \pm 0.024$ | $-3.8$ | 0.048 | * |
| 2017.3342 | 09483-1448 | BRT 575 | $-006+012 \mathrm{U}$ | $-006+012 \mathrm{U}$ | 2010 | 69.0 | 6.50 | 2 | $68.4 \pm 1.4$ | $6.539 \pm 0.118$ | -0.6 | 0.039 |  |
| 2017.3397 | 09497-1414 | BRT2722 | $-021+005 \mathrm{G}$ | $-022+006 \mathrm{U}$ | 2005 | 97.0 | 5.40 | 3 | $93.2 \pm 0.0$ | $5.415 \pm 0.005$ | $-3.8$ | 0.015 | * |
| 2017.3397 | 09549-1750 | FEN 16 | +025-033 U | +026-032 G | 2010 | 155.3 | 4.51 | 3 | $154.8 \pm 0.6$ | $4.567 \pm 0.039$ | -0.5 | 0.057 | * |
| 2017.3315 | 10025-0915 | RST3674 | $-001+000 \mathrm{G}$ | $-004+001 \mathrm{U}$ | 2012 | 142.5 | 2.84 | 4 | $142.3 \pm 0.1$ | $2.866 \pm 0.003$ | -0.2 | 0.026 | * |
| 2017.3315 | $10038+0125$ | BAL1435 | -005-000 U | -005-001 U | 2002 | 102.4 | 2.86 | 2 | $103.0 \pm 0.4$ | $2.879 \pm 0.015$ | 0.6 | 0.019 | * |
| 2017.3562 | $10057+8042$ | WFC 91 | -009-017 G | -010-020 W | 2011 | 272.0 | 8.40 | 4 | $271.1 \pm 0.0$ | $8.493 \pm 0.009$ | -0.9 | 0.093 | * |
| 2017.3370 | $10066+2602$ | TDS 569 | $-008+003 \mathrm{G}$ | $-012+008 \mathrm{G}$ | 2001 | 90.4 | 2.28 | 4 | $89.3 \pm 0.1$ | $2.324 \pm 0.002$ | -1.1 | 0.044 | * |
| 2017.3562 | $10090+6427$ | STF1407 | -010-026 U | -007-022 U | 2011 | 50.5 | 4.90 | 4 | $50.0 \pm 0.2$ | $4.935 \pm 0.022$ | -0.5 | 0.035 |  |
| 2017.3397 | $10135+3746$ | HJ 3322 | $-033+014 G$ | $-034+015 \mathrm{U}$ | 2010 | 131.6 | 8.06 | 3 | $131.8 \pm 0.3$ | $8.059 \pm 0.003$ | 0.2 | -0.001 | * |
| 2017.3397 | $10135+3928$ | STF1414 | +001-001 G | +002-003 U | 2012 | 94.2 | 3.94 | 4 | $93.9 \pm 0.1$ | $4.125 \pm 0.003$ | -0.3 | 0.185 | * |
| 2017.3726 | $10216+4609$ | STF1425 | +002-011 U | +006-009 U | 2012 | 358.0 | 4.80 | 4 | $358.0 \pm 0.1$ | $4.828 \pm 0.003$ | 0.0 | 0.028 |  |

Table 3 continues on next page.
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Table 3 (continued). Common Proper Motion Pairs Measured With the Cv Method

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \text { Yr } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Last } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \rho \end{gathered}$ | Msrs | Measured <br> $\theta \pm \operatorname{err}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Measured } \\ \rho \pm \text { err (") } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \rho \end{gathered}$ | tes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.3562 | $10232+6137$ | KR 36 | +002-021 G | +003-022 | G | 2011 | 243.0 | 5.50 | 4 | $243.0 \pm 0.0$ | $5.637 \pm 0.001$ | 0.0 | 0.137 | * |
| 2017.3808 | $10233+4843$ | ES 917 | +006-015 W | +006-015 | W | 2001 | 151.8 | 2.16 | 3 | $150.9 \pm 0.1$ | $2.046 \pm 0.004$ | -0.9 | -0.114 |  |
| 2017.3370 | $10236+2617$ | A 1991 | -081-010 W | -081-010 | W | 2012 | 189.2 | 1.47 | 4 | $188.8 \pm 0.2$ | $1.494 \pm 0.004$ | -0.4 | 0.024 | * |
| 2017.3644 | 10245+3259 | ES 2222 | -020-000 G | -020-000 | U | 2010 | 290.0 | 8.20 | 3 | $290.7 \pm 0.0$ | $7.701 \pm 0.002$ | 0.7 | -0.499 | * |
| 2017.3562 | $10248+6739$ | MLB 461 | -019-001 G | -017-002 | U | 2007 | 249.3 | 6.58 | 3 | $252.5 \pm 0.7$ | $6.648 \pm 0.030$ | 3.2 | 0.068 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $10258+3237$ | ES 432 | -033-004 G | -037-001 | G | 2002 | 163.3 | 2.92 | 3 | $162.9 \pm 0.1$ | $2.935 \pm 0.012$ | -0.4 | 0.015 | * |
| 2017.3836 | $10283+4013$ | HJ 2531 | +011-037 G | +009-040 | U | 2010 | 3.0 | 8.70 | 4 | $4.1 \pm 0.0$ | $647 \pm 0.002$ | 1.1 | -0.053 | * |
| 2017.3342 | 10291+0342 | BAL2841 | -042-017 G | -042-017 | U | 2010 | 355.3 | 4.68 | 2 | $355.0 \pm 0.2$ | $4.663 \pm 0.054$ | -0.3 | -0.017 | * |
| 2017.3836 | $10308+4414$ | ES 1151 | $-009+000 \mathrm{G}$ | $-012+001$ | U | 2002 | 298.1 | 2.58 | 4 | $299.5 \pm 0.1$ | $2.709 \pm 0.005$ | 1.4 | 0.129 | * |
| 2017.3260 | $10324+6800$ | HJ 3327 | -119-059 G | -114-066 | U | 2010 | 100.3 | 3.22 | 5 | $99.1 \pm 0.2$ | $3.258 \pm 0.017$ | -1.2 | 0.038 | * |
| 2017.3370 | $10335+1120$ | BU 1426 | $-042+032 \mathrm{G}$ | -040+031 | U | 2002 | 201.6 | 2.60 | 4 | $200.3 \pm 0.0$ | $2.706 \pm 0.002$ | -1.3 | 0.106 | * |
| 2017.3014 | 10341-1255 | J 1567 | -000-016 G | +001-017 | U | 2010 | 204.7 | 5.37 | 5 | $203.5 \pm 0.1$ | $5.432 \pm 0.016$ | -1.2 | 0.062 | * |
| 2017.3014 | 10355-1756 | HLD 107 | -016+008 W | -016+008 | W | 2010 | 306.6 | 1.64 | 5 | $306.7 \pm 0.3$ | $1.589 \pm 0.017$ | 0.1 | -0.051 | * |
| 2017.3014 | 10376-1921 | HJ 4337 | $-020+006$ G | $-020+005$ | U | 2010 | 73.0 | 9.45 | 5 | $71.4 \pm 0.0$ | $757 \pm 0.006$ | -1.6 | 0.307 | * |
| 2017.3342 | 10389+0721 | J 79 | -040-031 G | -043-030 | W | 2005 | 133.2 | 1.56 | 2 | $131.7 \pm 0.4$ | $1.500 \pm 0.000$ | -1.5 | -0.060 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $10400+3505$ | ES 2164 | -008-013 W | -008-013 | W | 2001 | 90.0 | 2.03 | 3 | $89.4 \pm 0.4$ | $1.895 \pm 0.025$ | -0.6 | -0.135 |  |
| 2017.3342 | 10410+0336 | J 1369 | +128-132 W | +125-134 | W | 2010 | 121.0 | 7.40 | 2 | $120.5 \pm 0.0$ | $7.530 \pm 0.055$ | -0.5 | 0.130 |  |
| 2017.3644 | $10420+3005$ | TDS7425 | +012-019 W | +012-019 | W | 1991 | 357.1 | 2.14 | 2 | $0.4 \pm 0.7$ | $1.921 \pm 0.014$ | 3.3 | -0.219 | * |
| 2017.3370 | 10422+0054 | BAL1440 | -034-064 G | -036-063 | U | 2002 | 210.9 | 3.34 | 3 | $212.3 \pm 0.1$ | $3.324 \pm 0.005$ | 1.4 | -0.016 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $10443+3739$ | ES 2634 | +004-001 G | +005-001 | U | 2010 | 233.8 | 9.26 | 3 | $234.1 \pm 0.0$ | $9.522 \pm 0.007$ | 0.3 | 0.262 |  |
| 2017.3288 | 10443-1731 | RST3711 | -073-020 G | -078-032 | W | 1999 | 96.6 | 2.29 | 5 | $97.9 \pm 0.2$ | $2.404 \pm 0.003$ | 1.3 | 0.114 | * |
| 2017.3288 | 10595-1430 | A 1772 | $-045+002 \mathrm{G}$ | $-043+006$ | U | 2011 | 212.7 | 3.68 | 5 | $212.8 \pm 0.2$ | $3.682 \pm 0.025$ | 0.1 | 0.002 | * |
| 2017.3370 | 11001-0657 | A 134 | +003-020 W | +003-020 | W | 2003 | 330.1 | 1.78 | 4 | $329.3 \pm 0.4$ | $1.867 \pm 0.017$ | -0.8 | 0.087 |  |
| 2017.3808 | $11004+5237$ | ES 722 | -013+019 G | $-013+017$ | U | 2010 | 103.0 | 7.00 | 4 | $103.9 \pm 0.0$ | $8.386 \pm 0.001$ | 0.9 | 1.386 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $11068+2513$ | TDS7670 | -014-043 G | -010-043 | U | 2002 | 359.2 | 2.32 | 3 | $359.1 \pm 0.6$ | $2.192 \pm 0.087$ | -0.1 | -0.128 | * |
| 2017.3370 | 11080+1012 | J 81 | -017-019 W | -017-019 | W | 2000 | 139.0 | 1.95 | 3 | $136.7 \pm 0.3$ | $1.944 \pm 0.033$ | -2.3 | -0.006 |  |
| 2017.3836 | $11175+5900$ | ES 1786 | -020-008 G | -020-008 | U | 2008 | 335.9 | 3.92 | 3 | $338.0 \pm 0.0$ | $4.144 \pm 0.004$ | 2.1 | 0.224 | * |
| 2017.4164 | $11183+6858$ | TDS 630 | +030+022 W | +030+022 | W | 2005 | 242.0 | 2.14 | 3 | $239.2 \pm 0.4$ | $2.040 \pm 0.028$ | -2.8 | -0.100 | * |
| 2017.3808 | $11190+5118$ | WNC 3 | $+028+002 \mathrm{G}$ | +030+005 | U | 2011 | 208.0 | 6.80 | 3 | $208.0 \pm 0.0$ | $6.713 \pm 0.005$ | 0.0 | -0.087 | * |
| 2017.4164 | $11230+6443$ | $\begin{array}{\|ll\|} \hline \text { AG } & 174 \\ \text { AB } & \\ \hline \end{array}$ | -008-112 G | -013-110 | W | 2014 | 104.0 | 2.05 | 3 | $103.7 \pm 0.1$ | $2.112 \pm 0.009$ | -0.3 | 0.062 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $11272+1908$ | KU 38 | -041-017 G | -042-016 | G | 2010 | 54.0 | 5.90 | 4 | $53.8 \pm 0.0$ | $6.252 \pm 0.005$ | -0.2 | 0.352 | * |
| 2017.3699 | $11323+3323$ | ES 2284 | -020-028 U | -024-031 | U | 2001 | 77.5 | 3.03 | 3 | $76.2 \pm 0.0$ | $3.093 \pm 0.003$ | -1.3 | 0.063 |  |
| 2017.4164 | $11333+5748$ | KR 39AB | +027+006 G | +028+011 | G | 2011 | 151.0 | 10.10 | 4 | $151.9 \pm 0.0$ | $10.379 \pm 0.014$ | 0.9 | 0.279 | * |
| 2017.3726 | $11336+4445$ | LEO 34 | +021-004 W | +021-004 | W | 2001 | 160.9 | 1.76 | 3 | $159.0 \pm 0.1$ | $1.669 \pm 0.010$ | -1.9 | 1.669 | * |
| 2017.3726 | $11392+4910$ | STF1562 | +016-037 G | +017-038 | U | 2010 | 270.0 | 16.20 | 3 | $269.7 \pm 0.0$ | $16.173 \pm 0.005$ | -0.3 | -0.027 | * |
| 2017.3699 | $11396+2657$ | STF1564 | +001-004 G | +000-003 | W | 2010 | 87.0 | 5.20 | 4 | $86.6 \pm 0.0$ | $5.277 \pm 0.002$ | -0.4 | 0.077 | * |

Table 3 continues on next page.

## Measurements of 161 Double Stars With a High-Speed CCD .

Table 3 (continued). Common Proper Motion Pairs Measured With the Cv Method

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A |  | PM B | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \text { Yr } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \theta \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \rho \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Msrs | $\begin{gathered} \text { Measured } \\ \left.\theta \pm \text { err }{ }^{( }\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Measured } \\ \rho \pm \text { err (") } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \rho \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.4164 | 11430+6421 | STF1567 | -011-003 | G | +012+002 U | 2014 | 85.0 | 3.45 | 4 | $84.3 \pm 0.0$ | $3.567 \pm 0.003$ | -0.7 | 0.117 | * |
| 2017.3699 | $11461+3727$ | ES 1738 | +003-018 | W | +003-018 W | 2001 | 163.2 | 1.91 | 3 | $163.6 \pm 0.2$ | $1.823 \pm 0.010$ | 0.4 | -0.087 |  |
| 2017.4027 | $11466+5710$ | STI2276 | $-035+009$ | G | $-032+007 \mathrm{U}$ | 2010 | 9.0 | 11.40 | 3 | $9.7 \pm 0.0$ | $11.456 \pm 0.002$ | 0.7 | 0.056 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $11468+5951$ | KR 40 | +024-020 | G | +026-022 U | 2003 | 274.0 | 3.30 | 4 | $274.5 \pm 0.0$ | $3.341 \pm 0.002$ | 0.5 | 0.041 | * |
| 2017.3699 | $11489+3342$ | KU 40 | $-006+000$ | G | -005-001 U | 2002 | 184.2 | 2.89 | 4 | $184.5 \pm 0.0$ | $2.959 \pm 0.005$ | 0.3 | 0.069 | * |
| 2017.3699 | $11533+2019$ | STF1577 | $-023+004$ | G | $-023+005 \mathrm{U}$ | 2011 | 10.0 | 8.40 | 3 | $9.6 \pm 0.0$ | $8.646 \pm 0.004$ | -0.4 | 0.246 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $11543+5033$ | ES 724 | -033-006 | G | -032-003 G | 2002 | 227.8 | 2.75 | 3 | $230.8 \pm 0.1$ | $2.720 \pm 0.003$ | 3.0 | -0.030 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $11556+1654$ | KU 41 | +011-021 | G | +003-019 G | 2011 | 68.0 | 5.10 | 4 | $67.7 \pm 0.0$ | $5.141 \pm 0.008$ | -0.3 | 0.041 | * |
| 2017.3370 | 12029-1908 | B 2536 | $-019+002$ | G | $-018+001$ G | 2002 | 289.0 | 2.47 | 3 | $288.2 \pm 0.5$ | $2.576 \pm 0.019$ | -0.8 | 0.106 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $12061+3850$ | STF1601 | -028-063 | G | - | 2007 | 300.0 | 2.10 | 4 | $297.6 \pm 0.1$ | $2.010 \pm .0 .013$ | -2.4 | -0.090 | * |
| 2017.3589 | $12126+3546$ | STF1613 | +009+008 | W | +009+008 W | 2015 | 11.0 | 1.10 | 5 | $7.3 \pm 0.2$ | $168 \pm 0.003$ | -3.7 | 0.068 | * |
| 2017.4055 | $12151+8349$ | WFC 124 | -014-006 | U | -014-008 G | 2004 | 132.3 | 4.63 | 3 | $132.0 \pm 0.0$ | $4.663 \pm 0.015$ | -0.3 | 0.033 | * |
| 2017.3808 | $12164+4444$ | A 1781 | $-032+002$ | G | -026+001 U | 2007 | 301.8 | 2.84 | 3 | $303.0 \pm 0.3$ | $2.857 \pm 0.015$ | 1.2 | 0.017 | * |
| 2017.3808 | $12239+4441$ | ES 1155 | +028+016 | G | +027+012 U | 2003 | 200.8 | 3.52 | 4 | $200.8 \pm 0.5$ | $3.594 \pm 0.062$ | 0.0 | 0.074 | * |
| 2017.3808 | $12242+4304$ | STF1638 | $+003+000$ | G | +004+002 U | 2010 | 282.0 | 8.20 | 3 | $282.0 \pm 0.0$ | $8.293 \pm 0.015$ | 0.0 | 0.093 | * |
| 2017.4055 | $12285+8841$ | STF1717 | -020-013 | G | -019-012 G | 2011 | 328.0 | 8.30 | 4 | $322.5 \pm 0.1$ | $8.316 \pm 0.021$ | -5.5 | 0.016 | * |
| 2017.4055 | $12291+8525$ | LDS1752 | $-143+074$ | W | $-154+046 \mathrm{~W}$ | 1991 | 205.1 | 3.30 | 3 | $200.2 \pm 0.6$ | $3.156 \pm 0.013$ | -4.9 | -0.144 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $12295+2931$ | BU 1324AB | -001-007 | G | +001-005 G | 2014 | 224.0 | 2.20 | 4 | $223.7 \pm 0.3$ | $2.367 \pm 0.011$ | -0.3 | 0.167 | * |
| 2017.3808 | $12334+3202$ | STF1653 | -006-002 | G | -004-003 U | 2013 | 342.0 | 8.00 | 4 | $342.9 \pm 0.0$ | $8.027 \pm 0.002$ | 0.9 | 0.027 | * |
| 2017.3589 | $12360+1124$ | STF1661 | -301-074 | G | -302-073 W | 2013 | 253.0 | 2.20 | 5 | $253.2 \pm 0.0$ | $2.322 \pm 0.000$ | 0.2 | 0.122 | * |
| 2017.3589 | $12388+1252$ | AG 343 | -056+027 | G | $-057+026 \mathrm{U}$ | 2010 | 325.0 | 8.50 | 3 | $325.2 \pm 0.0$ | $8.501 \pm 0.001$ | 0.2 | 0.001 | * |
| 2017.3836 | $12439+4950$ | BEM 1 | -003+006 | G | -010+010 W | 2010 | 202.0 | 9.40 | 3 | $203.9 \pm 0.0$ | $9.602 \pm 0.015$ | 1.9 | 0.202 | * |
| 2017.3808 | $12480+3420$ | AG 182 | -007+010 | W | -007+010 W | 1996 | 189.8 | 2.34 | 4 | $190.4 \pm 0.0$ | $2.363 \pm 0.001$ | 0.6 | 0.023 |  |
| 2017.3644 | 12587+2707 | STF1700 | -001+009 | G | +006+007 U | 2011 | 84.0 | 7.40 | 4 | $83.9 \pm 0.0$ | $7.439 \pm 0.002$ | -0.1 | 0.039 | * |
| 2017.3808 | $13080+4907$ | HJ 2642 | $-031+045$ | G | $-032+045 \mathrm{U}$ | 2010 | 177.0 | 9.00 | 3 | $177.5 \pm 0.0$ | $9.183 \pm 0.006$ | 0.5 | 0.183 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $13112+3050$ | STF1729AB-C | -38-013 |  | -041-013 G | 2011 | 276.0 | 8.70 | 2 | $275.5 \pm 0.0$ | $8.702 \pm 0.009$ | -0.5 | 0.002 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $13174+5812$ | MLB 69 | +006-014 | G | +009-016 U | 2004 | 40.2 | 4.02 | 3 | $39.6 \pm 0.1$ | $4.045 \pm 0.004$ | -0.6 | 0.025 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $13208+3158$ | ES 308 | $-028+025$ | G | $-031+029$ G | 2008 | 113.6 | 7.25 | 3 | $113.5 \pm 0.0$ | $7.360 \pm 0.005$ | -0.1 | 0.110 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $13298+5905$ | ES 1790 | +013-004 | U | +012-004 U | 2003 | 250.5 | 4.95 | 3 | $251.6 \pm 0.0$ | $4.996 \pm 0.006$ | 1.1 | 0.046 |  |
| 2017.3562 | $13378+2819$ | HJ 3341AB | $-140+035$ | G | $-141+041 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2000 | 190.8 | 2.30 | 3 | $189.6 \pm 0.2$ | $2.392 \pm 0.003$ | -1.2 | 0.092 | * |
| 2017.3644 | 13490+3056 | BRT 250 | $-028+043$ |  | -027+043 U | 2010 | 136.0 | 5.50 | 3 | $137.4 \pm 0.1$ | $5.514 \pm 0.001$ | 1.4 | 0.014 |  |
| 2017.3644 | $13525+2544$ | A 568 | -004+011 |  | $-004+013 \mathrm{U}$ | 2003 | 320.7 | 2.55 | 3 | $321.3 \pm 0.1$ | $2.606 \pm 0.002$ | 0.6 | 0.056 | * |
| 2017.4466 | $14156+2255$ | ROE 74 | +003+002 |  | +004+002 U | 2011 | 286.8 | 7.09 | 2 | $287.0 \pm 0.0$ | $7.118 \pm 0.014$ | 0.2 | 0.028 |  |
| 2017.4493 | $14170+2412$ | STF1828 | -004-006 |  | -005-004 W | 2013 | 159.2 | 2.09 | 4 | $159.2 \pm 0.1$ | $2.084 \pm 0.001$ | 0.0 | -0.006 | * |
| 2017.4493 | $14197+2330$ | STF3083 | +004+016 |  | +001+014 U | 2010 | 231.7 | 4.65 | 4 | $232.5 \pm 0.0$ | $4.794 \pm 0.007$ | 0.8 | 0.144 | * |
| 2017.4438 | $14207+1210$ | HO 541 | -005+013 |  | $-003+011$ U | 2002 | 89.8 | 2.60 | 2 | $88.9 \pm 0.2$ | $2.622 \pm 0.006$ | -0.9 | 0.022 |  |
| 2017.4438 | $14217+1003$ | HEI 779 | -019-014 |  | -017-013 U | 2002 | 102.8 | 2.77 | 2 | $103.5 \pm 0.1$ | $2.779 \pm 0.011$ | 0.7 | 0.009 |  |

Table 3 continues on next page.

# Measurements of 161 Double Stars With a High-Speed CCD 

Table 3 (conclusion). Common Proper Motion Pairs Measured With the Cv Method

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \text { Yr } \end{gathered}$ | Last $\theta$ | Last $\rho$ | Msrs | ```Measured 0 }\pm\mathrm{ err ( }\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ``` | $$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Resid } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \rho \end{gathered}$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.4438 | $14227+0039$ | J 439 | -024-010 U | -025-010 U | 2002 | 239.2 | 3.93 | 2 | $237.4 \pm 0.2$ | $3.917 \pm 0.017$ | -1.8 | -0.013 | * |
| 2017.4438 | $14229+0943$ | A 1103 | $-032+006 \mathrm{G}$ | $-032+005 \mathrm{U}$ | 2011 | 203.9 | 4.65 | 3 | $204.2 \pm 0.0$ | $4.726 \pm 0.004$ | 0.3 | 0.076 | * |
| 2017.4438 | $14244+1813$ | COU 62 | -050-004 G | -050-005 G | 2001 | 200.7 | 2.39 | 2 | $200.4 \pm 0.1$ | $2.397 \pm 0.032$ | -0.3 | 0.007 | * |
| 2017.4438 | $14266+0208$ | HJ 1254 | $-137+091 \mathrm{~W}$ | $-137+091 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2011 | 62.8 | 6.02 | 3 | $63.1 \pm 0.1$ | $6.229 \pm 0.002$ | 0.3 | 0.209 |  |
| 2017.4438 | $14317+0150$ | AG 195 | $-009+005 \mathrm{G}$ | $-008+002 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2010 | 337.7 | 1.74 | 4 | $336.9 \pm 0.2$ | $1.866 \pm 0.003$ | -0. 8 | 0.126 | * |
| 2017.4493 | $14326+3522$ | ALI 130 | $-010+005 \mathrm{G}$ | $-011+005 \mathrm{U}$ | 2002 | 182.2 | 8.13 | 3 | $182.6 \pm 0.0$ | $8.17 \pm 0.010$ | 0.4 | 0.040 | * |
| 2017.4493 | $14353+2004$ | BRT2418 | -000-066G | +001-066 G | 2001 | 195.2 | 3.70 | 3 | $194.8 \pm 0.1$ | $3.816 \pm 0.001$ | -0.4 | 0.116 | * |
| 2017.4466 | $14430+1310$ | KU 48 AB | $-004+066 \mathrm{~W}$ | $-006+065 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2010 | 136.7 | 6.45 | 4 | $137.6 \pm 0.0$ | $6.685 \pm 0.003$ | 0.9 | 0.235 |  |
| 2017.4493 | $14533+3426$ | ES 311 | +015-037 G | +017-039 U | 2010 | 290.5 | 4.00 | 3 | $290.8 \pm 0.0$ | $4.021 \pm 0.004$ | 0.3 | 0.021 | * |
| 2017.4438 | $14544+0017$ | J 440 | +009-009 G | +010-009 G | 2000 | 220.7 | 2.55 | 2 | $219.9 \pm 0.2$ | $2.618 \pm 0.004$ | -0. 8 | 0.068 | * |
| 2017.4493 | $16065+5441$ | MLB 135 | $-003+003 G$ | $-001+004 \mathrm{G}$ | 2011 | 96.1 | 3.52 | 3 | $96.1 \pm 0.0$ | $3.603 \pm 0.000$ | 0.0 | 0.083 | * |
| 2017.4493 | $16081+5605$ | STI2331 | +004-061 U | +004-060 U | 2010 | 18.0 | 5.40 | 2 | $18.9 \pm 0.1$ | $6.460 \pm 0.52$ | 0.9 | 1.060 |  |
| 2017.4493 | $16140+5844$ | STI2334 | +002-015 G | -004-014 U | 2006 | 111.4 | 8.98 | 2 | $112.4 \pm 0.0$ | $9.051 \pm 0.004$ | 1.0 | 0.071 | * |
| 2017.4493 | $16160+5718$ | STI2335 | $+020-052 \mathrm{U}$ | $+020-053 \mathrm{U}$ | 2010 | 149.0 | 9.80 | 2 | $151 \pm 0.1$ | $9.456 \pm 0.026$ | 2.0 | -0.344 |  |

Notes for Table 3

| WDS Number | Parallax | $\begin{gathered} \text { Parallax } \\ \text { Source } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Distance (Parsecs) | Min Sep (AU) | Plot Figure | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 09036-0225 AB | $3.44 \pm 0.25$ | G | 291 | 1,134 | - |  |
| 09330-1411 | $4.48 \pm 0.63$ | G | 223 | 804 | - |  |
| $09357+5318$ | $10.47 \pm 1.66$ | H | 96 | 797 | - |  |
| 09371-1350 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A}: 1.76 \pm 0.40 \\ & \mathrm{~B}: 2.19 \pm 0.93 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 515 | 1,878 | - | Weighted parallax of 1.94 mas used. There is a $58 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. Likely physical pair. |
| 09405-1509 | $2.07 \pm 0.54$ | G | N/A | N/A | - | The error makes the parallax unusable. |
| 09469-1121 | - | - | - | - | - | Only 6 measurements. A third star of estimated magnitude 13 noted at $204.5^{\circ}$, $1.852^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 09497-1414 | $2.40 \pm 0.44$ | G | 417 | 2,250 | - | The high theta residual is due to the WSI2005 measure which appears to be well away from the mean. |
| 09549-1750 | B: $6.56 \pm 0.64$ | G | 152 | 169 | - |  |
| 10025-0915 | $2.54 \pm 0.62$ | G | 394 | 1,102 | - |  |
| $10038+0125$ | - | - | - | - | - | Only four measurements. |
| $10057+8042$ | $2.77 \pm 0.30$ | G | 361 | 3,043 | - |  |
| $10066+2602$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A}: 2.46 \pm 0.46 \\ & \mathrm{~B}: 2.13 \pm 0.73 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 432 | 995 | - | Only 4 measurements. A weighted parallax (2.13 mas) was used; $40 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. Probably physical. |
| $10135+3746$ | $6.30 \pm 0.64$ | G | 159 | 1,286 | - |  |
| $10135+3928$ | $2.46 \pm 0.53$ | G | 407 | 1,602 | - | A weak trend is forming. |
| $10232+6137$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 2.51 \pm 0.25 \\ & \mathrm{~B}: 2.48 \pm 0.27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 401 | 2,188 | - | Weighted parallax of 2.49 mas, with an $87 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. Likely physical pair. |
| $10236+2617$ | - | - | - | - | - | A weak trend is forming. |

Measurements of 161 Double Stars With a High-Speed CCD ...

Notes for Table 3 continued

| WDS Number | Parallax | Parallax Source | Distance (Parsecs) | Min Sep <br> (AU) | Plot Figure | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10245+3259$ | $2.36 \pm 0.58$ | G | 424 | 3,475 | - |  |
| $10248+6739$ | $2.27 \pm 0.44$ | G | 250 | 2,907 | - |  |
| $10258+3237$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 4.00 \pm 0.36 \\ & \text { B: } 2.74 \pm 0.49 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 250 \\ & 365 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 730 \\ 1,066 \end{gathered}$ | - | There is no overlap in the parallax windows. The pair is probably not physical. |
| $10283+4013$ | $5.76 \pm 0.25$ | G | 174 | 1,502 | - |  |
| 10291+0342 | $3.49 \pm 0.37$ | G | 287 | 1,129 | - | The mean was used for the last measure. UPR2010.421 (the last measure on record) lies far from the mean; my measure is closer to the mean. A weak trend may be developing. |
| $10308+4414$ | $3.25 \pm 0.36$ | G | 308 | 800 | - |  |
| $10324+6800$ | $7.45 \pm 0.26$ | G | 134 | 432 | - |  |
| $10335+1120$ | $6.50 \pm 0.40$ | G | 154 | 400 | - | There appear to be quadrant reversals on OL1932.23 and HEI1983.74. A quadrant flip may be the case for BLW1981. 361 . |
| 10341-1255 | $2.45 \pm 0.49$ | G | 408 | 2.163 | - | A very scattered group of 9 measurements. |
| 10355-1756 | - | - | - | - | - | Only 7 measurements. Manual solution with STB. |
| $10422+0054$ | $5.23 \pm 0.55$ | G | 191 | 631 | - | Only 5 measurements. |
| 10376-1921 | $4.39 \pm 0.34$ | G | 228 | 2,210 | - |  |
| 10389+0721 | $7.82 \pm 0.31$ | G | 128 | 205 | - |  |
|  | - | - | - | - | - | Only 2 measurements. |
| 10443-1731 | $10.73 \pm 0.46$ | G | 93 | 213 | - | A short (possibly linear) trend is forming. |
| 10595-1430 | $6.52 \pm 0.46$ | G | 153 | 567 | - |  |
| $11004+5237$ | $3.68 \pm 0.27$ | G | 272 | 2,283 | - |  |
| $11068+2513$ | $2.82 \pm 0.40$ | G | 355 | 823 | - | Only 5 measurements. |
| $11175+5900$ | $2.87 \pm 0.24$ | G | 348 | 1,366 | - |  |
| $11183+6858$ | - | - | - | - | - | Only 2 measurements. |
| $11190+5118$ | $3.91 \pm 0.25$ | G | 256 | 1,731 | - |  |
| $11230+6443 \mathrm{AB}$ | $7.01 \pm 0.27$ | G | 143 | 292 | - |  |
| $11272+1908$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 6.18 \pm 0.38 \\ & \text { B: } 6.23 \pm 0.42 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 161 | 957 | - | Weighted parallax ( 6.20 mas) used. There is a $91 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. Likely physical pair. |
| $11333+5748$ AB | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 9.55 \pm 0.26 \\ & \text { B: } 9.91 \pm 0.28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 103 | 1,033 | - | Weighted parallax (9.73 mas) used. There is a $20 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. |
| $11336+4445$ |  |  |  |  | - | There appears to be a quadrant reversal for WOR1964.931. |
| $11392+4910$ | $11.72 \pm 0.33$ | G | 85 | 1,368 | - |  |
| $11396+2657$ | $1.22 \pm 0.34$ | G | N/A | N/A | - | The error make the parallax unusable. |
| $11430+6421$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 3.91 \pm 0.41 \\ & \text { B: } 3.89 \pm 0.28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G } \\ & \text { H } \end{aligned}$ | 256 | 885 | - | Weighted parallax ( 3.90 mas) used. There is a $67 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. Likely physical pair. |
| $11466+5710$ | $4.01 \pm 0.97$ | G | 249 | 2,840 | - |  |
| $11468+5951$ | $2.79 \pm 0.24$ | G | 358 | 1,184 | - |  |
| $11489+3342$ | $2.64 \pm 0.26$ | G | 379 | 1,095 | - |  |
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## Notes for Table 3 continued

| WDS Number | Parallax | $\begin{gathered} \text { Parallax } \\ \text { Source } \end{gathered}$ | Distance (Parsecs) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Min Sep } \\ \text { (AU) } \end{gathered}$ | Plot Figure | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $11533+2019$ | $4.34 \pm 0.31$ | G | 230 | 1,933 | - |  |
| $11543+5033$ | A: $3.67 \pm 0.34$ B: $3.39 \pm 0.52$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 283 | 778 | - | Weighted parallax of 3.53 mas used. There is a $45 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. Likely physical pair. |
| $11556+1654$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 9.27 \pm 0.51 \\ & \text { B: } 8.53 \pm 0.74 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 112 | 577 | - | Weighted parallax of 8.91 mas used. There is a $24 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. With a significant difference in the proper motions, this pair might not be physical. |
| 12029-1908 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 2.22 \pm 0.47 \\ & \text { B: } 3.01 \pm 0.54 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 381 | 953 | 1 | Weighted parallax of 2.62 mas used. There is a $46 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. Likely physical pair. Trend forming. Could be linear or edge-on short arc. |
| $12126+3546$ | - | - | - | - | - | Rough trend starting to emerge. |
| $12151+8349$ | B: $3.90 \pm 0.30$ | G | 256 | 278 | - | Only 6 measurements. |
| $12164+4444$ | $4.97 \pm 0.26$ | G | 201 | 571 | - |  |
| $12239+4441$ | $3.94 \pm 0.31$ | G | 254 | 888 | - |  |
| $12242+4304$ | $2.94 \pm 0.29$ | G | 340 | 2,786 | - |  |
| $12285+8841$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 4.55 \pm 0.25 \\ & \text { B: } 4.29 \pm 0.23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 226 | 187 | - | Weighted parallax of 4.42 mas was used. There is a $32 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows; possible physical pair. |
| $12291+8525$ | - | - | - | - | - | Only 5 measurements. |
| $12295+2931$ AB | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 5.19 \pm 0.29 \\ & \text { B: } 5.28 \pm 0.41 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 191 | 470 | - | Weighted parallax of 5.23 mas was used. There is a 76\% overlap in the parallax windows; likely physical pair. |
| $12334+3202$ | $4.45 \pm 0.36$ | G | 225 | 1,775 | - |  |
| $12360+1124$ | $12.56 \pm 0.26$ | G | 80 | 185 | - |  |
| $12388+1252$ | $3.83 \pm 0.34$ | G | 261 | 2,219 | - |  |
| $12439+4950$ | $2.69 \pm 0.27$ | G | 372 | 3,564 | - |  |
| $12587+2707$ | $1.68 \pm 0.28$ | G | 595 | 4,399 | - |  |
| $13080+4907$ | $4.14 \pm 0.24$ | G | 242 | 2,207 | - |  |
| $13112+3050$ AB-C | B: $6.91 \pm 0.26$ | G | 145 | 150 | - |  |
| $13174+5812$ | $5.51 \pm 0.39$ | G | 181 | 726 | - |  |
| $13208+3158$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 2.43 \pm 0.26 \\ & \text { B: } 1.43 \pm 0.31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 412 \\ & 699 \end{aligned}$ | - | - | There is no overlap in the parallax windows. Based on parallax, the pair is optical. But the proper motions are very similar, so we cannot yet rule on this pair. |
| $13378+2819$ | $6.79 \pm 0.27$ | G | 147 | 339 | - |  |
| $13525+2544$ | $3.31 \pm 0.43$ | G | 302 | 772 | 2 | Strong linear trend. |
| $14170+2412$ | $0.97 \pm 0.87$ | G | N/A | N/A | - | The error makes the parallax unusable. |
| $14197+2330$ | $9.00 \pm 0.25$ | G | 111 | 517 | - |  |
| 14227+0039 | - | - | - | - | 3 | Strong linear trend. |
| $14229+0943$ | $3.88 \pm 0.30$ | G | 258 | 1,198 | - |  |
| $14244+1813$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 5.2 \pm 0.25 \\ & B: 5.47 \pm 0.27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 187 | 450 | - | Weighted parallax of 5.33 mas used. The parallax windows have a $32 \%$ overlap. May be physical. |
| $14317+0150$ | $1.71 \pm 0.35$ | G | 585 | 1,016 | - |  |
| $14326+3522$ | $2.54 \pm 0.31$ | G | 394 | 3,189 | - |  |
| $14353+2004$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 3.75 \pm 0.27 \\ & \text { B: } 3.67 \pm 0.29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 270 | 997 | - | Weighted parallax of 3.71 mas used. There is a $42 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. May be physical. |
| $14533+3426$ | $3.50 \pm 0.29$ | G | 286 | 1,143 | - |  |
| $14544+0017$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 1.45 \pm 0.41 \\ & \text { B: } 1.41 \pm 0.30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N/A } \\ & 709 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { N/A } \\ 1,809 \end{gathered}$ | - | The error on the primary's parallax makes it unusable, but be that as it may, the weighted parallax (which I would not suggest we use) is 1.43 mas. The parallax windows, under this assumption, have a $75 \%$ overlap. Probably physical. |
| $16065+5441$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 1.89 \pm 0.28 \\ & \text { B: } 1.90 \pm 0.38 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 528 | 1,858 | - | Weighted parallax of 1.89 mas used; the parallax windows have a $73 \%$ overlap. This pair is probably physical. |
| $16140+5844$ | $1.59 \pm 0.26$ | G | 629 | 5,660 | - |  |
| Mean AB Separation in AU |  |  |  | 1,427 |  |  |
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Table 4: Different Proper Motion Pairs Measured With the Cv Method

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \mathrm{Yr} \end{gathered}$ | Last 9 | Last $r$ | Msrs | Measured <br> $\theta \pm \operatorname{err}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | Measured $\rho \pm \operatorname{err}(")$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \rho \end{gathered}$ | Notes ? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.3288 | 09154-1955 | I 826 | $-018+005 \mathrm{U}$ | $-009+010$ U | 1999 | 18.9 | 3.02 | 5 | $19.2 \pm 0.1$ | $3.065 \pm 0.005$ | 0.3 | 0.045 |  |
| 2017.3315 | 09202-1346 | TDS6485 | $-012+011 \mathrm{U}$ | $-015+003 \mathrm{U}$ | 2010 | 203.3 | 2.52 | 2 | $200.2 \pm 1.6$ | $2.553 \pm 0.027$ | -3.1 | 0.033 | * |
| 2017.3315 | 09213-1207 | TDS6501 | -016-027 W | -021-006 W | 2005 | 358.5 | 2.89 | 2 | $356.0 \pm 0.2$ | $3.143 \pm 0.006$ | -2.5 | 0.253 | * |
| 2017.3315 | 10078+0715 | HEI 755 | -047-025 G | -028-014 W | 2002 | 57.6 | 2.24 | 2 | $56.7 \pm 0.5$ | $2.293 \pm 0.008$ | -0.9 | 0.053 | * |
| 2017.3562 | $10285+4733$ | HU 635 | $-028+007 \mathrm{G}$ | $-027+009 \mathrm{U}$ | 2010 | 174.0 | 4.00 | 4 | $173.5 \pm 0.1$ | $4.131 \pm 0.008$ | -0.5 | 0.131 | * |
| 2017.3836 | $10369+4504$ | ES 1152 | +034-038 W | +020+010 W | 2012 | 349.0 | 2.83 | 3 | $349.3 \pm 0.1$ | $2.866 \pm 0.005$ | 0.3 | 0.036 | * |
| 2017.3288 | 10464-1259 | BRT2725 | +013-020 G | +015-014 U | 2001 | 5.3 | 3.81 | 5 | $4.8 \pm 0.3$ | $4.090 \pm 0.220$ | -0.5 | 0.280 | * |
| 2017.3370 | $10498+1805$ | A 2371 | -022-004 G | -046+010 W | 2012 | 321.0 | 2.50 | 4 | $320.2 \pm 0.1$ | $2.658 \pm 0.002$ | -0.8 | 0.158 | * |
| 2017.3260 | $10538+7947$ | STF1471 | +015+113 U | +004-077 U | 2013 | 183.0 | 2.07 | 5 | $185.8 \pm 0.5$ | $2.167 \pm 0.035$ | 2.8 | 0.097 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $11128+2158$ | ELS 2 | $-003+008 \mathrm{~W}$ | +035+006 W | 2002 | 88.1 | 3.65 | 3 | $89.2 \pm 0.2$ | $3.721 \pm 0.021$ | 1.1 | 0.071 | * |
| 2017.3288 | 11344+0407 | J 86 | -049-010 W | -014-008 W | 2006 | 95.6 | 2.62 | 5 | $90.9 \pm 0.3$ | $2.407 \pm 0.009$ | -4.7 | -0.213 | * |
| 2017.3288 | $11348+0130$ | AG 175 | +010-028 G | +012-018 W | 2013 | 191.7 | 2.22 | 5 | $191.3 \pm 0.2$ | $2.261 \pm 0.009$ | -0.4 | 0.041 | * |
| 2017.4164 | $11366+5608$ | STF1553 | -179-091 G | -145-052 U | 2010 | 166.0 | 6.20 | 4 | $165.1 \pm 0.0$ | $6.194 \pm 0.009$ | -0.9 | -0.006 | * |
| 2017.3288 | 11527+0701 | HEI 506 | -025-025 G | +000-017 W | 2010 | 75.5 | 2.26 | 3 | $75.1 \pm 0.1$ | $2.334 \pm 0.001$ | -0.4 | 0.074 | * |
| 2017.3836 | $12014+5600$ | STI2278 | -005-003 G | -014-002 U | 2006 | 297.8 | 4.84 | 2 | $298.5 \pm 0.1$ | $4.936 \pm 0.001$ | 0.7 | 0.096 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $12040+6429$ | STI 739 | $-001+010$ G | -015+016 G | 2010 | 245.0 | 9.80 | 3 | $246.0 \pm 0.0$ | $9.986 \pm 0.002$ | 1.0 | 0.186 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $12232+5621$ | MLB 67 | -019-005 G | $-001+000 \mathrm{U}$ | 2003 | 137.1 | 8.33 | 3 | $136.4 \pm 0.1$ | $8.496 \pm 0.012$ | -0.7 | 0.166 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $12272+5519$ | MLB1076 | -002-008 G | +007-021 U | 2004 | 225.4 | 10.94 | 3 | $225.2 \pm 0.0$ | $11.057 \pm 0.009$ | -0.2 | 0.117 | * |
| 2017.4055 | $12307+7518$ | DOO 55 | +015-003 G | +017-003 W | 2004 | 54.6 | 4.44 | 4 | $56.0 \pm 0.0$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.476 \\ 0.001 \end{gathered} \pm$ | 1.4 | 0.036 | * |
| 2017.4493 | $14317+3554$ | ALI 366 | $-026+020$ G | $-010+025 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2008 | 285.5 | 6.70 | 3 | $284.8 \pm 0.0$ | $6.906 \pm 0.006$ | -0.7 | 0.206 | * |
| 2017.4493 | $15018+5128$ | ES 739 | $-038+008 \mathrm{U}$ | $-022+037$ G | 2001 | 159.1 | 2.15 | 3 | $159.9 \pm 0.0$ | $2.121 \pm 0.001$ | 0.8 | -0.029 | * |

## Measurements of 161 Double Stars With a High-Speed CCD

## Notes for Table 4

| WDS Number | Parallax | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Parallax } \\ \text { Source } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Distance (Parsecs) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Min Sep } \\ \text { (AU) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Plot <br> Figure | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 09202-1346 | - | - | - | - | - | Only 4 measurements. |
| 09213-1207 | - | - | - | - | - | Only 4 measurements. |
| $10078+0715$ | $5.08 \pm 0.78$ | G | 197 | 441 | - | Only 5 measurements. |
| $10285+4733$ | $5.21 \pm 0.41$ | G | 192 | 852 | - |  |
| $10369+4504$ | - | - | - | - | 4 | The PM vector ( $344^{\circ}, 8.4^{\prime \prime}$ ) does not align well to the recorded motion. |
| 10464-1259 | $5.14 \pm 0.99$ | G | 195 | 739 | - |  |
| $10498+1805$ | $3.09 \pm 0.53$ | G | 324 | 845 | 5 | The PM vector ( $300^{\circ}, 2.8^{\prime \prime}$ ) does not fit the observations. Theta looks about right, but rho is far off. |
| $10538+7947$ | - | - | - | - | 6 | The PM vector ( $183^{\circ}, 34.3^{\prime \prime}$ ) is clearly incorrect. The historical data forms a very tight cluster. High residuals due to WSI2013, which appears to be off. |
| $11128+2158$ | - | - | - | - | 7 | The PM vector ( $267^{\circ} / 3.9^{\prime \prime}$ ) does not match the observations. |
| $11344+0407$ | - | - | - | - | 8 | The PM vector ( $87^{\circ}, 3.4^{\prime \prime}$ ) does not fit the observations. This historical data only spans approximately 1". |
| $11348+0130$ | $4.87 \pm 0.43$ | G | 205 | 456 | - |  |
| $11366+5608$ | $21.18 \pm 0.22$ | G | 47 | 291 | 9 | The PM vector does not comport with the history. |
| $11527+0701$ | $4.62 \pm 0.50$ | G | 216 | 498 | - |  |
| $12014+5600$ | $1.04 \pm 0.24$ | G | 962 | 4,615 | - |  |
| $12040+6429$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 1.04 \pm 0.26 \\ & \text { B: } 3.86 \pm 0.76 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G } \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 769 \\ & 216 \end{aligned}$ | - | 10 | The error in the primary's parallax makes that measurement unusable. There is no overlap of the proper motion windows either. <br> The PM vector ( $317^{\circ}, 2.28^{\prime \prime}$ ) comes close to matching the observations. |
| $12232+5621$ | $2.24 \pm 0.43$ | G | 446 | 3,705 | 11 | The PM vector ( $74^{\circ}$, $1.7^{\prime \prime}$ ) comes close to the observations. |
| $12272+5519$ | $0.72 \pm 0.31$ | G | N/A | N/A | - | The error in the proper motion makes it unusable. |
| $12307+7518$ | $2.97 \pm 0.24$ | G | 337 | 1,495 | - |  |
| $14317+3554$ | $3.24 \pm 0.33$ | G | 309 | 2,068 | 12 | The $P M$ vector is far larger than the measured motion. (73,$\left.~ 1.26^{\prime \prime}\right)$. |
| $15018+5128$ | B: $3.33 \pm 0.29$ | G | 300 | 645 | 13 | The PM vector (4.39" @ $200^{\circ}$ ) does not match the observations. |
| Mean AB Separation in AU |  |  |  | 1,585 |  |  |
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| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | pm ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \mathbf{Y r} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \rho \end{gathered}$ | Msrs | Measured <br> $\theta \pm \operatorname{err}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | Measured <br> $\rho \pm$ err (") | Resid $\theta$ | Resid $\rho$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.3288 | 10409-1306 | HDO 128 | -027-024 G | - | 2003 | 25.6 | 2.49 | 5 | $31.7 \pm 0.1$ | $3.028 \pm 0.003$ | 6.1 | 0.538 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $10441+3230$ | HJ 2543 AB | -057-029 G | -043-003 w | 2001 | 32.3 | 2.03 | 4 | $32.9 \pm 0.1$ | $3.363 \pm 0.012$ | 0.6 | 1.333 | * |
| 2017.3315 | 10517-0340 | HDS1551 | $-157+088$ G | -020+006 w | 2012 | 322.5 | 2.80 | 2 | $331.5 \pm 0.1$ | $1.969 \pm 0.003$ | 9.0 | -0.831 | * |
| 2017.3397 | $10592+2423$ | BRT 157 | -008-020 G | -006-015 U | 2002 | 293.4 | 3.41 | 3 | $294.0 \pm 0.1$ | $3.424 \pm 0.000$ | 0.6 | 0.014 | * |
| 2017.4164 | 11589+6002 | STI 736 | +012-009 G | -014-004 U | 2007 | 315.3 | 9.79 | 3 | $314.6 \pm 0.0$ | $9.691 \pm 0.009$ | -0.7 | -0.099 | * |

Notes for Table 5

| WDS Number | Parallax | Parallax Source | Distance (Parsecs) | Min Sep (AU) | Plot Figure | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10409-1306 | $5.64 \pm 0.43$ | G | 177 | 441 | - | Linear solution by HRT 2011. Ephemerides: $32.8^{\circ}$, 3.064". Residuals: $-1.1^{\circ},-0.036^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $10441+3230 \mathrm{AB}$ | $11.03 \pm 0.29$ | G | 91 | 312 | 14 | No linear solution yet. The PM vector ( $28^{\circ}$, 5.3") does not fit the observations very well. |
| 10517-0340 | $11.33 \pm 0.35$ | G | 88 | 247 | 15 | Very strong unsolved linear case. The PM vector ( $239^{\circ}, 3.4^{\prime \prime}$ ) is a close fit to history, but not exact. |
| $10592+2423$ | $4.34 \pm 0.35$ | G | 230 | 783 | 16 | This strongly linear case has no solution yet. |
| $11589+6002$ | $0.55 \pm 0.24$ | G | N/A | N/A | 17 | The error makes the parallax unusable. Strong linear case without a solution yet. |
| Mean $A B$ Separation in $A U$ |  |  |  | 446 |  |  |
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| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | Last Yr | Last $\theta$ | Last $\rho$ | Msrs | $\begin{gathered} \text { Measured } \\ \theta \pm \operatorname{err}\left({ }^{\circ}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Measured } \\ \rho \pm \operatorname{err} \text { (") } \end{gathered}$ | Resid $\theta$ | Resid $\rho$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.3260 | 10110+7508 | KUI 47 | +219+264 G | +228+252 w | 2012 | 121.0 | 1.84 | 5 | $121.1 \pm 0.7$ | $1.955 \pm 0.039$ | 0.1 | 0.115 | * |
| 2017.3589 | $12108+3953$ | STF1606 | -092-025 W | - | 2015 | 151.0 | 0.60 | 5 | $144.8 \pm 0.4$ | $0.627 \pm 0.015$ | -6.2 | 0.027 | * |
| 2017.3370 | $12160+0538$ | STF1621 | -320-066 W | -320-066 W | 2010 | 42.7 | 1.52 | 4 | $46.4 \pm 0.1$ | $1.815 \pm 0.004$ | 3.7 | 0.295 | * |
| 2017.3589 | $12291+3123$ | STT 251 | +148-041 W | +148-041 W | 2015 | 61.0 | 0.70 | 5 | $60.7 \pm 0.3$ | $0.781 \pm 0.001$ | -0.3 | 0.081 | * |


| WDS Number | Parallax | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parallax } \\ & \text { Source } \end{aligned}$ | Distance (Parsecs) | $\underset{(A U)}{\operatorname{Min} \text { Sep }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Plot } \\ & \text { Figure } \end{aligned}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10110+7508 | $47.5 \pm 0.27$ | G | 21 | 39 | - | Orbit by HEI1994. Ephemerides: $124.7^{\circ}$, $1.850^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: $-3.6^{\circ}$, +0.105". |
| $12108+3953$ | - | - | - | - | - | Orbit by MSN1999. Ephemerides: 146.4, 0.545". Residuals: $-1.6^{\circ}$, $+0.082^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 12160+0538 | $38.72 \pm 3.68$ | H | 26 | 39 | - | Orbit by SOD1999. Ephemerides: 44.6º 0.645". Residuals: $+1.8^{\circ}$, +0.17 l . |
| 12291+3123 | $5.76 \pm 1.46$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error makes the parallax unusable. Orbit by SCA2003. Ephemerides: $61.2^{\circ}, 0.676 "$. Residuals: -0.5ㅇ, +0.105". |
| Mean AB Separation in AU |  |  |  | 39 |  |  |

## Measurements of 161 Double Stars With a High-Speed CCD

Table 7: Unknown Cases Measured With the Cv Method
Note: These cases are called "unknown" because no proper motions are known, or only one proper motion is known.

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Last } \\ & \text { Yr } \end{aligned}$ | Last q | Last r | Msrs | Measured <br> $\mathrm{q} \pm \operatorname{err}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Measured } \\ \mathrm{r} \pm \text { err (") } \end{gathered}$ | Resid 9 | Resid r | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.3342 | 09383-1956 | RST2645 | -001-006 G | - | 2008 | 274.4 | 2.13 | 1 | 271.8 | 2.106 | -2.6 | -0.024 | * |
| 2017.3342 | 09410-1250 | RST3656 | $-015+013 \mathrm{G}$ | - | 2008 | 302.4 | 2.12 | 2 | $306.3 \pm 0.5$ | $2.206 \pm 0.001$ | 3.9 | 0.086 | * |
| 2017.3726 | $10129+4835$ | HU 632 | -006+007 G | - | 2001 | 66.6 | 3.12 | 4 | $64.6 \pm 0.1$ | $3.061 \pm 0.001$ | -2.0 | -0.059 | * |
| 2017.3370 | $10159+2746$ | COU 958 | +089+062 G | - | 2005 | 80.6 | 2.30 | 3 | $81.3 \pm 0.2$ | $2.345 \pm 0.014$ | 0.7 | 0.045 | * |
| 2017.3370 | $10173+1210$ | J 1126 | +011-020 W | - | 2001 | 307.5 | 2.26 | 4 | $307.0 \pm 0.1$ | $2.277 \pm 0.005$ | -0.5 | 0.017 |  |
| 2017.3644 | $10207+3719$ | ES 1639 | -025-011 G | - | 2010 | 132.0 | 2.27 | 3 | $133.3 \pm 0.4$ | $2.225 \pm 0.010$ | 1.3 | -0.045 | * |
| 2017.3808 | $10241+4034$ | ES 1394 | +015-077 W | - | 2010 | 142.6 | 6.80 | 4 | $143.5 \pm 0.0$ | $6.697 \pm 0.006$ | 0.9 | -0.103 |  |
| 2017.3342 | $10300+0543$ | HEI 762 | -001-002 G | - | 2002 | 146.8 | 2.74 | 2 | $145.0 \pm 1.2$ | $2.623 \pm 0.026$ | -1.8 | -0.117 | * |
| 2017.3014 | 10380-1257 | DOO 52AB | +007-024 W | - | 2001 | 331.4 | 2.27 | 5 | $330.3 \pm 0.1$ | $2.394 \pm 0.004$ | -1.1 | 0.124 | * |
| 2017.3370 | 11085-0721 | TDS 7694 | -055+010 W | - | 2002 | 43.5 | 2.73 | 3 | $67.7 \pm 0.1$ | $2.715 \pm 0.008$ | 24.2 | -0.015 | * |
| 2017.3726 | $11303+4115$ | ES 1399 | -031-046 W | - | 2008 | 123.9 | 3.14 | 3 | $122.5 \pm 0.2$ | $3.151 \pm 0.007$ | -1.4 | 0.011 | * |
| 2017.3699 | $11391+3225$ | ES 2412 | -001-014 G | - | 2002 | 321.7 | 2.39 | 3 | $319.6 \pm 0.1$ | $2.406 \pm 0.006$ | -2.1 | 0.016 | * |
| 2017.3726 | $11431+4808$ | TDS 642 | -045-028 G | - | 1991 | 185.1 | 2.33 | 2 | $191 \pm 0.0$ | $2.27 \pm 0.003$ | 5.9 | -0.060 | * |
| 2017.3288 | 11534+0340 | STF1578 | -050-029 W | - | 2014 | 161.4 | 3.13 | 2 | $160.5 \pm 0.3$ | $3.148 \pm 0.009$ | -0.9 | 0.018 |  |
| 2017.3726 | $11556+4815$ | ES 923 | +021-024 G | - | 2003 | 215.9 | 2.38 | 3 | $218.1 \pm 0.2$ | $2.359 \pm 0.008$ | 2.2 | -0.021 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $12061+3850$ | STF1601 | -028-063 G | - | 2007 | 300.0 | 2.10 | 4 | $297.6 \pm 0.1$ | $2.010 \pm .0 .013$ | -2.4 | -0.090 | * |
| 2017.3808 | $12076+4813$ | COU1907 | $-036+028$ G | - | 2001 | 357.8 | 2.96 | 3 | $357.5 \pm 0.1$ | $2.899 \pm 0.008$ | -0.3 | -0.061 | * |
| 2017.3370 | 12158+0902 | STF1620 | -003-008 G | - | 2000 | 81.1 | 2.19 | 5 | $81.5 \pm 0.2$ | $2.309 \pm 0.007$ | 0.4 | 0.119 | * |
| 2017.3370 | 12256-0818 | RST3789 | -043-001 W | - | 2002 | 10.1 | 2.74 | 3 | $9.3 \pm 0.4$ | $2.726 \pm 0.025$ | -0. 8 | -0.014 | * |
| 2017.3836 | $12412+4359$ | A 1850 | $-070+037 \mathrm{G}$ | - | 1999 | 49.0 | 2.86 | 4 | $50.3 \pm 0.0$ | $2.894 \pm 0.005$ | 1.3 | 0.034 | * |
| 2017.3808 | $12473+3357$ | AG 181 | -002-010 W | - | 2013 | 340.0 | 1.90 | 3 | $340.8 \pm 0.0$ | $2.258 \pm 0.003$ | 0.8 | 0.358 | * |
| 2017.3616 | $12483+1530$ | HEI 160 | +050-031 G | - | 2005 | 346.0 | 2.39 | 3 | $344.1 \pm 0.0$ | $2.425 \pm 0.000$ | -1.9 | 0.035 | * |
| 2017.3808 | $14004+3658$ | STF1796 | -018-004 G | - | 2007 | 193.0 | 2.60 | 4 | $192.2 \pm 0.1$ | $2.609 \pm 0.001$ | -0.8 | 0.009 | * |
| 2017.4493 | $14166+2328$ | BU 1441 | $+030+019$ G | - | 2002 | 78.5 | 3.56 | 4 | $79.5 \pm 0.2$ | $3.597 \pm 0.002$ | 1.0 | 0.370 | * |
| 2017.4438 | 14170-1626 | HJ 1249AB | -017-004 W | - | 1999 | 165.0 | 5.40 | 3 | $163.1 \pm 0.2$ | $5.212 \pm 0.027$ | -1.9 | -0.188 |  |
| 2017.4493 | $14198+3016$ | TDS9165 | +005-018 G | - | 2002 | 172.9 | 3.03 | 3 | $174.1 \pm 0.1$ | $3.129 \pm 0.000$ | 1.2 | 0.099 | * |
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Notes for Table 7

| WDS Number | Parallax | $\begin{gathered} \text { Parallax } \\ \text { Source } \end{gathered}$ | Distance (Parsecs) | $\underset{\text { (AU) }}{\operatorname{Min} \text { Sep }}$ | Plot Figure | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 09383-1956 | $2.58 \pm 0.40$ | G | 388 | 826 | - |  |
| 09410-1250 | $4.01 \pm 0.61$ | G | 249 | 529 | - |  |
| $10129+4835$ | $4.12 \pm 0.35$ | G | 243 | 752 | - | Only 6 measurements. |
| $10159+2746$ | $11.83 \pm 0.71$ | G | 85 | 194 | - | Just 7 measurements. |
| $10207+3719$ | $0.38 \pm 0.99$ | G | N/A | N/A | - | The error makes the parallax unusable. A trend might be emerging. |
| $10300+0543$ | $2.12 \pm 0.51$ | G | 472 | 1,274 | - | Only 3 measurements. |
| 10380-1257 | - | - | - | - | - | A linear trend is emerging. |
| 11085-0721 | - | - | - | - | - | Only 3 measurements. No other star near this position. |
| $11303+4115$ | - | - | - | - | - | Only 6 measurements, but a linear trend is emerging. |
| $11391+3225$ | $2.43 \pm 0.35$ | G | 412 | 988 | - | Only 5 measurements. |
| $11431+4808$ | $3.16 \pm 0.28$ | G | 316 | 736 | - | Only 2 measurements. |
| $11556+4815$ | $2.55 \pm 0.25$ | G | 392 | 941 | - | 5 measurements. |
| $12061+3850$ | $13.11 \pm 0.26$ | G | 76 | 157 | - |  |
| $12076+4813$ | $8.67 \pm 0.27$ | G | 115 | 341 | - | 4 measurements. |
| $12158+0902$ | $3.50 \pm 0.34$ | G | 286 | 625 | - |  |
| 12256-0818 | - | - | - | - | - | Only 4 measurements. |
| $12412+4359$ | $4.95 \pm 0.24$ | G | 202 | 578 | - |  |
| $12473+3357$ | - | - | - | - | - | Starting to show a linear trend. |
| $12483+1530$ | $5.19 \pm 0.53$ | G | 193 | 462 | 18 | Strong linear trend. |
| $14004+3658$ | $3.90 \pm 0.30$ | G | 256 | 655 | - |  |
| $14166+2328$ | $4.33 \pm 0.34$ | G | 231 | 831 | - |  |
| $14198+3016$ | $2.68 \pm 0.46$ | G | 373 | 1,131 | - | Only 4 measurements. |
| Mean AB Separation in AU |  |  |  | 659 |  |  |
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(Continued from page 262)

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1. The Impact of GAIA and UCAC5 data.

The new data from GAIA (DR1) has been of huge benefit in the analysis of double star systems. PM analysis can bolster a pair's odds of being physical, or dispel it (if the parallaxes are greatly different).

In addition, the latest high-quality PM data from GAIA and the UCAC5 catalog can support a pair's claim to physicality (if the PMs are nearly the same) or suggest a linear or optical nature (if the PMs are greatly different).

The Winter/Spring 2017 observing program at Brilliant Sky Observatory revealed the following possibilities flowing from GAIA and UCAC5 data. (Table 8)

## 6. Conclusion

We have already established in the pages of this Journal that small telescopes can do speckle interferometry of close pairs with a high degree of precision.

The results of the 2017 Winter and Spring observing program at Brilliant Sky Observatory show great promise for the addition of the new GAIA DR1 and UCAC5 parallax and proper motion data to our research as we continue to work on the WDS to determine which of its $140,000+$ pairs are true binaries and which are optical or non-binary but physical pairs. I can only assume that when GAIA DR2 is released in April of 2018, our pursuit of true binaries will literally explode. We are in for some exciting times!
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## Appendix. Plots of the Measurments Detailed in the Notes to the Tables.



Figure 1. Plot of WDS 12029-1908


Figure 3. Plot of WDS 14227+0039.


Figure 2. Plot of WDS 13525+2544


Figure 4. Plot of WDS 10369+4504
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Figure 5. Plot of WDS 10498+1805.


Figure 7. Plot of WDS $111128+2158$.


Figure 6. Plot of WDS $10538+7947$.


Figure 8. Plot of WDS 11344+0407.
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Figure 9. Plot of WDS 11344+0407.


Figure 11. Plot of WDS 12232+5621.


Figure 10. Plot of WDS 12040+6429.


Figure 12. Plot of WDS 14317+3554 AB.
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Figure 13. Plot of WDS 15018+5128.


Figure 14. Plot of WDS 10441+3230.


Figure 15. Plot of WDS 10517-0340.


Figure 16. Plot of WDS 10592+2423.
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Figure 17. Plot of WDS 11589+6002.


Figure 18. Plot of WDS 12483+1530.

Figure 20. Plot of WDS $13525+2544$.
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Figure 21. Plot of WDS 14227+0039.


Figure 23. Plot of WDS 10498+1805.


Figure 22. Plot of WDS 10369+4504.


Figure 24. Plot of WDS 10538+7947.
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Figure 25. Plot of WDS 11128+2158.


Figure 27. Plot of WDS 11366+5608.


Figure 26. Plot of WDS 11344+0407.


Figure 28. Plot of WDS 12040+6429.
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Figure 29. Plot of WDS 12232+5621.


Figure 31. Plot of WDS 15018+5128.


Figure 30. Plot of WDS 14317+3554 AB.

Figure 32. Plot of WDS 10441+3230
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Figure 33. Plot of WDS 10517-0340.


Figure 35. Plot of WDS 11589+6002.


Figure 34. Plot of WDS 10592+2423.


Figure 36. Plot of WDS 12483+1530.

# Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry: The Winter/Spring 2017 Observing Program at Brilliant Sky Observatory, Part 1 
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#### Abstract

In the winter and spring of 2017, an aggressive observing program of measuring close double stars with speckle interferometry and CCD imaging was undertaken at Brilliant Sky Observatory, my observing site in Cave Creek, Arizona. A total of 596 stars were observed, 8 of which were rejected for various reasons, leaving 588 pairs. Of these, 427 were observed and measured with speckle interferometry, while the remaining 161 were measured with a CCD. This paper reports the results of the observations of the 427 speckle cases. A separate paper in this issue will report the CCD measurements of the 161 other pairs.


## 1. Introduction

The winter and spring of 2017 marks the start of the third observing season at Brilliant Sky Observatory using speckle interferometry. Previous measurements have been reported in this journal by this author (Harshaw, A through G). This paper will continue the reports in that tradition.

## 2. Equipment Used

Brilliant Sky Observatory is equipped with a Celestron C-11 11-inch SCT telescope mounted on a Celestron CGEM-DX mount atop a PierTech adjustable pier. (See Figure 1.) The mount is controlled by a Lenovo desktop computer running TheSky 6.0.

The optical train consists of a Crayford focuser (locked in place so as not to affect focal length between observing sessions) which feeds into an Orion 1.25inch flip mirror. One leg of the flip mirror unit-the acquisition leg-feeds a 25 mm f/l illuminated reticle eyepiece with a single crosshair illuminated by a dimmable LED. The mount always places the target star within 5 arc minutes of the cross hair, so acquisition is fast and easy. The camera leg of the flip mirror unit feeds into a ZWO ASI290MM monochrome camera, known for its low read noise and excellent performance as a speckle camera. The camera has a 2 x "Shorty Bar-


Figure 1: The setup at Brilliant Sky Observatory
low" from Orion affixed to its mounting ring. Because only the lens and its mounting barrel from the Shorty
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Barlow are used, the actual multiplication of the Barlow is 1.5 , resulting in a system focal ratio of 14.98 .

The focal length of the system, as well as pixel scale and camera orientation with respect to north, are all determined by multiple drifts ( 20 or more drifts per session) of a star near declination $45^{\circ}$. The drift star is nudged to the east edge of the camera's field of view, the drive motor turned off, and the star allowed to drift across the camera's field of view while the computer is recording the file as a series of FITS frames. These files are then analyzed in The Speckle ToolBox (STB) using the Drift Analysis function of STB.

Focus is achieved and maintained by a Feathertouch focuser controlled by a MicroTouch temperaturecompensated focus controller, both obtained from Starizona, a telescope supply and service center located in Tucson, Arizona.

Stars measured with speckle must have rho under $5 "$ and be bright enough to permit both stars to appear with integration times at or under 40 ms .

When doing speckle measurements, 1,000 frames are made of each star at as short an integration time as possible given the magnitudes of the two stars. Usually five such files are made of each star (especially for speckle). A nearby single star is then imaged (again, 1,000 frames) and is used for deconvolution of the speckle files captured.

Files are written to a 2 TB portable USB3 hard drive, which is then taken into my office for analysis the next day using STB for data reduction and measurements.

Final results are then saved to a 5TB USB3 hard drive with a backup made to a second 5TB USB3 hard drive. The backup drive undergoes an incremental backup once a week.

## 3. Methodology

## 3a. Speckle or CCD?

The decision to make a file as a speckle interferometry case depends on two factors: the separation (rho) of the two stars and the magnitudes of the two stars.

To qualify for speckle interferometry, the pair must have a rho value of $5^{\prime \prime}$ or less (but on nights of very good seeing, this can be pushed up a bit, perhaps to 6 "). Also, the stars must be bright enough to register in 40 ms or less.

Any pair wider than $5^{\prime \prime}$ and/or requiring integration times over 40 ms is then recorded and processed as a CCD file.

## 3b. Using The Speckle Toolbox in Manual Mode.

Some of the stars in this report are described as "Manual solution with STB." When a pair is wide enough to produce three distinct star images in the auto-
corellogram (the primary flanked by symmetric images of the companion's power spectrum image), STB has no difficulty in automatically locating and selecting the companion star (although sometimes, the observer must use the complementary image $180^{\circ}$ from the one chosen by STB if theta is greater than $180^{\circ}$ ). But in cases where the power spectrum images of the stars are not distinct, or the frame is noisy, STB may not be able to automatically find the companion's power spectrum. In such cases, STB allows the user to manually select the companion's power spectrum by right clicking on it. In this report, all the pairs measured with "Manual solution" had distinct companion power spectra to select, but noise near the primary misled STB's automatic selection process.

## 3c. Using the Most Accurate Proper Motions Available.

Until recently, the most accurate data sources for parallax and proper motion were rather limited in depth and scope. Also, the WDS often reports proper motions for one or both of the stars in a system without referencing the source of the measurement. (See Harshaw 2017 H ) When reporting proper motions in this paper, I will indicate the source of the data by following the proper motion numbers with a letter - G for Gaia, $U$ for UCAC5, or W for a proper motion listed in the WDS but for which the source is not known.

In Harshaw 2017 H , I reported how the resultant of two proper motion vectors could be computed. I use that method in this paper to indicate when the proper motion vectors do not seem to agree with the observations of the pair.

For example, a pair with widely differing proper motions would be expected to exhibit a linear or nearlylinear track over time, and there are many examples of this in the WDS. However, there are also cases where pairs with widely differing proper motions show no apparent trend in the measurements at all - all of the data points tend to clump around a central point much like the random scattering of buckshot from a shotgun. When widely differing proper motion vectors are listed for a pair with a tight pattern of measurements like this, we may assume that one (or both) of the proper motion vectors is incorrect.

In correspondence with Norbert Zacharias, team leader for the UCAC5 catalog, Zacharias suggested that where data is available in both Gaia and UCAC5 that we use Gaia:
"I recommend to use Gaia DR1 data, i.e. for those stars which are in the TGAS... Keep in mind the UCAC data still has issues with poor charge transfer efficiency of the detector leading to magnitude (and field) dependent systematic errors at the
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#### Abstract

about 2000 epoch. This could translate into about 1 to $2 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$ systematic errors for individual stars. But if the UCAC5 random errors on proper motions are small (order 1-2 mas $/ \mathrm{yr}$ ) while the TGAS proper motions are larger, you might want to take UCAC5 or a mean between TGAS and UCAC5... For stars not in TGAS, UCAC5 is a good option, although there are several other attempts to get proper motions with Gaia data and some other earlier data. See for example HSOY (update of PPMXL) or the GPS1 (derived from Pan-STARRS, SDSS and 2MASS). Then there is also the PMA (proper motion absolute) catalog based on 2MASS. They all have their pros and cons and are on about the same level of formal errors - nobody knows which is better in an absolute sense."


In many cases, Gaia has good proper motion data on only one of the stars in a double star system. Since the UCAC5 catalog has a much larger sampling of proper motions, it is common for a star without a proper motion value in Gaia to be listed in the UCAC5 data. When this was the case, I looked at the proper motion data in both catalogs for the star that was listed in both catalogs. If the UCAC5 proper motion vector was within 5 milli-arc seconds (mas) of the Gaia value, I assumed that the UCAC5 data for the second star would be on a par with Gaia (had Gaia listed it). However, if the difference in proper motions exceeded 5 mas, the UCAC5 data for the second star was not used.

## 3d. Using the Most Accurate Parallax Data Available

Like the proper motion data, parallax data will be listed with attribution to its source. The format will be XX.XX $\pm 0 . \mathrm{XX} \mathrm{S}$, where the X's are the numbers of the parallax value (with $\pm 0 . \mathrm{XX}$ being the stated error estimate of the parallax) and S the source- H for Hipparcos, G for Gaia.

Most of the time, we only have parallax data on one of the stars in a double star system. In this report, only 34 of the 417 speckle measurements ( $8 \%$ ) have parallax on both stars.

Determining if two stars are close enough to be physical on the basis of parallax data alone is a bit tricky. Let's consider two of the stars in this report.

WDS 09371-1350 (BRT1909) has parallaxes for both stars shown in Gaia. For the primary, Gaia shows $1.76 \pm 0.40$ mas, while for the companion it shows 2.19 $\pm 0.93$ mas. Thus the primary could have a parallax ranging from 1.36 up to 2.16 mas while the companion could range from 1.26 to 3.12 mas. So there is a considerable range of parallaxes where the stars could be at the same distance from the earth. If we draw a diagram showing the parallaxes with their error estimates, we get a picture like Figure 2.


Figure 2: Parallax overlap of BRT1909
Whereas the two stars could clearly be at the same distance (as shown by the Region of Overlap), they could also be at quite different distances. The Region of Overlap is 0.80 mas whereas the entire parallax range is $3.12-1.26$ or 1.86 mas. So the range of overlap is equivalent to $0.80 / 1.86$ or $43 \%$ of the total parallax space. Does this mean the stars have a $43 \%$ chance of being at the same distance?

Unfortunately, no. The reason is that the probability of a star being at any given parallax value is not a linear function around the mean parallax value but rather a Gaussian distribution around the mean. The reported error estimate is one standard deviation. In a normal distribution, the first standard deviation from the mean contains $34.13 \%$ of the possible values, so there is a $68.26 \%$ chance that a star will be within its given parallax window (using 1 standard deviation on both sides of the mean). The actual math to compute a precise probability of two stars being at the same distance given their parallaxes is quite complicated. For our purposes, the percentage of overlap will serve as a reasonable indicator of a pair's likelihood of being at the same distance.

Let us consider a case where the stars clearly have no overlap in their parallaxes values. Let us look at WDS $10258+3237$ (ES 432), a pair with given parallaxes of $4.00 \pm 0.36$ and $2.74 \pm 0.49$. Here is a diagram of the parallax data (Figure 3):

Clearly, there is no overlap between the parallax values of the stars in the system, so they are probably too far apart to be captured by their mutual gravitational forces.

In doing parallax calculations, if the error estimate of the parallax was $25 \%$ or more of the mean, the parallax was rejected as being unreliable.

Also, at the suggestion of William Hartkopf at the US Naval Observatory, I decided to use a weighted average of the parallax values for stars whose parallaxes


Figure 3: Parallax range of ES 432
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could place them close enough in physical proximity to be physical. In such cases, the weighted parallax was computed as shown in Equation 1.
$P X_{w}=\frac{\left[\left(1-\text { PxA err }^{\circ} \%\right) * P_{x A}\right]+[(1-\text { PxB err } \%) * \text { PxB }]}{\left[(1-\text { PxA err } \%)+\left(1-\text { PxB err }^{2}\right)\right]}$
$P X_{w}$ is the weighted parallax. PxA err $\%$ is the error in parallax for the primary star expressed as a percentage (Error / Parallax). Likewise for $\operatorname{PxB} \mathrm{err} \%$.

Let's take an example. Consider the case of WDS $11272+1908$ (KU 38), a pair for which Gaia lists parallax for both stars. For the primary, Gaia shows $6.18 \pm$ 0.38 mas and for the companion, $6.23 \pm 0.42$ mas. The weighted parallax then works out to

$$
\begin{aligned}
P X_{w} & =\frac{[(1-0.38 / 6.18) * 6.18]+[(1-0.42 / 6.23) * 6.23]}{[(1-0.38 / 6.18)+(1-0.42 / 6.23)]} \\
& =6.20
\end{aligned}
$$

Knowing the weighted parallax, it is a simple matter to divide 1 by the parallax in arc seconds (converting mas to arc seconds by multiplying the mas by 0.001 ). In this case, the distance would be $1 / 0.0062$ $=161$ parsecs.

## 3e. Estimating the minimum separation between the two stars.

When we have a parallax for each star, we can then compute the minimum separation between the two stars once we have the distance in parsecs. This is found by simply multiplying the distance (in parsecs) by the latest value for rho (in arc seconds). In the case of KU 38, the last value for rho in the WDS was listed as 5.90". Hence, the minimum separation between the two stars is $5.90 * 161$ or 950 astronomical units (AU)— roughly 32 times the distance from the Sun to Neptune. This is a vast distance to be sure, but well within the realm of possibility for a binary star system.

This method will yield only the minimum separation between the two stars since we do not know the orientation of the stars relative to our line of sight. We are only seeing a projection of their distance on the sky's plane, and in all likelihood, one of the stars lies closer to earth than the other. As a result, we see one leg of a right triangle, while the stars are truly separated by the hypotenuse of that triangle.

This same procedure can be applied, of course, to pairs where the parallax to only one of the stars is known. In such cases, the minimum separation is a rough guide to the physicality of the system.

A survey of 888 systems from the Sixth Orbit Cata-
$\log$ where we have the distance to the pair and can therefore compute the true separation of a binary system in AU , the true separations of stars (based on the semi-major axis of the orbit) run a range from 4.1 AU at the low end to $1,707 \mathrm{AU}$ at the high end, with a mean of 281 AU .

The data available to date suggests that true separations in binary stars will be, at most, in the low thousands of astronomical units. Of course, this is not to say that a true binary could not have a separation of 30,000 astronomical units or more, but only that our research so far makes such a wide pair highly unlikely. Obviously, the $6^{\text {th }}$ Orbit Catalog represents a selection bias due to the fact that we only have good distance data and orbits on binary stars that are relatively close to us and with short enough periods to detect a short arc in the data when plotted on a graph. Such visual clues can then lead to an orbital solution. Nonetheless, I would be highly suspicious of a given pair's odds of being a true binary if the separation between the two stars exceeds 3 or 4 thousand astronomical units.

## 4. Results

## 4a. The Results Tables.

The speckle results of the winter and spring 2017 observing season at Brilliant Sky Observatory are presented in 6 tables as shown in Table 1. (The numbers indicate the number of pairs listed in each table.)

In Table 1, the number before the colon indicates the table number. CPM means common proper motion pairs (pairs where the proper motion vectors are both within 5 mas of each other, except where the proper motions are large, in which case the differences can be extended). DPM means the pair has different proper motions (more than 5 mas difference in both vector values). LIN means the pair is showing a linear pattern. ORB are pairs that have known orbits. SAB signifies short arc binaries, pairs that are showing an arc but for which there are not yet orbital solutions. And UNK

Table 1: Results by Type of System

| Type | Speckle |
| :---: | :---: |
| CPM | $3: 278$ |
| DPM | $4: 21$ |
| LIN | $5: 13$ |
| ORB | $6: 79$ |
| SAB | $8: 12$ |
| UNK |  |
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stands for unknown - cases that do not fit any of the other categories.

## 4b. A Quick Check of Measurement Consistency.

A quick way to check consistency of one's measurements has traditionally been to compare the observer's measurement to the last measurement listed in the WDS (and obtained by a datarequest email to the USNO). The problem with this method is that if the last measurement was of uncertain value, the residual (difference between the observer's measurement and the last measurement on record) may be large, suggesting a poor measurement. Of course, the large residual may be due to a weak prior measurement. This will be seen in several cases in the tables that follow.

A more consistent method is to compute the average annual difference between the values of theta and rho from the last measurement on record to the observer's measurement, and then add all of the differences. The closer to zero each sum would be (theta and rho), the more consistent the measurements of the observer.

The reasoning is that for any large sample (and 427 pairs is probably a large enough sample), one would expect the changes in theta to be evenly divided between increasing theta ( $\mathrm{a}+$ value for the difference) and decreasing theta ( $\mathrm{a}-$ value); likewise for rho. In other words, there is a $50 / 50$ chance that for any given pair, theta will increase over time or decrease, as will be the case for rho.

By computing the average annual change in theta and rho, one gets around those cases where the last measurement was made, say, 20 years ago and the residual seems very large. But if one computes the change in theta and rho per year over the 20 year window, the residuals become much smaller.

In computing annualized changes in theta and rho, I took the date of the observation minus the year of the last observation plus 0.5 (assuming an average measurement would be made mid-year), resulting in the number of years that have elapsed since the last measurement on file and the one I made. I then divided the raw residuals by this number of years to get the annual change.

I do this procedure for each night I observe and if the average annual change in theta exceeds $0.5^{\circ}$ or rho exceeds $0.100^{\prime \prime}$, I assume there is a problem with the measurements that night (more than likely, a calibration issue). If the cause of the error can be determined (for example, doing a drift calibration the next night without moving the camera from the night before), the correction will be applied to the measurements obtained and results reported. If the cause cannot be determined, or if even after finding the cause, the errors still lie outside the parameters I have set, I reject all the work for that

night and try to get the measurements on a later night.
For all of the pairs in this report, the annual differences came to the values shown in Table 2. I also report in this table the average standard error of the mean and average raw residual.
4c. Table Format.
The table column headings are as follows:

- Date: date of the observation (Julian)
- WDS No: the WDS number of the pair
- Disc/Comp: discoverer and components
- PM A: proper motion of the primary in mas per year. Source indicated by W for WDS, G for Gaia, or U for UCAC5
- PM B: proper motion of the companion as for A
- Last Yr: last year of measurement on file with the WDS
- Last $\theta$ : the last value for $\theta$ reported
- Last $\rho$ : the last value for $\rho$ reported
- Msrs: Number of measures made on the night of observation
- Measured $\theta \pm \operatorname{err}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ : the measured value of $\theta$ that night with the standard error of the mean, expressed in degrees
- Measured $\rho \pm$ err ("): the measured value of $\rho$ that night with the standard error of the mean, expressed in arc seconds
- Resid $\theta$ : the difference between the observed value of $\theta$ and the last value on record
- Resid $\rho$ : the difference between the observed value of $\rho$ and the last value on record

In the plot diagrams that accompany the notes, the historical data has been corrected for precession and the axis values are expressed in arc seconds.

Every pair that I measure has a plot of its measurements generated from a WDS data request. Any measurement I make that lies far from the mean of the his-

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

torical data is not reported, as there may be problems with calibration or even the measurement of the wrong star (surprisingly easy to do in a rich star field!).

In addition, some of the plots of the measurements presented in the "Notes" tables that follow each table of results contain a heavy orange line. This line is the PM vector that the stars should have followed if the displacement over its observed history is due only to a difference in proper motions. In some cases, the fit of the
orange line to the data is so good as to virtually confirm the pair is linear. In other cases, the orange line is displayed on a small and dense packing of measurements, which would indicate a problem with one (or both) of the proper motion vectors.

Table 3: Common Proper Motion Pairs (CPM) Measured With Speckle

| Date | WDS No | Disc | /Comp | PM A | PM B | Last Yr | Last $\theta$ | Last $\rho$ | Msrs | ```Measured 0 terr (%)``` | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Measured } \\ \rho \pm \text { err } \\ (") \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | Resid $\rho$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.0822 | 02123+2357 | STF | 226AB | +135-169 U | +130-160 W | 2009 | 231.9 | 1.76 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 230.9 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.755 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | -0.005 | * |
| 2017.0822 | 02214+0853 | BU | 8 | +000-015 W | +000-015 W | 2008 | 224.7 | 1.53 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 224.0 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.632 \pm \\ & 0.012 \end{aligned}$ | -0.7 | 0.102 | * |
| 2017.0767 | 02233-0749 | HO 3 | 313AB | +013-024 W | +013-024 W | 2012 | 75.9 | 2.13 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 73.3 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.279 \pm \\ & 0.012 \end{aligned}$ | -2.6 | 0.149 |  |
| 2017.0795 | 02244+1130 | STF 2 | 261 | $+000+003 \mathrm{G}$ | -001+005 U | 2008 | 252.0 | 2.90 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 253.6 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.831 \pm \\ & 0.015 \end{aligned}$ | 1.6 | -0.069 | * |
| 2017.0822 | 02327+0620 | STF 27 | 276 | +023-095 W | +023-095 W | 2011 | 274.0 | 1.70 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 275.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.839 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | 1.6 | 0.139 |  |
| 2017.0795 | 02389+1526 | AG | 43 | -016-011 U | -018-012 U | 2008 | 61.8 | 2.97 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 63.3 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.857 \pm \\ & 0.023 \end{aligned}$ | 1.5 | -0.113 |  |
| 2017.0822 | 02411+1848 | STF 2 | 291AB | -003-013 G | -002-013 W | 2016 | 117.1 | 3.31 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 117.2 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.366 \pm \\ & 0.012 \end{aligned}$ | 0.1 | 0.056 | * |
| 2017.0795 | 02429-0629 | A 4 | 452 | +066-057 G | +059-064 W | 2006 | 112.5 | 1.80 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 114.5 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.891 \pm \\ & 0.020 \end{aligned}$ | 2.0 | 0.091 | * |
| 2017.0795 | 02447-0158 | STF 3 | 303 | -009-004 G | -010-005 U | 2003 | 180.9 | 5.79 | 5 | $182.8 \pm$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.841 \pm \\ & 0.010 \end{aligned}$ | 1.9 | 0.051 | * |
| 2017.0795 | 02527+0628 | STF 3 | 323 | +022-013 W | +022-013 W | 2012 | 278.3 | 2.71 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 280.3 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.719 \pm \\ & 0.035 \end{aligned}$ | 2.0 | 0.009 | * |
| 2017.0795 | 03051+2755 | STF 3 | 342 | -009-038 U | -002-027 W | 2008 | 303.9 | 3.20 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 304.2 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.399 \pm \\ & 0.006 \end{aligned}$ | 0.3 | 0.199 | * |
| 2017.0822 | 03088+3528 | STF 3 | 352 | +032-031 G | +032-030 W | 2011 | 359.5 | 3.79 | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 358.7 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.898 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.8 | 0.108 | * |
| 2017.0795 | 03242+1733 | STF 3 | 383 | +016-048 U | +014-053 W | 2010 | 120.2 | 5.33 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 120.8 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.562 \pm \\ & 0.010 \end{aligned}$ | 0.6 | 0.232 | * |
| 2017.0767 | 03258-1304 | HU | 21 | +008-000 G | +003+001 W | 1999 | 36.8 | 1.39 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 37.8 \pm \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.458 \pm \\ & 0.015 \end{aligned}$ | 1.0 | 0.068 | * |
| 2017.0795 | 03312+1947 | STF 4 | 403 | +031+037 G | +034+024 W | 2012 | 171.4 | 2.29 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 172.7 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.296 \pm \\ & 0.010 \end{aligned}$ | 1.3 | 0.006 | * |
| 2017.0822 | 03446+3551 | HO 5 | 504 | +009-011 W | +009-011 W | 2009 | 192.4 | 1.11 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 193.1 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.105 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7 | -0.005 |  |
| 2017.0767 | 03545-1243 | HLD | 67 | -009-016 G | -017-011 W | 2009 | 149.8 | 2.78 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 146.8 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.885 \pm \\ & 0.006 \end{aligned}$ | -3.0 | 0.105 | * |
| 2017.0795 | 03554+1738 | BU | 85 | -000-005 G | -002-005 W | 2010 | 216.5 | 3.96 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 216.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.037 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.1 | 0.077 | * |
| 2017.0822 | 04024-0700 | STF 4 | 489 | -009+024 G | -010+027 U | 2010 | 197.2 | 3.08 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 196.5 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.078 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | -0.7 | -0.002 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 04059+1058 | STF 4 | 491 | -002-074 G | -004-072 W | 2010 | 96.8 | 2.90 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 96.5 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.843 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | -0.057 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 04160+0027 | STF 5 | 517 | +024-021 G | +024-022 W | 2012 | 8.0 | 3.29 | 5 | $6.6 \pm 0.3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.248 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -1.4 | -0.042 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 04409+0058 | STF 5 | 583AB | +000-001 G | +000-001 W | 2012 | 327.5 | 5.45 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 326.9 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.757 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.6 | 0.307 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 04448+0517 | STF 5 | 589AB | -118-045 G | -122-058 W | 2011 | 277.0 | 4.70 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 276.1 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.669 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.9 | -0.031 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 04551-0033 | STF 6 | $614 \mathrm{AB}-\mathrm{C}$ | $+003+002 \mathrm{G}$ | -001+002 W | 2010 | 69.1 | 4.39 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 68.5 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.420 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.6 | 0.030 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 04561+0908 | BU 4 | 405 | -005-004 W | -005-004 W | 2015 | 290.7 | 1.65 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 290.1 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.772 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.6 | 0.122 | * |
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Table 3 (continued): Common Proper Motion Pairs (CPM) Measured With Speckle

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \text { Yr } \end{gathered}$ | Last $\theta$ | Last $\rho$ | Msrs | ```Measured 0 terr (%)``` | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Measured } \\ \rho \pm \text { err } \\ \text { (") } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | Resid $\rho$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.1616 | 05030-0840 | STF 636 | -012-003 W | -012-003 W | 2013 | 103.2 | 3.60 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 103.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.669 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 0.4 | 0.069 | * |
| 2017.1644 | 05041+0257 | A 2632 | +000-006 W | +000-006 W | 2016 | 300.0 | 0.90 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 303.3 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.901 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 3.3 | 0.001 |  |
| 2017.1644 | 05079+0824 | STF 643 | +023-061 G | +018-061 G | 2010 | 124.4 | 2.38 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 124.9 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.448 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 0.5 | 0.068 | * |
| 2017.1616 | 05110-0146 | BU 885 | +006-001 W | +006-001 W | 2006 | 196.1 | 0.64 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 198.3 \pm \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.601 \pm \\ & 0.013 \end{aligned}$ | 2.2 | -0.039 | * |
| 2017.1671 | 05118+0102 | STF 652 | -001-017 W | -001-017 W | 2015 | 180.0 | 1.60 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 179.6 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.668 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.4 | 0.068 | * |
| 2017.1616 | 05125-0302 | A 51 | +000-008 W | +000-008 W | 2009 | 104.3 | 1.48 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 105.0 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.486 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7 | 0.006 |  |
| 2017.1616 | 05147-0704 | STF 667 | -008-008 G | -009-010 W | 2004 | 316.2 | 4.22 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 315.7 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.284 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | -0.5 | 0.064 | * |
| 2017.1671 | 05152+0826 | STF 664 | +015-036 G | +011-039 W | 2011 | 177.2 | 4.66 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 176.3 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.702 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.9 | 0.042 | * |
| 2017.1671 | 05159+0345 | A 2638 | -006-021 W | -006-021 W | 2016 | 279.0 | 0.90 | 5 | $\begin{array}{\|l} 280.3 \pm \\ 0.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.961 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 1.3 | 0.061 |  |
| 2017.1616 | 05162-0329 | BU 318 | -002-001 W | -002-001 W | 1997 | 261.6 | 0.62 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 264.3 \pm \\ & 1.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.643 \pm \\ & 0.010 \end{aligned}$ | 2.7 | 0.023 | * |
| 2017.1671 | 05177+0441 | STF 678AB | +017-032 G | +013-030 W | 2009 | 102.6 | 3.62 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 103.4 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.594 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 0.8 | -0.026 | * |
| 2017.1616 | 05204-0805 | BU 190AB | -000-063 G | +000-065 W | 2001 | 328.2 | 0.66 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 326.3 \pm \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.706 \pm \\ & 0.009 \end{aligned}$ | -1.9 | 0.046 | * |
| 2017.1616 | 05217-0203 | STF 693 | -001+010 G | -002+010 W | 2008 | 10.5 | 3.49 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 10.7 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.511 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.2 | 0.021 | * |
| 2017.1671 | 05231+0103 | STF 700 | +001-006 G | +003-007 W | 2015 | 6.9 | 4.73 | 5 | $3.9 \pm 0.0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.788 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -3.0 | 0.058 | * |
| 2017.1616 | 05231-0806 | A 486 | -003+005 W | -003+005 W | 1997 | 71.3 | 0.63 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 73.2 \pm \\ & 0.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.750 \pm \\ & 0.029 \end{aligned}$ | 1.9 | 0.120 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 05236-1025 | STN 10 | -002+005 W | -002+005 W | 2006 | 120.6 | 0.85 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 120.4 \pm \\ & 0.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.096 \pm \\ & 0.025 \end{aligned}$ | -0.2 | 0.246 |  |
| 2017.1671 | 05252+0155 | STF 708 | +002-007 W | +002-007 W | 2010 | 321.1 | 2.69 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 321.1 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.772 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 0.0 | 0.072 | * |
| 2017.1671 | 05265+0256 | STF 712AB | -002-006 W | -002-006 W | 2012 | 66.4 | 3.16 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 65.9 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.157 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.5 | -0.003 | * |
| 2017.1644 | 05291-0201 | D 8AB | -001-020 W | +003-023 W | 2010 | 49.0 | 4.80 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 47.7 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.711 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | -1.3 | 0.911 |  |
| 2017.1671 | 05312+0318 | STF 729AB | +000-006 W | +000-006 W | 2015 | 27.0 | 1.90 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 25.5 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.849 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -1.5 | -0.051 | * |
| 2017.1644 | 05314-0206 | STF 731AB | +001+001 W | -001+000 W | 2006 | 327.2 | 4.94 | 5 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 327.0 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.830 \pm \\ & 0.008 \end{aligned}$ | -0.2 | -0.110 | * |
| 2017.1644 | 05331-0143 | STF 734AB | -001-007 W | -001-007 W | 2008 | 357.3 | 1.65 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 355.3 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.614 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | -2.0 | -0.036 |  |
| 2017.1644 | 05345-0429 | BU 13 | -009-007 W | -009-007 W | 1991 | 141.9 | 0.96 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 144.1 \pm \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.830 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | 2.2 | -0.130 |  |
| 2017.1644 | 05347-0424 | STF 743 | -006-004 W | -006-004 W | 2012 | 282.0 | 1.80 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 283.2 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.852 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 1.2 | 0.052 |  |
| 2017.1644 | 05355-0422 | STF 750 | +004+001 W | +004+001 W | 2014 | 60.1 | 4.10 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 59.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.238 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.5 | 0.138 | * |
| 2017.1671 | 05381-0011 | STF 757AB | -001-008 W | -001-008 W | 2010 | 239.4 | 1.45 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 239.3 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.525 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | -0.1 | 0.075 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 05457-1447 | A 3018 | -002-048 W | -002-048 W | 1998 | 294.2 | 0.75 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 303.3 \pm \\ & 0.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.707 \pm \\ & 0.018 \end{aligned}$ | 9.1 | -0.043 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 05484-1842 | HJ 3799 | -011+002 W | -011+002 W | 2008 | 152.4 | 3.79 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 151.4 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.781 \pm \\ & 0.008 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | -0.009 |  |
| 2017.1616 | 05495-1234 | HDS 783 | -001+005 W | -001+005 W | 2000 | 167.2 | 1.70 | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 168.6 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.944 \pm \\ & 0.011 \end{aligned}$ | 1.4 | 0.244 |  |
| 2017.1616 | 05514-1139 | A 2512 | -008-004 W | -008-004 W | 1991 | 279.0 | 1.13 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 275.3 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.999 \pm \\ & 0.008 \end{aligned}$ | -3.7 | -0.131 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 06041-1541 | SKI 2 | -010+014 W | -006+007 W | 1999 | 171.9 | 5.50 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 170.8 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.293 \pm \\ & 0.027 \end{aligned}$ | -1.1 | -0.207 |  |
| 2017.2137 | 06049-0243 | STF 839AB | -003-006 G | -002-005 G | 2004 | 289.1 | 4.94 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 288.1 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.100 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | 0.160 | * |
| 2017.2137 | 06074-0400 | STF 850AB | -004-010 G | -004-010 G | 2008 | 17.8 | 2.02 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 15.2 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.171 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | -2.6 | 0.151 | * |
| 2017.1616 | 06114-1650 | A 3022 | -013-006 W | -013-006 W | 2008 | 359.9 | 1.04 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 357.6 \pm \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.098 \pm \\ & 0.018 \end{aligned}$ | -2.3 | 0.058 |  |
| 2017.1507 | 06167-1203 | BU 18 | -012-035 G | -015-039 W | 1993 | 284.5 | 1.81 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 286.0 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.872 \pm \\ & 0.014 \end{aligned}$ | 1.5 | 0.062 | * |

Table 3 continues on next page.

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Table 3 (continued): Common Proper Motion Pairs (CPM) Measured With Speckle

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \text { Yr } \end{gathered}$ | Last $\theta$ | Last $\rho$ | Msrs | ```Measured 0 terr (')``` | ```Measured p terr (")``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | Resid $\rho$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.1644 | 06217-1424 | HU 1241AB | -016+008 W | -016+008 W | 1996 | 81.4 | 0.83 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 79.7 \pm \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.766 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | -1.7 | -0.064 |  |
| 2017.1644 | 06238-1947 | BU 568 | -004+003 W | -004+003 W | 2005 | 153.0 | 0.79 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 155.2 \pm \\ & 0.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.849 \pm \\ & 0.015 \end{aligned}$ | 2.2 | 0.059 | * |
| 2017.1644 | 06252-1056 | BU 569 | -002-013 W | -002-013 W | 1991 | 117.1 | 1.69 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 115.0 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.675 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | -2.1 | -0.015 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 06372-1415 | HLD 80 | -002+002 G | -001+002 G | 2011 | 311.9 | 4.03 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 310.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.090 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | -1.3 | 0.060 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 06420-1600 | BU 19 | -004+002 G | -002+004 W | 1999 | 168.5 | 3.95 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 166.9 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.797 \pm \\ & 0.009 \end{aligned}$ | -1.6 | -0.153 | * |
| 2017.1644 | 06484-1326 | STF 971AB | -010-009 W | -010-009 W | 2008 | 323.0 | 1.20 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 323.0 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.237 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 0.0 | 0.037 | * |
| 2017.1644 | 06488-1613 | BU 20 | +009-049 G | +011-049 W | 2002 | 27.2 | 3.29 | 5 | $\begin{array}{\|l} 26.7 \pm \\ 0.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.315 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | -0.8 | 0.025 | * |
| 2017.2137 | 06573-1005 | A 514 | -025+014 W | -025+014 W | 1991 | 101.4 | 1.39 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 103.0 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.465 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 1.6 | 0.075 | * |
| 2017.2137 | 06584-1011 | A 515 | -009+004 W | -009+004 W | 1991 | 313.0 | 1.68 | 5 | $314.7 \pm$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.708 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 1.7 | 0.028 |  |
| 2017.2712 | 08019-0333 | A 539 | -009-001 W | -009-001 W | 2005 | 19.6 | 0.75 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 21.3 \pm \\ & 1.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.663 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | 1.7 | -0.087 |  |
| 2017.2712 | 08042-0151 | BU 903 | -006-005 G | -002-012 W | 1991 | 33.6 | 1.72 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 34.0 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.649 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 0.4 | -0.071 | * |
| 2017.2986 | 08046+5445 | STF1172 | -018-017 G | -018-014 W | 1995 | 243.6 | 1.66 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 243.5 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.746 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.1 | 0.086 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 08091+3714 | HU 849 | -035-042 G | -035-040 W | 2008 | 283.1 | 1.17 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 282.5 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.255 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.6 | 0.085 | * |
| 2017.2712 | 08092-0642 | BU 583 | -003-009 W | -003-009 W | 2010 | 71.3 | 1.83 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 70.7 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.844 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.6 | 0.014 |  |
| 2017.2740 | 08101+0403 | AG 150 | +022-001 G | +018-001 G | 2010 | 30.3 | 5.00 | 5 | $30.0 \pm$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.085 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | 0.085 | * |
| 2017.2712 | 08109-0455 | A 335 | -011-003 G | -015-006 W | 1991 | 125.9 | 1.43 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 127.2 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.512 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | 1.3 | 0.082 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 08127+2933 | STF1197 | -008+005 W | -008+005 W | 2015 | 99.5 | 1.83 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 99.9 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.783 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 0.4 | -0.047 |  |
| 2017.2795 | 08136+1023 | BU 204 | -008+010 W | -008+010 W | 2004 | 292.0 | 0.80 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 291.0 \pm \\ & 0.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.773 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | -0.027 | * |
| 2017.2740 | 08138+0159 | BU 1244 | +043-056 W | +043-056 W | 2005 | 10.8 | 0.98 | 5 | $5.8 \pm 0.1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.033 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -5.0 | 0.053 | * |
| 2017.2795 | $08138+1538$ | PRT 3 | -022+045 W | -022+045 W | 2015 | 339.7 | 1.50 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 338.7 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.506 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | 0.006 |  |
| 2017.2712 | 08140-1740 | HU 1249 | +026-028 W | +026-028 W | 2003 | 122.2 | 0.73 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 124.2 \pm \\ & 1.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.910 \pm \\ & 0.012 \end{aligned}$ | 2.0 | 0.180 | * |
| 2017.2986 | 08296+5203 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HDS1213 } \\ & \text { AaAb } \end{aligned}$ | -087+025 W | -087+025 W | 2015 | 323.0 | 0.90 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 321.8 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.019 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -1.2 | 0.119 | * |
| 2017.2986 | 08298+5112 | STF1225 | +004+001 G | +003-002 G | 2008 | 189.4 | 3.68 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 192.3 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.759 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 2.9 | 0.079 | * |
| 2017.2740 | 08330+0958 | A 2895 | +007-037 W | +007-037 W | 1991 | 57.3 | 0.81 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 55.9 \pm \\ & 1.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.768 \pm \\ & 0.021 \end{aligned}$ | -1.4 | -0.042 |  |
| 2017.2712 | 08331-1257 | A 2365 | -005+006 W | -005+006 W | 2005 | 282.1 | 1.29 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 282.3 \pm \\ & 0.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.363 \pm \\ & 0.007 \end{aligned}$ | 0.2 | 0.073 |  |
| 2017.2740 | 08339+0135 | STF1243 | -002-004 W | -002-004 W | 2008 | 233.2 | 1.74 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 232.8 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.724 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.4 | -0.016 |  |
| 2017.2986 | $08342+5655$ | STF1235 | -014-029 G | -014-033 W | 1996 | 85.4 | 1.50 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 88.3 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.529 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | 2.9 | 0.029 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 08421+2501 | J 1110 | -046-018 G | -042-021 G | 2012 | 41.6 | 3.36 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 41.5 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.424 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.1 | 0.064 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 08432+3849 | BU 209 | +036+016 G | +035+008 W | 2012 | 8.3 | 1.25 | 5 | $8.2 \pm 0.1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.278 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.1 | 0.028 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 08437+1654 | A 2546 | +019-007 W | +019-007 W | 2010 | 215.5 | 1.70 | 5 | $218.6 \pm$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.243 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 3.1 | -0.457 | * |
| 2017.2795 | $08444+1555$ | A 2472 | -002-016 W | -002-016 W | 2012 | 262.7 | 0.80 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 260.8 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.810 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -1.9 | 0.010 | * |
| 2017.2712 | 08453-0236 | STF1270 | +001-010 G | +004-013 W | 2013 | 264.4 | 4.61 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 264.5 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.699 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 0.1 | 0.089 | * |
| 2017.2740 | 08461+0748 | J 735 | -097+054 G | -099+053 W | 2014 | 339.7 | 2.79 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 339.2 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.818 \pm \\ & 0.013 \end{aligned}$ | -0.5 | 0.028 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 08466+3829 | STF1259 | -049-059 G | -050-058 U | 2010 | 341.5 | 5.00 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 340.5 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.102 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | 0.102 | * |
| 2017.2740 | 08482+0235 | BU 335 | -023-037 G | -023-038 W | 2013 | 265.5 | 2.74 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 264.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.607 \pm \\ & 0.004 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -0.9 | -0.133 | * |

Table 3 continues on next page.

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Table 3 (continued): Common Proper Motion Pairs (CPM) Measured With Speckle

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | Last Yr | Last $\theta$ | Last $\rho$ | Msrs | ```Measured 0 terr (')``` | ```Measured p terr (")``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | Resid $\rho$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.2877 | 08500+3935 | STF1279 | +073-007 G | +073-015 W | 2013 | 87.0 | 1.25 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 87.4 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.277 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | 0.4 | 0.027 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 08505+2308 | AG 157 | $-047+013 \mathrm{U}$ | $-045+016 \mathrm{G}$ | 2013 | 75.2 | 2.27 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 74.8 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.295 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.4 | 0.022 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 08508+3504 | STF1282AB | $-174+114$ W | $-174+114$ W | 2014 | 277.6 | 3.50 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 277.8 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.518 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.2 | 0.018 | * |
| 2017.2740 | 08512+0820 | PER 1 | -005-006 W | -005-006 W | 2015 | 353.7 | 0.84 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 350.0 \pm \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.838 \pm \\ & 0.017 \end{aligned}$ | -3.7 | -0.002 |  |
| 2017.2712 | 08516-0711 | BU 587AB | -053-017 W | -053-017 W | 2003 | 120.6 | 1.15 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 121.2 \pm \\ & 0.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.186 \pm \\ & 0.023 \end{aligned}$ | 0.6 | 0.036 | * |
| 2017.2712 | 08518-1108 | SCJ 11 | -005-002 W | -005-002 W | 2008 | 353.2 | 2.16 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 353.0 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.282 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.2 | 0.122 |  |
| 2017.2712 | 08538-0035 | STF1292AB | $-043+044 \mathrm{G}$ | -043+043G | 2004 | 188.1 | 5.93 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 188.5 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.082 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.4 | 0.152 | * |
| 2017.2740 | 08542-0846 | BU 24 | -009+001 G | -012-003 W | 2014 | 174.8 | 1.17 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 174.0 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.179 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.8 | 0.009 | * |
| 2017.2986 | $08548+4335$ | STF1289 | -057-153 G | -055-154 W | 2015 | 7.0 | 3.70 | 5 | $6.6 \pm 0.0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.700 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.4 | 0.000 | * |
| 2017.2740 | 08549-0749 | BU 103 | -008-002 G | -002-005 W | 2014 | 74.6 | 3.22 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 71.9 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.008 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | $-2.7$ | -0.212 | * |
| 2017.2986 | 08561+4341 | STF3120 | +014-005 W | +014-005 W | 2015 | 1.0 | 1.40 | 5 | $0.7 \pm 0.0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.393 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | -0.007 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 08571+1045 | A 2968 | -034-027 W | -034-027 W | 2015 | 132.4 | 1.11 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 132.3 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.177 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.1 | 0.067 |  |
| 2017.2740 | 08598-0607 | RST4427 | -001-017 W | -001-017 W | 1991 | 340.6 | 0.57 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 334.0 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.588 \pm \\ & 0.009 \end{aligned}$ | $-6.6$ | 0.018 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 09016-0832 | A 3071 | -070-025 W | -070-025 W | 2004 | 335.3 | 1.27 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 336.1 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.318 \pm \\ & 0.006 \end{aligned}$ | 0.8 | 0.048 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 09020+0240 | BU 211 | -006-003 G | -005-010 W | 2006 | 268.4 | 1.10 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 268.2 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.125 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.2 | 0.025 | * |
| 2017.3096 | $09033+4740$ | HU 720 | -017-011 W | -017-011 W | 2015 | 140.0 | 0.70 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 135.6 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.781 \pm \\ & 0.011 \end{aligned}$ | -4.4 | 0.081 | * |
| 2017.3096 | $09071+3037$ | AG 162 | +029-039 G | +030-039 G | 2007 | 106.8 | 4.01 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 106.6 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.114 \pm \\ & 0.013 \end{aligned}$ | -0.2 | 0.104 | * |
| 2017.3260 | $09080+8102$ | STF1284 | -054-016 U | -050-031 W | 2012 | 167.8 | 2.58 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 168.3 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.484 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.5 | -0.096 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 09095+0256 | STT 197 | -016-037 W | -016-037 W | 2000 | 66.3 | 1.43 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 64.5 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.438 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -1.8 | 0.008 | * |
| 2017.2740 | 09101-1507 | A 3073 | -014-001 G | -026-010 W | 1991 | 347.0 | 1.80 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 348.9 \pm \\ & 0.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.856 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | 1.9 | 0.056 | * |
| 2017.3096 | $09103+5223$ | STF1312 | -012-014 G | -014-014 W | 2010 | 149.0 | 4.50 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 148.2 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.766 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | -0.8 | 0.266 | * |
| 2017.2740 | 09118-1649 | BU 336 | $-017+005 \mathrm{~W}$ | $-017+005 \mathrm{~W}$ | 1991 | 239.3 | 1.79 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 240.0 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.933 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7 | 0.143 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 09122-0729 | A 2972 | $-037+014 \mathrm{U}$ | $-038+015 \mathrm{U}$ | 2011 | 340.5 | 4.26 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 340.6 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.363 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 0.1 | 0.103 |  |
| 2017.3014 | $09127+1632$ | STF1322 | +002-006 G | +001-003 W | 2015 | 53.0 | 1.72 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 53.4 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.748 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 0.4 | 0.028 | * |
| 2017.2986 | 09149+0413 | BU 455 | +039-050 W | +039-050 W | 2002 | 69.3 | 1.84 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 68.1 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.845 \pm \\ & 0.000 \end{aligned}$ | -1.2 | 0.005 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 09161-0821 | BU 212 | -047-000 G | -043-011 W | 2011 | 198.4 | 1.60 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 198.0 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.627 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.4 | 0.027 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 09168-0050 | RST4906 | -011-003 W | -011-003 W | 1991 | 153.4 | 0.73 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 154.0 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.842 \pm \\ & 0.013 \end{aligned}$ | 0.6 | 0.112 | * |
| 2017.2740 | 09186-1712 | A 3076 | +000-001 W | +000-001 W | 2003 | 282.8 | 1.04 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 285.2 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.071 \pm \\ & 0.014 \end{aligned}$ | 2.4 | 0.031 |  |
| 2017.3096 | $09188+3648$ | STF1334AB | -033-124 W | - | 2014 | 223.6 | 2.54 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 223.0 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.620 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | -0.6 | 0.080 |  |
| 2017.2795 | 09188-1025 | A 125AB | $-022+004 \mathrm{G}$ | -020+001 W | 2012 | 30.9 | 3.02 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 30.4 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.048 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | -0.5 | 0.028 | * |
| 2017.3260 | 09208+6121 | STF1331AB | -016+010 W | -016+010 W | 2010 | 151.9 | 0.90 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 152.5 \pm \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.941 \pm \\ & 0.019 \end{aligned}$ | 0.6 | 0.041 | * |
| 2017.3096 | 09210+3643 | STF1339 | -003+009 W | -003+009 W | 2015 | 65.0 | 1.40 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 64.9 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.485 \pm \\ & 0.008 \end{aligned}$ | -0.1 | 0.085 |  |
| 2017.3014 | 09233+2211 | AG 165 | -008+000 W | -008+000 W | 2015 | 15.2 | 1.27 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 15.5 \pm \\ & 1.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.381 \pm \\ & 0.071 \end{aligned}$ | 0.3 | 0.111 |  |
| 2017.3096 | 09235+3908 | STF1344 | -014-032 G | -020-030 W | 2014 | 103.2 | 3.72 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 102.9 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.815 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | 0.095 | * |
| 2017.3014 | 09239+2754 | STT 201AB | -005-040 W | -005-040 W | 2015 | 207.0 | 1.24 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 206.1 \pm \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.373 \pm \\ & 0.021 \end{aligned}$ | -0.9 | 0.133 | * |

Table 3 continues on next page.

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Table 3 (continued): Common Proper Motion Pairs (CPM) Measured With Speckle

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \text { Yr } \end{gathered}$ | Last $\theta$ | Last $\rho$ | Msrs | ```Measured 0 terr ( }\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ``` | Measured $\rho \pm e r r$ (") | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | Resid $\rho$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.3096 | 09256+5401 | STF1346AB | -036-022 G | -038-023 W | 2014 | 315.3 | 5.77 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 314.0 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.762 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | -1.3 | -0.008 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 09269-0315 | A 128 | -041-028 W | -041-028 W | 1997 | 262.5 | 1.30 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 262.1 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.335 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | -0.4 | 0.035 |  |
| 2017.3014 | 09277+1545 | STF1353 | -022-019 U | -020-019 U | 2010 | 126.0 | 3.26 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 125.1 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.315 \pm \\ & 0.020 \end{aligned}$ | -0.9 | 0.055 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 09296-0307 | BU 591 | -002-004 G | +000-006 W | 1997 | 30.4 | 0.86 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 28.6 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.967 \pm \\ & 0.009 \end{aligned}$ | -1.8 | 0.107 | * |
| 2017.3096 | 09300+4216 | A 1985 | -029-039 W | -029-039 W | 2015 | 24.0 | 1.60 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 23.2 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.670 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.8 | 0.070 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 09310-1544 | BU 339 | -047+025 W | $-047+025 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2001 | 247.3 | 1.25 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 248.8 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.211 \pm \\ & 0.007 \end{aligned}$ | 1.5 | -0.039 | * |
| 2017.2986 | 09315+0128 | STF1365 | -011-030 W | -011-030 W | 2012 | 157.1 | 3.44 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 156.4 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.456 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.7 | 0.016 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 09338-1020 | A 131AB | -091-001 W | -091-001 W | 2014 | 324.3 | 0.90 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 323.6 \pm \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.954 \pm \\ & 0.043 \end{aligned}$ | -0.7 | 0.054 |  |
| 2017.2795 | 09400-1710 | STN 19AB | +001-019 U | -002-022 U | 2012 | 263.9 | 2.71 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 261.9 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.791 \pm \\ & 0.035 \end{aligned}$ | -2.0 | 0.081 |  |
| 2017.2795 | 09415-1829 | BU 214AB | +007-010 W | +007-010 W | 2002 | 243.0 | 3.62 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 242.1 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.749 \pm \\ & 0.011 \end{aligned}$ | -0.9 | 0.129 | * |
| 2017.3096 | $09450+4314$ | STF1376AB | -009-119 W | -008-100 G | 2014 | 310.0 | 5.30 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 309.3 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.371 \pm \\ & 0.007 \end{aligned}$ | -0.7 | 0.071 |  |
| 2017.3260 | 09460+7643 | STF1373 | -009-119 W | -008-100 G | 2012 | 135.5 | 1.89 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 137.1 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.168 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 1.6 | 0.278 | * |
| 2017.3096 | 09476+5057 | HU 630 | +008-005 U | +005-001 U | 2013 | 72.6 | 2.24 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 74.0 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.200 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 1.4 | -0.040 |  |
| 2017.3260 | 09509+5812 | KR 33 | -014-083 W | -014-083 W | 2005 | 213.4 | 2.06 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 214.0 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.082 \pm \\ & 0.006 \end{aligned}$ | 0.6 | 0.022 |  |
| 2017.3014 | 09521+1628 | STF1390AB | -004+002 W | $-004+002 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2010 | 206.9 | 2.22 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 206.6 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.223 \pm \\ & 0.023 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | 0.003 |  |
| 2017.3260 | 09551+6854 | STF1386AB | -010-002 G | -006-001 W | 2012 | 110.5 | 2.10 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 110.7 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.183 \pm \\ & 0.013 \end{aligned}$ | 0.2 | 0.083 | * |
| 2017.3096 | $09572+4554$ | STF1394 | -024-086 G | -025-085 W | 2013 | 249.2 | 4.59 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 250.5 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.525 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 1.3 | -0.065 | * |
| 2017.3260 | 09591+8023 | STF1380 | +003-003 W | +003-003 W | 1991 | 25.8 | 1.65 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 21.6 \pm \\ & 0.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.736 \pm \\ & 0.028 \end{aligned}$ | -4.2 | 0.086 | * |
| 2017.2959 | $10040+3239$ | HU 631 | -039+005 W | $-039+005 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2015 | 255.1 | 0.70 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 257.5 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.800 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 2.4 | 0.100 | * |
| 2017.2959 | $10056+3105$ | STF1406 | -045-013 W | -045-013 W | 2015 | 221.0 | 0.80 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 219.1 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.728 \pm \\ & 0.009 \end{aligned}$ | -1.9 | -0.072 | * |
| 2017.3315 | 10076+0621 | WEI 23 | +006+002 U | +010-001 U | 2011 | 314.6 | 3.33 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 314.3 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.396 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | 0.066 |  |
| 2017.2959 | 10114+7302 | STF1408 | $+014+014$ G | $+013+015 \mathrm{U}$ | 2011 | 13.3 | 3.71 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.7 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.782 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.6 | 0.072 | * |
| 2017.2822 | $10151+1907$ | STF1417 | -031-005 W | $-018+001 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2013 | 77.2 | 2.33 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 76.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.376 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.6 | 0.046 | * |
| 2017.3397 | $10163+3309$ | HU 634 | +003+018 W | +003+018 W | 2010 | 169.3 | 1.95 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 169.4 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.984 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.1 | 0.034 |  |
| 2017.2822 | 10180+1711 | A 2369 | $-004+001$ G | $-003+002 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2010 | 296.7 | 1.09 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 295.7 \pm \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.031 \pm \\ & 0.007 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | -0.059 | * |
| 2017.2822 | $10181+2731$ | STF1421 | +001-020 G | +001-020 W | 2012 | 330.9 | 4.54 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 330.3 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.601 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.6 | 0.061 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 10206-1621 | HLD 103 | +023-024 G | -019-024 W | 2001 | 344.0 | 1.76 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 343.3 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.738 \pm \\ & 0.007 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | -0.022 | * |
| 2017.2959 | $10234+2630$ | A 1990 | -001+001 W | -001+001 W | 2015 | 290.5 | 1.48 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 290.1 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.511 \pm \\ & 0.000 \end{aligned}$ | -0.4 | 0.031 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 10256+0847 | STF1431 | -013-002 G | -011-005 W | 2012 | 73.7 | 3.56 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 73.5 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.586 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.2 | 0.026 | * |
| 2017.2959 | $10260+5237$ | STF1428 | -125-040 G | -131-044 W | 2012 | 87.4 | 2.88 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 88.3 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.810 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.9 | -0.066 | * |
| 2017.2959 | $10321+8136$ | TDS 594 | -049-045 U | -051-043 U | 2011 | 104.2 | 2.86 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 103.0 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.894 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -1.2 | 0.034 | * |
| 2017.2959 | $10333+3740$ | STF1443 | +011-075 G | +010-079 U | 2010 | 160.1 | 5.43 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 160.7 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.313 \pm \\ & 0.008 \end{aligned}$ | 0.6 | -0.117 | * |
| 2017.2822 | $10336+1513$ | STF1446 | +012-007 G | +012-008 U | 2013 | 250.5 | 5.50 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 249.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.601 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | -0.9 | 0.101 | * |
| 2017.2959 | $10338+2321$ | STF1447 | -046-005 G | -047-004 W | 2011 | 124.4 | 4.44 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 123.9 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.463 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.5 | 0.023 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 10391-1735 | HLD 108AB | -004-002 W | -004-002 W | 2005 | 26.5 | 0.97 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 22.8 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.981 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | -3.7 | 0.011 |  |

Table 3 continues on next page.

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Table 3 (continued): Common Proper Motion Pairs (CPM) Measured With Speckle

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \text { Yr }_{r} \end{gathered}$ | Last $\theta$ | Last $\rho$ | Msrs | ```Measured 0 \pm err (%)``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { Measured } \\ \rho \pm \text { err } \\ (") \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | Resid $\rho$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.2959 | $10402+3824$ | STF1459 | -027-015 G | -028-016 W | 2014 | 152.1 | 5.33 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 152.2 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.423 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 0.1 | 0.093 | * |
| 2017.2822 | 10417+1044 | STT 227 | +020-001 W | +020-001 W | 2010 | 2.9 | 0.89 | 5 | $1.9 \pm 0.2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.903 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | 0.013 | * |
| 2017.2959 | $10447+2042$ | STF1468 | +040-012 G | +038-012 U | 2010 | 334.5 | 4.24 | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 333.5 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.265 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | 0.025 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 10462-0546 | STF1470 | -015+005 G | $-022+002 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2005 | 193.7 | 1.40 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 190.8 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.459 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | -2.9 | 0.059 | * |
| 2017.2959 | $10473+2235$ | STT 228 | -037-001 W | -037-001 W | 2015 | 170.4 | 0.62 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 169.9 \pm \\ & 0.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.650 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | -0.5 | 1.035 | * |
| 2017.3315 | 10512-0906 | BU 111AB | -003-001 G | $-004+001$ G | 2013 | 4.8 | 3.40 | 5 | $4.2 \pm 0.1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.282 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | -0.6 | -0.118 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 10575-1105 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { A } & 1770 \mathrm{AB}- \\ \mathrm{C} & \\ \hline \end{array}$ | -011+018 W | $-011+018$ W | 2012 | 8.7 | 4.51 | 5 | $8.0 \pm 0.1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.561 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.7 | 0.051 | * |
| 2017.3397 | $11023+3049$ | STF1501 | -047-042 W | -047-042 W | 2015 | 186.0 | 1.30 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 184.5 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.317 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -1.5 | 0.017 | * |
| 2017.3616 | $11024+8313$ | STF1479 | -025-021 W | -022-013 W | 2011 | 25.4 | 4.46 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 24.7 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.588 \pm \\ & 0.013 \end{aligned}$ | -0.7 | 0.128 | * |
| 2017.3397 | $11050+3825$ | но 378 | -065-031 W | -065-031 W | 2015 | 236.0 | 1.00 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 236.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.092 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | 0.6 | 0.092 | * |
| 2017.3397 | $11137+4105$ | HO 50 | -014+016 G | -014+016 W | 2003 | 35.1 | 3.03 | 5 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 35.0 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.005 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.1 | -0.025 | * |
| 2017.3397 | $11151+3735$ | STT 232AB | +003-005 W | +003-005 W | 2014 | 246.0 | 0.70 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 243.2 \pm \\ & 0.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.604 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | -2.8 | -0.096 | * |
| 2017.3315 | $11154+2734$ | STF1521 | -035+001 G | -036+001 W | 2013 | 96.3 | 3.65 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 97.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.705 \pm \\ & 0.006 \end{aligned}$ | 1.3 | 0.055 | * |
| 2017.3616 | $11156+5947$ | STF1519 | -029-015 G | -027-018 W | 2015 | 290.0 | 1.40 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 289.0 \pm \\ & 0.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.485 \pm \\ & 0.019 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | 0.085 | * |
| 2017.3562 | $11195+4728$ | STF1525 | -003-008 G | -004-005 W | 2010 | 174.0 | 4.00 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 173.2 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.285 \pm \\ & 0.006 \end{aligned}$ | -0. 8 | -1.715 | * |
| 2017.3616 | $11328+6004$ | KR 38 | +004+004 G | +009+005 U | 2014 | 52.3 | 2.78 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 52.6 \pm \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.802 \pm \\ & 0.013 \end{aligned}$ | 0.3 | 0.022 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $11329+5525$ | A 1593 | -025-003 G | -026-002 U | 2011 | 255.0 | 4.00 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 255.4 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.177 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.4 | 0.177 | * |
| 2017.3562 | $11332+4927$ | HU 727 | -023-021 W | -023-021 W | 2014 | 205.0 | 1.20 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 205.2 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.253 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 0.2 | 0.053 |  |
| 2017.3315 | $11367+2128$ | STF1558AB | -061-030 W | -061-030 W | 2010 | 165.1 | 1.28 | 5 | $168.2 \pm$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.265 \pm \\ & 0.008 \end{aligned}$ | 3.1 | -0.015 | * |
| 2017.3562 | 11371+4040 | A 1996 | -016+013 W | -016+013 W | 2014 | 190.0 | 2.00 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 188.9 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.988 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -1.1 | -0.012 | * |
| 2017.3616 | $11388+6421$ | STF1559 | +018+006 W | +018+006 W | 2013 | 322.9 | 1.96 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 323.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.974 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7 | 0.014 | * |
| 2017.2795 | $11438+1831$ | BRT2412 | -147+010 G | -157-004 W | 2015 | 291.9 | 4.95 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 290.9 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.886 \pm \\ & 0.008 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | -0.064 | * |
| 2017.3562 | $11517+4449$ | HJ 842 | -067-010 G | -067-011 W | 2010 | 88.6 | 3.15 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 88.9 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.104 \pm \\ & 0.011 \end{aligned}$ | 0.3 | -0.046 | * |
| 2017.3397 | $11529+3050$ | STF1576 | -067+024 G | -066+026 W | 2013 | 241.1 | 5.18 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 241.2 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.369 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | 0.1 | 0.189 | * |
| 2017.3562 | $11551+4629$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STF1579AB- } \\ & \text { C } \end{aligned}$ | -010-003 W | -010-003 W | 2014 | 42.0 | 3.90 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 41.8 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.882 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | -0.2 | -0.018 | * |
| 2017.3726 | $11561+4533$ | STF1581 | -024-006 G | -026-007 W | 2012 | 169.9 | 2.39 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 170.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.459 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7 | 0.069 | * |
| 2017.3397 | $11563+3527$ | STT 241 | -097+010 G | -085-023 W | 2011 | 145.5 | 1.83 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 146.6 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.830 \pm \\ & 0.006 \end{aligned}$ | 1.1 | 0.000 | * |
| 2017.3616 | $11598+5324$ | STT 243 | -044-020 W | -044-020 W | 2015 | 8.0 | 1.10 | 5 | $8.2 \pm 0.0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.169 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 0.2 | 0.069 |  |
| 2017.3397 | 12005-1517 | A 2162 | -026+023 G | -026+0221 W | 1999 | 151.9 | 1.41 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 149.4 \pm \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.716 \pm \\ & 0.019 \end{aligned}$ | -2.5 | 0.306 | * |
| 2017.4055 | $12120+6836$ | STF1611 | +006-003 G | +004-002 W | 2000 | 5.0 | 1.80 | 5 | $4.1 \pm 0.0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.890 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.9 | 0.090 | * |
| 2017.3616 | $12137+7826$ | HU 891 | -001-087 G | +002-075 W | 1999 | 13.0 | 2.73 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.0 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.808 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | 0.078 | * |
| 2017.3726 | 12167+3004 | AG 176 | +010-068 G | +011-064 U | 2001 | 185.3 | 2.65 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 183.7 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.336 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | -1.6 | -0.314 | * |
| 2017.3836 | $12189+5622$ | STF1630 | -011-013 W | -011-013 W | 2004 | 169.0 | 2.40 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 171.1 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.542 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 2.1 | 0.142 |  |
| 2017.3562 | $12207+2255$ | STF1634 | -072-029 W | -072-029 W | 2014 | 147.2 | 5.08 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 147.3 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.380 \pm \\ & 0.011 \end{aligned}$ | 0.1 | 0.300 | * |
| 2017.3397 | 12217+0333 | HU 737 | +028-057 G | +028-057 U | 2013 | 56.6 | 2.64 | 5 | $\begin{array}{\|l} 55.8 \pm \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.648 \pm \\ & 0.010 \end{aligned}$ | -0.8 | 0.008 | * |

Table 3 continues on next page.
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Table 3 (continued): Common Proper Motion Pairs (CPM) Measured With Speckle

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \mathrm{Yr} \end{gathered}$ | Last $\theta$ | Last $\rho$ | Msrs | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Measured } \\ \theta \pm \text { err } \\ \left({ }^{\circ}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Measured } \\ \rho \pm \text { err } \\ (") \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | Resid $\rho$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.3836 | $12257+4444$ | STF1642 | -071-005 G | -072-004 W | 2012 | 179.4 | 2.53 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 179.6 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.488 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 0.2 | -0.042 | * |
| 2017.3397 | 12311+0207 | AG 178 | -008-014 W | -008-014 W | 2005 | 284.2 | 1.33 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 285.5 \pm \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.314 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | 1.3 | -0.016 |  |
| 2017.3616 | 12321+7449 | STF1654 | -010-008 G | -010-007 W | 2006 | 22.8 | 3.77 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 22.5 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.834 \pm \\ & 0.000 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | 0.064 | * |
| 2017.3589 | $12396+6440$ | STF1667AB | +017-010 W | +017-010 W | 2015 | 38.0 | 1.10 | 5 | $40.2 \pm$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.244 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 2.2 | 0.144 |  |
| 2017.3836 | $12406+4017$ | HJ 2617AB | $-020+062 \mathrm{G}$ | $-020+063 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2010 | 2.0 | 5.70 | 5 | $2.5 \pm 0.0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.762 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 0.5 | 0.062 | * |
| 2017.3589 | $12427+3349$ | STF1672 | +000-006 G | +004-004 U | 2013 | 313.0 | 4.30 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 312.7 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.393 \pm \\ & 0.015 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | 0.093 | * |
| 2017.3397 | $12438+0733$ | STF1674 | +001+009 W | +001+009 W | 2013 | 173.5 | 2.38 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 172.9 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.322 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | -0.6 | -0.058 | * |
| 2017.3836 | $12460+4949$ | STF1679AB | +013+003 G | +013+001 U | 2013 | 207.0 | 5.90 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 208.0 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.909 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 1.0 | 0.009 | * |
| 2017.3397 | 12533+1310 | HU 894 | +003-029 W | +003-029 W | 2011 | 145.2 | 1.19 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 143.1 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.237 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -2.1 | 0.047 | * |
| 2017.3589 | 12563+5406 | STF1695AB | -062-002 W | -087+003 W | 2015 | 282.0 | 3.60 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 280.6 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.867 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | -1.4 | 0.267 | * |
| 2017.3616 | 12564-0057 | STT 256 | +027-092 W | +027-092 W | 2013 | 101.0 | 1.10 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 100.7 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.057 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | -0.043 | * |
| 2017.3589 | $12574+3022$ | STF1696 | -022-006 G | -020-006 W | 2014 | 203.2 | 3.53 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 203.7 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.651 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 0.5 | 0.121 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $12587+2728$ | STF1699 | -122-104 G | -128-103 W | 2014 | 8.0 | 1.70 | 5 | $8.7 \pm 0.1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.650 \pm \\ & 0.023 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7 | -0.050 | * |
| 2017.3616 | $12592+8256$ | STF1720 | -018+001 W | $-018+001 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2009 | 329.3 | 1.62 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 329.4 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.701 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 0.1 | 0.081 |  |
| 2017.4055 | 13007+7343 | HJ 2633 | -038-111 G | -043-112 G | 2013 | 90.3 | 4.67 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 91.4 \quad \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.633 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 1.1 | -0.037 | * |
| 2017.4027 | 13026+5625 | KR 41 | $+022+012 \mathrm{G}$ | -025+008 U | 2003 | 333.8 | 3.68 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 334.0 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.614 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | 0.2 | -0.066 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 13034-0626 | BU 928AB | -021-023 W | - | 2011 | 318.8 | 2.41 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 318.7 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.523 \pm \\ & 0.006 \end{aligned}$ | -0.1 | 0.113 |  |
| 2017.4055 | 13048+7302 | BU 799AB | -019+010 W | -017+013 W | 2013 | 265.1 | 1.39 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 266.9 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.343 \pm \\ & 0.012 \end{aligned}$ | 1.8 | -0.047 | * |
| 2017.4055 | $13128+4030$ | A 1606 | -062+007 W | -062+007 W | 2012 | 16.8 | 1.27 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 16.8 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.297 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.0 | 0.270 |  |
| 2017.4055 | 13166+5034 | STT 263 | -045+023 W | -051+031 W | 2011 | 135.8 | 1.72 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 137.9 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.735 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 2.1 | 0.015 | * |
| 2017.3562 | 13207+0257 | STF1734 | -060-012 W | -060-012 W | 2014 | 174.0 | 1.10 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 173.1 \pm \\ & 0.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.069 \pm \\ & 0.011 \end{aligned}$ | -0.9 | -0.031 | * |
| 2017.3562 | 13243+0124 | STF1742 | -026-014 W | -026-014 W | 2012 | 356.0 | 0.90 | 5 | $357.0 \pm$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.940 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 1.0 | 0.040 | * |
| 2017.4164 | $13261+3509$ | A 1855 | +005+020 G | +001+020 U | 2011 | 291.5 | 3.58 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 290.9 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.691 \pm \\ & 0.006 \end{aligned}$ | -0.6 | 0.111 | * |
| 2017.4055 | $13288+5956$ | STF1752AB | -084+031 W | -084+031 W | 2010 | 107.9 | 0.97 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 107.4 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.973 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | -0.5 | 0.003 | * |
| 2017.4164 | $13324+3649$ | STF1755 | -019-022 G | +018-020 W | 2012 | 129.9 | 4.21 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 129.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.185 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | -0.025 | * |
| 2017.4055 | $13341+6746$ | STF1767 | $-180+021$ G | $-180+019$ U | 2013 | 344.5 | 4.22 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 344.8 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.143 \pm \\ & 0.010 \end{aligned}$ | 0.3 | -0.077 | * |
| 2017.3644 | $13344+2617$ | STF1760 | +010+001 G | +009+001 U | 2007 | 64.0 | 8.70 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 64.2 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.824 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 0.2 | 0.124 | * |
| 2017.3644 | 13346+3308 | BU 933AB | +049-055 G | +049-054 W | 2011 | 22.0 | 2.70 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 22.7 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.827 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7 | 0.127 | * |
| 2017.4027 | 13354+5955 | KR 42 | -071+023 G | $-070+022$ G | 2011 | 215.4 | 3.73 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 216.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.723 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | 1.2 | -0.007 | * |
| 2017.4055 | 13356+4939 | AG 190 | +007-002 G | +007-006 G | 2011 | 12.8 | 2.56 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 13.3 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.619 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.5 | 0.059 | * |
| 2017.4055 | $13367+6947$ | STF1771 | -019+032 W | -019+032 W | 2013 | 82.9 | 1.79 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 82.8 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.786 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | -0.1 | -0.004 | * |
| 2017.4164 | 13368+0650 | A 1611 | -048+002 W | $-048+002 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2010 | 121.7 | 0.86 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 120.7 \pm \\ & 1.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.885 \pm \\ & 0.011 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | 0.025 | * |
| 2017.4055 | 13377+5043 | STF1770 | -012+004 G | -016+004 W | 2012 | 126.0 | 1.77 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 123.0 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.669 \pm \\ & 0.006 \end{aligned}$ | -3.0 | -0.101 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $13509+4422$ | A 1613AB | -075+031 U | -076+028 U | 2011 | 260.7 | 3.10 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 261.4 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.136 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7 | 0.036 | * |
| 2017.4164 | $13563+0517$ | STT 273AB | +045-059 W | +045-059 W | 2014 | 112.2 | 1.01 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 111.7 \pm \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.972 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | -0.5 | -0.038 | * |

Table 3 continues on next page.

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Table 3 (continued): Common Proper Motion Pairs (CPM) Measured With Speckle

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | Last Yr | Last $\theta$ | Last $\rho$ | Msrs | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Measured } \\ \theta \pm \text { err } \\ \left({ }^{\circ}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Measured } \\ \rho \pm \text { err } \\ (") \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | Resid $\rho$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.4055 | $13571+3426$ | BU 937 | -040+020 W | -040+020 W | 2011 | 135.3 | 1.03 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 136.6 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.052 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 1.3 | 0.022 | * |
| 2017.4164 | $13591+2549$ | STF1793 | +011-005 G | +004-003 W | 2015 | 241.3 | 4.64 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 242.0 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.854 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7 | 0.214 | * |
| 2017.4164 | 14033+0557 | HWE 29AB | -103+009 W | -103+009 W | 2012 | 235.8 | 1.28 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 235.2 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.421 \pm \\ & 0.000 \end{aligned}$ | -0.6 | 0.014 | * |
| 2017.4466 | $14101+2636$ | STF1808AB | -173-055 W | -173-055 W | 2011 | 81.0 | 2.60 | 5 | $82.8 \pm$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.624 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 1.8 | 0.024 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 14116+2802 | STF1810 | -027+047 G | -026+044 W | 2013 | 183.7 | 2.36 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 183.7 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.392 \pm \\ & 0.000 \end{aligned}$ | 0.0 | 0.032 | * |
| 2017.4411 | $14143+3356$ | STF1818 | -108+029 G | $-104+028$ U | 2013 | 330.1 | 5.50 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 330.5 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.473 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.4 | -0.027 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 14158+1018 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STF1823AB- } \\ & \text { C } \end{aligned}$ | +119-193 U | +119-193 W | 2012 | 147.0 | 3.84 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 146.7 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.933 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | 0.093 |  |
| 2017.4164 | 14203+0835 | STT 281 | +014-022 W | +014-022 W | 2010 | 165.6 | 1.50 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 165.6 \pm \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.456 \pm \\ & 0.006 \end{aligned}$ | 0.0 | -0.044 |  |
| 2017.4164 | 14270+0341 | STF1842 | -052-069 W | -057-090 W | 2010 | 198.0 | 2.74 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 197.0 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.743 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | 0.003 | * |
| 2017.4411 | $14279+2123$ | HO 543 | +042-095 G | -044-095 U | 2010 | 236.9 | 4.59 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 237.5 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.669 \pm \\ & 0.000 \end{aligned}$ | 0.6 | 0.079 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $14339+5514$ | STF1860 | -011+014 W | -011+014 W | 2011 | 112.3 | 0.99 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 112.3 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.045 \pm \\ & 0.004 \end{aligned}$ | 0.0 | 0.055 | * |
| 2017.4466 | 14363+1924 | STF3087 | -004-008 W | -004-008 G | 2005 | 222.1 | 2.25 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 222.9 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.378 \pm \\ & 0.007 \end{aligned}$ | 0.8 | 0.128 | * |
| 2017.4466 | 14403+1206 | HWE 34 | -056-005 G | -054-005 G | 2012 | 12.8 | 2.58 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.4 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.599 \pm \\ & 0.008 \end{aligned}$ | -0.4 | 0.019 | * |
| 2017.4247 | $14417+0932$ | STF1866 | -050+024 W | -050+024 W | 2010 | 203.5 | 0.74 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 205.0 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.742 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 1.5 | 0.002 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $14436+3745$ | STF1875 | -024+052 U | -024+050 G | 2012 | 128.1 | 3.04 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 129.4 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.085 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 1.3 | 0.045 |  |
| 2017.4247 | 14471+0058 | STF1881 | -028-029 W | -028-029 W | 2011 | 0.3 | 3.44 | 5 | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.462 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | 0.022 | * |
| 2017.4466 | $14524+1757$ | A 2071 | -029-012 W | -029-012 W | 2011 | 270.0 | 1.40 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 272.9 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.295 \pm \\ & 0.021 \end{aligned}$ | 2.9 | -0.105 | * |
| 2017.4411 | $14531+7811$ | HU 908AB | -013-002 G | -011-002 W | 2012 | 237.3 | 1.52 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 236.3 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.590 \pm \\ & 0.008 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | 0.070 | * |
| 2017.4027 | 14545+3406 | STF1891 | -067+044 G | -067+045 W | 2010 | 246.6 | 3.58 | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 247.8 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.519 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 1.2 | -0.061 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $14584+4403$ | STF1896AB | -061-068 G | -058-069 W | 2013 | 277.0 | 4.05 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 277.6 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.091 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | 0.6 | 0.041 | * |
| 2017.4493 | 15058+5841 | A 1114 | -020+034 W | -020+034 W | 2010 | 285.6 | 1.22 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 286.1 \pm \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.225 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | 0.5 | 0.005 |  |
| 2017.4247 | 15087-0059 | STF3090AB | +030-096 W | +030-096 W | 2010 | 286.3 | 0.62 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 287.2 \pm \\ & 0.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.627 \pm \\ & 0.024 \end{aligned}$ | 0.9 | 0.007 | * |
| 2017.4438 | $15126+1523$ | STF1917 | -005-009 G | -008-012 U | 2011 | 232.9 | 2.52 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 232.6 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.448 \pm \\ & 0.008 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | -0.072 | * |
| 2017.4438 | $15138+1427$ | STF1923AB | -056-012 G | -054-014 W | 2010 | 11.6 | 4.64 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.3 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.841 \pm \\ & 0.008 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | 0.201 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 15227-1654 | HU 307 | -012-001 G | -014+000 W | 1999 | 2.7 | 2.94 | 5 | $2.4 \pm 0.0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.959 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 | 0.019 | * |
| 2017.4466 | $15257+2638$ | STF1941 | +016-005 G | -018-007 W | 2014 | 212.0 | 1.40 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 212.2 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.397 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | 0.2 | -0.003 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 15264+0822 | A 1119 | -012-002 W | -012-002 W | 2012 | 178.5 | 1.57 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 179.7 \pm \\ & 0.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.796 \pm \\ & 0.026 \end{aligned}$ | 1.2 | 0.226 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 15276+0522 | STF1943 | -031-028 G | -031-031 W | 2014 | 148.0 | 4.93 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 147.2 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.093 \pm \\ & 0.025 \end{aligned}$ | -0. 8 | 0.163 | * |
| 2017.4466 | $15300+2530$ | STF1950 | -004+007 W | -005+008 W | 2013 | 91.3 | 3.37 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 91.8 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.338 \pm \\ & 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | 0.5 | -0.032 | * |
| 2017.4493 | $15361+4849$ | HU 652 | -020-012 W | -020-012 W | 2011 | 185.1 | 1.12 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 185.9 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.158 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | 0.8 | 0.038 | * |
| 2017.4493 | $15361+5531$ | A 1124 | -001+055 G | -003+056 W | 2012 | 143.2 | 1.38 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 143.3 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.458 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | 0.1 | 0.078 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 15391-0834 | STF3094 | -102-016 G | -108-024 W | 2010 | 297.4 | 2.49 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 296.4 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.575 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | 0.085 | * |
| 2017.4466 | $15398+2117$ | AG 197 | +022-024 G | +021-026 U | 2010 | 126.7 | 3.11 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 126.8 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.183 \pm \\ & 0.006 \end{aligned}$ | 0.1 | 0.073 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 15443-1943 | HU 654 | -029-024 W | -029-024 W | 1991 | 11.7 | 1.08 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 14.2 \pm \\ & 0.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.079 \pm \\ & 0.021 \end{aligned}$ | 2.5 | -0.001 |  |
| 2017.4438 | 15453+0432 | AG 198 | +003-015 W | +002-016 W | 2013 | 144.4 | 2.25 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 144.3 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.249 \pm \\ & 0.005 \end{aligned}$ | -0.1 | -0.001 | * |

Table 3 concludes on next page.

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Table 3 (conclusion): Common Proper Motion Pairs (CPM) Measured With Speckle

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | Last Yr | Last $\theta$ | Last $\rho$ | Msrs | ```Measured 0 terr (')``` | Measured <br> $\rho \pm$ err <br> (") | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | Resid $\rho$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.4247 | 15470-1908 | HU 656 | -004-009 U | -004-009 W | 2002 | 16.9 | 1.36 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 15.0 \pm \\ & 0.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.484 \pm \\ & 0.007 \end{aligned}$ | -1.9 | 0.124 |  |
| 2017.4247 | 15492-0314 | STF1974 | -007-002 G | -006-001 G | 2009 | 158.7 | 2.43 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 157.7 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.467 \pm \\ & 0.021 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | 0.370 | * |
| 2017.4493 | $15499+4247$ | STF1982 | $-032+025 \mathrm{G}$ | $-033+027 \mathrm{U}$ | 2008 | 298.0 | 4.94 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 299.5 \\ & \pm 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.903 \\ & \pm 0.002 \end{aligned}$ | 1.5 | -0.037 | * |
| 2017.4466 | 15509+1911 | A 2078 | -015-016 W | -015-016 W | 2010 | 166.3 | 1.09 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 165.3 \pm \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.14 \pm \\ & 0.008 \end{aligned}$ | -1.0 | 0.050 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 15589-0304 | STF3101 | $-237+042 \mathrm{G}$ | -237-042 W | 2009 | 73.4 | 2.22 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 72.7 \pm \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.200 \pm \\ & 0.001 \end{aligned}$ | -0.7 | -0.020 | * |
| 2017.4438 | 16179-0724 | A 23 | -013-006 W | -013-006 W | 1999 | 69.6 | 1.89 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 71.6 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.95 \pm \\ & 0.011 \end{aligned}$ | 2.0 | 0.060 |  |
| 2017.4438 | 16394-0306 | BU 820AB | $-060+039 \mathrm{G}$ | $-059+040 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2010 | 235.2 | 4.25 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 234.6 \pm \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.414 \pm \\ & 0.003 \end{aligned}$ | -0.6 | 0.164 | * |
| 2017.4438 | 16462-1721 | SKI 10 | -023-017 G | -027-017 U | 2014 | 84.8 | 3.37 | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 84.0 \pm \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.434 \pm \\ & 0.008 \end{aligned}$ | -0.8 | 0.064 | * |

Notes to Table 3 (CPM Pairs)

| WDS Number | Parallax | Parallax Source | Distance <br> (Parsecs) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Min Sep } \\ \text { (AU) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Plot } \\ \text { Figure } \end{gathered}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02123+2357AB | $27.3 \pm 1.19$ | H | 37 | 65 | 4 | The PM vector (331, 1.8"), shown as an orange line on the plot, is a rough fit to data. |
| 02214+0853 | $8.31 \pm 0.81$ | H | 120 | 184 | - |  |
| 02244+1130 | $5.39 \pm 0.29$ | G | 186 | 529 | - |  |
| 02429-0629 | $8.13 \pm 0.27$ | G | 123 | 221 | 5 | A short arc might be forming. |
| 02447-0158 | $3.94 \pm 0.26$ | G | 254 | 1,469 | - | Very tight clustering of data on the plot. |
| 02527+0628 | $5.10 \pm 0.90$ | H | 196 | 531 | - | Tight grouping. |
| 03051+2755 | - | - | - | - | - | The PM vector ( $32^{\circ}, 2.3^{\prime \prime}$ ) does not fit the observations. This suggests that one (or both) of the PM vectors may be wrong. All of the measurements (except one from 1914) fall within a 0.5" region. |
| $03088+3528$ | $7.83 \pm 0.34$ | G | 128 | 484 | - |  |
| $03242+1733$ | $9.49 \pm 3.48$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The Hipparcos parallax has an error that exceeds $25 \%$. |
| 03258-1304 | $2.63 \pm 0.42$ | G | 380 | 529 | - |  |
| 03312+1947 | $9.2 \pm 0.32$ | G | 109 | 249 | - | The PM vector ( $193^{\circ}, 2.4^{\prime \prime}$ ) is right for theta, but twice the value for rho. The data plot is showing an emerging trend that may lead to a short arc binary. |
| 03545-1243 | $1.95 \pm 0.73$ | G | N/A | N/A | - | The Gaia parallax has an error that exceeds $25 \%$. |
| $03554+1738$ | $3.79 \pm 0.25$ | G | 264 | 1,045 | - |  |
| 04024-0700 | $10.91 \pm 0.23$ | G | 92 | 282 | - |  |
| $04059+1058$ | $7.98 \pm 0.42$ | G | 125 | 363 | - |  |
| $04160+0027$ | $7.11 \pm 0.35$ | G | 141 | 462 | - |  |
| $04409+0058$ AB | $3.71 \pm 0.41$ | G | 270 | 1,469 | - |  |
| $04448+0517 A B$ | $25.56 \pm 0.24$ | G | 39 | 178 | 6 | This pair is trending towards a short arc binary. |
| 04551-0033AB-C | $2.87 \pm 0.27$ | G | 648 | 1,530 | - |  |
| 05030-0840 | $5.31 \pm 0.69$ | G | 188 | 678 | - |  |

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Notes to Table 3 (CPM Pairs) continued

| WDS Number | Parallax | Parallax Source | Distance (Parsecs) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Min Sep } \\ \text { (AU) } \end{gathered}$ | Plot Figure | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 05079+0824 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { A: } & 18.91 \pm \\ & 0.28 \\ \text { B: } & 18.67 \pm \\ & 0.48 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 53 | 127 | - | A weighted parallax ( 18.79 mas) was used. The parallax bars overlap 51\%. Given the nearly identical proper motions (of moderately high value), this pair is probably physical. |
| 05118+0102 | $5.12 \pm 1.07$ | H | 195 | 328 | - |  |
| 05147-0704 | $2.59 \pm 0.46$ | G | 386 | 1,629 | - |  |
| 05152+0826 | $10.32 \pm 0.30$ | G | 97 | 452 | - |  |
| 05162-0329 | $5.09 \pm 1.14$ | H | 196 | 132 | - |  |
| 05177+0441 AB | $5.21 \pm 0.24$ | G | 192 | 696 | - |  |
| 05204-0805 AB | $6.10 \pm 0.37$ | G | 164 | 108 | - | Tight grouping of data points, but a trend may be starting to form. |
| 05217-0203 | $4.17 \pm 0.26$ | G | 240 | 839 | - |  |
| 05231+0103 | $3.52 \pm 0.51$ | G | 284 | 1,403 | - |  |
| 05231-0806 | $4.43 \pm 0.89$ | H | 2,326 | 142 | 7 | A very strong trend is emerging in the data. |
| 05252+0155 | $1.84 \pm 1.10$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | Hipparcos parallax is not usable (error too large). |
| 05265+0256 AB | $6.86 \pm 0.89$ | H | 146 | 461 | - |  |
| $05312+0318$ AB | $2.87 \pm 0.84$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | Hipparcos parallax is not usable (error too large). |
| 05314-0206 AB | $2.49 \pm 0.27$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | Hipparcos parallax is not usable (error too large). |
| 05355-0422 | $2.77 \pm 0.82$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | Hipparcos parallax is not usable (error too large). |
| 05381-0011 AB | $3.72 \pm 1.25$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | Hipparcos parallax is not usable (error too large). |
| 05457-1447 |  |  |  |  | 8 | Trend forming. |
| 05495-1234 |  |  |  |  | - | Only 4 measurements. |
| 05514-1139 | $2.71 \pm 0.88$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | Hipparcos parallax is not usable (error too large). |
| 06041-1541 | $\mathrm{B}: \begin{aligned} & 3.28 \pm \\ & \\ & 0.92 \end{aligned}$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | Hipparcos parallax is not usable (error too large). |
| 06049-0243 AB |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 418 | 2,065 | - | A weighted parallax (2.39 mas) was used. The overlap in the parallaxes is $98 \%$. This pair is probably physical. But no trend can yet be seen in the data plot; the past measurements are all very tightly clustered together. |
| 06074-0400 AB | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 4.53 \pm \\ & 0.27 \\ & \text { B: } 4.04 \pm \\ & 0.27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G } \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 233 | 471 | - | A weighted parallax ( 4.29 mas) was used. The overlap in the parallaxes is only $5 \%$. Yet Gaia has identical proper motions for this pair. Despite the weak indicator provided by the parallaxes, the pair does indeed appear to be physical. |
| 06167-1203 | $6.98 \pm 0.45$ | G | 143 | 260 | - |  |
| 06238-1947 | $2.43 \pm 0.59$ | H | 412 | 325 | - |  |
| 06252-1056 | $5.37 \pm 1.01$ | H | 186 | 314 | - |  |
| 06372-1415 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 177 | 712 | - | A weighted parallax ( 5.66 mas) was used. There is an overlap of $98 \%$ in the parallax windows. Given that these two stars have the same (albeit small) proper motion, they are most likely a physical pair. However, the plot of the measurements shows a very tight clustering with no apparent trend showing. |
| 06420-1600 | $2.47 \pm 0.40$ | G | 405 | 1,599 | - |  |
| 06484-1326 AB | $7.75 \pm 0.78$ | H | 129 | 156 | - |  |

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Notes to Table 3 (CPM Pairs) continued

| WDS Number | Parallax | Parallax Source | Distance (Parsecs) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \operatorname{Min} \text { Sep } \\ \text { (AU) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Plot } \\ \text { Figure } \end{array}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 06488-1613 | $5.57 \pm 0.31$ | G | 180 | 591 | - |  |
| 06573-1005 | $18.29 \pm 0.25$ | G | 55 | 79 | - |  |
| 08042-0151 | $3.54 \pm 0.62$ | G | 282 | 486 | - | Tightly grouped data plot. |
| 08046+5445 | $2.44 \pm 0.29$ | G | 410 | 680 | - |  |
| $08091+3714$ | $12.39 \pm 0.37$ | G | 81 | 100 | - |  |
| 08101+0403 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 7.30 \pm \\ & 0.63 \\ & \mathrm{~B}: 4.67 \pm \\ & 0.30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 137 \\ & 214 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | There is absolutely no overlap in the parallax windows. On the basis of parallax alone, this pair would not be physical, as the stars are (by parallax) 77 parsecs apart. Yet the proper motion data suggests a physical connection. This star needs more observations, but not on a frequent schedule. 114 years of observations yields a cluster of data that fits inside a 0.50 " circle. |
| 08109-0455 | $2.96 \pm .049$ | G | 338 | 483 | 9 | A trend (perhaps short arc binary?) is emerging. |
| $08136+1023$ | $5.70 \pm 1.07$ | H | 175 | 140 | - |  |
| $08138+0159$ | $7.02 \pm 0.67$ | H | 142 | 140 | 10 | This pair is one of those cases where the last measurement produces a high residual. The data plot shows an emerging short arc. |
| 08140-1740 | - | - | - | - | 11 | Very interesting case. This pair is showing a very strong linear pattern, but given the identical proper motions, we may be seeing a nearly edge-on short arc orbit (a large orbit would appear linear as the companion passes the primary). The $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ value shown on the chart is generated by Excel using the Trend Line function and represents the fit of the trend line to the data. 1.00 is a perfect fit, and this system is showing an $R^{2}$ value of 0.9569 , an extremely high correlation. Note, however, that Excel assigns equal weight to all of the data in the sample, something that would not actually be done when analyzing an orbit (or linear case). |
| $08296+5203 \mathrm{AaAb}$ | - | - | - | - | - | Only 5 measurements. |
| $08298+5112$ | A: $4.62 \pm$  <br> 0.49  <br> B: $3.85 \pm$ <br> 0.24  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G } \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 216 \\ & 260 \end{aligned}$ | - | - | There is no overlap in the parallax windows. |
| $08342+5655$ | $5.17 \pm 0.33$ | G | 193 | 290 | 12 | This pair may be starting to exhibit a short arc. |
| 08421+2501 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 169 | 567 |  | A weighted parallax of 5.92 mas was used. There is a 98\% overlap in the parallax windows. Given the nearly identical (and significant) proper motions, this pair is most likely physical. |
| $08432+3849$ | $7.72 \pm 0.93$ | G | 130 | 161 | - |  |
| $08437+1654$ | - | - | - | - | 13 | Linear trend, $\mathrm{R}^{2}=0.8735$. This pair could be an edge-on short arc binary. |
| 08444+1555 | - | - | - | - | - | Evn1980.159 appears to be a quadrant reversal. |
| 08453-0236 | $12.51 \pm 0.32$ | G | 80 | 369 | - | Very tight grouping of measurements. |
| $08461+0748$ | $13.64 \pm 0.34$ | G | 73 | 205 | - |  |
| $08466+3829$ | $4.71 \pm 0.26$ | G | 212 | 1,062 | - | Very tight grouping of measurements. |
| $08482+0235$ | $7.30 \pm 0.33$ | G | 133 | 375 | - | Very tight grouping of measurements. |
| $08500+3935$ | $7.87 \pm 0.54$ | G | 127 | 159 | 14 | Trend forming. PM vector (180, 1.5") does not fit observations. |
| 08505+2308 | $\mathrm{B}: \begin{aligned} & 5.45 \pm \\ & 0.50 \end{aligned}$ | G | 183 | 417 | - | A trend is beginning to emerge. |

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Notes to Table 3 (CPM Pairs) continued

| WDS Number | Parallax | Parallax Source | Distance (Parsecs) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Min Sep } \\ \text { (AU) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Plot } \\ \text { Figure } \end{array}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 08508+3504 AB | $18.41 \pm 0.26$ | G | 54 | 190 | - |  |
| 08516-0711 AB | $7.31 \pm 0.60$ | H | 137 | 157 | - |  |
| 08538-0035 AB |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 161 \\ & 192 \end{aligned}$ | - | - | The stars are probably not physical. But the proper motions are identical. Puzzling case. |
| 08542-0846 | $2.44 \pm 0.24$ | G | 410 | 480 | - |  |
| $08548+4335$ | $18.55 \pm 0.29$ | G | 54 | 201 | - |  |
| 08549-0749 | $3.97 \pm 0.30$ | G | 252 | 811 | - | Manual solution with STB. (Companion star had to be selected manually since STB's automatic detection routine failed to find it.) |
| $08561+4341$ | $4.80 \pm 1.03$ | H | 208 | 280 | - |  |
| 08598-0607 | - | - | - | - | - | Only 5 measurements. |
| 09016-0832 | - | - | - | - | - | There appear to be several quadrant reversals among the measurements: A 1918.28, A 1922.98, A 1931.72, B 1937.27, Wor 1980.254 and Wor 1983.156. |
| $09020+0240$ | $4.71 \pm 0.53$ | G | 212 | 234 | - | A vague trend seems to be shaping up. |
| $09033+4740$ | $6.56 \pm 1.49$ | H | 152 | 111 | - |  |
| 09071+3037 | A: 6.32 $\pm .038$ B: $6.26 \pm$ 0.44 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G } \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 159 | 638 | - | Weighted parallax ( 6.29 mas) used. $85 \%$ overlap in the parallax values. |
| $09080+8102$ | $4.06 \pm 0.61$ | H | 246 | 635 | 15 | Trend emerging. PM vector (195 $\left.{ }^{\circ}, 2.8^{\prime \prime}\right)$ does not match the observations. |
| 09095+0256 | $6.07 \pm 0.66$ | H | 165 | 236 | - |  |
| 09101-1507 | $3.39 \pm 0.44$ | G | 295 | 532 | - |  |
| 09103+5223 | $2.47 \pm 0.34$ | G | 405 | 2,000 | 16 | Trend forming. |
| 09118-1649 | - | - | - | - | 17 | Trend forming. |
| 09127+1632 | $3.49 \pm 0.35$ | G | 287 | 516 | - |  |
| 09149+0413 | $3.21 \pm 1.16$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error in the Hipparcos parallax is too large to make the measurement usable. |
| 09161-0821 | $4.78 \pm 0.42$ | G | 209 | 335 | - |  |
| 09168-0050 | - | - | - | - | 18 | Short but pronounced linear trend. May be a nearly edge -on short arc binary? |
| 09188-1025 AB | $5.98 \pm 0.46$ | G | 167 | 505 | - |  |
| $09208+6121$ AB | $4.84 \pm 1.15$ | H | 207 | 185 | - |  |
| 09235+3908 | $5.16 \pm 0.49$ | G | 194 | 721 | - |  |
| $09239+2754$ AB | $6.40 \pm 1.01$ | H | 156 | 191 | - |  |
| 09256+5401 AB | $5.56 \pm 0.32$ | G | 180 | 1,038 | - | High residual due to CTT2014.282 having higher theta than the mean. My measurement plots well with the mean. |
| 09277+1545 | - | - | - | - | - | Phl1934.12 appears to be a quadrant reversal. |
| 09296-0307 | $2.94 \pm 0.27$ | G | 340 | 313 | - |  |
| $09300+4216$ | $7.39 \pm 1.14$ | H | 135 | 213 | 19 | Trending linear, but with identical proper motions, this may be a short piece of an arc. Cll1980 appears to be a quadrant reversal. |
| 09310-1544 | $7.59 \pm 0.96$ | H | 132 | 165 | - | This pair may be starting to show a short arc. Very rough and difficult to be sure. |
| 09315+0128 | $10.45 \pm 1.29$ | H | 96 | 329 | - |  |

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Notes to Table 3 (CPM Pairs) continued

| WDS Number | Parallax | Parallax Source | Distance (Parsecs) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Min Sep } \\ \text { (AU) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Plot } \\ \text { Figure } \end{gathered}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 09415-1829 | $18.09 \pm 1.86$ | H | 55 | 55 | - | Scattered grouping. Is Tok2010 a measurement of the wrong star? |
| $09450+7643$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A}: 7.67 \pm \\ 1.11 \\ \mathrm{~B}: 8.78 \pm \\ 0.29 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { H } \\ & \text { G } \end{aligned}$ | 121 | 229 | - | A weighted parallax of 8.26 mas was used, and the parallax windows have a 10\% overlap. Probably a physical pair, despite the significant difference in proper motions. Cll 1979.999 looks like a quadrant reversal. |
| $09551+6854 \mathrm{AB}$ | $6.33 \pm 0.26$ | G | 158 | 332 | - | A weak trend is starting to show. |
| $09572+4554$ | $14.05 \pm 0.41$ | G | 71 | 327 | - |  |
| 09591+8023 | $4.57 \pm 0.77$ | H | 219 | 360 | - |  |
| $10040+3239$ | $13.08 \pm 1.03$ | H | 76 | 64 | - |  |
| 10056+3105 | $4.66 \pm 1.50$ | H | N/A | N/A | 20 | The error is too large to make the Hipparcos parallax usable. A short arc is forming. |
| $10114+7302$ | $7.48 \pm 0.27$ | G | 134 | 496 | - |  |
| 10151+1907 | - | - | - | - | 21 | Tight grouping. The PM vector ( $65^{\circ}, 2.6^{\prime \prime}$ ) does not fit the observations. |
| $10180+1711$ | $1.78 \pm 0.62$ | G | N/A | N/A | - | The error in the parallax measurement makes the parallax unusable. |
| 10181+2731 | $3.77 \pm 0.28$ | G | 265 | 1,205 | - | Tight grouping with five wide outliers. |
| 10206-1621 | $4.76 \pm 0.66$ | G | 210 | 370 | - |  |
| 10234+2630 | - | - | - | - | 22 | Definite trend developing. |
| 10256+0847 | $6.08 \pm 0.29$ | G | 164 | 587 | - |  |
| $10260+5237$ | $12.62 \pm 0.51$ | G | 79 | 221 | 23 | Definite trend forming. |
| $10321+8136$ | - | - | - | - | - | Only 4 measurements. |
| $10333+3740$ | $7.03 \pm 0.24$ | G | 142 | 772 | - |  |
| $10336+1513$ | $5.85 \pm 0.79$ | G | 171 | 940 | - | Tight grouping. |
| $10338+2321$ | $6.70 \pm 0.40$ | G | 149 | 663 | - |  |
| 10402+3824 | $3.14 \pm 0.27$ | G | 318 | 1,697 | - | Tight grouping. |
| $10417+1044$ | - | - | - | - | - | May be trending to a short arc binary. |
| $10447+2042$ | $7.81 \pm 0.29$ | G | 128 | 549 | - |  |
| 10462-0546 | $2.62 \pm 0.92$ | G | N/A | N/A | 24 | The error is too large to make the parallax usable. The PM vector ( $247^{\circ}, 1.3^{\prime \prime}$ ) matches observations closely. The may be a QR in BAB1933.26. |
| $10473+2235$ | $6.32 \pm 1.20$ | H | 158 | 97 | 25 | Manual solution. The data may be starting to reveal a short arc. |
| 10512-0906AB | $\begin{gathered} \text { A: } 5.20 \pm \\ 0.45 \\ \mathrm{~B}: 4.42 \pm \\ 0.50 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 208 | 706 | - | Weighted parallax of 4.82 mas. There is a $10 \%$ overlap in the error windows. Given the CPM, this pair is probably physical. |
| 10575-1105AB-C | $-1.10 \pm 3.04$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error is too large to make the parallax usable. |
| $11023+3049$ | - | - | - | - | 26 | Strong trend developing. |
| $11024+8313$ | $7.59 \pm 1.13$ | H | 132 | 588 | - | The PM vector ( $21^{\circ}, 1.5^{\prime \prime}$ ) does not align well with the observations. The data cluster fits inside a 0.5" region. |
| $11050+3825$ | $7.35 \pm 1.05$ | H | 136 | 147 | 27 | A strong trend is developing. |
| $11137+4105$ | $8.24 \pm 0.23$ | G | 121 | 368 | - |  |
| $11151+3735 \mathrm{AB}$ | $3.18 \pm 1.17$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error is too large to make the parallax usable. |
| 11154+2734 | $8.06 \pm 0.59$ | G | 124 | 453 | - |  |
| $11156+5947$ | $4.58 \pm 0.23$ | G | 218 | 317 | - | Starting to develop a loose trend in the data plot. |
| $11195+4728$ | $3.97 \pm 0.29$ | G | 252 | 574 | - |  |
| $11328+6004$ | $3.45 \pm 0.55$ | G | 290 | 806 | - |  |
| $11329+5525$ | $4.23 \pm 0.25$ | G | 236 | 957 | - |  |
| $11388+6421$ | $4.74 \pm 0.57$ | H | 211 | 413 | 28 |  |
| $11438+1831$ | $19.78 \pm 0.30$ | G | 51 | 250 | - |  |
| $11517+4449$ | $6.06 \pm 0.22$ | G | 165 | 520 | - |  |
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Notes to Table 3 (CPM Pairs) continued

| WDS Number | Parallax | Parallax Source | Distance (Parsecs) | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{Min} \text { Sep } \\ \text { (AU) } \end{gathered}$ | Plot Figure | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $11529+3050$ | $6.38 \pm 0.25$ | G | 157 | 812 | - |  |
| $11551+4629 \mathrm{AB}-\mathrm{C}$ | $4.72 \pm 0.58$ | H | 212 | 784 | - |  |
| $11561+4533$ | $3.55 \pm 0.38$ | G | 282 | 672 | - |  |
| $11563+3527$ | $7.41 \pm 0.40$ | G | 135 | 247 | - | Scattered data plot that is beginning to converge on a trend. |
| 12005-1517 | $7.89 \pm 0.43$ | G | 127 | 179 | - | Weak trend may be starting to emerge. |
| $12120+6836$ | $4.9 \pm 0.55$ | G | 204 | 376 | - |  |
| $12137+7826$ | $8.12 \pm 0.29$ | G | 123 | 336 | 29 | The PM vector ( $14^{\circ}, 1.2^{\prime \prime}$ ) does not match the observations. |
| $12167+3004$ | $14.36 \pm 0.30$ | G | 70 | 185 | - |  |
| $12207+2255$ | $3.50 \pm 1.16$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error makes the parallax unusable. |
| $12217+0333$ | $10.36 \pm 0.32$ | G | 97 | 255 | - |  |
| $12257+4444$ | $4.93 \pm 0.30$ | G | 203 | 513 | - |  |
| $12321+7449$ | $4.17 \pm 0.23$ | G | 240 | 904 | - |  |
| $12406+4017$ AB | $15.39 \pm 0.29$ | G | 65 | 373 | - |  |
| $12427+3349$ | $3.66 \pm 0.23$ | G | 273 | 1,123 | - |  |
| $12438+0733$ | $5.01 \pm 1.64$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error makes the parallax unusable. |
| $12460+4949 \mathrm{AB}$ | $5.21 \pm 0.26$ | G | 192 | 1,138 | - |  |
| $12533+1310$ | - | - | - | - | 30 | Strong trend forming. |
| $12563+5406 \mathrm{AB}$ | $11.54 \pm 0.51$ | H | 87 | 329 | 31 | Tight grouping. The PM vector ( $281^{\circ}, 4.9^{\prime \prime}$ ) is clearly off. |
| 12564-0057 | $12.56 \pm 1.26$ | H | 80 | 84 | - | The data plot shows a scattered early history that is beginning to converge on a trend. (This convergence is due to better measurement techniques over the years.) |
| $12574+3022$ | $5.16 \pm 0.23$ | G | 194 | 684 | - |  |
| $12587+2728$ | $11.20 \pm 0.41$ | G | 89 | 148 | 32 | This pair may be starting to reveal an arc. |
| $13007+7343$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A}: 7.67 \pm \\ 1.11 \\ \mathrm{~B}: 8.78 \pm \\ 0.29 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G } \\ & \text { H } \end{aligned}$ | 143 | 666 | - | A weighted parallax ( 7.01 mas) was used. However, the error windows only share a $29 \%$ overlap. Yet given the large and common proper motions, this pair is most likely physical. |
| $13026+5625$ | $9.94 \pm 0.26$ | G | 101 | 372 | - |  |
| $13048+7302$ | $8.32 \pm 0.49$ | G | 120 | 167 | 33 | Strong trend emerging. |
| $13166+5034$ | - | - | - | - | 34 | Solid trend emerging. |
| 13207+0257 | $7.38 \pm 0.66$ | H | 136 | 151 | - | The trend in the plot shows a tightening of the measurements. |
| $13243+0124$ | $9.06 \pm 0.81$ | H | 110 | 104 | - |  |
| $13261+3509$ | $9.10 \pm 0.26$ | G | 110 | 393 | - |  |
| $13288+5956$ | $13.62 \pm 0.65$ | G | 73 | 71 | - | The data plot is showing a convergence, but an arc is not yet emerging. |
| $13324+3649$ | 3.490 .29 | G | 287 | 1,205 | - | The PM vector ( $87^{\circ}, 6.7{ }^{\prime \prime}$ ) is clearly not correct. |
| $13341+6746$ | $13.48 \pm 0.25$ | G | 74 | 313 | - |  |
| $13344+2617$ | $8.02 \pm 0.32$ | G | 125 | 1,087 | - |  |
| $13346+3308$ AB | $9.10 \pm 0.30$ | G | 110 | 301 | 35 | Short arc emerging? |
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| WDS Number | Parallax | Parallax Source | Distance (Parsecs) | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{Min} \text { Sep } \\ \text { (AU) } \end{gathered}$ | Plot Figure | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $13354+5955$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 90 | 335 | - | A weighted average parallax (11.15 mas) was used. The parallax windows have a $50 \%$ overlap, with $\mathrm{B}^{\prime}$ s window being totally contained inside $A^{\prime}$ s. Given the substantial common proper motion, this pair is likely physical. |
| $13356+4939$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { A: } 4.60 \pm \\ 0.27 \\ \text { B: } 4.64 \pm \\ 0.44 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G } \\ & \text { G } \end{aligned}$ | 216 | 554 | - | The weighted Gaia parallaxes ( 4.62 mas) were used. The parallax windows show a $39 \%$ overlap, with $A^{\prime} s$ window being totally contained in $\mathrm{B}^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$. Given the small but almost identical proper motions, this pair is likely physical. |
| $13367+6947$ | $10.19 \pm 0.95$ | H | 98 | 176 | - |  |
| $13368+0650$ | $4.18 \pm 1.79$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error is too large to make the parallax usable. A weak trend is beginning to emerge. |
| $13377+5043$ | $2.05 \pm 0.52$ | G | N/A | N/A | - | The error is too large to make the parallax usable. |
| $13509+4422 A B$ | $5.05 \pm 0.23$ | G | 198 | 614 | - |  |
| $13563+0517$ | $18.22 \pm 3.81$ | H | 55 | 55 | - |  |
| $13571+3426$ | $7.12 \pm 1.56$ | H | 140 | 144 | - |  |
| 13591+2549 | $5.09 \pm 0.30$ | G | 196 | 912 | 36 | The PM vector $\left(286^{\circ}, 1.4 "\right)$ does not match the observations. |
| $14033+0557 \mathrm{AB}$ | - | - | - | - | 37 | Definite trend is showing. |
| $14101+2636$ AB | $\begin{aligned} \mathrm{B}: & 13.86 \pm \\ & 0.28 \end{aligned}$ | G | 72 | 187 | - |  |
| $14116+2802$ | $8.80 \pm 0.26$ | G | 114 | 368 | - | This pair may be starting to exhibit a short arc. |
| $14143+3356$ | $11.82 \pm 0.24$ | G | 85 | 465 | - |  |
| 14270+0341 | $10.92 \pm 1.59$ | H | 92 | 251 | 38 | Tight group. The PM vector ( $193^{\circ}, 3.9^{\prime \prime}$ ) is far from the observations. |
| $14279+2123$ | $10.69 \pm 0.26$ | G | 94 | 429 | - |  |
| $14339+5514$ | $6.57 \pm 0.77$ | H | 152 | 151 | - |  |
| $14363+1924$ | $\begin{aligned} \text { B: } & 7.46 \pm \\ & 0.27 \end{aligned}$ | G | 134 | 139 | - | Madler's 1854.31 measurement looks like an error. |
| $14403+1206$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { A: } 4.09 \pm \\ 0.27 \\ \text { B: } 4.1 \pm 0.35 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 244 | 630 | - | Weighted parallax ( 4.09 mas) used, with an overlap in the parallax windows of $79 \%$. Combined with the rather high common proper motion, this pair is physical. |
| 14417+0932 | $2.19 \pm 5.27$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error makes the parallax unusable. |
| $14436+3745$ | $\begin{aligned} \text { B: } & 4.10 \pm \\ & 0.24 \end{aligned}$ | G | 244 | 259 | - |  |
| 14471+0058 | $7.52 \pm 1.62$ | H | 133 | 457 | - |  |
| $14524+1757$ | - | - | - | - | - | Definite trend is starting to emerge. |
| $14531+7811$ AB | $14.73 \pm 0.23$ | G | 68 | 103 | - | Weak trend may be forming. |
| $14545+3406$ | $9.93 \pm 0.61$ | G | 101 | 361 | - |  |
| $14584+4403$ AB | $9.30 \pm 0.33$ | G | 108 | 435 | - |  |
| 15087-0059AB | $14.17 \pm 2.78$ | H | 71 | 44 | 39 | Strong trend emerging, but impossible to tell yet if it is linear or short arc. Given the CPM nature, it is probably a small segment of a long arc. |
| $15126+1523$ | $7.89 \pm 0.25$ | G | 127 | 319 | - |  |
| 15138+1427AB | $7.03 \pm 0.27$ | G | 142 | 660 | - |  |
| 15227-1654 | $2.73 \pm 0.25$ | G | 366 | 1,075 | - |  |
| 15257+2638 | $5.61 \pm 0.69$ | G | 178 | 244 | - |  |
| 15264+0822 | - | - | - | - | 40 | May be in the early stages of showing a short arc. |
| 15276+0522 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 116 \\ 80 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | Based on parallax, the stars are 36 parsecs apart and thus clearly not physical. But with nearly identical proper motions, this pair presents an enigma. Is it physical or not? |
| $15300+2530$ | $1.68 \pm 0.28$ | G | 595 | 2,006 | - |  |
| $15361+4849$ | $6.88 \pm 1.11$ | H | 145 | 163 | - | A weak pattern is starting to emerge. |
| $15361+5531$ | $7.17 \pm 0.25$ | G | 139 | 193 | - |  |

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Notes to Table 3 (CPM Pairs) conclusion

| WDS Number | Parallax | Parallax Source | Distance (Parsecs) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \operatorname{Min} \text { Sep } \\ \text { (AU) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Plot } \\ \text { Figure } \end{array}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15391-0834 | $7.28 \pm 0.75$ | G | 137 | 342 | 41 | The PM vector (2170, 1.8") does not fit the observations. |
| $15398+2117$ | $3.54 \pm 0.25$ | G | 282 | 879 | - |  |
| 15453+0432 | $4.98 \pm 0.30$ | G | 201 | 452 | - | A definite trend is emerging, but it is not possible yet to detect an arc. This pair may be involved in a large and nearly edge-on orbit. |
| 15492-0314 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A}: 7.15 \pm \\ & 0.27 \\ & \mathrm{~B}: \begin{array}{l} \mathrm{l} \\ 6.70 \pm \\ 0.33 \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 144 | 351 | - | Weighted parallax ( 6.96 mas) used. The parallax windows overlap only 14\%. Yet the proper motions are similar. Evidence suggests this is an optical pair, but more or better data is needed. |
| $15499+4247$ | $4.24 \pm 0.23$ | G | 236 | 1,165 | - |  |
| 15509+1911 | $2.69 \pm 1.40$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error makes the parallax unusable. |
| 15589-0304 | $13.85 \pm 0.24$ | G | 72 | 160 | - |  |
| 16394-0306AB | $5.52 \pm 0.26$ | G | 181 | 770 | - |  |
| 16462-1721 | $8.94 \pm 0.28$ | G | 112 | 377 | - |  |
| Mean AB separation in AU |  |  |  | 504 |  |  |

Table 4: Different Proper Motion Pairs (DPM) Measured With Speckle

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Last } \\ \text { Yr } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Last } \\ \theta \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Last } \\ \mathrm{p} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Msrs | Measured <br> $\theta \pm \operatorname{err}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Measured } \\ \rho \pm \operatorname{err} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Resid } \\ \mathrm{p} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.0822 | 02062+2507 | STF 212 | -020+029 U | -012-011 W | 2010 | 161.0 | 1.90 | 5 | $160.4 \pm 0.0$ | $1.961 \pm 0.001$ | -0.6 | 0.061 |  |
| 2017.0767 | 02087-0026 | STF 218 | -042-013 W | -008-001 W | 2009 | 248.0 | 4.90 | 5 | $245.7 \pm 0.1$ | $4.983 \pm 0.009$ | -2.3 | 0.083 | * |
| 2017.0795 | 02341-0538 | STF 280 | +032+030 U | +004+095 U | 2012 | 346.0 | 3.70 | 5 | $347.3 \pm 0.3$ | $3.612 \pm 0.013$ | 1.3 | -0.088 | * |
| 2017.0767 | 03244-1400 | BU 12 | +031-016 U | +008+006 W | 2001 | 280.6 | 2.40 | 5 | $277.8 \pm 0.3$ | $2.302 \pm 0.020$ | -2.8 | -0.098 | * |
| 2017.0822 | 03354+3341 | STF 413 | $-052+040 \mathrm{U}$ | +019-006 G | 2010 | 124.7 | 2.38 | 5 | $124.3 \pm 0.0$ | $2.410 \pm 0.001$ | -0.4 | 0.030 | * |
| 2017.0822 | 03581-0454 | HLD 70 | +029-013 G | -045-010 W | 2008 | 273.5 | 3.47 | 5 | $272.0 \pm 0.1$ | $3.504 \pm 0.005$ | -1.5 | 0.034 | * |
| 2017.0822 | 04222-0441 | STF 536 | $+008+001 \mathrm{G}$ | -007-009 W | 2008 | 190.1 | 1.51 | 5 | $190.8 \pm 0.2$ | $1.561 \pm 0.003$ | 0.7 | 0.051 | * |
| 2017.2137 | 06512-1126 | HLD 83 | -017+037 W | +002-015 W | 1999 | 163.1 | 2.88 | 5 | $161.4 \pm 0.2$ | $2.883 \pm 0.020$ | -1.7 | 0.003 | * |
| 2017.2137 | 06561-1403 | STF 997 AB | +000-011 W | -002+007 W | 2011 | 343.9 | 2.88 | 5 | $343.0 \pm 0.1$ | $2.851 \pm 0.015$ | -0.9 | -0.029 | * |
| 2017.2740 | 08054+0550 | STF1182 | -011-006 G | -010-022 U | 2010 | 73.7 | 4.69 | 5 | $73.4 \pm 0.1$ | $4.767 \pm 0.009$ | -0.3 | 0.077 | * |
| 2017.2986 | 08298+5112 | STF1225 | $+004+001 \mathrm{G}$ | +003-002 G | 2008 | 189.4 | 3.68 | 5 | $192.3 \pm 0.0$ | $3.759 \pm 0.001$ | 2.9 | 0.079 | * |
| 2017.2740 | 08555-0758 | STF1295 | +006-026 G | $-034+005 \mathrm{U}$ | 2014 | 4.3 | 4.09 | 5 | $3.5 \pm 0.0$ | $4.068 \pm 0.005$ | -0.8 | -0.022 | * |
| 2017.3096 | 09051+3931 | AG 160 | $+089+028 \mathrm{G}$ | +018-025 W | 2009 | 60.0 | 3.95 | 5 | $59.4 \pm 0.1$ | $3.908 \pm 0.007$ | -0.6 | -0.042 | * |
| 2017.3096 | 09136+4659 | STF1318 | -008+001 W | -011-015 W | 2013 | 228.3 | 2.63 | 5 | $228.1 \pm 0.0$ | $2.632 \pm 0.001$ | -0.2 | 0.002 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 09318-1126 | HU 127 | $+008+000 \mathrm{G}$ | +022+003 W | 1991 | 85.6 | 0.89 | 5 | $84.9 \pm 0.2$ | $0.881 \pm 0.002$ | -0.7 | -0.009 | * |
| 2017.3014 | 09556+0806 | AG 170 | -058-069 G | -009-019 W | 2005 | 43.3 | 1.65 | 5 | $42.5 \pm 0.5$ | $1.692 \pm 0.060$ | -0.8 | 0.042 | * |
| 2017.4027 | 10406+4209 | STF1460 | -014+030 W | +003-002 W | 2013 | 162.0 | 3.80 | 5 | $162.6 \pm 0.0$ | $3.818 \pm 0.002$ | 0.6 | 0.018 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 10533-1045 | A 132 | $-012+004 \mathrm{U}$ | -012-007 U | 2011 | 201.0 | 4.41 | 5 | $200.3 \pm 0.0$ | $4.404 \pm 0.008$ | -0.7 | -0.006 |  |
| 2017.4247 | 13376-0752 | STF1763 AB | $-011+001 \mathrm{U}$ | -026-010 W | 2010 | 39.1 | 2.66 | 5 | $38.6 \pm 0.0$ | $2.694 \pm 0.000$ | -0.5 | 0.034 | * |
| 2017.4247 | $14083+2112$ | STF1804 | -004-004 W | +002-004 W | 2014 | 14.1 | 4.88 | 5 | $13.3 \pm 0.2$ | $4.843 \pm 0.009$ | -0.8 | -0.037 |  |
| 2017.4411 | $14568+7050$ | STF1905 | +032-025 G | -052-077 U | 2012 | 160.0 | 2.80 | 5 | $161.3 \pm 0.0$ | $2.815 \pm 0.004$ | 1.3 | 0.015 | * |
| 2017.4466 | $15208+3459$ | но 62 | +016-005 W | -043+019 W | 2014 | 103.2 | 1.47 | 5 | $103.4 \pm 0.1$ | $1.526 \pm 0.002$ | 0.2 | 0.056 | * |

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

## Notes to Table 4 (DPM Pairs)

| WDS Number | Parallax | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parallax } \\ & \text { Source } \end{aligned}$ | Distance (Parsecs) | Min Sep (AU) | Plot Figure | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02087-0026 | $7.98 \pm 0.32$ | G | 125 | 614 | - |  |
| 02341-0538 | $5.62 \pm 1.22$ | H | 178 | 653 | 42 | The PM vector ( $337^{\circ}, 12.8^{\prime \prime}$ ) clearly does not reflect the motion. |
| 03244-1400 | - | - | - | - | 43 | The PM vector ( $313^{\circ}, 4.1^{\prime \prime}$ ) does not fit observations at all. One (or both) of the PM values is questionable. This pair looks to be CPM from the data plot. |
| 03354+3341 | $6.05 \pm 0.44$ | G | 165 | 393 | 44 | The PM vector ( $237^{\circ}, 15.5^{\prime \prime}$ ) does not match the observations at all. |
| 03581-0454 | $6.66 \pm 0.24$ | G | 150 | 526 | 45 | The PM vector ( $272^{\circ}$, 9.3") is clearly not correct. |
| 04222-0441 | $8.21 \pm 0.27$ | G | 122 | 183 | 46 | Trend emerging. The PM vector $\left(236^{\circ}, 3.2^{\prime \prime}\right)$ does not fit the observed motion. |
| 06512-1126 | - | - | - | - | 47 | The PM vector ( $200^{\circ}, 6.48^{\prime \prime}$ ) is clearly incorrect. |
| 06561-1403 AB | $2.62 \pm 0.58$ | H | 382 | 1,503 | 48 | The PM vector ( $354^{\circ}, 3.3^{\prime \prime}$ ) is clearly wrong. |
| 08054+0550 | $3.86 \pm 0.49$ | G | 259 | 1,215 | 49 | Weak trend. The PM vector (184ㅇ $2.9^{\prime \prime}$ ) does not fit the observations. |
| 08555-0758 | $10.74 \pm 0.58$ | G | 93 | 381 | - | The PM vector ( $308^{\circ}, 11.7^{\prime \prime}$ ) is far from the observations. |
| 09051+3931 | $6.44 \pm 0.34$ | G | 155 | 613 | 50 | Tight grouping. The PM vector $\left(233^{\circ}, 10.3^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is clearly incorrect. |
| 09136+4659 | $19.07 \pm 0.98$ | H | 52 | 138 | 51 | Trend forming. The PM vector ( $191^{\circ}, 3^{\prime \prime}$ ) does not fit the observations. |
| 09318-1126 | $-0.88 \pm 0.97$ | G | N/A | N/A | - | The parallax is not usable. A short trend is forming. |
| $09556+0806$ | $-24.82 \pm 0.63$ | G | N/A | N/A | - | The parallax is not usable. |
| $10406+4209$ | $5.38 \pm 1.00$ | H | 186 | 699 | - | A linear pattern is emerging. |
| 13376-0752 AB | $5.11 \pm 0.80$ | H | 196 | 521 | 52 | The PM vector ( 4.22 " @ $234^{\circ}$ ) is clearly incorrect. |
| $14568+7050$ | $13.14 \pm 0.25$ | G | 76 | 213 | 53 | Linear trend. The PM vector ( $201^{\circ}, 10^{\prime \prime}$ ) is clearly incorrect. |
| $15208+3459$ | $5.61 \pm 0.69$ | G | 178 | 238 | - | Trend may be emerging. |
| Mean AB separation in AU |  |  |  | 564 |  |  |

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Table 5: Linear Pairs Measured With Speckle

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | Last Yr | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \theta \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Last $\rho$ | Msrs | ```Measured 0 terr (')``` | $$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Resid } \\ \rho \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.0767 | 02493-1033 | STF 315 | +099-020 U | +099-039 W | 2013 | 164.9 | 1.30 | 5 | $164.2 \pm 0.1$ | $1.427 \pm 0.005$ | -0.7 | 0.127 | * |
| 2017.0767 | 03061-1326 | BU 527 AB | +000-018 U | $-020+013 \mathrm{~W}$ | 1998 | 98.1 | 1.28 | 5 | $96.8 \pm 0.2$ | $1.406 \pm 0.022$ | $-1.3$ | 0.126 | * |
| 2017.0822 | 03401+3407 | STF 425 | -135-018 U | $-070+006 \mathrm{G}$ | 2012 | 60.4 | 1.94 | 5 | $58.2 \pm 0.0$ | $1.92 \pm 0.001$ | -2.2 | -0.020 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 04257-0214 | BU 403 | $+058+003 \mathrm{~W}$ | +058+003 W | 2015 | 83.3 | 0.95 | 5 | $82.2 \pm 0.4$ | $0.916 \pm 0.014$ | -1.1 | 0.916 | * |
| 2017.1644 | 05245-0224 | DA 5 AB | +003-001 W | - | 2015 | 76.5 | 1.81 | 5 | $77.5 \pm 0.1$ | $1.827 \pm 0.003$ | 1.0 | 0.017 | * |
| 2017.1671 | 05269+0039 | LEO 2 | +006-013 G | +005-011 G | 2002 | 85.4 | 2.87 | 5 | $85.9 \pm 0.5$ | $3.243 \pm 0.006$ | 0.5 | 0.373 | * |
| 2017.2986 | 08194+5627 | STF1205 | $+004+020 \mathrm{~W}$ | $+004+020 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2016 | 166.0 | 1.70 | 5 | $166.2 \pm 0.3$ | $1.801 \pm 0.005$ | 0.2 | 0.101 | * |
| 2017.2712 | 08430-0242 | HO 355 | -016-028 W | -016-028 W | 2005 | 159.3 | 0.66 | 5 | $152.4 \pm 0.1$ | $0.805 \pm 0.004$ | $-6.9$ | 0.145 | * |
| 2017.2986 | 08593+3457 | STF1296 | $+016+001$ G | +011-002 G | 2015 | 76.0 | 1.80 | 5 | $76.3 \pm 0.0$ | $1.753 \pm 0.001$ | 0.3 | -0.047 | * |
| 2017.3014 | 09521+0249 | A 2561 AB | -058-007 G | $-088+018 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2005 | 309.5 | 1.06 | 5 | $309.0 \pm 0.1$ | $1.138 \pm 0.009$ | -0.5 | 0.078 | * |
| 2017.2959 | $10029+6847$ | STF1400 AB | -030-022 G | -031-022 W | 2011 | 225.8 | 3.25 | 5 | $224.8 \pm 0.2$ | $3.564 \pm 0.006$ | $-1.0$ | 0.314 | * |
| 2017.3315 | $11406+2102$ | STF1566 | -009-020 G | -010-024 W | 2011 | 350.0 | 2.42 | 5 | $349.1 \pm 0.0$ | $2.366 \pm 0.004$ | -0.9 | -0.054 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $14497+4843$ | STF1890 | $-078+097 \mathrm{~W}$ | $-078+097 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2013 | 46.3 | 2.58 | 5 | $46.7 \pm 0.1$ | $2.614 \pm 0.004$ | 0.4 | 0.034 | * |

Notes to Table 5 (Linear Pairs)

| WDS Number | Parallax | Parallax Source | Distance (Parsecs) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Min Sep } \\ \text { (AU) } \end{gathered}$ | Plot Figure | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02493-1033 | $17.45 \pm 0.95$ | H | 57 | 74 | - | Linear solution by HRT2013. Ephemerides predict $165^{\circ}, 1.337 "$ Residuals: $-0.8^{\circ}$, +0.090". |
| 03061-1326 AB | $8.04 \pm 0.98$ | H | 124 | 159 | 54 | Strong linear pattern, no solution yet. |
| 03401+3407 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 21.73 \pm 0.84 \\ & \text { B: } 22.90 \pm 0.73 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { H } \\ & \text { G } \end{aligned}$ | 45 | 87 | $\begin{gathered} 55 \text { and } \\ 56 \end{gathered}$ | The distance and separation assume a weighted parallax of 22.32 mas, with a $16 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. This pair could be physical, but a linear solution by FMR2014 yields ephemerides of $59.8^{\circ}, 1.755^{\prime \prime}$. Curiously, another solution by GnR2015 yields the same ephemerides. The residuals for either case are $-1.6^{\circ}$, $+0.165^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 04257-0214 | $23.4 \pm 1.04$ | H | 43 | 40 | - | Linear solution by HRT2012 for which the ephemerides project $83.2^{\circ}, 0.951 "$. The residuals are -$1.0^{\circ},-0.035^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 05245-0224 AB | $3.34 \pm 0.07$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error in the parallax makes it unusable. Linear solution by HRT2012. Ephemerides predict $77.2^{\circ}$, 1.815". Residuals are $+0.3^{\circ}$, $+0.012^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 05269+0039 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 4.30 \pm 0.22 \\ & \text { B: } 3.94 \pm 0.23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 233 \\ & 254 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 667 \\ & 728 \end{aligned}$ | - | There is no overlap in the parallax windows. There are only six measurements, but a definite linear trend is beginning to emerge. |
| 08194+5627 | - | - | - | - | 57 | No solution yet. A strong linear pattern is forming. |
| 08430-0242 | $6.37 \pm 1.39$ | H | 157 | 108 | - | A moderately strong linear pattern is emerging. The $R^{2}$ value is 0.6707 . |
| $08593+3457$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A}: 10.12 \pm 0.26 \\ & \mathrm{~B}: \\ & 10.65 \pm 0.44 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 96 | 179 | 58 | A weighted parallax of 10.38 mas was used. The parallax windows have a 19\% overlap. |
| 09521+0249 AB | $27.71 \pm 0.72$ | G | 36 | 40 | 59 | The PM vector $\left(310^{\circ}, 3.6^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is too long but it does have the correct theta. This is a strong linear case without a solution. |
| $10029+6847$ AB | $13.9 \pm 0.23$ | G | 72 | 234 | - | Linear solution by HRT2011. Ephemerides predict $225.0^{\circ}, 3.525^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals of $-0.2^{\circ}$, +0.039". However, this pair has identical proper motions. Is this then a short arc binary? Manual solution with STB. |
| $11406+2102$ | $8.38 \pm 0.99$ | G | 119 | 289 | - | Linear solution by HRT2011. The ephemerides predict $350.5^{\circ}$, 2.377 ". The residuals are $-1.4^{\circ}$, 0.011 " |
| $14497+4843$ | $14.58 \pm 0.51$ | G | 69 | 177 | - | Linear solution by HRT2011. The ephemerides predict $45.8^{\circ}, 2.576^{\prime \prime}$. The residuals are $+0.9^{\circ}$, +0.038". |
| Mean $A B$ separation in AU |  |  |  | 139 |  |  |

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Table 6: Known Orbit Pairs Measured With Speckle

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \text { Yr } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Last } \\ \theta \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Last } \\ \rho \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Msrs | Measured <br> $\theta \pm \operatorname{err}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Measured } \\ \rho \pm \text { err (") } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Resid } \\ \theta \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Resid } \\ \rho \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.0795 | 02020+0246 | STF 202AB | +042-011 W | +042-011 W | 2012 | 266.0 | 1.70 | 5 | $264.5 \pm 0.3$ | $1.941 \pm 0.007$ | -1.5 | 0.241 | * |
| 2017.0822 | 02037+2556 | STF 208AB | $+127+012 \mathrm{G}$ | +134+010 W | 2012 | 343.0 | 1.38 | 5 | $343.8 \pm 0.5$ | $1.410 \pm 0.009$ | 0.8 | 0.030 | * |
| 2017.0767 | 02158-1814 | HTG 1 | -036-119 G | -052-135 W | 2014 | 162.5 | 1.97 | 5 | $164.1 \pm 0.2$ | $2.020 \pm 0.024$ | 1.6 | 0.050 | * |
| 2017.0822 | 02475+1922 | STF 305AB | +118-160 W | +118-159 G | 2012 | 306.5 | 3.60 | 5 | $306.5 \pm 0.1$ | $3.675 \pm 0.004$ | 0.0 | 0.075 | * |
| 2017.0822 | $03122+3713$ | STF 360 | +069-017 U | -030-027 U | 2011 | 125.6 | 2.79 | 5 | $124.3 \pm 0.0$ | $2.931 \pm 0.001$ | -1.3 | 0.141 | * |
| 2017.0822 | 03356+3141 | BU 533AB | +067+003 W | +061-000 G | 2012 | 220.9 | 1.05 | 5 | $220.4 \pm 0.1$ | $1.048 \pm 0.001$ | -0.5 | -0.002 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 04199+1631 | STT 79 | +114-030 W | - | 2012 | 358.1 | 0.51 | 5 | $3.3 \pm 1.5$ | $0.525 \pm 0.021$ | 5.2 | 0.015 | * |
| 2017.1644 | 05005+050 | STT 93 | +035-038 W | +035-038 W | 2014 | 243.5 | 1.61 | 5 | $243.6 \pm 0.0$ | $1.632 \pm 0.003$ | 0.1 | 0.022 | * |
| 2017.1644 | 05079+0830 | STT 98 | +022-061 W | +022-061 W | 2015 | 286.0 | 0.90 | 5 | $286.1 \pm 0.2$ | $0.952 \pm 0.004$ | 0.1 | 0.052 | * |
| 2017.1671 | 05135+015 | STT 517AB | +007+002 W | +007+002 W | 2014 | 243.0 | 0.69 | 5 | $240.2 \pm 0.6$ | $0.693 \pm 0.004$ | 0.2 | 0.003 | * |
| 2017.1616 | 05239-0052 | WNC $2 \mathrm{~A}-$ BC | -007+001 G | -005-009 W | 2016 | 159.6 | 3.00 | 5 | $158.3 \pm 0.0$ | $3.166 \pm 0.003$ | -0.5 | 0.166 | * |
| 2017.1671 | 05308+0557 | STF 728 | +005-042 W | +005-042 W | 2013 | 44.9 | 1.28 | 5 | $43.4 \pm 0.1$ | $1.279 \pm 0.002$ | -1.5 | -0.001 | * |
| 2017.1671 | 05407-015 | STF 774AB | +004+003 W | +004+003 W | 2013 | 167.1 | 2.36 | 5 | $165.9 \pm 0.2$ | $2.377 \pm 0.013$ | -1.2 | 0.017 | * |
| 2017.1671 | 05417-0254 | BU 1052 | +054+017 W | +054+017 W | 2013 | 185.2 | 0.62 | 5 | $186.9 \pm 0.5$ | $0.636 \pm 0.007$ | 1.7 | 0.006 | * |
| 2017.1644 | 06336-120 | HU 43 | -048-215 W | -048-215 W | 2010 | 307.6 | 0.79 | 5 | $308.1 \pm 0.2$ | $0.864 \pm 0.005$ | 0.5 | 0.074 | * |
| 2017.2740 | 08024+0409 | STF1175 | +066-103 G | +065-105 W | 2012 | 285.1 | 1.42 | 5 | $286.6 \pm 0.0$ | $1.477 \pm 0.001$ | 1.5 | 0.057 | * |
| 2017.2712 | 08061-0047 | A 1971 | +087-064 W | +087-064 W | 2014 | 2.8 | 0.96 | 5 | $2.2 \pm 0.1$ | $0.976 \pm 0.001$ | -0.6 | 0.016 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 08095+3213 | STF1187 | +016-096 U | +033-008 W | 2013 | 20.4 | 2.96 | 5 | $19.4 \pm 0.0$ | $3.103 \pm 0.002$ | -1.0 | 0.148 | * |
| 2017.2712 | 08213-0136 | STF1216 | -009-028 W | -009-028 W | 2013 | 304.8 | 0.53 | 5 | $306.7 \pm 0.6$ | $0.535 \pm 0.017$ | 1.9 | 0.005 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 08369+2315 | AG 154 | -109-107 W | -109-107 W | 2011 | 1.2 | 2.62 | 5 | $0.5 \pm 0.0$ | $2.688 \pm 0.003$ | -0.7 | 0.068 | * |
| 2017.2740 | 08507+0752 | VDK 3 | -069+009 W | - | 2010 | 168.4 | 1.39 | 5 | $185.0 \pm 0.2$ | $1.146 \pm 0.004$ | 16.6 | -0.244 | * |
| 2017.2986 | 09273+0614 | STF1355 | -178-151 W | -178-151 W | 2016 | 355.0 | 1.70 | 5 | $354.7 \pm 0.0$ | $1.808 \pm 0.001$ | -0.3 | 0.108 | * |
| 2017.3096 | 09414+385 | STF1374AB | +083-136 W | - | 2014 | 310.0 | 2.70 | 5 | $311.0 \pm 0.1$ | $2.842 \pm 0.002$ | 1.0 | 0.142 | * |
| 2017.2822 | 10131+2725 | STT 213 | -050-123 W | -050-123 W | 2015 | 121.7 | 1.07 | 5 | $120.8 \pm 0.3$ | $1.091 \pm 0.006$ | -0.9 | 0.021 | * |
| 2017.2822 | 10200+1950 | STF1424AB | +311-153 W | +306-161 W | 2015 | 127.0 | 4.69 | 5 | $125.5 \pm 0.1$ | $4.776 \pm 0.006$ | -1.5 | 0.176 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 10205+0626 | STF1426AB | -007-044 W | -007-044 W | 2014 | 312.0 | 0.94 | 5 | $313.3 \pm 0.4$ | $0.903 \pm 0.001$ | 1.3 | -0.037 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 10217-0946 | BU 25 | +009-040 W | - | 2015 | 130.2 | 1.55 | 5 | $128.6 \pm 0.0$ | $1.535 \pm 0.001$ | -1.6 | -0.015 | * |
| 2017.2822 | 10269+1713 | STT 217 | -042-067 W | -042-067 W | 2015 | 146.3 | 0.73 | 5 | $146.5 \pm 0.2$ | $0.818 \pm 0.001$ | 0.2 | 0.088 | * |
| 2017.2822 | 10397+0851 | STT 224AB | -105+006 W | -105+006 W | 2014 | 135.2 | 0.49 | 5 | $135.4 \pm 1.2$ | $0.550 \pm 0.014$ | 0.2 | 0.060 | * |
| 2017.2959 | $10480+4107$ | STT 229 | -021-003 W | -021-003 W | 2013 | 259.8 | 0.63 | 5 | $256.3 \pm 0.9$ | $0.714 \pm 0.008$ | -3.5 | 0.084 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 11000-0328 | STF1500 | +064+031 W | +064+031 W | 2014 | 300.0 | 1.35 | 5 | $298.8 \pm 0.0$ | $1.345 \pm 0.002$ | -1.2 | -0.005 | * |
| 2017.3808 | $11080+5249$ | STF1510 | -062-003 G | -072+003 W | 2008 | 330.0 | 5.40 | 5 | $328.2 \pm 0.0$ | $5.586 \pm 0.005$ | -1.8 | 0.186 | * |
| 2017.3562 | 11136+5525 | A 1353 | -037+007 W | -037+007 W | 2013 | 209.8 | 0.57 | 5 | $210.9 \pm 0.8$ | $0.600 \pm 0.010$ | 1.1 | 0.030 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 11137+2008 | STF1517AB | -388-125 W | -388-125 W | 2015 | 315.7 | 0.71 | 5 | $314.4 \pm 0.3$ | $0.710 \pm 0.002$ | -1.3 | 0.000 | * |
| 2017.3562 | $11390+4109$ | STT 237AB | -082-034 G | -081-038 W | 2015 | 245.0 | 2.10 | 5 | $242.8 \pm 0.1$ | $2.042 \pm 0.007$ | -2.2 | -0.058 | * |
| 2017.3562 | $11520+4805$ | HU 731 | $-217+047 \mathrm{~W}$ | $-217+047 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2013 | 307.6 | 1.14 | 5 | $307.2 \pm 0.5$ | $1.211 \pm 0.005$ | -0.4 | 0.071 | * |

Table 6 concludes on next page.

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Table 6 (conclusion): Known Orbit Pairs Measured With Speckle

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \text { Yr } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Last } \\ \theta \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Last } \\ \rho \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Msrs | Measured <br> $\theta \pm \operatorname{err}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Measured } \\ \rho \pm \text { err (") } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Resid } \\ \theta \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Resid } \\ \rho \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.3562 | $11520+4805$ | HU 731 | $-217+047 \mathrm{~W}$ | $-217+047 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2013 | 307.6 | 1.14 | 5 | $307.2 \pm 0.5$ | $1.211 \pm 0.005$ | -0.4 | 0.071 | * |
| 2017.3562 | $12244+2535$ | STF1639AB | -013-013 W | -013-013 W | 2015 | 323.0 | 1.80 | 5 | $323.6 \pm 0.0$ | $1.851 \pm 0.001$ | 0.6 | 0.051 | * |
| 2017.3562 | $12272+2701$ | STF1643AB | +096-229 W | +085-240 W | 2014 | 4.0 | 2.70 | 5 | $3.4 \pm 0.2$ | $2.747 \pm 0.008$ | -0.6 | 0.047 | * |
| 2017.3397 | $12306+0943$ | STF1647 | +051-058 W | +051-058 W | 2015 | 248.0 | 1.20 | 5 | $248.7 \pm 0.1$ | $1.306 \pm 0.005$ | 0.7 | 0.106 | * |
| 2017.3562 | $12372+2112$ | STF1663 | -012-023 W | -012-023 W | 2014 | 66.0 | 0.70 | 5 | $65.4 \pm 1.6$ | $0.537 \pm 0.018$ | -0.6 | -0.163 | * |
| 2017.3589 | $12533+2115$ | STF1687AB | -048-027 W | -048-027 W | 2015 | 198.0 | 1.20 | 5 | $198.8 \pm 0.3$ | $1.145 \pm 0.020$ | 0.8 | -0.055 | * |
| 2017.4164 | $13120+3205$ | STT 261 | +026-007 G | +015-006 W | 2014 | 337.6 | 2.53 | 5 | $337.9 \pm 0.0$ | $2.669 \pm 0.004$ | 0.3 | 0.139 | * |
| 2017.4164 | $13235+2914$ | HO 260 | $-468+245 \mathrm{~W}$ | $-468+245 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2012 | 86.0 | 1.62 | 5 | $88.6 \pm 0.0$ | $1.684 \pm 0.003$ | 2.6 | 0.064 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 13237-0043 | A 2489 | -053-023 W | -053-023 W | 2010 | 189.9 | 0.84 | 5 | $188.1 \pm 0.1$ | $0.998 \pm 0.018$ | -1.8 | 0.158 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 13343-0019 | STF1757AB | -219+021 W | -219+021 W | 2014 | 137.3 | 1.70 | 5 | $141.1 \pm 0.0$ | $1.702 \pm 0.000$ | 3.8 | 0.002 | * |
| 2017.4164 | $13375+3618$ | STF1768AB | -095+023 G | -085+002 W | 2014 | 97.4 | 1.81 | 5 | $94.9 \pm 0.2$ | $1.703 \pm 0.010$ | -2.5 | -0.107 | * |
| 2017.4164 | 13461+0507 | STF1781AB | -093-028 G | -103-035 W | 2014 | 193.1 | 0.99 | 5 | $195.1 \pm 0.2$ | $1.047 \pm 0.009$ | 2.0 | 0.057 | * |
| 2017.4164 | $13491+2659$ | STF1785 | -427-090 W | -471-092 W | 2015 | 189.7 | 2.66 | 5 | $187.1 \pm 0.1$ | $2.902 \pm 0.006$ | -2.6 | 0.242 | * |
| 2017.4055 | $13577+5200$ | A 1614 | +236-007 W | +236-007 W | 2013 | 300.4 | 1.43 | 5 | $299.5 \pm 0.1$ | $1.426 \pm 0.003$ | -0.9 | -0.004 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $14131+5520$ | STF1820 | -342-002 W | -350-018 W | 2012 | 121.7 | 2.49 | 5 | $124.1 \pm 0.0$ | $2.799 \pm 0.001$ | 2.4 | 0.309 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $14203+4830$ | STF1834 | -073-013 G | -073-014 W | 2013 | 102.6 | 1.64 | 5 | $104.5 \pm 0.0$ | $1.667 \pm 0.000$ | 1.9 | 0.037 | * |
| 2017.4411 | $14336+3535$ | STF1858AB | -193+064 W | -192+058 W | 2013 | 37.9 | 3.05 | 5 | $38.4 \pm 0.0$ | $3.078 \pm 0.002$ | 0.5 | 0.028 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $14380+5135$ | STF1863 | -056+007 W | -056+007 W | 2013 | 59.2 | 0.65 | 5 | $58.9 \pm 0.1$ | $0.665 \pm 0.002$ | -0.3 | 0.015 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $14407+3117$ | STF1867 | -050-063 W | -050-063 W | 2013 | 353.7 | 0.70 | 5 | $354.9 \pm 0.4$ | $0.674 \pm 0.004$ | 1.2 | -0.026 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 14525+1844 | BU 31AB | -026+198 W | -026+198 W | 2013 | 220.3 | 2.06 | 5 | $221.7 \pm 0.0$ | $1.986 \pm 0.000$ | 1.4 | -0.074 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $14455+4223$ | STT 285AB | -067+054 W | -067+054 W | 2013 | 83.6 | 0.50 | 5 | $78.6 \pm 0.1$ | $0.533 \pm 0.003$ | -5.0 | 0.033 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 14463+0939 | STF1879AB | +071-266 U | +071-266 W | 2014 | 84.6 | 1.73 | 5 | $81.1 \pm 0.0$ | $1.746 \pm 0.001$ | -3.5 | 0.016 | * |
| 2017.3808 | 14464-0723 | STF1876AB | $-150+103 \mathrm{~W}$ | $-150+103 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2013 | 113.3 | 1.27 | 5 | $115.2 \pm 0.1$ | $1.256 \pm 0.010$ | 1.9 | -0.014 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 14489+0557 | STF1883 | +027-125 U | -008-089 W | 2013 | 278.2 | 0.98 | 5 | $277.4 \pm 0.0$ | $1.045 \pm 0.001$ | -0.8 | 0.065 | * |
| 2017.4027 | $14515+4456$ | STT 287 | -013-039 W | -013-039 W | 2013 | 0.0 | 0.65 | 5 | $4.9 \pm 0.5$ | $0.575 \pm 0.028$ | 4.9 | -0.075 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 14534+1542 | STT 288 | -020+030 W | -020+030 W | 2014 | 159.7 | 0.98 | 5 | $159.0 \pm 0.0$ | $1.008 \pm 0.001$ | -0.7 | 0.028 | * |
| 2017.4493 | $15038+4739$ | STF1909 | -444+010 W | $-374+039$ W | 2014 | 66.1 | 1.13 | 5 | $74.9 \pm 0.2$ | $0.656 \pm 0.002$ | 8.8 | -0.474 | * |
| 2017.4466 | $15183+2650$ | STF1932AB | +093+071 W | +088+077 W | 2014 | 264.0 | 1.56 | 5 | $266.9 \pm 0.1$ | $1.639 \pm 0.001$ | 2.9 | 0.079 | * |
| 2017.4438 | 15277+0606 | STF1944 | -002-036 W | -002-036 W | 2013 | 295.2 | 0.66 | 5 | $292.5 \pm 1.1$ | $0.702 \pm 0.010$ | -2.7 | 0.042 | * |
| 2017.4438 | $15348+1032$ | STF1954AB | -005+000 U | +008-017 U | 2014 | 172.7 | 3.62 | 5 | $172.2 \pm 0.1$ | $4.097 \pm 0.005$ | -0.5 | 0.477 | * |
| 2017.4466 | 15360+3948 | STT 298AB | -483+028 W | -455+051 W | 2014 | 185.8 | 1.18 | 5 | $186.2 \pm 0.0$ | $1.22 \pm 0.004$ | 0.4 | 0.040 | * |
| 2017.4466 | 15405+1840 | A 2076 | -019+019 W | -019+019 W | 2012 | 185.1 | 0.73 | 5 | $186 \pm 0.3$ | $0.742 \pm 0.005$ | 0.9 | 0.012 | * |
| 2017.4493 | 15413+5959 | STF1969 | $-223+160$ G | $-220+165 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2013 | 29.0 | 1.01 | 5 | $31.5 \pm 0.2$ | $1.073 \pm 0.007$ | 2.5 | 0.063 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 15559-0210 | STF1985 | -091-062 G | -089-061 W | 2013 | 353.1 | 5.92 | 5 | $354.1 \pm 0.0$ | $6.062 \pm 0.003$ | 1.0 | 0.142 | * |

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

## Notes to Table 6 (Known Orbits) <br> All ephemerides were computed with an Excel spreadsheet prepared by Jack Drummond (April, 2014). The number after the term "Orbit" is the orbit's grade. True Separation computed from orbital elements (semi-major axis).

| WDS Number | Parallax | Parallax Source | Distance (Parsecs) | True Sep (AU) | Plot Figure | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02020+0246 AB | $21.66 \pm 1.06$ | H | 46 | 340 | - | Orbit (4) by PRU2017. The ephemerides predict $262.1^{\circ}$, $1.834^{\prime \prime}$ and the residuals are $+2.4^{\circ}$, $+0.107^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $02037+2556$ AB | $18.2 \pm 0.46$ | G | 55 | 76 | - | Orbit (3) by HEI1996. The ephemerides predict $346.5^{\circ}$, 1.492". The residuals are $-2.7^{\circ},-0.082^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 02158-1814 | $42.52 \pm 0.53$ | G | 24 | 52 | - | Orbit (4) by TOK2015. The ephemerides are $163.1^{\circ}$, 1.736". The residuals are $+1.0^{\circ},+0.284 "$. |
| 02475+1922 AB | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A}: 29.8 \pm 0.82 \\ & \mathrm{~B}: 29.88 \pm 0.27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { H } \\ & \text { G } \end{aligned}$ | 34 | 78 | - | Orbit (4) by MSN2014. There is a $50 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. The ephemerides predict $306.0^{\circ}$, 3.726". The residuals are $+0.5^{\circ},-0.051 "$. |
| $03122+3713$ | $25.05 \pm 1.50$ | H | 40 | 146 | $\begin{array}{ll}  & 60 \\ 61 & \text { (Orb) } \\ 62 & \text { (Lin) } \end{array}$ | Orbit (5) by WSI2004. The ephemerides predict $125.7^{\circ}$, 2.857", while the residuals are $-1.4^{\circ},-0.027$ ". <br> Curiously, there is also a linear solution by HRT2011. The ephemerides predict $124.9^{\circ}$, 2.919", while its residuals are $-0.6^{\circ},+0.012^{\prime \prime}$. My measurement seems to favor the linear solution over the orbit. The PM vector ( $264^{\circ}, 18.2^{\prime \prime}$ ) is far too long for the orbital solution. |
| 03356+3141 AB | B: $11.32 \pm 0.37$ | G | 88 | 87 | - | Orbit (5) by ZIR2015. The ephemerides predict $221^{\circ}$, 1.027 " while the residuals are $-0.6^{\circ}$, $+0.021^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $04199+1631$ | - | - | - | - | - | Orbit (2) by SOD1999. The ephemerides predict $4.3^{\circ}$, $0.561 "$ while the residuals are $-0.50^{\circ}$, $-0.036^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 05005+0506 | $17.98 \pm 1.51$ | H | 56 | 102 | - | Orbit (4) by WSI2015. The ephemerides predict 1.550 ". The residuals are $+0.0^{\circ},+0.082^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 05079+0830 | $15.47 \pm 1.89$ | H | 65 | 65 | 63 | Orbit (2) by SCA2008. The ephemerides predict $291.2^{\circ}$, 0.932 ". The residuals are $-5.1^{\circ}$, +0.020". |
| 05135+0158 AB | $4.71 \pm 0.85$ | H | 212 | 163 | - | Orbit (4) by TOK2014. The ephemerides predict $240.4^{\circ}$, $0.687^{\prime \prime}$ while the residuals are $-0.2^{\circ}$, $+0.006^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $\begin{gathered} 05239-0052 \mathrm{~A}- \\ \mathrm{BC} \end{gathered}$ | $18.75 \pm 0.47$ | G | 53 | 153 | - | Orbit (5) by FMR2013. Ephemerides: $158.5^{\circ}$, $3.096^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: $-1.4^{\circ},+0.070^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $05308+0557$ | $10.77 \pm 0.64$ | H | 93 | 149 | - | Orbit (4) by USN1999. Ephemerides: 44.4 ${ }^{\circ}$, 1.315". Residuals: $-1.0^{\circ},-0.036^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 05407-0157 AB | $4.43 \pm 0.64$ | H | 226 | 617 | - | Orbit (5) by HOP1967. Ephemerides: 166.4 ${ }^{\circ}$, 2.197". Residuals: $-0.5^{\circ},+0.180^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 05417-0254 | $12.39 \pm 0.87$ | H | 81 | 56 | - | Orbit (3) by HRT2010. Ephemerides: $183.7^{\circ}$, $0.584^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: $+3.2^{\circ}$, +0.052". |
| 06336-1207 | $11.8 \pm 20.90$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error makes the parallax unusable. Orbit (5) by HEI1993. Ephemerides: 312.00, 0.860". Residuals: $3.9^{\circ},+0.004^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 08024+0409 | $24.21 \pm 0.44$ | G | 41 | 124 | - | Orbit (5) by OLE2001. Ephemerides: 290.4º $1.386^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: $-3.8^{\circ}$, +0.091". |
| 08061-0047 | $9.86 \pm 3.72$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The magnitude of the error makes the parallax unusable. Orbit (5) by TOK2015. Ephemerides: 359.0 ${ }^{\circ}$, 0.819". Residuals: $+3.2^{\circ}$, +0.157 ". |
| 08095+3213 | $15.46 \pm 1.23$ | H | 65 | 198 | - | Orbit (5) by OLE2001. Ephemerides: 20.4, $2.955^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: $-1.0^{\circ},+0.148^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 08213-0136 | - | - | - | - | - | Orbit (3) by TOK2014. Ephemerides: 307.6, 0.521". Residuals: $-0.9^{\circ},+0.014 "$. Manual solution with STB. |
| $08369+2315$ | $24.04 \pm 2.97$ | H | 42 | 131 | - | Orbit (5) by HRT2011. Ephemerides: 0.9ㅇ 2.670". Residuals: -0.4, +0.018". |
| 08507+0752 | - | - | - | - | 64 | Orbit (4) by WSI2006. Ephemerides: 181.4º 1.063". Residuals: $+3.6^{\circ},+0.083^{\prime \prime}$. The last few measures appear to be veering off the predictions. |
| 09273+0614 | $18.41 \pm 1.23$ | H | 54 | 94 | - | Orbit (4) by LIN2011. Ephemerides: $354.5^{\circ}$, 1.810". Residuals: $+0.2^{\circ},-0.002^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 09414+3857 AB | $19.5 \pm 0.83$ | H | 51 | 163 | - | Orbit (5) by LIN2013. Ephemerides: 310.4ㅇ, 2.817 ". Residuals: $+0.6^{\circ}$, $+0.025^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $10131+2725$ | $13.93 \pm 1.22$ | H | 72 | 71 | - | Orbit (4) by SCA2008. Ephemerides: $120.8^{\circ}$, $1.071^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: +0.0, -0.020". |
| $10200+1950 \mathrm{AB}$ | $25.07 \pm 0.52$ | H | 40 | 124 | - | Orbit (4) by PKO2014. (Two orbits with the apparent motion parameters method.) Ephemerides: $126.2^{\circ}$, 4.627". Residuals: $-0.7^{\circ},+1.149^{\prime \prime}$. |

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Notes to Table 6 (Known Orbits) continued
All ephemerides were computed with an Excel spreadsheet prepared by Jack Drummond (April, 2014). The number after the
term "Orbit" is the orbit's grade. True Separation computed from orbital elements (semi-major axis).

| WDS Number | Parallax | $\begin{gathered} \text { Parallax } \\ \text { Source } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Distance (Parsecs) | True Sep <br> (AU) | Plot Figure | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10205+0626$ AB | $6.68 \pm 1.99$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error makes the parallax unusable. Orbit (5) by NOV2006. Ephemerides: $312.5^{\circ}$, 0.912". Residuals: $+0.8^{\circ},-0.009 "$. |
| 10217-0946 | $16.68 \pm 1.18$ | H | 60 | 110 | - | Orbit (5) by ZIR2012. Ephemerides: $130.5^{\circ}$, 1.566". Residuals: -1.9º -0.031". |
| $10269+1713$ | $11.8 \pm 1.44$ | H | 85 | 40 | - | Orbit (3) by SCA2015. Ephemerides: $148.4^{\circ}$, $0.782^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: -1.9º +0.036". |
| $10397+0851 \mathrm{AB}$ | - | - | - | - | - | Orbit (3) by HRT2010. Ephemerides: $135.3^{\circ}, 0.496^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: +0.1, +0.054". Manual solution with STB. |
| $10480+4107$ | $6.04 \pm 0.96$ | H | 166 | 104 | - | Orbit (4) by ALZ1998. Ephemerides: 257.4 ${ }^{\circ}$, 0.637 ". Residuals: $-1.1^{\circ},+0.077{ }^{\prime \prime}$. Manual solution with STB. |
| 11000-0328 | $18.66 \pm 0.86$ | H | 54 | 182 | - | Orbit (5) by HRT2013. Ephemerides: 299.9º 1.336". Residuals: $-1.1^{\circ},+0.009 "$. |
| $11080+5249$ | $17.54 \pm 0.26$ | G | 57 | 450 | - | Orbit (5) by KIS2012. Ephemerides: 328.3 5.461 ". Residuals: $-0.1^{\circ}$, +0.125". |
| $11136+5525$ | - | - | - | - | - | Orbit (3) by DOC2015. Ephemerides: 209.0 ${ }^{\circ}$, $0.537{ }^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: $+1.9^{\circ}$, $+0.063^{\prime \prime}$. Manual solution with STB. |
| $11137+2008$ AB | $18.35 \pm 0.96$ | H | 54 | 123 | - | Orbit (4) by FMR2011. Ephemerides: 316.3º, 0.694". Residuals: -1.9․ +0.016". |
| $11390+4109 \mathrm{AB}$ | $12.24 \pm 0.40$ | G | 82 | 374 | - | Orbit (5) by USN2002. Ephemerides: 244.4º 2.033". Residuals: $-1.6^{\circ},+0.009 "$. |
| $11520+4805$ | $20.16 \pm 3.04$ | H | 50 | 59 | - | Orbit (4) by HRT2008. Ephemerides: 307.9 ${ }^{\circ}$, 1.171". Residuals: $-0.7^{\circ},+0.040^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $12244+2535 \mathrm{AB}$ | $11.08 \pm 0.59$ | H | 90 | 110 | - | Orbit (4) by OLE2006. Ephemerides: $323.2^{\circ}$, $1.823^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: $+0.4^{\circ},+0.028^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $12272+2701 \mathrm{AB}$ | $36.75 \pm 0.90$ | H | 27 | 73 | - | ```Orbit (4) by WSI2004. Ephemerides: 4.0}\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ},2.745". Re- siduals: -0.6, +0.002".``` |
| $12306+0943$ | $10.81 \pm 0.90$ | H | 93 | 405 | - | Orbit (4) by HOP1970. Ephemerides: 251.4, 1.243". Residuals: $-2.7^{\circ},+_{0} .063^{\prime \prime}$. <br> There appear to be quadrant reversals on L 1902.35, FUR 1902.40, POS 1903.27, BOW 1904.30, and PHL 1923.07. |
| $12372+2112$ | $5.34 \pm 1.09$ | H | 187 | 131 | - | Orbit (5) by ZIR2013. Ephemerides: 68.0ㅇ, $0.636^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: $-2.6^{\circ},-0.099^{\prime \prime}$. Manual solution with STB. |
| $12533+2115$ AB | $11.52 \pm 0.87$ | H | 87 | 103 | - | Orbit (4) by DRU2014. Ephemerides: 197.4º 1.158". Residuals: +1.4ㅇ $-0.013^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $13120+3205$ | $13.68 \pm 0.28$ | G | 73 | 131 | $\begin{array}{ll} 65 & \text { (Hsw) } \\ 66 & \text { (Kis) } \\ 67 & \text { (Hrt) } \end{array}$ | Interesting case - Kiselev derived an orbit whereas Hartkopf found a linear solution. <br> Orbit (4) by KIS2012. Ephemerides: $338.5^{\circ}$, 2.582 ". Residuals: $+0.6^{\circ}$, $+0.087{ }^{\prime \prime}$. <br> Linear solution by HRT2011. Ephemerides not available. |
| $13235+2914$ | $53.97 \pm 2.13$ | H | 19 | 40 | - | Orbit (3) by ZIR2013. Ephemerides: 87.1, 1.626". Residuals: $+1.5^{\circ},+0.058^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 13237-0043 | $10.96 \pm 4.13$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error makes the parallax unusable. Orbit (5) by WSI2004. Ephemerides: 191.6º 0.945". Residuals: $-3.5^{\circ},+0.053^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 13343-0019 AB | $37.68 \pm 1.30$ | H | 27 | 75 | - | Orbit (4) by HEI1988. Ephemerides: $138.6^{\circ}$, $1.755^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: $+2.5^{\circ},-0.053^{\prime \prime}$ |
| $13375+3618$ AB | $18.39 \pm 0.99$ | G | 54 | 55 | - | Orbit (3) by SOD1999. Ephemerides: 95.2ㅇ, 1.697". Residuals: $-0.3^{\circ},+0.006^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $13461+0507 \mathrm{AB}$ | $13.96 \pm 0.58$ | G | 72 | 72 | - | Orbit (3) by ALZ2007. Ephemerides: $194.5^{\circ}$, $0.975^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: +0.6º +0.072". |
| $13491+2659$ | - | - | - | - | 68 | Orbit (2) by HEI 1988. Ephemerides: $185.5^{\circ}$, 2.937 ". Residuals: $+1.6^{\circ}$, $-0.035^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $13577+5200$ | $18.92 \pm .76$ | H | 53 | 45 | - | Orbit (3) by RAO2014. Ephemerides: 301.6º 1.486". Residuals: -2.1, -0.060". |
| $14131+5520$ | $26.14 \pm 0.90$ | G | 38 | 135 | - | Orbit (4) by KIY1998. Ephemerides: 122.4º $2.265^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: $+1.7^{\circ},+0.146^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $14203+4830$ | $14.06 \pm 0.34$ | G | 71 | 72 | - | Orbit (3) by WSI2015. Ephemerides: $103.8^{\circ}$, $1.580^{\prime \prime}$. Residuals: +0.70, +0.097". |
| $14336+3535$ AB | $25.34 \pm 0.24$ | G | 39 | 187 | - | Orbit (5) by ZIR2015. Ephemerides: 37.8 ${ }^{\circ}$ 3.029". Residuals: +0.6º +0.049". |

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Notes to Table 6 (Known Orbits) conclusion
All ephemerides were computed with an Excel spreadsheet prepared by Jack Drummond (April, 2014). The number after the term "Orbit" is the orbit's grade. True Separation computed from orbital elements (semi-major axis).

| WDS Number | Parallax | Parallax <br> Source | Distance (Parsecs) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { True Sep } \\ & \text { (AU) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Plot } \\ \text { Figure } \end{gathered}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $14380+5135$ | $11.67 \pm 1.36$ | H | 86 | 93 | - | Orbit (4) by ZIR2013. Ephemerides: 60.3,$~ 0.649 "$. Residuals: $-1.4^{\circ}$, $+0.016^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $14407+3117$ | $8.55 \pm 1.73$ | H | 117 | 141 | - | ```Orbit (5) by ZIR2013. Ephemerides: 353.7o, 0.662". Residuals: +1.2 ', +0.012".``` |
| $14525+1844$ | $20.65 \pm 1.08$ | H | 48 | - | - | Orbit (5) by HRT2014. Ephemerides: 221.2 ${ }^{\circ}$, 2.012 ". Residuals: $+0.5^{\circ}, 0.026^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $14455+4223$ AB | - | - | - | - | - | ```Orbit (2) by SCA2015. Ephemerides: 82.2`, 0.498". Residuals: -3.6o +0.035".``` |
| 14463+0939 AB | $23.14 \pm 1.26$ | H | 43 | 48 | - | Orbit (3) by MSN1999. Ephemerides: 83.1, 1.720". Residuals: $-2.0^{\circ},-1.720^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 14464-0723 AB | - | - | - | - | - | ```Orbit (5) by USN2002. Ephemerides: 112.6, 1.247". Residuals: +2.6o +0.009".``` |
| $14489+0557$ | $17.99 \pm 1.82$ | H | 56 | 45 | - | ```Orbit (2) by WSI2015. Ephemerides: 277.1 248/0.988". Residuals: +0.30, +0.057".``` |
| $14515+4456$ | $16.91 \pm 0.86$ | H | 59 | 54 | - | Orbit (4) by HEI1997. Ephemerides: $0.6^{\circ}$, 0.721". Residuals: +4.3, -0.146". |
| $14534+1542$ | $20.99 \pm 0.93$ | H | 48 | 65 | - | ```Orbit (4) by HEI1998. Ephemerides: 158.8}\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ}, 1.016" Residuals: +0.2', +0.028".``` |
| $15038+4739$ | $79.95 \pm 1.56$ | H | 13 | 48 | - | Orbit (2) by ZIR2011. Ephemerides: 66.7º 1.02". Residuals: +8.2 ${ }^{\circ}$, $-0.364^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 15183+2650 AB | $27.29 \pm 0.34$ | G | 37 | 45 | - | Orbit (2) by SCA2015 . Ephemerides: 265.1, 1.622". Residuals: $+1.8^{\circ}$, $+0.017{ }^{\prime \prime}$. |
| 15277+0606 | $5.1 \pm 1.29$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error makes the parallax unusable. <br> Orbit (5) by ZIR2015. Ephemerides: 294.0 ${ }^{\circ}$, $0.620^{\prime \prime}$. <br> Residuals: $-1.5^{\circ}$, $+0.082^{\prime \prime}$. <br> Manual solution with STB. |
| $15348+1032$ AB | $14.3 \pm 0.75$ | G | 70 | 268 | - | ```Orbit (4) by WSI2004. Ephemerides: 172.1, 3.977". Residuals: +0.10, +0.120".``` |
| $15360+3948$ AB | - | - | - | - | - | ```Orbit (1) by SOD1999. Ephemerides: 183.6, 1.194". Residuals: +2.6o +0.026".``` |
| $15405+1840$ | $3.23 \pm 1.74$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The error makes the parallax unusable. Orbit (4) by ZIR2014. Ephemerides: 185.4º 0.729". Residuals: $+0.6^{\circ},+0.013^{\prime \prime}$. |
| $15413+5959$ | $16.19 \pm 0.25$ | G | 62 | 63 | - | ```Orbit (4) by RA01999. Ephemerides: 29.4*, 0.957". Residuals: +2.10, +0.116".``` |
| 15559-0210 | $26.19 \pm 0.40$ | G | 38 | 264 | - | Orbit (5) by HOP1973. Ephemerides: 354.9º 6.281". Residuals: $-0.8^{\circ},-0.219^{\prime \prime}$. |
| Mean $A B$ separation in $A U$ |  |  |  | 136 |  |  |

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Table 7: Short Arc Pairs Measured With Speckle

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A | PM B | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \text { Yr } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \rho \end{gathered}$ | Msrs | Measured <br> $\theta \pm \operatorname{err}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | Measured $\rho \pm \text { err (") }$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \rho \end{gathered}$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.1507 | 04518+0115 | BU 748 | $+009+004 \mathrm{G}$ | +007+009 G | 2010 | 70.0 | 2.80 | 5 | $69.0 \pm 0.0$ | $3.019 \pm 0.001$ | -1.0 | 0.219 | * |
| 2017.1671 | 05181+0342 | A 2639 | -061+002 W | -061+002 W | 2016 | 273.0 | 0.90 | 5 | $277.2 \pm 1.6$ | $0.846 \pm 0.002$ | 4.2 | -0.054 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 08033+2616 | STT 186 | -014-009 W | -014-009 W | 2012 | 73.7 | 0.99 | 5 | $73.4 \pm 0.1$ | $1.004 \pm 0.001$ | -0.3 | 0.014 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 08136+1051 | STF1202 | +005-070 G | - | 2011 | 306.2 | 2.70 | 5 | $303.8 \pm 0.0$ | $2.700 \pm 0.003$ | -2.4 | 0.000 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 09193-0933 | A 126 | -050-001 W | -050-001 W | 2014 | 121.6 | 1.09 | 5 | $122.3 \pm 0.1$ | $1.164 \pm 0.004$ | 0.7 | 0.074 | * |
| 2017.3014 | 09290+1917 | COU 936 | +026+033 W | +026+033 W | 2012 | 226.3 | 0.88 | 5 | $225.8 \pm 1.1$ | $0.956 \pm 0.017$ | -0.5 | 0.076 | * |
| 2017.2986 | 09500+0148 | A 2560 | -034-010 W | -034-010 W | 2005 | 17.4 | 1.13 | 5 | $17.8 \pm 0.1$ | $1.122 \pm 0.008$ | 0.4 | -0.008 | * |
| 2017.3260 | 09513+6037 | STF1381 | $-018+088 \mathrm{~W}$ | $-018+088 \mathrm{~W}$ | 2015 | 186.2 | 0.80 | 5 | $187.3 \pm 0.1$ | $0.798 \pm 0.005$ | 1.1 | -0.002 | * |
| 2017.3315 | 10069-0143 | HDO 125 | $-072+023 \mathrm{G}$ | -078+019 W | 2012 | 190.0 | 2.70 | 5 | $190.3 \pm 0.0$ | $2.875 \pm 0.003$ | 0.3 | 0.267 | * |
| 2017.3397 | $11431+3715$ | HU 1135 | -026-014 W | -026-014 W | 2014 | 336.0 | 0.70 | 5 | $334.1 \pm 0.2$ | $0.742 \pm 0.001$ | -1.9 | 0.042 | * |
| 2017.3589 | $12409+0850$ | STF1668 | -013-030 W | -013-030 W | 2009 | 187.0 | 1.10 | 5 | $186.8 \pm 0.0$ | $1.129 \pm 0.001$ | -0.2 | 0.029 | * |
| 2017.4247 | $14165+2007$ | STF1825 | -136-095 G | -131-084 W | 2012 | 153.6 | 4.33 | 5 | $152.7 \pm 0.1$ | $4.425 \pm 0.020$ | -0.9 | 0.095 |  |

Notes to Table 7 (Short Arc Binaries, or SABs)

| WDS Number | Parallax | $\begin{gathered} \text { Parallax } \\ \text { Source } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Distance (Parsecs) | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{Min} \text { Sep } \\ \text { (AU) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Plot Figure | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04518+0115 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { A: } 12.69 \pm 0.35 \\ \text { B: } & 14.46 \pm 0.47 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79 \\ & 69 \end{aligned}$ | - | 69 | There is no overlap in the parallax windows. |
| 05181+0342 | $7.78 \pm 1.76$ | H | 129 | 100 | 70 |  |
| $08033+2616$ | $5.31 \pm 1.04$ | H | 188 | 187 | 71 | Trend line does not "orbit" the primary star. |
| 08136+1051 | $14.42 \pm 0.35$ | G | 69 | 187 | - |  |
| 09193-0933 | - | - | - | - | 72 | Trend line does not "orbit" the primary star. |
| 09290+1917 | $12.03 \pm 1.20$ | H | 83 | 73 | 73 | Trend line does not "orbit" the primary star. |
| 09500+0148 | $4.40 \pm 1.26$ | H | N/A | N/A | - | The parallax error makes the parallax unusable. Early case of showing a weak arc. |
| 09513+6037 | $5.26 \pm 2.19$ | H | N/A | N/A | 74 | The parallax error makes the parallax unusable. |
| 10069-0143 | $10.4 \pm 0.33$ | G | 96 | 274 | - | Weak arc is forming. |
| $11431+3715$ | - | - | - | - | - | Early case of a weak arc forming. The $R^{2}$ value is very high (0.9463), but the motion of the companion has only traversed 0.5". |
| 12409+0850 | $8.26 \pm 0.85$ | H | 121 | 137 | - | Weak arc forming. |
| $14165+2007$ | $29.68 \pm 0.47$ | G | 34 | 146 | 75 |  |
| Mean AB Separation in AU |  |  |  | 158 |  |  |

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Table 8: Unknown Cases Measured With Speckle
Note: These cases are called "unknown" because no proper motions are known, or only one proper motion is known.

| Date | WDS No | Disc/Comp | PM A |  | PM B | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \text { Yr } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Last } \\ \theta \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Last } \\ \mathrm{p} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Msrs | Measured <br> $\theta \pm \operatorname{err}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Measured } \\ \rho \pm \text { err (") } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Resid } \\ \theta \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Resid $\rho$ | Notes? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017.0795 | 02593-0615 | A 454 | +072+005 | W | - | 2010 | 132.1 | 3.89 | 5 | $134.3 \pm 0.3$ | $3.957 \pm 0.033$ | 2.2 | 0.067 |  |
| 2017.0822 | 03384+1736 | A 2420 | -009-005 | G | - | 2008 | 268.9 | 2.08 | 5 | $267.6 \pm 0.1$ | $1.990 \pm 0.004$ | -1.3 | -0.090 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 04581+0141 | STF 622 | +058-003 | G | +062-003 G | 2010 | 162.0 | 2.40 | 5 | $161.4 \pm 0.0$ | $2.537 \pm 0.001$ | -0.6 | 0.137 | * |
| 2017.1644 | 05063+0257 | AG 89 | +002-016 | G | - | 2006 | 178.8 | 2.31 | 5 | $178.5 \pm 0.1$ | $2.325 \pm 0.002$ | -0.3 | 0.015 | * |
| 2017.1616 | 05099-0906 | A 483 AB | +002+001 | G | $-003+002 \mathrm{G}$ | 2009 | 58.0 | 3.95 | 5 | $58.5 \pm 0.0$ | $3.846 \pm 0.002$ | 0.5 | -0.104 | * |
| 2017.1616 | 05129-0347 | BRT 534 | -001-002 | G | -001-003 G | 2000 | 171.9 | 4.16 | 5 | $171.8 \pm 0.0$ | $4.247 \pm 0.004$ | -0.1 | 0.087 | * |
| 2017.2137 | 05589-0120 | STF 826 | +001-007 | W | - | 2010 | 132.6 | 1.99 | 5 | $132.2 \pm 0.2$ | $2.014 \pm 0.011$ | -0.4 | 0.024 |  |
| 2017.2137 | 06025-0222 | STF 836 | -005-011 | W | - | 2013 | 25.5 | 1.99 | 5 | $23.6 \pm 0.1$ | $1.967 \pm 0.004$ | -1.9 | -0.023 |  |
| 2017.1644 | 06116-1727 | A 3023 | -010-020 | G | - | 2002 | 327.3 | 2.20 | 5 | $328.4 \pm 0.0$ | $2.316 \pm 0.001$ | 1.1 | 0.116 | * |
| 2017.1507 | 06249-1943 | HO 339 | $-034+018$ | G | - | 2005 | 191.8 | 5.29 | 5 | $191.2 \pm 0.0$ | $5.359 \pm 0.007$ | -0.6 | 0.069 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 08413+1916 | KU 32 | -036-012 | G | - | 2000 | 165.4 | 2.16 | 5 | $164.7 \pm 0.0$ | $2.178 \pm 0.001$ | -0.7 | 0.018 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 08515+1208 | STF1287AB | -020-030 | G | - | 2012 | 87.0 | 2.18 | 5 | $86.1 \pm 0.0$ | $2.187 \pm 0.003$ | -0.9 | 0.007 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 08521+0428 | STF1290 | -006-002 | G | - | 2009 | 325.1 | 2.77 | 5 | $324.7 \pm 0.0$ | $2.775 \pm 0.003$ | -0.4 | 0.005 | * |
| 2017.2877 | 09012+0245 | STF1302AB | $-062+021$ | G | - | 2009 | 236.3 | 2.71 | 5 | $233.3 \pm 0.1$ | $2.745 \pm 0.005$ | -3.0 | 0.035 | * |
| 2017.2795 | 09463-1627 | A 3079 | -008-012 | W | - | 2000 | 122.4 | 2.73 | 5 | $123.8 \pm 0.1$ | $2.799 \pm 0.011$ | 1.4 | 0.069 |  |
| 2017.3315 | 10314-0226 | A 1350 | -086-017 | G | - | 2008 | 317.2 | 2.59 | 5 | $316.0 \pm 0.1$ | $2.600 \pm 0.003$ | -1.2 | 0.010 | * |
| 2017.2822 | 10350+0839 | STF1450 | -054-003 | W | - | 2013 | 155.8 | 2.11 | 5 | $155.7 \pm 0.1$ | $2.160 \pm 0.004$ | -0.1 | 0.050 | * |
| 2017.3315 | $11245+2037$ | STF1537 | $-001+005$ | G | - | 2013 | 358.3 | 2.28 | 5 | $358.1 \pm 0.1$ | $2.298 \pm 0.004$ | -0.2 | 0.018 | * |
| 2017.3616 | $12168+7009$ | STF1626 | +056+001 |  | - | 2005 | 4.8 | 2.16 | 5 | $2.0 \pm 0.0$ | $2.133 \pm 0.000$ | -2.8 | -0.027 | * |
| 2017.4247 | $14301+0617$ | STF1853 | $-024+027$ | U | - | 2011 | 81.5 | 2.86 | 5 | $82.4 \pm 0.0$ | $2.858 \pm 0.000$ | 0.9 | -0.002 |  |
| 2017.4411 | $14450+2704$ | STF1877AB | $-042+014$ |  | - | 2014 | 343.4 | 2.90 | 5 | $344.8 \pm 0.1$ | $2.930 \pm 0.011$ | 1.4 | 0.030 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 15479-0519 | STF3096 | +027+004 | G | $+028+007 \mathrm{G}$ | 2011 | 77.2 | 3.73 | 5 | $76.1 \pm 0.0$ | $3.725 \pm 0.001$ | -1.1 | -0.005 | * |
| 2017.4247 | 15509-0902 | STF 3097 | -153-103 |  | - | 2009 | 188.1 | 3.95 | 5 | $187.2 \pm 0.0$ | $4.001 \pm 0.001$ | -0.9 | 0.051 |  |
| 2017.4438 | 16120-1928 | BU 120AB | -010-025 |  | - | 2014 | 1.9 | 1.33 | 5 | $1.8 \pm 0.5$ | $1.514 \pm 0.012$ | -0.1 | 0.184 | * |

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...

Notes to Table 8 (Unknown Cases)

| WDS Number | Parallax | Parallax Source | Distance (Parsecs) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Min Sep } \\ \text { (AU) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Plot } \\ \text { Figure } \end{gathered}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03384+1736 | $2.31 \pm 0.32$ | G | 433 | 902 | - |  |
| 04581+0141 | $\begin{gathered} \text { A: } 10.42 \pm 0.32 \\ \text { B: } 9.84 \pm 0.42 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 99 | 254 | - | Weighted parallax (10.13 mas) used. There is a $16 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. |
| 05063+0257 | $4.06 \pm 0.27$ | G | 246 | 569 | - |  |
| 05099-0906 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 3.15 \pm 0.28 \\ & \text { B: } 3.12 \pm 0.27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 319 | 1,260 | - | A weighted parallax of 3.13 mas was used. There is a $90 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. |
| 05129-0347 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 2.56 \pm 0.29 \\ & \mathrm{~B}: 2.97 \pm 0.28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G } \\ & \text { G } \end{aligned}$ | 361 | 1,502 | - | Weighted parallax (2.77 mas) used. There is a 20\% overlap in the parallax windows. |
| 06116-1727 | $1.64 \pm 0.51$ | G | N/A | N/A | - | The error makes the parallax unusable. |
| 06249-1943 | $16.54 \pm 0.23$ | G | 60 | 320 | - |  |
| $08413+1916$ | $5.00 \pm 0.69$ | G | 200 | 432 | - | DAL2005.274 looks like a quadrant flip ( $90^{\circ}$ west). |
| $08515+1208$ AB | $5.58 \pm 0.35$ | G | 179 | 391 | - | A trend appears to be forming. |
| 08521+0428 | $6.75 \pm 0.49$ | G | 148 | 410 | - |  |
| 09012+0245 AB | $12.84 \pm 0.30$ | G | 78 | 211 | - | Linear trend forming. |
| 10314-0226 | $10.69 \pm 0.94$ | G | 91 | 242 | - |  |
| $10350+0839$ | $7.61 \pm 0.67$ | H | 131 | 277 | - |  |
| $11245+2037$ | $10.44 \pm 0.27$ | G | 96 | 218 | - |  |
| $12168+7009$ | $5.81 \pm 0.22$ | G | 172 | 372 | - |  |
| $14450+2704 \mathrm{AB}$ | $16.10 \pm 0.66$ | G | 62 | 180 | - |  |
| 15479-0519 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A: } 16.62 \pm 0.3 \\ & \text { B: } 16.8 \pm 0.24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | 60 | 223 | - | Weighted parallax of 16.71 mas. $100 \%$ overlap in the parallax windows. Pair is probably physical. |
| 16120-1928 AB | - | - | - | - | - | A linear trend is forming. |
| Mean AB Separation in AU |  |  |  | 485 |  |  |
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## (Continued from page 289)

## 5. Discussion

## 5.1- The Impact of GAIA and UCAC5 data.

The new data from GAIA (DR1) has already been of huge benefit in the analysis of double star systems. PM analysis can bolster a pair's odds of being physical, or dispel it (if the parallaxes are greatly different).

In addition, the latest high-quality PM data from GAIA and the UCAC5 catalog can support a pair's claim to physicality (if the PMs are nearly the same) or suggest a linear or optical nature (if the PMs are greatly different).

The Winter/Spring 2017 observing program at Brilliant Sky Observatory revealed the following possibilities flowing from GAIA and UCAC5 data. (Table 9).

## 5.2- The Mean Separations and Projected Orbital Periods of the Stars by Type.

In addition to the possible new classifications arising from GAIA and UCAC5 data, it is also interesting to compare the mean separation of the two stars in cases where the distance is known (either for both stars, or it is assumed that both stars lie at the distance indicated by the one parallax on record). A survey of the data in the Notes to Tables 3 to 8 yields the data summarized in Table 10.

In the case of the known orbits, the mean orbital velocity may be calculated by using the orbital ele-

$$
\begin{equation*}
p=\pi(a+b) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\binom{0.5}{n}^{2} h^{n} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

ments of the solution and solving for the perimeter of an ellipse, and then dividing that result by the orbital period.

The perimeter of an ellipse is given by the infinite series (Equation 2):

$$
\begin{equation*}
b=a x \sqrt{1-e^{2}} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

In orbital solutions, we know the semi-major axis
Table 10: Mean AB Separation in $A U$

| Type of Pair | Mean AB Sep in AU |
| :---: | :---: |
| CPM | 504 |
| DPM | 564 |
| LIN | 139 |
| ORB | 136 |
| SAB | 158 |
| UNK | 485 |

Table 9: Outcomes From GAIA/UCAC5

| Physicality suggested by parallax |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Type | WDS Number |
| CPM | 05079+0824 |
|  | 06049-0243 AB |
|  | 06074-0400AB ? |
|  | 06372-1415 |
|  | 08421+2501 |
|  | 09071+3037 |
|  | 09300+4216 |
|  | 09450+7643 ? |
|  | 13007+7343 |
|  | $13354+5955$ |
|  | $13356+4939$ |
|  | 14403+1206 |
|  | 15087-0059 AB |
|  | 15453+0432 ? |
|  | 15492-0314 ? |
| LIN | 08593+3457 |
| UNK | 04581+0141 |
|  | 05099-0906 |
|  | 05129-0347 |
|  | 15479-0519 |
| Proper Motion accounts for observations (probable optical pairs) |  |
| CPM | $02123+2357$ AB ? |
|  | 03312+1947 ? |
|  | 10462-0546 |
| Proper Motion does NOT account for observations (one or both $P M$ values are incorrect) |  |
|  |  |
| CPM | $08500+3935$ |
|  | 08538-0035 AB |
|  | 09080+8102 |
|  | 10151+1907 |
|  | $11024+8313$ |
|  | 12137-7826 |
|  | $13324+3649$ |
|  | 14270+0341 |
|  | 15391-0834 |
| DPM | 02341-0538 |
|  | 03244-1400 |
|  | 03354+3341 |
|  | 03581-0454 |
|  | 04222-0441 |
|  | 06512-1126 |
|  | 06561-1403 |
|  | 08054+0550 |
|  | 08555-0758 |
|  | 09051+3931 |
|  | 09136+4659 |
|  | 13376-0752 AB |
|  | 14568+7050 |
| Parallax suggests optical pair (different distances) |  |
| CPM | 08101+0403 |
|  | 15276+0522 |
| LIN | 05269+0039 |
| SAB | 04518+0115 |
| Probable | Cases without solutions |
| CPM | 08140-1740 |
|  | 08437+1654 ? |
| LIN | 03061-1326 AB |
|  | $08194+5627$ |
|  | 08430-0242 |
|  | $09521+0249 \mathrm{AB}$ |
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(a) and the eccentricity (e). From these, we can compute the semi-minor axis (b) by using the expression (Equation 3):

If we substitute the expression $(a-b)^{2} /(a+b)^{2}$ for $h$ in $p=\pi(a+b)\left(1+\frac{1}{4} h+\frac{1}{64} h^{2}+\frac{1}{256} h^{3}+\frac{1}{16384} h^{4} \ldots\right)$

Equation 2, this conveniently expands into a series Excel can handle and gives a very accurate answer after the fourth expansion (Equation 4):

By determining the length of the semi-major axis in AU , that value can then be used to convert the total perimeter from arc seconds to AU.

This exercise shows us that the average orbital velocity of the 51 known orbits in this observing program (for which we have good parallax data) is $35,267 \mathrm{~km} /$ hour or $9.80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$. (The earth's mean orbital speed around the sun is $29.8 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$ for comparison. The mean orbital speed of Neptune, a planet that is at a distance typical of many of the closer known binaries, is $5.43 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$.)

A plot of the results, showing the mean orbital velocity in red, is shown in Figure 4.(The y-axis maximum value is $40,000 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ and axis divisions are in $5,000 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ increments.)

The spread in orbital velocities spans a wide range, from $0.76 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$ for the slowest pair (WDS $02020+0246=$ STF 202AB) to the highest value of $51.70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$ for the fastest pair (WDS 10269+1713 =

STT 217). The standard deviation of the 51 velocities was $8.43 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$, so this data is not of highly consistent quality. However, by matching the separation in the stars in AU from Table 10 to the nearest matching semi -major axis from the known orbits and using the orbital velocity of that pair as representative of the stars in the classes of Table 10, we can derive a rough estimate of periods of the stars of Table 10 to see if the velocity computations are consistent, and they are.

Considering only the CPM, SAB and UNK cases (since DPMs are most likely either pairs that are not physical or pairs with one or both proper motions in question, and LIN cases are linear and hence not likely to be physical), we get the following orbital period estimates (Table 11).

Since all of these estimates are well within the bounds of the 51 orbital cases, it would appear that the GAIA parallax data used to derive these projected periods is reasonably accurate. (The 51 orbital cases had a mean period of 1,104 years, with a minimum of 140 years and a maximum of 6,600 years.)

Table 11: Orbital Velocity Estimates of the 2017 Program Stars

| Type of Pair | Projected orbital <br> period, years |
| :---: | :---: |
| CPM | 897 |
| SAB | 293 |
| UNK | 863 |



Figure 4: Spread of orbital velocity (km/hr) for known orbits in the 2017 observing program.
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## 5.3- Analysis of 888 Orbits from the Sixth Orbit Catalog.

After the findings presented in section 5.2, I decided to investigate a larger sample of orbits. I downloaded the Sixth Orbit Catalog from the U. S. Navy's web site and selected only those pairs for which we had good parallax data ("good" defined as parallaxes from Hipparcos or GAIA). 888 pairs met this criterion.

I did the calculations detailed in section 5.2, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Min Sep }=(1-e) a \\
& \text { Max Sep }=(1+e) a
\end{aligned}
$$

added two new factors- the minimum separation of the stars (in AU) and the maximum separation (in AU). These values are derived from

The results of my analysis are shown in Table 12.
For comparison, the maximum velocity of the 51 orbits in this paper was $51.70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$; the minimum velocity was $0.76 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$; and the mean velocity was $8.43 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$. The mean semi-major axis of the 51 orbits was 118.04 AU (slightly over twice that of the Sixth Catalog pairs); the mean semi-minor axis was 112.41 (roughly three times the Sixth Catalog); and the mean perimeter in AU was 955 (roughly three times the value of the Sixth Catalog pairs). Obviously, there are many pairs analyzed in the Sixth Orbit Catalog that are much closer than the pairs studied in this observing program (indeed, the closest pair being Mu Ori AaAb, a pair separated by only 0.08 AU , with a period of only 4.447585 days). In fact, many of the Sixth Orbit Catalog pairs in this analysis are far too close to resolve in an 11-inch telescope.

Of equally great importance, however, is the distribution of true A-B separations (in AU) that can be derived from the Sixth Orbit Catalog analysis. A histo-

Table 12: Orbital Velocity Estimates of 888 Known Orbits

| Max Velocity, km/sec | $\mathbf{2 1 1 . 1 7}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Min Velocity, km/sec | 0.13 |
| Mean Velocity, km/sec | 9.80 |
| Mean semi-minor axis, AU | 43.30 |
| Mean semi-major axis, AU | 54.57 |
| Mean minimum sep, AU | 62.32 |
| Mean maximum sep, AU | 83.22 |
| Mean perimeter, " | 6.432 |
| Mean perimeter, AU | 312.00 |

gram of the data is shown in Figure 76 (at the end of this paper). The surprising thing about this graph is how fast the distance between stars in known binaries drops off with increasing rho. $87.38 \%$ of the 888 pairs are less than 100 AU apart, and the widest pair analyzed (WDS $05407-0157$, $\zeta$ Ori) was 615.80 AU apart. This would suggest caution regarding any computed separation that exceeds a few thousand AU.

Of course, the Sixth Orbit Catalog also represents a heavily biased sample to date- it contains, almost by default, pairs that have short enough orbital periods to display meaningful data that leads to orbital solutions. It may well be that there are binaries with periods in the tens of thousands (or even hundreds of thousands) of years, but for such pairs, the change in relative position of the two stars will be barely detectable even over time frames of centuries.

It would make an interesting student project to run a set of simulations of hypothetical binaries in which pairs of different masses are compared, probable orbital velocities computed, and the binding force of gravity between the two is estimated. If the orbital velocity results in a centripetal force that exceeds the binding energy, it would be highly unlikely for the two stars to be a true binary.

Finally, Figure 5 shows the strong relationship between the semi-major axis (in AU) and the orbital peri-

$$
\text { Period }=1.3444 \times \text { Sep }{ }^{0.6827}
$$

od. An equal-weight trend line has been established by Excel and shows a best-fit correlation of 0.8331 . The equation of that trend line is shown as
where Sep is the semi-major axis in AU and Peri$o d$ is the orbital period in years.

## 5.4-Comparison of AB Separation for the DPM pairs to All Other Classes.

When we compare the minimum AB separation for the stars for the DPM classes to all other classes, an obvious fact emerges: the mean separations for these stars is the greatest for any class of double star observed in the Winter/Spring 2017 program (564 AU). This is only slightly higher than the mean separation for the CPM pairs ( 504 AU ), but considerably higher than those for the known orbits (136) and the short arc binaries (which may become orbits eventually, at 158 AU ).

The widest DPM pair (WDS 06561-1403) came in at $1,503 \mathrm{AU}$, while the closest pair (WDS 09136+4659) was at 138 AU . The minimum AB separation for the orbital pairs in the observing program was 14 AU while the maximum was 533 . Granted, this is a biased selection as we are dealing with close pairs (under 5"), but it would seem that pairs with separations in the thousands
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Figure 5. The relationship between the Semi-major axis (in AU) and the Orbital Period (in years)
of AU may not be very stable, if they exist as true binaries at all.

## 6. Conclusion

We have already established in the pages of this Journal that small telescopes can do speckle interferometry of close pairs with a high degree of precision.

The results of the 2017 Winter and Spring observing program at Brilliant Sky Observatory show great promise for the addition of the new GAIA DR1 and UCAC5 parallax and proper motion data to our research as we continue to work on the WDS to determine which of its $140,000+$ pairs are true binaries and which are optical or non-binary but physical pairs. I can only assume that when GAIA DR2 is released in April of 2018, our pursuit of true binaries will literally explode. We are in for some exciting times!
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## Appendix: Plots of Special Cases Detailed in the Notes



Figure 4: Plot of WDS 02429-0629.


Figure 5: Plot of WDS 02123+2357.

## Measurements of 427 Double Stars With Speckle Interferometry ...



Figure 6. Plot of WDS 04448+0517 AB.


Figure 8. Plot of WDS 05231-0806..


Figure 10. Plot of WDS 08138+0159


Figure 7. Plot of WDS 05231-0806..


Figure 9. Plot of WDS 08109-0455.


Figure 11. Plot of WDS 08140-1740.
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Figure 12. Plot of WDS 08342+5655.


Figure 14. Plot of WDS 08500+3935.


Figure 16. Plot of WDS 09103+5223


Figure 13. Plot of WDS 08437+1654.


Figure 15. Plot of WDS 09080+8102.


Figure 17. Plot of WDS 09118-1649.
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Figure 18. Plot of WDS 09168-0500.


Figure 20. Plot of WDS 10056+3105.


Figure 22. Plot of WDS 10234+2630


Figure 19. Plot of WDS 09300+4216.

Figure 21. Plot of WDS 10151+1907.


Figure 23. Plot of WDS 10260+5237.
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Figure 24. Plot of WDS 10642-0546.


Figure 26. Plot of WDS 11023+3049.


Figure 28. Plot of WDS 11388+6421.


Figure 25. Plot of WDS 10473+2235.


Figure 27. Plot of WDS 11050+3825.


Figure 29. Plot of WDS 12137+7826.
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Figure 30. Plot of WDS 12533+1310.


Figure 32. Plot of WDS 12587+2728.


Figure 34. Plot of WDS 13166+5034.


Figure 31. Plot of WDS 12563+5460 AB.


Figure 33. Plot of WDS 13048+7302.


Figure 35. Plot of WDS 13346+3308.
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Figure 42. Plot of WDS 02341-0538


Figure 44. Plot of WDS 03354+3341.


Figure 46. Plot of WDS 04222-0441.


Figure 43. Plot of WDS 03244-1400


Figure 45. Plot of WDS 03581-0454.


Figure 47. Plot of WDS 06512-1126.
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Figure 48. Plot of WDS 06561-1403


Figure 50. Plot of WDS 03354+3341.


Figure 52. Plot of WDS 13376-0752.


Figure 49. Plot of WDS 08054+0550.

Figure 51. Plot of WDS 09136+4659.


Figure 53. Plot of WDS 14568+7050.
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Figure 54. Plot of WDS 03061-1326 AB.


Figure 56. Linear solution of WDS 03401+3407 by FMR2014..


Figure 58. Plot of WDS 08593+3457.


Figure 55. Plot of WDS 03401+3407.


Figure 57. Plot of WDS 02123+2357.


Figure 59. Plot of WDS 09521+0249.
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Figure 60. Plot of WDS 03122+3713.


Figure 62: Linear solution of WDS 03122+3713.


Figure 64. Plot of WDS 08507+0752.


Figure 61. Orbital solution of WDS 03122+3713.


Figure 63. Plot of WDS 05079+0830.


Figure 65. Plot of WDS 13120+0830.
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Figure 66: Kiselev's orbit for WDS 13120+3205.


Figure 68: Plot of WDS 13491+2659.


Figure 70. Plot of WDS 05181+0342.


Figure 67: Hartkopf's linear solution for WDS 13120+3205.


Figure 69. Plot of WDS 04518+3205.

Figure 71. Plot of WDS 08033+2616.
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Figure 72: Plot of WDS 09193-0933.


Figure 74. Plot of WDS 09513+6037.


Figure 73. Plot of WDS 09290+1917.


Figure 75. Plot of WDS 14165+2007.


Figure 76: Histogram of A-B Separations (in AU) from the Sixth Orbit Catalog

# A Simple Method for Reproducing Orbital Plots for Illustration Using Microsoft Paint and Microsoft Excel 

Cole Niebuhr<br>Global Science Directive - Las Vegas, NV<br>Concordia University Irvine - Irvine, CA


#### Abstract

Papers published in the astronomical community, particularly in the field of double star research, often contain plots that display the positions of the component stars relative to each other on a Cartesian coordinate plane. Due to the complexities of plotting a threedimensional orbit into a two-dimensional image, it is often difficult to include an accurate reproduction of the orbit for comparison purposes. Methods to circumvent this obstacle do exist; however, many of these protocols result in low-quality blurred images or require specific and often expensive software. Here, a method is reported using Microsoft Paint and Microsoft Excel to produce high-quality images with an accurate reproduction of a partial orbit.


## Introduction

Accurate orbital reproductions are often difficult and time-consuming requiring advanced software coupled with a thorough knowledge of the program. Many of these methods do not translate well into Microsoft Excel graphs and attempts often result in low-quality images instead of high-quality plots. To this end, a method was developed that allows for high-quality reproductions to be made in Microsoft Excel using data extracted from images with Microsoft Paint. For purposes of illustration, recent work published on the binary star WDS 15559-0210 will be reproduced.

## Methods

An orbital plot and the represented data points were obtained from the Washington Double Star Catalog (WDS) maintained by the United States Naval Observatory (ref: Washington Double Star Catalog). The data points were filtered (Musegades et al 2017) and plotted in MS Excel (Figure 1). The orbital plot was opened in MS Paint and the image was cropped to only include the third (lower left) quadrant. This placed the origin of the plot in the upper right corner of the image corresponding to pixel $(230,0)$ as read in the cursor position readout at the bottom left corner of the MS Paint screen (Figure 2). Using the cursor position, 0 arcseconds(") corresponded with 0 -pixels and $-5^{\prime \prime}$ with 160 pixels. This means that, for this image, $1^{\prime \prime}$ is equivalent to 32 pixels. This was an important conversion factor needed for plotting the orbit in MS Excel.

Next, using the cursor position readout, five points were collected from the orbit itself and the corresponding pixels recorded in MS Excel. Two additional points were collected for the endpoints of the orbit as determined by the window range desired for the graph. Each of the points was subtracted from the identified origin so that the new coordinate was in terms of distance from the origin. These values were made negative in order to correspond with the third quadrant. The points were converted to arcseconds with the conversion factor mentioned above.

For this equation, Q is the quadrant multiplier (-1
$\left(x_{\text {excel }}, y_{\text {excel }}\right)=\left(Q_{x} * C . F . *\left|x_{\text {origin }}-x_{n}\right|, Q_{y} * C . F .\left|y_{\text {origin }}-y_{n}\right|\right)$
for both x and y in Quadrant Three), C.F. is the conversion factor ( $1 / 32$ for this example), and includes the pixel coordinates for the origin $(230,0)$

These points, now in arcseconds from the origin,

$$
\left(x_{\text {excel }}, y_{\text {excel }}\right)=\left(-\frac{1}{32} *\left|230-x_{n}\right|,-\frac{1}{32} *\left|0-y_{n}\right|\right)
$$

were added to the MS Excel graph (Figure 3). Finally, as shown in Figure 4, a polynomial trend line of the extracted data points was added and the points were rendered invisible (Format Data Series - Marker Option - None).
(Text continues on page 333)
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Figure 2. The orbital plot cropped to only include Quadrant Three. This places the origin of the orbit at pixel $(230,0)$ in the MS Paint Screen. Cursor position is shown in the bottom left corner of the screen and is highlighted in the figure with a red box.
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Figure 3. The points extracted from the published orbit (in pixels) were converted to arcseconds and plotted with the previous data points.

## (Continued from page 331)

## Discussion

This method has many advantages but is not without limitation. The advantages include the low price, accessibility, and ease of use of the MS Paint software and MS Excel. The resultant plot is not completely accurate, but it does serve as a good approximation sufficient for illustrating small arcs of an orbit. As seen in Figure 5, the $2^{\text {nd }}$ - through $5^{\text {th }}$-order polynomial trend lines quickly lose fidelity to the orbit once the domains of the functions move beyond the preselected data points. Within the scope of the selected data, however, the trend lines and published orbit overlap together nearly identically.
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Figure 4. The "final product" where a reproduced orbit using the trend line feature is included with the previous data points for comparison.


Figure 5. MS Excel trend lines plotted for comparison with the published orbit (black). The plots includes $2^{\text {nd }}, 3^{\text {rd }}, 4^{\text {th }}$, and $5^{\text {th }}$ order polynomial trend lines (colored). The graphs were produced with the Desmos software and MS Paint was used to paste the graphs onto the orbital plot by aligning the origin of the two images.
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#### Abstract

We obtained and analyzed CCD images of the double star system WDS 11582 +0335 (HJ 1204) using the iTelescope network and a variety of specialized software. WCS coordinates were attached to each image, and the separation distance ( $\rho$ ) and mean position angle ( $\theta$ ) were measured at $\rho=7.9^{\prime \prime} \pm 0.03^{\prime \prime}$ and $\theta=59.3^{\circ} \pm 0.2^{\circ}$. These results were compared to historical data, dating back $\sim 200$ years and we find that HJ 1204 is currently exhibiting a linearly decreasing $\rho$ and a constant $\theta$. This suggests that HJ 1204 could be a visual double or an edge-on binary. Follow-up spectroscopic observations should resolve the two possibilities.


## Introduction

Double stars are two stars that appear close to each other when observed from Earth. Some double stars are gravitationally bound, referred to as binary stars, and some are apparent, simply aligned by chance in our line of sight. By observing double stars over time, we can track their relative proper motion, which can aid in distinguishing between gravitationally bound and apparent, or visual double star systems.

The goal of our research is to provide current astrometric measurements of separation distance ( $\rho$ ) and position angle ( $\theta$ ) for one double star system, known by its Washington Double Star (WDS) identifier, $11582+0335 \mathrm{HJ} 1204$ and hereafter referred to as HJ 1204 (Figure 1). Cumulative data on the system will ultimately show presence or absence of observed motion - evidence which distinguishes between visual doubles and gravitationally bound systems. Binary and multi-star systems are of broader scientific interest because by analyzing their orbits stellar mass can be determined, offering insight into the life cycle and death of the star. We also learn from binary systems that the laws of gravitation apply to distant stellar and solar systems and are therefore a universal property of mass.

We selectively choose a double star system that fit our search parameters: right ascension and declination such that the pair are observable from approximately


Figure 1: False color image of HJ 1204. North is down, east is right. The primary star is labeled $\alpha$ and the secondary star is labeled $\beta$. The image size shown is $120^{\prime \prime} \times 120^{\prime \prime}$.
$\sim 35^{\circ}$ north latitude during the astronomical spring season, with a previously measured $\rho$ between the primary $(\alpha)$ and secondary $(\beta)$ stars of 7 " and a magnitude dif-
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Figure 2. Graphical representation of HJ 1204's relative path through the night sky. The Object Visibility plot shows altitude above horizon ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) vs. time (hours), which was useful in determining an appropriate date and time to observe the pair. The curve indicates HJ 1204's path with numerical figures in blue representing relative distance from the Moon in degrees.
ference ( $\Delta \mathrm{m}$ ) between $\alpha$ and $\beta$ of less than 1 . The double star system HJ 1204 was an ideal candidate for observation, located in the Virgo constellation.

This system was first observed in 1828 by English astronomer Sir John Frederick William Herschel (17921871), who first recorded $\rho=15^{\prime \prime}$ and $\theta=125^{\circ}$. The latter measurement is inconsistent with subsequent measurements, and Herschel's records indicate he was unsure about the orientation (Herschel, 1831). We have noted when this data point has been adjusted or omitted for the sake of consistency (see Discussion). Since 1828 there have been 13 observations, the most recent was a large sky survey in 2014 (Cvetkovic et al. 2015), with a $\rho=8^{\prime \prime}$ and $\theta=59^{\circ}$, and a difference in magnitude of 0.44 .

## Methods and Equipment

We utilized the iTelescope network and requested images from two telescopes, T11 and T24, located in Mayhill, New Mexico and Auberry, California respectively. Both telescopes are equipped with cameras classified as CCD, or Charged Coupled Device technology (Table 3). The CCD camera has had a tremendous impact on astronomical imaging and spectroscopy since
the 1980 's. Deep space imaging is complicated by conditions of low light, noise, and cosmetics, however the CCD's high quantum efficiency (a ratio of the number of charge carriers collected by the solar cell to the number of incident photons) is $80-90 \%$ at peak in optical and is greatly advantageous over past observation methods (O'Connell, 2015). Figures 6 and 7 support the notion that measurements became more accurate with use of CCD. The T11 is a Planewave CDK20 equipped with a FLI ProLine PL1102M CCD and has a pixel scale of 0.81 "/pixel. The T24 is a Planewave CDK24 equipped with an FLI Proline PL09000 CCD camera and has a pixel scale of 0.62 "/pixel. We selected the telescopes based on geographic location, sub-arcsecond resolution, and equipment performance.

Observations were performed during times when HJ 1204 was approximately $\sim 52^{\circ}$ above the horizon in order to minimize atmospheric effects. Figure 2 shows the system's visibility curve for March 22, 2017 (ING, 2017). Eight images were taken on March 22, 2017 via the T11 (2 in luminance, 2 in $\mathrm{H} \alpha, 2$ in green, and 2 in blue) and three images were taken April 24, 2017 via the T24 ( 1 in luminance, 1 in $\mathrm{H} \alpha$, and 1 in blue). The flat-fielded and dark subtracted images were processed
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Figure 3. Quality analysis for one of eleven images taken of HJ 1204. The figure is a screenshot, using SAO Image DS9 software. The stellar image on the left is from the first set of images and shows the projection tool as a line segment that crosses the highest pixel value of each star. The graph on the right relays electron counts vs. pixel location (in WCS degree coordinates). The shape of the graph indicates a quality image, as the electron saturation for each star is less than half of the full-well limit of the T11 CCD, which is 60,000 electrons per pixel.
by the iTelescope Network's data reduction pipeline and downloaded.

In order to verify the quality of each image, we used SAO Image DS9 software's projection tool to display a graph of pixel count vs. position (Figure 3). By observing the peak count and the overall shape of the histogram, we were able to check that no saturation or unusual artifacts were present in the pixels associated with our double star system.

We used Maxim DL software to attach WCS coordinates to the image pixels. The U.S. Naval Observatory CCD Astrograph Catalog (UCAC4) was used as the WCS reference catalog for pattern recognition. Coordinates are determined by aligning known positions of stars within the image's field-of-view. A total of 867 imaged and catalog stars were used to fit WCS coordinates, with an average root-mean-square of $0.1^{\prime \prime}$.

To measure separation distance and position angle, each image was analyzed using Mira Pro software's point-to-point tool that connects a line between the centroids of the $\alpha$ and $\beta$ stars (Figure 4). Mira Pro measures the centroid position by performing a Gaussian fit with a specified radius. The process is repeated several times on each image to ensure consistent results.


Figure 4. Astrometric analysis for one of eleven images taken of HJ 1204. This image was analyzed in Mira Pro. The red line depicts the point-to-point tool connecting the centroid of the primary to the centroid of the secondary star. Several red lines are superimposed, indicating the measured centers are consistently located to provide accurate measurements.

## Results

Two sets of images were taken at separate locations, 31 days apart. The data sets are consistent with each other, indicating that the system exhibited negligi-
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Table 1. Recent data sets for observations of HJ 1204. Position angle and separation distance are recorded for each telescope and epoch. For comparison, the most recent measurements taken in 2014 from the Rozhen Observatory in Bulgaria are listed in blue at bottom. Consistent with historical data, HJ 1204 currently exhibits a linearly decreasing $\rho$ and a constant $\theta$.

| Astrometric Results for HJ 1204 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```T11 Telescope (8) Images Filters: (2) Luminance, (2) H\alpha, (2) G, (2) B``` |  |  |
| Epoch 2017.2224 | $\theta\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $\rho$ (") |
| Mean | 59.3 | 7.92 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.2 | 0.03 |
| Standard Error of Mean | 0.08 | 0.01 |
| Filters: (1) Luminance | (1) $\mathrm{H} \alpha$, | B |
| Epoch 2017.3114 | $\theta\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $\rho$ (') |
| Mean | 59.3 | 7.9 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Standard Error of Mean | 0.07 | 0.1 |
| Epoch: 2014.2543 (Bulgaria) | 59.3 | 8.01 |

ble movement between these two times. The results also concur with the trend exhibited by historical data.

Table 1 shows measurements from both observations along with the most recent for comparison. The average position angle calculated from the first set of images taken from the T11 telescope is $59.3^{\circ} \pm 0.2^{\circ}$, and separation of $7.9^{\prime \prime} \pm 0.03^{\prime \prime}$ For the images obtained from the T24 telescope, we calculated a position angle of $59.3^{\circ} \pm 0.1^{\circ}$ and a separation of $7.9^{\prime \prime} \pm 0.2^{\prime \prime}$ We note that we are unable to compare the statistical significance of our results with the last observation (Cvetkovic et al. 2015), since no uncertainties were reported with their measurements.

A full summary of historical astrometric data for HJ 1204 is shown along with present results in Table 2, and the method of measurement for each observation is further detailed in Table 3, with an implication that astrometric data for HJ 1204 may become more precise as a result of advanced technology.

Separation distance and position angle are plotted over time, shown in Figure 5 and Figure 6 respectively. The separation between $\alpha$ and $\beta$ appears to be decreasing and supports a linear trend, with the two stars getting closer at a rate of $0.0375^{\prime \prime}$ per year.

The evolution of relative orientation between $\alpha$ and $\beta$ features an obvious outlier of 125 degrees, recorded by Herschel in 1828. According to his remarks, Her-

Table 2. Historical data for HJ 1204. Observer code indicates author and year of publication. The technique code (Table 3) identifies the type of technical equipment associated with each observation. Delta t in years is shown to note two significant periods of no observations following the initial observation and the 1913 observation.

| Historical Data for HJ 1204 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Observation <br> Date | $\boldsymbol{\theta} \mathbf{(}^{\circ}$ ) | $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ (") | $\Delta t$ <br> (yrs) | Observer <br> Code | Technique <br> Code |
| 1828 | 125 | 15 | N/A | HJ_1831 | Mb |
| 1903.3 | 62.2 | 12.042 | 75.3 | Gau1926a | Pa |
| 1910.34 | 60.4 | 12.009 | 7.04 | WFC1998 | Pa |
| 1912.481 | 60.9 | 11.91 | 2.141 | Fox1915 | Ma |
| 1913.34 | 61 | 11.76 | 0.859 | Doo1923 | Ma |
| 2000.319 | 59.7 | 8.541 | 86.979 | UC_2013 | Eu |
| 2000.91 | 59.6 | 8.48 | 0.591 | TMA2003 | E2 |
| 2006.315 | 59.4 | 8.32 | 5.405 | Wly2007 | C |
| 2011.2379 | 59.43 | 8.06 | 4.9229 | Pal2013 | C |
| 2012.3114 | 59.41 | 8.14 | 1.0735 | Cve2015 | C |
| 2013.2843 | 59.32 | 8.05 | 0.9729 | Cve2016 | C |
| 2014.2543 | 59.3 | 8.01 | 0.97 | Cve2016 | C |
| 2017.2224 | 59.25 | 7.92 | 2.7457 | N/A | C |
| 2017.3114 | 59.3 | 7.9 | N/A | N/A | C |

schel was unsure about the correct orientation of north and south. Based on subsequent measurements including our own, we conclude this data point is likely an orientation error. If we adjust this record to reflect a reversed north and south, the result is 55 degrees, shown as an adjusted data point on the orbital plot (Figure 7) and the plot showing position over time (Figure 6). Once adjustments are made, $\alpha$ and $\beta$ exhibit a position angle that has remained approximately con-

Table 3. Expanded technique codes from those listed in Table 2.

| Technique <br> Code | Method of Measurement |
| :---: | :--- |
| Ma | Micrometer with Refractor |
| Mb | Micrometer with Reflector |
| Pa | Photographic technique, with astrograph |
| Eu | U.S. Naval Observatory CCD Astrograph <br> Catalog (UCAC4) |
| E 2 | Two Micron All-Sky Survey (2MASS) |
| C | Charged Coupled Device (CCD) |
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Figure 5. The graph represents the separation distance between $\alpha$ and $\beta$ stars in arc seconds over time. Our 2017 measurement for $\rho$ is shown as a darkened triangle at bottom right. Thirteen measurements over nearly two centuries show the distance between the stars is decreasing, and the data supports a linear trend, expressed in algebraic form. The linear fit suggests HJ 1204 is a visual double rather than gravitationally bound.
stant over the past 200 years.
The trends shown in Figure 5 and 6 are reflected in the orbital plot, with the secondary directly approaching the primary, positioned at the origin (Figure 7). The current set of data supports a linear solution for HJ 1204, where the relative proper motion will eventually cause these two stars to be completely aligned along our line of sight. If this is indeed the case, we would


Figure 6. HJ 1204's change in position over time. Hershel's initial measurement in 1828 of $125^{\circ}$ (darkened blue marker) at bottom left has been adjusted to reflect reversed poles. Our 2017 data points are combined at bottom right (darkened red marker). The vertical axis is degrees from north, the horizontal axis is time.
expect them to be aligned in $\sim 2200$ years, given the current rate at which the separation distance is decreasing. If this happens and given the right conditions, HJ 1204 might demonstrate an extremely rare and exotic strong gravitational lensing event (Einstein, 1936), producing multiple images of background star, lensed by the foreground star.

Another less likely possibility is that the primary


Figure 7. The graph shows relative declination and relative right ascension with respect to the origin, where the primary star is placed. The data shows a generally linear motion where the position is changing at a constant rate, which would suggest a linear solution. Our 2017 result (Table 2) is shown as a darkened triangle. Herschel's 1828 data point is omitted for consistency.
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and secondary are physically associated and is being observed edge-on, making HJ 1204 an ideal candidate for spectroscopic observations. In addition, having spectroscopic data would also determine physical distances for both stars, which will allow observers to correctly classify whether the HJ 1204 is a physical or a visual double. If HJ 1204 is a spectroscopic binary, we would expect it to have a period in the order of thousands of years, given that the slope in Figure 5 has remained constant for $\sim 200$ years.

## Conclusion

We obtained and processed CCD images to measure the separation distance and position angle for HJ 1204. Our results are consistent with historical data. Over a timespan of $\sim 200$ years, the separation distance is linearly decreasing and cumulative changes in position angle are small enough to consider it constant. The current set of results show two possibilities: HJ 1204 could be aligned by chance or it could be an edge-on binary system. Spectroscopic follow-up observations would be necessary in order to arrive at a resolution.
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#### Abstract

Astrometric measurements of WDS 15098-0445 were obtained using the iTelescope Network. The distance between the A and B components was found to be 26.314" and the position angle was found to be $35.197^{\circ}$. The distance between the A and C components was found to be $607.927^{\prime \prime}$ and the position angle was found to be $217.868^{\circ}$. The change in the AC pair is consistent with past data, which indicates it is an optical double. The change in the AB pair indicates it is also an optical double.


## Introduction

WDS 15098-0445 is a triple star system in which the AB pair was first measured in 1999 and the AC pair was first measured in 1920. The AB and AC pairs have discoverer codes of OSO and LDS, respectively, which identify the original measurements. This star system was selected for research from the Washington Double Star Catalog (WDS) because it possessed the following characteristics: The AB pair had few measurements and had not been measured since 1999, the AC pair had first been measured in 1920 and most recently measured in 2000, and was listed as an optical double (Mason \& Hartkopf, 2012). These characteristics were desired because the researchers wanted to provide more data for a system that had been overlooked. Additionally, because the AC pair was an optical double and initial research using the online double star search engine, Stelle Doppie, indicated that the A star is a "high proper motion star" (SiMBADWeb), the researchers hypothesized that the AB pair was also an optical double.

The AB pair, with three measurements spanning a period of four years (1995-1999), has shown relatively high changes in position angle (Theta) and separation (Rho) for stars separated by a Rho of 20 arcseconds (20"). Over a period of 80 years, the separation of the AC pair has changed by 64 ", with an average change of almost an arcsecond per year. The measurements from this paper show significant movement since 2000 for both pairs.

## Materials and Procedure

The AB components have a differential magnitude of 5 while the AC components have similar magnitudes. Given the differential magnitudes and separations, many of the iTelescope Network's telescopes were suitable imaging platforms. Additionally, because the declination of the system is near the celestial equator, all iTelescope locations were able to image this double star.
iTelescope T3, a one-shot color imaging system located in Nerpio, Spain, was chosen to image both pairs. In the original set of images, the B component was not visible, thus the images were not usable. The second set of images was obtained using the Mayhill, New Mexico Telescope 11 (T11) in the iTelescope network. The imaging session utilized hydrogen-alpha, red, and luminance filters. All components of the system were visible using the T11.

Images were downloaded from the iTelescope FTP site and imported into MaximDL to calibrate each pixel in the images with the World Coordinate System (WCS) Right Ascension and Declination. The WCS calibrated images were imported into Mira Pro x64 to measure Theta and Rho values. This data was then imported into Microsoft Excel to organize each measure and for statistical analysis.

## Data and Results

Both the AB and AC pairs were successfully captured in seven images. Tables 1 and 2 provide the meas-

## CCD Study of WDS 15098-0445

Table 1. Mira Pro measurement of the AB pair of WDS 15098-0445

| AB Pair | Position Angle <br> (degrees) | Separation <br> (arc seconds) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Individual <br> Measurements | 35.47 | 26.29 |
|  | 35.30 | 26.29 |
|  | 35.20 | 26.29 |
|  | 35.74 | 26.29 |
|  | 34.52 | 26.24 |
| Mean | 34.98 | 26.36 |
| Std. Dev. | 35.18 | 26.44 |
| Std. Error of Mean | 0.385 | 26.31 |

urements for each image individually as well as the mean, standard deviation, and standard error of the mean. The precision afforded via the Maxim and Mira software provides measurements to three significant figures. These were included in the Tables; however, to match historical measurements the values were rounded to match the precision of the WDS Catalog in Tables 3 and 4.

## Discussion

## AB Pair

The primary star in the $A B$ pair is referenced by many catalogs, with SiMBAD specifically identifying the star as WOLF 1137, named after German Astronomer Max Wolf who compiled a catalog of over 1,500 low-luminosity, high proper motion stars, of which this star is the $1,137^{\text {th }}$ in that catalog (SimBAD Web).

The first recorded data for this pair is from the Hipparcos mission in 1991 in which the location and magnitude of the A component was measured (HIPPARCOS). Osorio \& Martin measured the AB pair in their paper, $A$ CCD Imaging Search for Wide MetalPoor Binaries (Osorio \& Martin, 1995). The last reported measurement was recorded in 1999 by the TwoMicron All Sky Survey (2MASS).

Locating the AB pair in the T11 images was difficult due to the large difference in magnitude between the stars. There were a few candidate stars close to A, but none with a similar Theta and Rho to the last reported measurement. To locate the B component, ALADIN was used to obtain the image from 1999 from the 2MASS survey to compare with the Theta and Rho measurements of $51.7^{\circ}$ and $21.0^{\prime \prime}$ in the WDS (see Figure 1) (ALADIN).

After the B component was located, the 2017 T11 images indicated a Theta of $35.2^{\circ}$ and Rho of $26.4^{\prime \prime}$, a change of $16.5^{\circ}$ and $5.4^{\prime \prime}$ (see Figure 2). Measuring

Table 2. Mira Pro measurement of the AC pair of WDS 15098-0445

| AC Pair | Position Angle <br> (degrees) | Separation <br> (arc seconds) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Individual <br> Measurements | 217.863 | 608.15 |
|  | 217.868 | 608.18 |
|  | 217.868 | 608.17 |
|  | 217.864 | 607.95 |
|  | 217.863 | 607.66 |
|  | 217.874 | 607.69 |
| Mean | 217.877 | 607.69 |
| Std. Dev. | 217.868 | 607.93 |
| Std. Error of Mean | 0.006 | 0.244 |

Table 3. Historical data for the AB pair.

| Epoch | Position Angle <br> (degrees) | Separation <br> (arcseconds) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1995 | 20.19 | 56.8 |
| 1999 | 20.99 | 51.6 |
| 1999 | 21.06 | 51.5 |
| 2017 | 35.19 | 26.3 |

Table 4. Historical data for the AC pair.

| Epoch | Position Angle <br> (degrees) | Separation <br> (arcseconds) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1920. | 225.00 | 677.0 |
| 1991.25 | - | 677.0 |
| 1999.20 | 217.30 | 614.04 |
| 1999.44 | 217.10 | 612.8 |
| 2000.268 | 217.30 | 613.5 |
| 2017 | 217.86 | 607.9 |



Figure 1. 2MASS image of AB from epoch 1999.


Figure 2. 2017 T11 image of $A B$ from epoch 1999.


Figure 3. 1955 Palomar Sky Survey image from ALADIN.
such a significant change in only 18 years raised doubt as to whether the 2017 T 11 images correctly imaged the B component. To determine an accurate position for B , ALADIN was again consulted to obtain older images (ALADIN).

ALADIN provided access to the Palomar Sky Survey from 1955. This image was downloaded and imported into Mira to measure the star field. At first review, the area surrounding the AB pair did not resemble the previous images (see Figure 3). To establish the precise location of the B star in each image, a fixed background galaxy was used as a reference from which a galaxy-to-B component Theta and Rho measurement could be made. This measurement was then compared to the position of the B component in the 1999 and 2017 images with consistent results. Thus, the location of B was firmly established and the measurements from the 2017 T11 epoch were confirmed.

Reviewing the images obtained from ALADIN and the 2017 epoch, Figure 4 illustrates the motion of the primary A star against the background stars. Given its proper motion, the distance and angle changes, and the consistent position of B, it can be concluded that WDS

15098-0445 is an optical double and not a physically bound binary star.

## AC Pair

The WDS notes indicate that the AC component (Figure 5) has already been established as an optical double (Mason and Hartkopf, 2012). The A component, as discussed above, is observed to have high proper


Figure 5. 2017 T11 image of the AC components.
motion which accounts for the historical Theta and Rho changes. The data from the 2017 images was consistent with the conclusion that the AC pair is an optical double.

## Conclusion

The high proper motion of the A star accounts for the historical changes in Theta and Rho for both components. Through the use of a stationary background galaxy over short time frames, the position of the B component was correctly identified. From the historical data and the images obtained from ALADIN and 2017, we conclude that the AB pair is an optical double. The changes in the AC components were consistent with historical data.
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#### Abstract

If any double star discoverer is in urgent need of photometry then it is Jonckheere. There are over 3000 Jonckheere objects listed in the WDS catalog and a good part of them with magnitudes obviously far too bright. This report covers 28 of the in total 82 Jonckheere objects in the constellation Hercules selected by a quick WDS data check for being potentially listed with questionable magnitudes. At least one image per object was taken with V-filter to allow for visual magnitude measurement by differential photometry. All objects were additionally checked for common proper motion and two qualify indeed as potential CPM pairs.


## Introduction

As follow up to the report on J-objects I submitted so far I selected this time the J-objects in Hercules. To concentrate on the objects most in need of photometry I checked in the next step all objects for potentially suspect data - this process reduced the objects to check more in detail to 29 . This does not mean that the data for the eliminated J-objects in Her are to be considered correct in all cases but the comparison of the given magnitudes with the UCAC4 fmag values suggests at least that any potential errors should be rather small.

## Results of Photometry and Catalog Checking

For all but one of the selected J-objects one single image was taken with iTelescope iT24 with V-filter and 3s exposure time. The single image random effects seem less significant for the measured magnitudes as a magnitude error of $\sim 0.1$ or even a bit larger seems negligible in comparison with the Jonckheere objects often given magnitude errors in the range of up to 2 magnitudes. The images were then plate solved with Astrometrica using the URAT1 catalog with reference stars in the Vmag range of 8.5 to 14.5 giving not only RA/ Dec coordinates but also photometry results for all reference stars used including an average dVmag error. The J-objects were then located in the center of the image and astrometry/photometry was then done by the rather comfortable Astrometrica procedure with point and click at the components delivering RA/Dec coordinates and Vmag measurements based on all reference
stars used for plate solving. In one case, I had to take additional images with a different telescope to avoid issues with image quality.

The measurement results are given in Table 1 with the following structure:

- J\# gives the number of the J-object
- RA/Dec gives the position in the HH:MM:SS/ DD:MM:SS format for both components
- dRA and dDEc give the average plate solving error for RA and Dec in arcseconds
- Sep gives separation in arcseconds in the data lines calculated as

$$
\text { Sep }=\sqrt{\left[\left(\cos \left(R A_{1}-R A_{2}\right) \cos \left(D e c_{1}\right)\right)^{2}+\left(D e c_{2}-D e c_{1}\right)^{2}\right]}
$$

in radians

- ErrSep gives the calculated error range for Sep as

$$
\text { ErrSep }=\sqrt{d R A^{2}+d D e c^{2}}
$$

- PA gives position angle in degrees in the data lines calculated as

$$
P A=\arctan \left[\frac{\left(R A_{2}-R A_{1}\right) \cos \left(D e c_{1}\right)}{D e c_{2}-D e c_{1}}\right]
$$

in radians depending on quadrant

- $\operatorname{ErrPA}=$ position angle error estimation in degrees
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calculated as

$$
E r r P A=\arctan \left(\frac{E r r S e p}{S e p}\right)
$$

assuming the worst case that ErrSep points perpendicular to the separation vector

- Mag gives Vmag for both components according to plate solving
- $\quad$ Err_Mag = magnitude error estimation calculated as

$$
\text { ErrMag }=\sqrt{d V \text { mag }^{2}+[2.5 \log (1+1 / S N R)]^{2}}
$$

- SNR as signal to noise ratio for the given object
- dVmag as average magnitude plate solving error
- Date gives the Julian observation epoch (instead of the Bessel epoch used up to 2017 in the WDS cata$\log )$
- N gives the number of images used
- Notes indicate the telescope used, number of images with exposure time, and additional comments if considered necessary.

In an additional step, I checked all objects for common proper motion using the UCAC5 catalog data when available. Table 2 lists the found data for the J objects in question and the assessment if the proper motion data allows for common proper motion using the following structure:

## First row:

- J\# gives the number of the J-object
- RA/Dec gives the GAIA DR1 position as given in the UCAC5 catalog in degrees for the primary
- Sep gives separation in arcseconds in the data lines calculated as

$$
S e p=\sqrt{\left[\left(\cos \left(R A_{1}-R A_{2}\right) \cos \left(D e c_{1}\right)\right)^{2}+\left(\text { Dec }_{2}-D e c_{1}\right)^{2}\right]}
$$

in radians

- PA gives position angle in degrees in the data lines calculated as
$P A=\arctan \left[\frac{\left(R A_{2}-R A_{1}\right) \cos \left(D e c_{1}\right)}{D e c_{2}-D e c_{1}}\right]$
in radians depending on quadrant
- M1(G) and M2(G) give the GAIA DR1 Gmag values for both components as given in the UCAC5 catalog
- pmRA1, pmDec1/pmRA2, pmDec2 give the UCAC5 proper motion data and e_pm1/2 gives the total pm data error for both components
- Ap gives the GAIA aperture diameter (calculated for a corresponding surface with the used rectangular aperture)
- Me gives the observation method
- Date gives the GAIA DR1 observation epoch
- CPM Rat gives the CPM rating according to Knapp and Nanson 2017 (see Appendix A)
- Source/Notes gives the reference to the used cata$\log$ and additional comments on the objects

Second row:

- RA/Dec gives the UCAC5 position in degrees for the primary (from UCAC images re-reduced with TGAS reference stars)
- Sep gives separation in arcseconds in the data lines calculated as

$$
\text { Sep }=\sqrt{\left[\left(\cos \left(R A_{1}-R A_{2}\right) \cos \left(D e c_{1}\right)\right)^{2}+\left(D e c_{2}-D e c_{1}\right)^{2}\right]}
$$

in radians

- PA gives position angle in degrees in the data lines calculated as before.
- Ap gives the used UCAC5 aperture
- Me gives the observation method
- Date gives the UCAC5 observation epoch (average from the used images)
- Source/Notes gives UCAC5 as used catalog and additional comments on the objects if necessary.


## Summary

A good part of the listed J-objects in Hercules shows the expected significant magnitude difference compared with the WDS catalog data. Further, only two of these objects qualify as solid or at least good CPM candidates based on a rating scheme using UCAC5 proper motion data with the caveat that several objects are with at least one component not covered by UCAC5.

Jonckheere Double Star Photometry - Part X: Hercules
Table 1: Measurement results for Jobjects in Her

| J\# |  | RA | Dec | dRA | dDec | Sep | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Err } \\ & \text { Sep } \end{aligned}$ | PA | $\begin{gathered} \overline{\mathrm{Err}} \\ \mathrm{PA} \end{gathered}$ | Mag | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Err} \\ & \mathrm{Mag} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | SNR | dVmag | Date | N | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 98 | A | 18:33:12.263 | 17:28:33.74 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 3.928 | 0.106 | 146.883 | 1.550 | 10.324 | 0.110 | 173.98 | 0.11 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s. Touching star disks |
|  | B | 18:33:12.413 | 17:28:30.45 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.894 | 0.111 | 73.55 |  |  |  |  |
| 103 | A | 18:42:23.866 | 14:03:15.31 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 5.718 | 0.127 | 164.502 | 1.275 | 8.959 | 0.110 | 303.21 | 0.11 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s. Touching stardisks |
|  | B | 18:42:23.971 | 14:03:09.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.166 | 0.112 | 47.72 |  |  |  |  |
| 399 | A | 16:23:11.312 | 23:41:16.97 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 4.931 | 0.092 | 49.997 | 1.071 | 10.168 | 0.080 | 204.53 | 0.08 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s |
|  | B | 16:23:11.587 | 23:41:20.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.514 | 0.082 | 58.90 |  |  |  |  |
| 400 | A | 16:44:06.847 | 42:02:39.67 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 5.945 | 0.085 | 173.761 | 0.818 | 12.075 | 0.071 | 88.49 | 0.07 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s. SNR B <20 |
|  | B | 16:44:06.905 | 42:02:33.76 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.889 | 0.102 | 14.27 |  |  |  |  |
| 469 | A | 18:50:24.772 | 12:43:33.61 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 2.773 | 0.120 | 110.920 | 2.487 | 11.812 | 0.081 | 81.47 | 0.08 | 2017.467 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { iT24 1x3s. Touching star } \\ & \text { disks } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | B | 18:50:24.949 | 12:43:32.62 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.796 | 0.086 | 33.47 |  |  |  |  |
| 532 | A | 18:54:51.539 | 12:59:59.89 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 4.420 | 0.135 | 3.792 | 1.744 | 11.056 | 0.081 | 113.60 | 0.08 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s |
|  | B | 18:54:51.559 | 13:00:04.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.658 | 0.084 | 41.71 |  |  |  |  |
| 738 | A | 16:41:30.635 | 21:47:29.57 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 1.969 | 0.114 | 247.924 | 3.314 | 11.813 | 0.095 | 36.11 | 0.09 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s.Overlapping stardisks |
|  | B | 16:41:30.504 | 21:47:28.83 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.724 | 0.094 | 37.91 |  |  |  |  |
| 740 | A | 17:03:14.600 | 34:58:55.70 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 2.826 | 0.099 | 224.088 | 2.006 | 10.239 | 0.080 | 196.82 | 0.08 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s. Touching star disks |
|  | B | 17:03:14.440 | 34:58:53.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.926 | 0.080 | 124.08 |  |  |  |  |
| 752 | A | 18:25:07.654 | 16:47:44.25 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 4.630 | 0.156 | 256.128 | 1.924 | 10.863 | 0.091 | 78.65 | 0.09 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s |
|  | B | 18:25:07.341 | 16:47:43.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.035 | 0.095 | 34.06 |  |  |  |  |
| 757 | A | 18:02:15.397 | 38:04:10.50 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 3.170 | 0.163 | 327.050 | 2.940 | 11.879 | 0.073 | 52.78 | 0.07 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s. Touching star disks |
|  | B | 18:02:15.251 | 38:04:13.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.456 | 0.035 | 30.55 |  |  |  |  |
| 799 | A | 18:36:59.774 | 19:10:17.73 | 0.12 | 0.10 | 2.641 | 0.156 | 77.535 | 3.385 | 11.488 | 0.081 | 72.69 | 0.08 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s. Touching star disks |
|  | B | 18:36:59.956 | 19:10:18.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.882 | 0.082 | 55.19 |  |  |  |  |
| 1032 | A | 17:26:48.230 | 22:37:43.12 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 4.119 | 0.141 | 350.324 | 1.967 | 11.253 | 0.111 | 64.38 | 0.11 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s. Touching star disks |
|  | B | 17:26:48.180 | 22:37:47.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.568 | 0.112 | 47.32 |  |  |  |  |
| 1033 | A | 17:26:59.379 | 22:43:42.44 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 6.312 | 0.141 | 247.654 | 1.283 | 10.791 | 0.090 | 116.61 | 0.09 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s |
|  | B | 17:26:58.957 | 22:43:40.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.212 | 0.093 | 50.16 |  |  |  |  |
| 1071 | A | 18:42:20.344 | 14:06:36.03 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 5.089 | 0.127 | 66.983 | 1.433 | 13.118 | 0.110 | 303.21 | 0.11 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s. Same image as J103 |
|  | B | 18:42:20.666 | 14:06:38.02 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.843 | 0.112 | 47.72 |  |  |  |  |
| 1127 | A | 18:00:36.903 | 30:13:24.59 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 2.862 | 0.136 | 341.244 | 2.721 | 12.544 | 0.073 | 55.38 | 0.07 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s. Touching star disks |
|  | B | 18:00:36.832 | 30:13:27.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.729 | 0.074 | 43.12 |  |  |  |  |
| 1132 | A | 18:06:37.776 | 20:14:20.98 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 3.275 | 0.149 | 134.849 | 2.599 | 12.021 | 0.121 | 63.42 | 0.12 | 2017.467 |  | iT24 1x3s. Touching star |
|  | B | 18:06:37.941 | 20:14:18.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.719 | 0.125 | 32.02 |  |  |  |  |

## Jonckheere Double Star Photometry－Part X：Hercules

Table 1 （continues）．Measurement results for Jobjects in Her

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \stackrel{y}{2} \\ & \mathrm{z} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \underset{\sim}{X} \\ & \sim \\ & \underset{-}{N} \\ & \underset{-}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \underset{\sim}{*} \\ & \underset{H}{H} \\ & \underset{H}{H} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{x} \\ & - \\ & \underset{-}{\underset{~}{~}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $z$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |  | $\stackrel{+}{\square}$ |  | $\sim$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { п̃ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{1} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{+} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{6} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\bullet} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{-} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{6} \\ & \stackrel{1}{1} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{6} \\ & \dot{1} \\ & \dot{N} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{6} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\dot{1}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{6} \\ & \stackrel{1}{+} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ర్ } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { E } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & 0 \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{m}{\stackrel{m}{0}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{r}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & ! \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |
| 䍝 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { in } \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \stackrel{i}{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{2} \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\dot{~}} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{o}{n} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\dot{~}} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\dot{~}} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | ¢ $\stackrel{\text { N }}{ }$ $\stackrel{\text { N}}{-}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \dot{\omega} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{r}{m}}{\underset{m}{r}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{r} \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{+}{\sim}$ $\stackrel{\text { N }}{ }$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | N $\stackrel{\text { N }}{ }$ |  | $\stackrel{m}{\stackrel{n}{1}}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { H } \\ & \text { 苗 } \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N̄ } \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n} \\ & \stackrel{2}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0 \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}{\stackrel{+}{+}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{-}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{H}{n} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hூ } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{-}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{+} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { サु } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{+} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{H}{H} \\ & \stackrel{+}{\bullet} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{-} \\ & \stackrel{r}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\wedge}{n}}{\stackrel{i}{0}}$ | 0 $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\cdots$ 0 | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ $\vdots$ 0 | N $\cdots$ 0 | $\stackrel{n}{\sim}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { on } \\ & \pi \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{i}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ro } \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{n}{n} \stackrel{n}{n}$ | n $\stackrel{1}{2}$ $\stackrel{y}{2}$ $\cdots$ |  | $\xrightarrow{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\star}{\infty}$ | 0 0 0 $n$ $\cdots$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \\ & \stackrel{n}{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $N$ <br> $N$ <br>  <br>  |  | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\underset{\sim}{N}}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim}$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\circ$ $\stackrel{+}{6}$ $\stackrel{y}{*}$ İ |
| 号出 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{m} \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{i}{-} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{m} \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ro } \\ & \text { ? } \\ & \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cap}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{0}{4} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{N}}{\stackrel{N}{\sim}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{n}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \\ & \stackrel{1}{n} \\ & - \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \underset{m}{m} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 岀 | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{0}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\underset{N}{2}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{0} \\ & m \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \infty \\ & \cdots \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \dot{\bullet} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{-}{\square} \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { f} \\ & \text { ! } \\ & \text { た } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{O}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\prime} \\ & \dot{\circ} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ \text { Hi } \\ \text { 品 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{\sim}{n}} \stackrel{+}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\circ} \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \text { O} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { m } \\ & \stackrel{0}{!} \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{n}{\bullet} \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{+} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{-} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{?}{-} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\circ}{+} \\ \underset{\circ}{-} \end{gathered}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\varphi} \\ & \stackrel{y}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\sim}{N} \\ \stackrel{N}{N} \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{6} \\ & \stackrel{\text { N}}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N̈ } \\ & \dot{\circ} \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{6} \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\star}{\lambda} \\ & \stackrel{y}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{n} \\ & \stackrel{?}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \text { 0 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 응 } \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{-}{7} \\ & \stackrel{O}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{-}{7} \\ & \stackrel{O}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 皆 | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{-}{7} \\ & \stackrel{-}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \stackrel{O}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ㅇ } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\xrightarrow{+}$ |  |
| ロ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \dot{n} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \ddot{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\bullet}{n} \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \ddot{O} \\ & \ddot{\sim} \\ & \ddot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & n \\ & \cdots \\ & \cdots \\ & \ddot{\sim} \\ & \ddot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\ominus}{N} \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \\ & \ddot{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \ddot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \dot{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \ddot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\wedge}{N} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \\ & \ddot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\ddot{~}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \ddot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \dot{6} \\ & \ddot{\sim} \\ & \ddot{\sim} \\ & \ddot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\square} \\ & \ddot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |
| 㐫 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\dot{~}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\ddot{~}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{H} \\ & \stackrel{H}{0} \\ & \dot{N} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\ddot{H}} \\ & \ddot{m} \\ & \ddot{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \ddot{\infty} \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $n$ $\stackrel{n}{0}$ $\stackrel{n}{0}$ 0 $\ddot{0}$ 0 $\ddot{0}$ $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \overrightarrow{0} \\ \stackrel{1}{n} \\ \dot{\sigma} \\ \ddot{n} \\ \ddot{\sim} \\ \ddot{\sim} \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \ddot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \tilde{N} \\ & \ddot{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 4 | ๓ | « | $\square$ | « | ๓ | « | $\infty$ | ब | $\square$ | « | m | 4 | ๓ | « | ๓ | \＆ | $๓$ | \＆ | m |
| 芳 |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ì } \\ & \text { I- } \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Jonckheere Double Star Photometry - Part X: Hercules

Table 1 (conclusionn). Measurement results for $J$ objects in Her

| Ј\# |  | RA | Dec | dRA | dDec | Sep | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Err } \\ & \text { Sep } \end{aligned}$ | PA | $\underset{\mathrm{PA}}{\mathrm{Err}}$ | Mag | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Err } \\ & \text { Mag } \end{aligned}$ | SNR | dVmag | Date | N | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2924 | A | 18:46:04.863 | 18:15:40.16 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 3.637 | 0.163 | 69.395 | 2.563 | 12.179 | 0.113 | 40.95 | 0.11 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s. Touching star disks |
|  | B | 18:46:05.102 | 18:15:41.44 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.623 | 0.117 | 26.95 |  |  |  |  |
| 2931 | A | 18:55:17.751 | 18:16:07.11 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 5.257 | 0.163 | 143.024 | 1.774 | 13.154 | 0.115 | 30.35 | 0.11 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s. Touching star disks. Curious mag difference compared with WDS suggests object mismatch |
|  | B | 18:55:17.973 | 18:16:02.91 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.849 | 0.111 | 59.49 |  |  |  |  |
| 3268 | A | 17:58:22.742 | 18:14:13.52 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 3.970 | 0.149 | 215.547 | 2.145 | 13.338 | 0.116 | 29.51 | 0.11 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s |
|  | B | 17:58:22.580 | 18:14:10.29 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.779 | 0.117 | 26.92 |  |  |  |  |
| 3324 | A | 16:29:51.725 | 24:52:37.50 | 0.11 | 0.08 | 2.224 | 0.136 | 60.349 | 3.500 | 11.899 | 0.091 | 85.20 | 0.09 | 2017.467 | 1 | iT24 1x3s. Touching/ overlapping star disks |
|  | B | 16:29:51.867 | 24:52:38.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.672 | 0.094 | 42.28 |  |  |  |  |

[^1]
## Jonckheere Double Star Photometry－Part X：Hercules

Table 2．Jobjects in Her being checked for being potentially CPM pairs

| $$ |  | 荅 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \substack{0 \\ 0 \\ d \\ 0 \\ 0} \end{array}$ |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \text { un } \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ |  | $\left.\begin{aligned} & \text { 足 } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ |  | $\left\lvert\,\right.$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & 0 \\ & \text { y } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | 氝 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ư } \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ư } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ص } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ص } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & U \\ & U \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ص } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 凹 } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { صu } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ü } \\ & \text { ü } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { صu } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \text { ص} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \circ \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \\ & \stackrel{N}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c} n \\ n \\ n \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ n \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | $\circ$ $\circ$ 0 in $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0_{1} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \sim \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\circ$ $\circ$ 0 $\stackrel{0}{n}$ $\stackrel{1}{2}$ N | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \\ n \\ n \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\circ$ $\circ$ 0 0 $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2}$ N | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \\ \underset{1}{1} \\ \dot{N} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ N \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} n \\ \sim \\ \underset{\sim}{n} \\ \underset{\sim}{0} \\ 0 \\ \sim \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \\ & \text { v } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} n \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ i \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \sim \end{gathered}$ | $\circ$ $\circ$ 0 0 $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{n}{n} \\ \sim \\ \underset{\sim}{\dot{N}} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \sim \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \circ \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{N}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\begin{gathered} n \\ 0 \\ n \\ n \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ N \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ & \text { i } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{i}{0} \\ 0 \\ \dot{\sim} \\ \dot{N} \\ 0 \\ N \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{o}} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \dot{r} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ i \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \sim \end{gathered}$ | $\circ$ $\circ$ 0 0 0 $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{3}$ N |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | c |
| $\stackrel{0}{\sim}$ | 圃 | 品 | 掃 | 品 | ， | 3 | 号 | 号 | 号 | 3 | 号 | 枵 | 号 | 芴 | 品 | 嗗 | 哯 | ， | 号 | 号 | 呂 | 号 | 品 | ， | 品 |
| 只 | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \stackrel{2}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \text { oे } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{n} \\ \underset{0}{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \dot{\circ} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \stackrel{1}{0} \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \stackrel{?}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \stackrel{y}{0} \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{6}{2} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \underset{0}{0} \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{6}{2} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\sigma} \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \underset{0}{0} \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ơ } \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \underset{0}{0} \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{6}{2} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \underset{0}{0} \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\sigma} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\bigcirc}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{N}_{1} \\ & { }_{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\sim}{m}}{\dot{m}} .$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{7} \times$ |  | m $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ $\sim$ |  | $\circ$ $\cdots$ $\square$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{\circ}{\sim}}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}}{\sim}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { m }}{\text { m }}$ |  | m $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ $\sim$ |  | $\infty$ $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\stackrel{m}{m}$ . |  | ＋ － $\sim$ $i$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { m．}}{\text { m }}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { en } \\ & \text { 兑 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\infty}$ $\stackrel{+}{\square}$ $\square$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}}$ |  | $\stackrel{+}{\circ}$ |  | $\xrightarrow{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { N }}$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\square}$ |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{0}{\infty}$ 0 |  | ® Nे ¢ |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{9}{1}$ $\stackrel{1}{2}$ $\stackrel{1}{1}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \dot{e} \\ & \stackrel{1}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | O $\stackrel{1}{1}$ $\stackrel{+}{1}$ |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1}}{\stackrel{1}{4}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\bigcirc}$ |  | $\stackrel{+}{+}$ |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{0}{4}$ $i$ |  |  | ¢ |  | $\stackrel{\text { ®}}{\stackrel{1}{2}}$ |  | $\xrightarrow{\circ}$ |  | $\circ$ $\infty$ + + |  | $\xrightarrow{\stackrel{\circ}{n}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{2} \\ & \stackrel{1}{1} \\ & \stackrel{1}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{{\underset{N}{0}}^{0}}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\text { ㄱ，}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\stackrel{-}{\text {－}}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\stackrel{\text { N }}{\text { N }}}$ |  | $\stackrel{H}{7}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\stackrel{1}{-}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\stackrel{1}{*}}$ |  | $\stackrel{+}{\infty}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\sim}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\sim}$ |  | $$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { - } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \text { E. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\ddagger} \\ & \stackrel{1}{+} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\stackrel{\circ}{\text { ¢ }}}$ |  | 0 $\cdots$ + + $!$ |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\sim}$ |  | $\bigcirc$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ $\vdots$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\text { ¢ }}$ $\stackrel{1}{\text { n }}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \stackrel{2}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\sim}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{+}}$ |  | ＋ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \infty \\ & i \\ & i \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\infty}$ |  | $\circ$ $\cdots$ $\cdots$ - $\vdots$ $\vdots$ |  | $\stackrel{+}{\circ}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\stackrel{1}{2}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\stackrel{1}{*}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\stackrel{1}{*}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{1}{\circ}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{\sim}{2}}$ |  | $\xrightarrow{\circ}$ |  | $\circ$ $\infty$ $\sim$ $\sim$ 1 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \widehat{U} \\ & \mathbb{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{-} \\ & - \\ & -1 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\infty$ $\stackrel{0}{+}$ - - - |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{3}$ <br> $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ <br>  |  | ¢े ¢ r－ |  | $\stackrel{-}{0}$ $\stackrel{n}{1}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1}$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{+}$ $\stackrel{1}{*}$ $\stackrel{\sim}{7}$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { サु } \\ & 0 \\ & \dot{O} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{-}{\infty}$ <br> $\cdots$ <br> - <br> - |  |  |  | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ |  | m $\infty$ - - - |  |
| $\frac{\widehat{V}}{\Sigma}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \stackrel{-}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\wedge}{\stackrel{ }{\wedge}}$ |  | N $\cdots$ $\cdots$ - $\cdots$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\gtrless}$ |  | $\infty$ $\infty$ 0 0 $\cdots$ |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\gtrless}$ | ¢ 0 0 $\bigcirc$ $\cdots$ |  | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\text { ¢ }}$ |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{0}{1}$ $\vdots$ - |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{-}$ $\cdots$ |  | － $\stackrel{-}{+}$ $\cdots$ - |  |  |  |
| 㟧 | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{0}{\bullet} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\square} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} n \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ - \\ - \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\bullet} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\square} \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} -\vec{G} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ - \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \vdots \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} m \\ \underset{\sim}{n} \\ \underset{\sim}{7} \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n. } \\ & \dot{\circ} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \sim \\ & \\ & \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ | $\dot{?}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}} \underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{N} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { m. } \\ & \stackrel{0}{\infty} \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{9} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { } \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n. } \\ & \dot{0} \\ & m \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | ¢ <br> $\stackrel{1}{6}$ <br> $\stackrel{1}{\sim}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & ̣_{1} \\ & \omega_{2}= \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{4} \\ & \dot{\gamma} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & 0 \\ & \dot{r} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\imath}{\wedge} \\ \stackrel{y}{n} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\gamma} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 . \\ i n \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & i \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \infty \\ & n \\ & n \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { + } \\ & \dot{m} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \dot{v} \end{aligned}$ | $$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ \text { H} \\ \dot{\gamma} \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{N}}}{\substack{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \dot{N} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} n \\ \sim \\ \sim \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{3}{8} \\ & \dot{\gamma} \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\begin{gathered} \infty \\ \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ r \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { r} \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & m \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\imath}{n} \\ \dot{\sim} \end{gathered}$ | ® $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ $\sim$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ri } \\ & \dot{\gamma} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{0}{6} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{7}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \text { ® } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & m \\ & - \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -7 \\ & -7 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \underset{r}{n} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{H}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\top} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jु } \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \dot{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{y} \\ \underset{1}{0} \\ 0 \\ \underset{\sim}{N} \\ \dot{\sim} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \circ \\ & \stackrel{ }{\circ} \\ & \text { oे } \\ & \text { oे } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{i} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{-}{\prime} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} n \\ \tilde{m} \\ \tilde{m} \\ \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ \infty \\ o \\ \underset{m}{n} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{6} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & -1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \\ & \\ & \dot{n} \\ & -1 \end{aligned}\right.$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} n \\ \stackrel{n}{1} \\ \vdots \\ - \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \cdots \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{-}{0} \\ & \tilde{N} \\ & \sim \\ & \infty \\ & \tilde{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \\ & \dot{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ | H $\sim$ $\sim$ $\sim$ $\infty$ $\sim$ $\sim$ $\sim$ $\sim$ |
| 峎 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & N \\ & N \\ & \\ & \\ & i \\ & \underset{N}{n} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \infty \\ & \sim \\ & N \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{+}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\lambda} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \\ & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | 255.81075270 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{H}{H} \\ & \underset{H}{7} \\ & \underset{H}{0} \\ & n \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{N} \\ & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \infty \\ N \\ N \\ \underset{\sim}{N} \\ \vdots \\ \underset{N}{N} \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 艻 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \stackrel{-}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{9}{6} \\ & \stackrel{6}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{O}}$ |  | $\stackrel{N}{\sim}$ |  | $\stackrel{N}{\sim}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}$ |  | N $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ $\sim$ |  | $$ |  |

Jonckheere Double Star Photometry－Part X：Hercules
Table 2 （continued）．J objects in Her being checked for being potentially CPM pairs

|  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}\right.$ |  | U |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}\right.$ |  |  |  |  | 遈 |  | 号 |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |  | 足 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { u } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{W} \\ & \text { 心 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \infty \\ \stackrel{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\infty}} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { p } \\ & \text { ư } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { صu } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ư } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 足 } \\ & \text { 岕 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \text { ص} \end{aligned}$ | $\circ$ <br>  <br> 0 <br> $\stackrel{0}{n}$ <br> $\stackrel{1}{2}$ <br> N | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ \underset{1}{1} \\ \dot{-} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \sim \end{gathered}$ | $\circ$ $\circ$ $\circ$ 0 $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2}$ N |  | $\circ$ $\circ$ $\circ$ $\stackrel{0}{n}$ $\stackrel{1}{2}$ N | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & -2 \\ & 0 \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \circ \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \\ & \stackrel{N}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ \infty \\ \underset{\sim}{1} \\ \dot{\sim} \\ \dot{O} \\ \sim \end{gathered}$ | $\circ$ $\circ$ 0 $\stackrel{0}{n}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ N |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{1} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \\ & \text { N} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \infty \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ n \\ i \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \sim \end{gathered}$ | $\circ$ $\circ$ 0 0 0 $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2}$ N | $\begin{gathered} n \\ \stackrel{n}{0} \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ - \\ 0 \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\circ$ $\circ$ 0 0 $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2}$ N |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{0}{2}$ | ， | 品 | 国 | 号 | 号 | 枵 | 定 | 枵 | 岃 | 号 |  | 掃 |  | 掃 | 号 | ， | 品 | ， | 品 | 掃 | 品 |
| 只 | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{y}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \underset{\sim}{0} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \underset{\sim}{0} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \underset{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{O}{N} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{+}{\circ}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & {\underset{N}{N}}_{1} \\ & \mathbf{N}_{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\infty} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{2}$ $\stackrel{1}{2}$ |  | $\stackrel{+}{\infty}$ |  | ¢ $\sim$ - $i$ |  | $\underset{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}{\underset{\sim}{n}}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{n} \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { n }}{\text { in }}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { T}}{\stackrel{\text { N}}{\sim}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\sim}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N} \\ 0 \\ \stackrel{1}{0} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | O $\stackrel{1}{0}$ 1 |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\circ}$ |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{+}$ $\stackrel{+}{4}$ $\square$ |  |  |  |  | 0 $\cdots$ $\cdots$ $\cdots$ $\cdots$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\stackrel{1}{*}}$ |  | $\stackrel{+}{\sim}$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\infty}$ |  |
| 䜤 | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{0}{+} \\ & \stackrel{i}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{+}{+}$ |  |  |  | － |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  | ㅇ． |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{c}}{\stackrel{1}{c}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { 가 }}{+}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & { }_{F}^{E} \\ & 0_{1} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\ominus}{\stackrel{\circ}{i}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{i} \\ & i \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\stackrel{1}{*}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\sim}$ |  | $\stackrel{\therefore}{\therefore}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\bullet}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & i \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\bullet}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\stackrel{0}{\sim}}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ |  | $\circ$ $\circ$ ® ì |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{+}$ $\stackrel{\square}{1}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\bigcirc}$ |  |  |  |  | 0 0 0 $i$ |  | $\xrightarrow{\stackrel{-}{2}}$ |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{0}{*}$ $\stackrel{1}{1}$ |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{-}{\text { ® }}$ $\stackrel{1}{1}$ 1 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & i \\ & i \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}}{\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}}$ |  | $\xrightarrow{+}$ |  | ¢ |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  | O |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\circ}$ |  | ㅇ． $\stackrel{1}{2}$ ！ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OV } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \dot{-} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { サु } \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | in $\stackrel{\text { H }}{\text { H }}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{1}{\sim}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\dot{1}} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\stackrel{m}{4}} \stackrel{+}{\sim}$ |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\substack{\text { © }}}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{+}{\dot{I}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 앙 } \\ & \underset{-}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \stackrel{1}{-} \\ & - \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{1}{+}}{\stackrel{1}{*}}$ |  | $\bigcirc$ $\cdots$ $\cdots$ - - |  | n $\stackrel{3}{\circ}$ $\cdots$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ |  |
| $\stackrel{\circ}{\text { • }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\bullet}{\dot{\sigma}} \\ & \stackrel{i}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \grave{r} \\ & \dot{\infty} \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{m}}{\stackrel{m}{\dot{m}}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\square} \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{m}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\bullet}{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{N}}}{\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{~N}}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{+} \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \underset{\sim}{\lambda} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{O}} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{-} \\ & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\underset{ }{2}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & ? \\ & \dot{\bullet} \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{N}} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & Q_{1} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}=$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{M}{\sim} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{I} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\bullet}{N} \\ & \stackrel{m}{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{N}{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{n} \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{n}{\stackrel{n}{4}}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\stackrel{0}{r}} \stackrel{+}{r}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \dot{m} \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { İ } \\ & \text { r } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ \because \\ \cdots \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{o} \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{6}{0} \\ & \stackrel{9}{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{e}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{r} \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\sim$ $\cdots$ $\cdots$ $\cdots$ |
| $$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & \tilde{N} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & - \\ & \vdots \\ & \underset{\sim}{H} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{m}{n} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { g} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \tilde{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { নু } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\curvearrowright} \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\infty} \\ & \infty \\ & \circ \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \infty \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \infty \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ \underset{i}{1} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{2} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{i} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 允 | 0 $\cdots$ $\infty$ $n$ $\sim$ $\infty$ $\infty$ 0 0 $\infty$ $\sim$ $\sim$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & -7 \\ & -1 \\ & 0 \\ & \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & n \end{aligned}$ |  | 270.15365080 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ - \\ -1 \\ - \\ n \\ n \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ \\ \end{gathered}$ |  | $278.02886440$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\wedge} \\ & \stackrel{7}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \stackrel{i}{N} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 - 0 0 0 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \\ & \sim \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{N}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{+}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{+} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 艻 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { H} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{7}}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{n} \\ \underset{\sim}{7} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{7} \\ & \underset{7}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { } \\ & \text { İ } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\underset{\sim}{\sim}} \underset{\sim}{1}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{2}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{7}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | n $\stackrel{\sim}{2}$ $\sim$ |  |

## Jonckheere Double Star Photometry－Part X：Hercules

Table 2 （conclusion）．J objects in Her being checked for being potentially CPM pairs

|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { U } \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \text { U } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}\right.$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \text { U } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | U U d 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & 0 \\ & \text { N } \\ & \Sigma \\ & \Sigma_{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ص } \\ & \text { Ư世 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ou } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \text { a } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \infty \\ \infty \\ n \\ n \\ i \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \sim \\ N \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \dot{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ & \text { v} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & n \\ & n \\ & \vdots \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\Sigma$ | ， | 号 | \％ | 呂 | \％ | 号 | 岃 | 呂 |
| 只 | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{O}{N} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{y}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{+}{\bigcirc}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & N_{1} \\ & \mathbf{R}_{1} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\gtrless}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{i} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\infty} \\ & \dot{\infty} \\ & i \end{aligned}$ |  | $\xrightarrow{+}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ň } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { Q } \\ & \text { م, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{7} \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \vdots 1 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \infty \\ & \\ & \stackrel{1}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\dot{~}} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { N্, } \\ \text { E1 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{+}{2} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \text { i. } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 . \\ & i \\ & i \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{m} \\ & \vdots \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \vec{E}_{1} \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n} \\ & \stackrel{0}{i} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\ominus}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{\circ}{i}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{n}{\sim} \\ & \therefore \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\stackrel{O}{\stackrel{O}{i}} \underset{i}{i}$ |  | 0 + $\stackrel{1}{*}$ 1 |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{0}{1}$ $\stackrel{1}{2}$ |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{0}{+}$ $\dot{\square}$ $\square$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{e} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\text { Hi}}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{1} \\ & -1 \\ & i \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\frac{\widehat{N}}{\mathrm{~N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{3}{3}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \underset{m}{n} \\ \dot{\sim} \end{gathered}$ |  | ¢ $\stackrel{\infty}{0}$ $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\sim}$ $\sim$ |  |
| $\underset{\underset{\Sigma}{\mathrm{N}}}{\substack{\widehat{2}}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\text { の }}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{6}{\stackrel{1}{2}} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\llcorner }{\Omega} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\sim}$ |  |
| む | $\begin{aligned} & -\quad . \\ & \dot{6} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \dot{n} \\ & \dot{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{m} \\ \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ \dot{\sim} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \dot{M} \\ & \dot{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{0} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\dot{N}} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & i n \end{aligned}$ | $\cdots$ |
| $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{m}} \\ & \dot{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\lambda} \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \text { e. } \\ & i . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N} \\ \dot{n} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\mathrm{m}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{2} \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{b} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{n}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \text { ロ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & \sim \\ & \infty \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \sim \\ & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \infty \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { m } \\ & 0 \\ & \sim \\ & م \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 台 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 芳 | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{-}{N} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\omega} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}$ |  |
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(Continued from page 345)

## References

Buchheim, Robert - 2008, CCD Double-Star Measurements at Altimira Observatory in 2007, Journal of Double Star Observations, Vol. 4 No. 1 Page 27-31

Knapp, Wilfried; Nanson, John - 2017, A new concept for counter-checking of assumed CPM pairs, Journal of Double Star Observing, Vol. 13 No 1 pp. 31-51

## Acknowledgements:

The following tools and resources have been used for this research:
2MASS catalog
2MASS images
AAVSO APASS
AAVSO VPhot
Aladin Sky Atlas v9.0
Astrometrica v4.10.0.427
AstroPlanner v2.2
iTelescope:
iT24: 610 mm CDK with 3962 mm focal length. Resolution $0.625 \mathrm{arcsec} / \mathrm{pixel}$. V-filter. No transformation coefficients available. Located in Auberry, California. Elevation 1405m
iT18: 318 mm CDK with 2541 mm focal length. CCD: SBIG-STXL-6303E. Resolution 0.73 $\operatorname{arcsec} /$ pixel. V-filter. No transformation coefficients available. Located in Nerpio, Spain. Elevation 1650m
GAIA DR1 catalog
MaxIm DL6 v6.08
POSS images
SDSS DR9 and DR7 catalogs
SDSS images
SIMBAD
UCAC4 catalog
UCAC5 catalog
URAT1 catalog
VizieR
Washington Double Star Catalog

## Appendix A

## CPM rating scheme according to Knapp/Nanson 2017 with extensions:

Four rating factors are used: Proper motion vector direction, proper motion vector length, size of position error in relation to proper motion vector length and relationship separation to average proper motion speed:

- Proper motion vector direction rating: "A" for within the error range identical direction, "B" for similar direction within the double error range and " C " for outside
- Proper motion vector length rating: "A" for within the error range identical length, "B" for similar length within the double error range and C for outside
- Error size rating: "A" for error size of less than $5 \%$ of the proper motion vector length, "B" for less than $10 \%$ and "C" for a larger error size
- Rating for relation separation to average proper motion speed: "A" for less than 100 years, "B" for 100 to 1000 years and "C" for above.

To compensate for (depending on the selected objects and available catalogs) excessively large position errors resulting an "A" rating despite rather high deviations absolute upper limits are applied regardless calculated error size:

- Proper motion vector direction: Max. $2.86^{\circ}$ difference for an "A" and $5.72^{\circ}$ for a " B "
- Proper motion vector length: Max. 5\% difference for an "A" and $10 \%$ for a "B"

Modification for cases of very small position errors (when for example using SDSS9 instead of 2MASS or directly proper motion data from GAIA DR1 or UCAC5) with the consequence that the requirements to get an A or even B CPM rating get unreasonable hard:

- The from the position error resulting error estimation for proper motion vector direction and length is in this case calculated as root mean square from both position errors (instead of so far only the larger 2MASS one)
- If the PM vector direction difference is larger than this calculated "allowed" error but still less than $0.5^{\circ}$ then an "A" is given, a " B " is given for larger than 0.5 but less than 1 degree, and a " C " is given if above
- If the PM vector length difference is larger than this calculated "allowed" error but still less than $0.5 \%$ then an " A " is given, a " B " is given for larger than 0.5 but less than 1 percent, and a " C " is given if above.


# The Double Star Orbit Initial Value Problem 

Hagan Hensley<br>Stanford Online High School, Stanford, California


#### Abstract

Many precise algorithms exist to find a best-fit orbital solution for a double star system given a good enough initial value. Desmos is an online graphing calculator tool with extensive capabilities to support animations and defining functions. It can provide a useful visual means of analyzing double star data to arrive at a best guess approximation of the orbital solution. This is a necessary requirement before using a gradient-descent algorithm to find the bestfit orbital solution for a binary system.


## Introduction

Many double stars have hundreds of past observations showing an obvious curved pattern in the motion of the secondary relative to the primary, suggesting an orbit. By determining the precise orbital parameters of a double star system based on past observations, it is possible to predict where the secondary should be relative to the primary at any point in the future. Knowing the orbital parameters of binary systems in aggregate can provide valuable insight into the processes of binary star system dynamics. Waiting for the system to complete a full orbit before coming to conclusions about its orbital parameters is ideal, but would often take hundreds if not thousands of years. Therefore it is essential to make accurate determinations of a binary system's orbital parameters based on observations over only a small portion of the orbit.

Since a binary system orbit takes seven parameters to describe, the search space for finding a best-fit orbit is seven-dimensional and very computationally expensive to search using conventional methods. There are more efficient ways of finding a best-fit orbital solution, but all with the requirement that they must start with a fairly good best-guess initial value for the solution in order to converge in a reasonable amount of time. For this reason it is important to be able to arrive at good initial values for the orbital parameters before actually using any fitting algorithm.

## Parameters of an Orbital Solution

Any double star orbit can be described uniquely by 7 orbital parameters, shown in Table 1 and described in "Keplerian Elements in Detail" (see references), slight-

Table 1: The 7 parameters of an Orbital Solution

| Parameter | Definition |
| :---: | :--- |
| $a$ | Semi-major axis in arcseconds |
| $e$ | Eccentricity of orbit |
| $\omega$ | Argument of periapsis, measured CCW from <br> north |
| $\theta_{m}$ | Mean anomaly at epoch (default 2000). A <br> time-dependent parameter |
| $i$ | Inclination, measured in degrees from <br> being face on looking down from above, <br> where "above" means that the secondary <br> is moving counterclockwise around the <br> primary. |
| $\Omega$ | Longitude of ascending node, measured <br> CcW from north |
| $p$ | Orbital period of secondary. A time- <br> dependent parameter, necessary when the <br> mass of the primary is unknown |

ly modified for a double star system instead of an Earth -orbiting body.

Normally, the semi-major axis is measured as a physical distance. However, since the distance to the double star system is not necessarily known, it is not possible to convert an observed separation into a physical separation. Normally, there are just six orbital parameters; the seventh, $p$, is not included. Here, $p$ is necessary because the stars' mass and physical separation are unknown, so we can't calculate p from the semimajor axis with Kepler's $3^{\text {rd }}$ law like we normally would. Knowing p and a gives us information about the ratio of the stars' mass and physical separation, using Kepler's $3^{\text {rd }}$ law.

## The Double Star Orbit Initial Value Problem

We can use these seven parameters to calculate the expected observed position of the secondary relative to the primary (in rectangular coordinates) at any given time based on a certain orbit.

## Calculation of Expected Position

In any best-fitting algorithm, there must be some way to quantify the goodness of fit parameter to be optimized. In this case, the best-fit orbital solution is that which minimizes the sum of squares of the residuals. The calculated values to be compared to the observed values for determination of weighted residuals are found as such, as detailed by Giesen (2017):

First, we calculate the position of the secondary on the orbital plane, using $a, e, \omega, \theta$, and $n$. We also need the value of t , or time from epoch. This calculation will tell us where we should expect to see the secondary if we were looking at its orbit face-on, with 0 inclination.

Mean anomaly M represents the position angle that the secondary would be at on the orbital plane if it swept out its orbit at a uniform rate with respect to angle instead of following Kepler's $2^{\text {nd }}$ law, but with the same orbital period. The expected mean anomaly at time $t$ can be calculated as $\theta+n t$.

The next step is to solve Kepler's equation to find the eccentric anomaly $E$ from the mean anomaly $M$. The eccentric anomaly represents the position angle of the secondary on the orbital plane measured not from the focus of the ellipse but the center of the ellipse. E and M should be thought of as intermediate values for the sake of simplification of the calculation, not as representing physical angles in the binary system.

Kepler's equation gives a simple relationship between $M$ and $E: M=E-e \sin E$. This equation cannot be solved algebraically for $E$ (except in the special case where $e=0$, a circular orbit). The most computationally efficient way to solve it, and the way it is typically solved, is using Newton's method, starting by inverting the equation. For a first guess, we set

$$
E=M+\sin M
$$

Then, for three to four iterations, we apply Newton's method, repeatedly setting

$$
E_{\text {new }}=E-\frac{E-e \sin E-M}{1-e \cos E}
$$

This should give us a satisfactory approximation of $E$, accurate to several decimal places.

From the eccentric anomaly $E$, we can now find the x and $y$ coordinates of the secondary on its orbital plane, treating the argument of periapsis as the $x$ axis.

$$
x=a \cos E-a e ; \quad y-a \sqrt{1-e^{2}} \sin E
$$

Converting this to polar coordinates gives the true anomaly and true separation. Lastly, we apply a rotation matrix by an angle equal to the inclination about the axis of $\Omega$, and set the resulting $z$ coordinate to 0 , giving the projected position of the secondary.

## Method 1: Visualization

Desmos is an online graphing calculator tool with extensive capabilities to support animations and defining functions. Using the orbital parameters and the calculations described above, it is possible to graph a projection of an orbit in Desmos. One issue is that Desmos cannot define functions, such as the Newton's method approximation of eccentric anomaly, recursively in terms of themselves. Therefore the recursion must be done indirectly, by defining each successive iteration as its own function. Despite limitations on processing power required to make the graph run smoothly, the iterative method shown in Equation 1 is repeated to 4 iterations without slowing things down. This means it is satisfactory for $\mathrm{e}<0.95$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{2}(m)=E_{1}(m)-\frac{E_{1}(m)-e_{o}\left[E_{1}(m)\right]-m}{1-e_{o} \cos \left[E_{1}(m)\right]} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

An iterative approximation of $E(m)$ using Newton's method, as shown in Desmos. This step is repeated to calculate $E_{3}, E_{4}$, et cetera.

Figure 1 is a plot based on randomly generated sample data representative of a possible orbit with observations perturbed slightly from their calculated locations, getting closer as time goes on, shown with residuals. The sliders on the left hand side can be adjusted to modify the orbital parameters, and the residuals will be adjusted in turn. The eccentricity $e$ was defined as $e_{o}$, so Desmos didn't think it was the number $e$. The solution shown in Figure 1 has an $R^{2}$ value of 0.97 .

Changing the time-dependent parameters, $\theta_{m}$ and $p$, can have a large effect on the residuals while not changing the shape of the orbit. Figure 2 shows the same orbit with an incorrect value of $p$, and an $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ value of -0.13 :

## 3D Visualization

With some more manipulation, it is possible to get Desmos to display a 3-dimensional visualization of the orbit and residuals, which can further help build intuition for the effects of altering the various elements. The orbit in purple is the orbit as we observe it from Earth, which appears as projected onto a plane perpendicular to our line of sight. The orbit in red is the actual orbit of
(Text continues on page 356)

## The Double Star Orbit Initial Value Problem



Figure 1: An orbital solution as shown in Desmos: from
https://www.desmos.com/calculator/skxwjseto5



Figure 2: The same sample data with an incorrect value of $p$ and the same other parameters, showing very different residuals.

Figure 3. Selected points from the past observations of a real binary system, fitted manually using the $3 d$ visualization tool.

## The Double Star Orbit Initial Value Problem

(Continued from page 354)
the secondary, which can be seen to extend above and below the projected orbital plane in green. The blue line represents the line of nodes. Figure 3 shows an example of this method using 50 randomly selected data points for the Grade 1 system WDS 18055+0230

## Manually finding a best guess for some parameters

By careful analysis of the data, we can come to an initial best guess for some of the parameters. For a large enough arc, we can use the sample data to get a fairly good approximation of the orbital period p. In the above data, for example, the position angles appear to traverse a full 360 degrees approximately once every 90 years, which can be used as a good guess at p. Because inclination is defined such that an inclination of 0 corresponds to CCW motion of the secondary, we can use the direction of the secondary's motion around the primary to constrain the value of i: CCW motion means that $i$ must be between 0 and $\pi / 2$, while CW motion means that i must be between $\pi / 2$ and $\pi$ (such that we are viewing the orbit 'from behind'). By playing around with the sliders, it becomes fairly simple to arrive at a good approximation of all the orbital parameters by trying to minimize the residuals visually.

## Testing

This method was tested on 10 grade 1 orbits and four grade 2 orbits. On six of the grade 1 orbits and all of the grade 2 orbits, manually fitting an orbit to the data gives orbital elements very similar to the official values and can be done within just a few minutes. The other four grade 1 orbits exhibited some inconsistencies in the data points, as it appeared that some points had position angles flipped by 90 or 180 degrees from the correct values.

## Implication

Given the success and ease of fitting randomly chosen data points from known orbits, this method holds promise for fitting previously unknown orbits.

## Conclusion

Desmos can provide a useful visual means of arriving at a best guess of the seven orbital parameters for a set of observational data. This best guess can then be fed into a gradient descent algorithm or something similar to arrive at an optimized orbital solution.
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# Counter-Check of CBL Double Stars for being Physical Pairs 
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#### Abstract

This report counter-checks a random sample of CBL objects for the probability of being physical pairs using TGAS proper motion and parallax data finding most of them common proper motion pairs indeed but only in one case with some probability for gravitational relationship


## Introduction

The WDS catalog contains (starting with the first Caballero JDSO report in 2009) per August 2017 about 600 CBL objects - most of them V-coded as assumed physical pairs by means of common proper motion. The TGAS subset of GAIA provides PM and Plx data for stars already covered in the Tycho and Hipparcos catalogs (Michalik at al. 2015) with some overlap for a part of the CBL objects. As a random CBL objects sample, I selected 23 objects with $\sim 12 \mathrm{mag}$ secondaries. Next step was then to identify these objects in the 2MASS images and load the GAIA DR1 data to check the PM values for common proper motion using the CPM assessment model from Knapp and Nanson 2017. The results for the selected CBL objects are given in Table 1.

To make the CPM assessment more transparent the proper motion vector attributes direction and length and the differences are given in Table 2 as well as the TGAS Plx data with a calculation of the distance between the components for three cases with an assessment of the probability of an existing gravitational relationship:

- Best case: The Plx values are assumed the largest possible value within the given error range - the distance is then simply the part of the circumference with a radius given by this Plx
- Realistic case: Using the given GAIA DR1 values Plx1 and Plx2 - this adds to the best case the distance of the Plx data calculated approximately using the Pythagorean theorem
- Worst case: The given Plx errors work to full extent giving the largest possible distance - again calcu-
lated approximately using Pythagoras.
The assessment of a potential gravitational relationship between the components is then based on a quite simple approach assuming average means Sun like star mass with a then assumed gravitational "border" at the outer rim of the Oort cloud at $\sim 100,000 \mathrm{AU}$. If the "realistic" distance between the components is therefore less than $200,000 \mathrm{AU}$ then a potential gravitational relationship is assumed to be present with a high probability because of the overlapping Oort clouds (for details see Appendix B).


## Summary

From 23 total objects, only 2 are to be considered probably not CPM pairs, confirming the assumed high quality of the CBL objects. Eleven objects did not allow for an assessment of gravitational relationship due to missing GAIA DR1 Plx data for at least one component. From the remaining 12 objects, only one can be considered physical in terms of at least some probability of gravitational relationship. All other pairs save 2, have a very small probability of being physical. And 2 objects are, with the given measurements, outside of any possibility of gravitational relationship (however, this does not exclude the possibility of common origin from the same molecular cloud).

Counter-Check of CBL Double Stars for being Physical Pairs
Table 1. CPM Rating for the selected CBL objects

| Descrip <br> - Heade <br> WDS dat <br> - Data <br> -- RA a <br> - Sep g <br> (Buchhe <br> -- PA g <br> pending <br> -- M1 a <br> -- pmRA <br> -- Ap i <br> -- Me i <br> -- Date <br> -- CPM <br> -- Sour | ion of table line: Gives the Tycho ine: <br> d Dec give ves separati m 2008) ves position on quadrant d M2 give GA and pmDE1 dicates in dicates the is the Julia at gives the e/Notes fina | contents: the WDS ca I data is g <br> he coordina on in arcse <br> angle in d (Buchheim 2 IA DR1 Gmag ith e_pm1 g he aperture WDS code fo n observati rating of lly indicat | talog iven <br> tes fro conds <br> egrees <br> 008) <br> s or in ive the used $r$ the on epoc the CPM es the | m the u calculat <br> calcula <br> case <br> proper <br> (calcula <br> used obs ch <br> M assess <br> used ca | sed cat ed fron <br> ted fro <br> f URATI motion ted cir ervatio <br> ment ba talog | talog i the m the <br> Vmags data cular n meth sed on and giv | e sele <br> n deci coordin <br> coordi <br> if av <br> for A <br> surfac <br> hod <br> compa <br> ves add | imal de nates <br> inates <br> vailabl and pm ce diam <br> arison <br> ditiona | grees both <br> of bot <br> RA2, p ter) <br> of the comm | format compon <br> compo <br> DE2 an <br> given <br> nts an | ar of <br> as thes ents as <br> nents a <br> d e_pm2 <br> PM data <br> d expla | SQRT <br> s arct <br> for <br> (desc <br> nation | es ar ( (RA2 <br> an ( R <br> ripti <br> if | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{e} \text { di } \\ & -\mathrm{RA} 1 \\ & \mathrm{~A} 2-\mathrm{F} \end{aligned}$ | in the <br> rectly u ) * $\cos$ (De <br> A1) * $\cos ($ <br> ee Appen idered n | sable <br> c1)) <br> Dec1) | column, for one object without <br> for calculating Sep and PA $\left.2+(\operatorname{Dec} 2-D e c 1)^{\wedge} 2\right)$ in radians <br> )/(Dec2-Dec1)) in radians de- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Name | RA | Dec | Sep | PA | M1 | M2 | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | e_pm1 | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Ap | Me | Date | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPM } \\ & \text { Rat } \end{aligned}$ | Source/Notes |
| CBL 130 | 07:08:55.240 | -11:23:29.6 | 48.0 | 31 | 11.29 | 12.27 | -7 | -73 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2010 |  | WDS07089-1123 |
|  | 107.2301783 | -11.39187011 | 48.002 | 31.114 | 11.096 | 11.988 | -3.60 | -74.25 | 1.909 | -4.76 | -71.55 | 1.963 | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.0 | AAAB | GAIA DR1. PM data from GAIA DR1 catalog. Solid CPM candidate |
| CBL 114 | 00:32:19.100 | -21:50:33.7 | 49.7 | 209 | 11.62 | 12.26 | 60 | -1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2010 |  | WDS00323-2151 |
|  | 8.079834197 | -21.84265497 | 49.714 | 208.503 | 11.436 | 12.032 | 60.57 | -0.09 | 1.724 | 63.13 | 4.89 | 1.127 | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.0 | CBAB | GAIA DR1. PM data from GAIA DR1 catalog. Rather optical |
| CBL 47 | 10:59:33.138 | +23:15:47.1 | 19.9 | 183 | 11.08 | 12.22 | 44 | -38 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2013 |  | WDS10596+2316 |
|  | 164.8882947 | 23.2628989 | 19.808 | 182.982 | 10.602 | 11.750 | 42.40 | -40.30 | 1.414 | 41.70 | -39.50 | 1.414 | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAB | GAIA DR1. PM data from UCAC5 catalog. Solid CPM candidate |
| CBL 112 | 05:55:36.199 | +45:01:15.7 | 8.1 | 74 | 11.44 | 12.11 | 17 | -68 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2002 |  | WDS05556+4501 |
|  | 88.9009386 | 45.0207906 | 8.064 | 73.531 |  |  | 17.34 | -68.64 | 5.75 | 17.67 | -72.04 | 5.75 | 0.2 | Eu | 2013.603 | AABB | URAT1. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. Solid CPM candidate |
| CBL 170 | 18:27:24.763 | +21:51:53.4 | 26.6 | 160 | 10.31 | 12.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2010 |  | WDS18274+2152 |
|  | 276.8531292 | 21.8650538 | 26.596 | 160.014 | 10.027 | 11.532 | -14.24 | 54.36 | 1.265 | -15.78 | 53.82 | 1.338 | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.0 | AAAB | GAIA DR1. PM data from GAIA DR1 catalog. Solid CPM candidate |
| CBL 56 | 13:21:51.651 | +55:54:04.2 | 25.1 | 77 | 9.33 | 12.05 | -66 | -4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2010 |  | WDS13219+5554 |
|  | 200.4647731 | 55.9011578 | 25.068 | 76.646 |  | 12.051 | -73.07 | 6.68 | 5.88 | -71.28 | -2.22 | 5.87 | 0.2 | Eu | 2013.697 | CABB | URAT1. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. Rather optical |
| CBL 178 | 20:33:53.247 | -27:10:17.3 | 52.0 | 40 | 9.46 | 12.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2010 |  | WDS20339-2710 |
|  | 308.4722226 | -27.17185331 | 52.047 | 39.939 | 9.117 | 11.355 | 70.39 | -85.20 | 0.088 | 70.84 | -86.59 | 2.456 | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.0 | AAAB | GAIA DR1. PM data from GAIA DR1 catalog. Solid CPM candidate |
| CBL 147 | 13:17:35.429 | -11:57:01.3 | 24.1 | 345 | 11.23 | 12.02 | -82 | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2013 |  | WDS13176-1157 |
|  | 199.3972222 | -11.9501914 | 24.296 | 344.748 | 10.917 | 11.586 | -85.20 | 35.40 | 1.628 | -84.80 | 36.10 | 1.628 | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAB | GAIA DR1. PM data from UCAC5 catalog. Solid CPM candidate |
| CBL 185 | 21:54:22.589 | -44:09:46.4 | 18.0 | 74 | 10.97 | 12.01 | 20 | -92 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2010 |  | WDS21544-4410 |
|  | 328.5942328 | -44.1632639 | 17.990 | 73.727 | 10.621 | 11.490 | 18.40 | -88.90 | 1.273 | 18.20 | -88.10 | 1.414 | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAB | GAIA DR1. PM data from UCAC5 catalog. Solid CPM candidate |
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \circ \\
& \stackrel{n}{i} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{~N}}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{3} \\
& \underset{N}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{n} \\
& \stackrel{n}{\sim} \\
& \stackrel{y}{c}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \stackrel{y}{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\circ}{n} \\
& \stackrel{i}{\sim} \\
& \stackrel{1}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\
& \underset{N}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\circ}{n} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i} \\
& \stackrel{y}{c}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{1} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\
& \dot{\circ} \\
& i \\
& \stackrel{i}{i} \\
& i
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{o}} \\
& \text { N }
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\
& \stackrel{i}{1} \\
& \stackrel{y}{c}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{7} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \circ \\
& 0 \\
& \dot{o} \\
& i \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i} \\
& \underset{\sim}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$
\] <br>

\hline $\stackrel{N}{2}$ \& \& \& \％ \& \& 品 \& \& \％ \& \& 品 \& \& \％ \& \& \％ \& \& \％ \& \& 䍖 \& \& 운 \& \& \％ \& \& \％ \& \& 面 \& \& \％ \& \& \％ <br>

\hline 是 \& \& \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& \circ \\
& \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\
& \vdots
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\
& \stackrel{0}{\circ}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \circ \\
& \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\
& \vdots
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bullet \\
& ? \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\circ}{6} \\
& \stackrel{0}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \vdots \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \circ \\
& \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\
& \vdots
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \circ \\
& \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bullet \\
& \stackrel{0}{\circ}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \circ \\
& \stackrel{O}{\circ} \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \because \\
& \stackrel{\circ}{\circ}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bullet \\
& \vdots \\
& \vdots
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& \& $\stackrel{\bullet}{\circ}$ <br>

\hline $$
{\underset{\sim}{N}}_{\underset{\sim}{E}}^{1}
$$ \& \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \vec{e} \\
& \stackrel{\sim}{0} \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \stackrel{\sim}{n} \\
& \sim
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\circ}{\infty} \\
& \stackrel{\circ}{~} \\
& \underset{\sim}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

\stackrel{i}{\sim}

\] \& \& \[

\stackrel{m}{\underset{\sim}{c}}

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{+} \\
& \underset{\sim}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& $\stackrel{\sim}{\infty}$ \& \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\underset{N}{N} \\
\underset{\sim}{\wedge}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{2} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\circ}{\dot{N}} \\
& \stackrel{+}{\dot{N}} \\
& \dot{N}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& $\stackrel{\text { N}}{\stackrel{\sim}{\text { ® }} \text { ¢ }}$ \& \&  \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\
& \underset{\sim}{c}
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& \&  <br>

\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ň } \\
& \text { © } \\
& \text { E, }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \underset{\sim}{n} \\
& \text { in } \\
& 1
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \circ \\
& \infty \\
& \infty \\
& \stackrel{\infty}{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\circ}{\dot{~}} \\
& \dot{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{n}{\mathrm{O}} \\
& \dot{\gamma}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\imath}{0} \\
& \dot{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\
& \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\
& \stackrel{1}{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \&  \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { oi } \\
& \dot{\sim} \\
& \dot{-}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { H} \\
& \text { en } \\
& \stackrel{0}{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \stackrel{0}{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ \& \& $\stackrel{\stackrel{\sim}{n}}{\substack{\text { in }}}$ \& \& \[

\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{\underset{\sim}{7}}}
\] \& \& $\circ$

$\stackrel{+}{+}$
$\stackrel{\text { İ }}{ }$ <br>

\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Nै } \\
& \text { W. } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{m}{0} \\
& \dot{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \circ \\
& \infty \\
& i \\
& i \\
& i
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \underset{\sim}{0} \\
& \underset{\sim}{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { } \\
& \stackrel{0}{\dot{~}}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \underset{\sim}{n} \\
& \vdots
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\
\dot{W}
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { N. } \\
\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\
\sim
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \& \[

\underset{\underset{\sim}{N}}{\underset{\infty}{\infty}} \underset{\substack{0}}{ }

\] \& \& $\stackrel{\ominus}{0}$ \& \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
n \\
\stackrel{n}{i} \\
\dot{n}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \& $\stackrel{\stackrel{\circ}{2}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}}$ \& \& $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}}{\stackrel{1}{4}}$ \& \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { N } \\
\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i} \\
\vdots
\end{gathered}
$$
\] \& \& $\stackrel{1}{\circ}$

$\stackrel{n}{1}$
$\stackrel{n}{1}$ <br>

\hline $$
\underset{0}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{5}}
$$ \& \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \stackrel{0}{n} \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\circ}{\sim} \\
& \stackrel{\sim}{i}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \circ \\
& \stackrel{\infty}{乌} \\
& \underset{\sim}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { N} \\
& \text { b } \\
& \underset{\sim}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{n}}{\underset{\sim}{n}}

\] \& \&  \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{i} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
n \\
\stackrel{n}{n} \\
\sim
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \& $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\stackrel{1}{*}}$ \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N} \\
& \stackrel{\sim}{i}
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& \& $\stackrel{\circ}{\infty}$

$\stackrel{\sim}{m}$

$\stackrel{1}{2}$ \& \&  \& \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{n}{0} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\top}
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \& 1

$\stackrel{\wedge}{\circ}$
$\stackrel{0}{0}$
-

- <br>

\hline  \& $$
\stackrel{n}{i}
$$ \& \[

\underset{\substack{\circ <br> i <br> i}}{ }

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
0 \\
\cdots \\
\vdots \\
\infty \\
1
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

\underset{\sim}{\bullet}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\circ}{4} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& N \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& \infty \\
& \underset{\sim}{\infty}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& ¢\％ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\
& \underset{\sim}{7}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& ® \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}

\] \&  \& \[

\underset{i}{\bullet}

\] \&  \& $\underset{\sim}{7}$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \circ \\
& \infty \\
& \underset{\sim}{\infty}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4 \\
& \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \dot{\amalg} \\
& \vdots
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& $\stackrel{H}{1}$ \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\stackrel{8}{2} \\
\stackrel{1}{2} \\
\vdots
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

\underset{i}{6}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { in } \\
& \stackrel{n}{n} \\
& i
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\underset{i}{7}

\] \& \[

\stackrel{\stackrel{i}{m}}{\underset{\sim}{m}}

\] \& $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\underset{\sim}{N} \\
\underset{\sim}{n}
\end{gathered}
$$
\] \& $\stackrel{-}{1}$ \& O

¢
N
I <br>

\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 誌 } \\
& \text { E. }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& † \& $\stackrel{m}{7}$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& \stackrel{\infty}{\circ} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\top}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { n } \\
& \vdots
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\text { O}}{n} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i} \\
& i
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\stackrel{n}{\substack{\sim <br> 1}}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\circ}{\dot{1}} \\
& \dot{\sim} \\
& \stackrel{1}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& ¢ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& \stackrel{\infty}{\bullet} \\
& \stackrel{\circ}{\circ}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& ？ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \vdots
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& ¢ \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{j}} \\
\underset{\sim}{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ZW. } \\
& \stackrel{0}{6}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\infty \\
\infty \\
1
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \&  \& $i$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Jু } \\
& \stackrel{0}{\infty} \\
& i
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& $\stackrel{\bullet}{\circ}$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{n}{\mathrm{~N}} \\
& \underset{\sim}{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& $\infty$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\circ}{n} \\
& \stackrel{0}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& $\stackrel{m}{\square}$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\
& \dot{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& 00 \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{m}{n} \\
& \dot{0} \\
& \vdots
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& $\underset{~}{4}$ \&  <br>

\hline N \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{\beth} \\
& \underset{\sim}{n}
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\circ \\
\stackrel{\circ}{-} \\
\underset{-}{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\
& \infty \\
& \underset{\sim}{-}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{m}{\underset{\sim}{n}} \\
& \underset{\sim}{-}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\underset{\gamma}{\prime} \\
\underset{\sim}{1}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& \stackrel{\infty}{\uparrow} \\
& \underset{\sim}{7}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& n \\
& \stackrel{n}{2} \\
& \underset{\sim}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\
& \underset{\sim}{7} \\
& \underset{\sim}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\
& \dot{-}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\
& \underset{\sim}{I}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\ddots}{\circ} \\
& \stackrel{-}{\square} \\
& \underset{\sim}{-}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \ddot{\infty} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\circ}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{O}} \\
& \stackrel{1}{-} \\
& \underset{-}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& \infty \\
& \dot{-}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\underset{\sim}{\lambda} \\
\underset{\sim}{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\
& \stackrel{1}{\sim} \\
& \underset{\sim}{7}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{\lambda} \\
& \underset{\sim}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\sim}{2} \\
& \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\
& \underset{\sim}{-}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{i} \\
& \underset{\sim}{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\stackrel{\circ}{0} \\
\stackrel{1}{7} \\
\underset{\sim}{7}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

\underset{\underset{\sim}{7}}{\underset{\sim}{7}}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& 0 \\
& \stackrel{0}{-} \\
& -\quad
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{7}}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\
\underset{\sim}{7} \\
\underset{\sim}{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

\stackrel{\underset{~ H}{H}}{\underset{\sim}{2}}
\] \&  <br>

\hline 필 \& $$
\begin{gathered}
\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \\
\underset{\sim}{7}
\end{gathered}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { J. } \\
& \dot{\text { İ }}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \vec{\infty} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\
& \underset{\sim}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\underset{m}{\tilde{~}} \\
\underset{\sim}{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { N} \\
& \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\
& \dot{\square}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{\underset{~}{\prime}}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& \stackrel{\infty}{n} \\
& \underset{\sim}{-}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{-}{6} \\
& \underset{\sim}{-}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\infty \\
\stackrel{\infty}{-} \\
-\underset{7}{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { O} \\
& \text { on } \\
& \stackrel{0}{i}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{N} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\square}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{\sim} \\
& \underset{\sim}{-}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\] \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& N \\
& \underset{\sim}{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { n} \\
& 0 \\
& \dot{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\stackrel{-}{m} \\
\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\circ}{\sim} \\
& \stackrel{\sim}{7}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{n}{\mathrm{O}} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\square}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{7} \\
& \underset{\sim}{7}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { n} \\
& 0 \\
& \infty \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& \underset{\sim}{\square} \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{\underset{~}{7}} \\
& \underset{\sim}{-}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\underset{\sim}{\sim} \\
\underset{\sim}{7}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
n \\
\stackrel{n}{0} \\
\underset{\sim}{i}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{6}{\square} \\
& \underset{\sim}{7}
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& a

$\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$
$\infty$
0
$\rightarrow$ <br>

\hline 出 \& $\vec{m}$ \& \[
\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\sim}{N} \\
& \sim \\
& \underset{\sim}{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{N}}{ }

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{N}{N} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\bullet} \\
& \underset{N}{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\stackrel{-}{7}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{7} \\
& \dot{ } \\
& \dot{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& Jু \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\sim}{0} \\
& \stackrel{1}{n} \\
& \dot{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\underset{\sim}{\circ}
\] \& $\infty$

$\infty$
$\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$
$\dot{+}$

$\underset{\sim}{-1}$ \& － \& \[
$$
\begin{aligned}
& \dot{\infty} \\
& \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\
& \stackrel{\sim}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& ก \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \vec{m} \\
& \underset{\sim}{n} \\
& \dot{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{x}}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{7}{\tilde{6}} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { I- } \\
& \underset{7}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\
& \stackrel{\circ}{\dot{7}} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& の \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\sim}{n} \\
& \stackrel{1}{\infty}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\stackrel{n}{\Omega}

\] \&  \& \[

\underset{\sim}{\sim}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
n \\
\stackrel{\sim}{0} \\
\dot{n} \\
\stackrel{n}{1}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

\stackrel{n}{\mathrm{n}}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { + } \\
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \dot{\sim} \\
& \text { m}
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& \％ \&  <br>

\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{Q}{\circ} \\
& \stackrel{y}{n}
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \dot{\infty} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\circ}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{M}{\circ} \\
& \stackrel{+}{\infty} \\
& \stackrel{\infty}{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
m \\
\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{m}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{0} \\
& \stackrel{1}{\sim} \\
& \stackrel{-}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\lambda}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n}}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\
& \stackrel{\sim}{\circ} \\
& \dot{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \dot{O} \\
& \underset{\sim}{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{N} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\
& \underset{\sim}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { di } \\
\dot{i}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\underset{N}{N} \\
\stackrel{1}{n} \\
i
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

\underset{\sim}{\stackrel{N}{\underset{\sim}{~}}}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\text { I }} \\
& \underset{\sim}{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \dot{\circ} \\
& \dot{\oplus}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\
& \underset{\sim}{m} \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \dot{+} \\
& \dot{N}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { N } \\
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \stackrel{1}{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\
& \stackrel{\sim}{m}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{n}{0} \\
& \stackrel{+}{0} \\
& \dot{m}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{i}}

\] \& \[

\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{N}}{\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\underset{\sim}{m} \\
\underset{\sim}{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\ominus}{\top} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\top} \\
& \underset{\sim}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\stackrel{m}{\stackrel{-}{m}}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\underset{\sim}{n} \\
\underset{\sim}{j}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

\underset{\sim}{\sim}

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
m \\
\infty \\
\stackrel{\infty}{\dot{m}} \\
\stackrel{1}{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& \text { in } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \&  <br>

\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { © } \\
& \text { ロ́ }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{\dot{1}} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\
& \underset{\sim}{ت} \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{r}{i} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\ddot{0}}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \grave{r} \\
& \underset{\sim}{1} \\
& \ddot{\ddot{ }} \\
& \ddot{0} \\
& \ddot{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \&  \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{\infty} \\
& \infty \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& \infty \\
& \stackrel{\infty}{n} \\
& \stackrel{i}{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& - \\
& \dot{\infty} \\
& \ddot{\infty} \\
& \ddot{0} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\
& \underset{\sim}{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \dot{9} \\
& \tilde{n} \\
& \ddot{\ddot{n}} \\
& \stackrel{m}{\tilde{1}}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& \infty \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& \infty \\
& \infty \\
& \underset{\sim}{0} \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& n \\
& \stackrel{n}{n} \\
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \ddot{0} \\
& \ddot{0} \\
& \stackrel{\sim}{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

\] \&  \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \ddot{~} \\
& \ddot{\circ} \\
& \ddot{O} \\
& \ddot{O} \\
& \ddot{O} \\
& \ddot{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|}
\hline \infty \\
\infty \\
\infty \\
\infty \\
\infty \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\dot{O} \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

\] \&  \&  \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \infty \\
& \stackrel{\infty}{0} \\
& 0 \\
& \hline \\
& \hline \\
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \dot{广} \\
& \vdots \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& \infty \\
& \stackrel{\infty}{N} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\
& \infty \\
& \sim \\
& \sim \\
& \vdots \\
& \vdots \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sigma \\
& \dot{3} \\
& \ddot{0} \\
& \ddot{O} \\
& \ddot{\circ} \\
& i \\
& i
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \dot{-} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\ddot{0}} \\
& \stackrel{0}{\ddot{0}} \\
& \stackrel{i}{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{m} \\
& \underset{\sim}{y} \\
& \underset{0}{0} \\
& \underset{\sim}{m} \\
& \dot{0} \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \&  \&  <br>

\hline 出 \&  \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\
& \tilde{m} \\
& \tilde{\sim} \\
& \ddot{\sim} \\
& 0 . \\
& 0 \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
$$ \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
-\infty \\
\check{\sim} \\
\underset{\sim}{\mu} \\
\ddot{\sim} \\
\underset{\sim}{\ddot{~}}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\sim}{\mu} \\
& \stackrel{\sim}{\mathrm{N}} \\
& \underset{\sim}{m} \\
& \underset{\sim}{m}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \&  \&  \&  \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\
& \underset{\sim}{0} \\
& \ddot{m} \\
& \stackrel{-}{\dot{o}}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \&  \&  \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\underset{\sim}{\tilde{y}} \\
\underset{\sim}{n} \\
\underset{\sim}{\ddot{~}} \\
\ddot{\sim} \\
\ddot{\sim}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { N} \\
& \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& \sim
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \&  \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& \infty \\
& \dot{N} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\ddot{~}} \\
& \ddot{\sim} \\
& \ddot{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& m \\
& \stackrel{m}{\circ} \\
& \underset{7}{m} \\
& \infty \\
& \stackrel{\infty}{7}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\dot{0}} \\
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \ddot{\circ} \\
& \ddot{\ddot{~}}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& \overrightarrow{7} \\
& \stackrel{1}{\overleftarrow{ }} \\
& \stackrel{1}{3} \\
& \stackrel{8}{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \&  \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{y} \\
& \underset{\sim}{m} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\ddot{0}} \\
& \ddot{\sim} \\
& \ddot{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \&  \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{0}{0} \\
& \stackrel{0}{\infty} \\
& \infty \\
& \ddot{0} \\
& \ddot{O} \\
& \ddot{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\
& \infty \\
& \infty \\
& \infty \\
& \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\grave{0}} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\
& \stackrel{0}{\ddot{\circ}}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { m } \\
& \underset{y}{c} \\
& \underset{\sim}{n} \\
& \stackrel{N}{n} \\
& \dot{\sigma}
\end{aligned}
$$
\] <br>

\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 0 } \\
& \underset{\sim}{5}
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\
& \underset{\sim}{1} \\
& \underset{\sim}{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { n } \\
& \underset{7}{7} \\
& \underset{0}{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \&  \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { in } \\
& \stackrel{1}{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\sim}{\mathrm{N}} \\
& \underset{7}{1} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{w}}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{7} \\
& \underset{\sim}{w} \\
& \underset{\sim}{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \&  \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& N \\
& \underset{1}{1} \\
& \underset{\sim}{U}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \underset{\sim}{n} \\
& \underset{\sim}{0} \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{O} \\
& \underset{\sim}{1} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{B}}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \&  \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { n } \\
& \underset{0}{1} \\
& 1 \\
& \underset{\sim}{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { N } \\
& \stackrel{\text { N }}{1} \\
& \text { w }
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\sim}{m} \\
& \underset{\sim}{p} \\
& \underset{\sim}{\oplus}
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& \& $\infty$

$\sim$
$\sim$
$\bullet$
$\bullet$
0 \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

Counter－Check of CBL Double Stars for being Physical Pairs
Table 2．PM evaluation data and Plx Rating for the selected TGAS objects

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { y } \\ & \text { + } \\ & \text { 号 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | әtवettene y tof eqep xta on |  | $\text { ətवetțene } y \text { xof eqep xta on }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{llll} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \stackrel{0}{4} & \circ \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array}$ | 只 | 罗 | － |  |  | 岂 |  | 妥 |  |  | ～ |  |  | \％ |  | U |  | － | 岂 | U | 岂 |  | 岂 |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { og } \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \dot{-} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\overleftarrow{j}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\overleftarrow{j}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ò } \\ & \text { m } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i} \\ & \stackrel{i}{m} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { e} \\ & \stackrel{+}{\circ} \\ & \dot{m} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & i \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\sim} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \\ & \infty_{0}^{\circ} \\ & \sim_{0}^{\prime} \\ & \sigma^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M } \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \text { ò } \\ & i \\ & \stackrel{y}{\circ} \\ & i \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{~}{I} \\ & \underset{~}{\text { I }} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{m}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{4} \\ & \underset{i}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{n} \\ & i \\ & i \\ & \stackrel{i}{i} \\ & i \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \text { 가 } \end{aligned}$ | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ $\dot{\circ}$ ̈ $\vdots$ $i$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \underset{i}{3} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { オु } \\ & \text { b } \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { e } \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\infty}{\sim} \\ \underset{\sim}{r} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\overleftarrow{~}} \\ & \stackrel{~}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { rin }}{\stackrel{y}{n}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { o } \\ & 0 \\ & \text { mi } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{o}^{\prime} \\ & 0_{0}^{-} \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \underset{\sim}{4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \infty \\ \underset{\sim}{\underset{N}{N}} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{i n}{\sim}}{\stackrel{\sim}{\lambda}}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & {\underset{\sim}{x}}_{A_{1}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{m}{m} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{n}{\mathrm{~N}}}{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { オ } \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{N}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{N}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { Ĩ }}{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \stackrel{n}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { N}}{\stackrel{1}{2}}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} .$ | $\stackrel{+}{N}$ |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{0}{0}}{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}$ |  |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{3} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\underset{ }{-}}{\stackrel{\circ}{0}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}{\stackrel{1}{2}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { J. } \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{0}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{0}{\circ}}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { m } \\ & \underset{\sim}{x} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\dot{\sim}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{N}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & - \\ & - \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\dot{~}} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \vec{~} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{n}{\mathrm{n}} \underset{\mathrm{~m}}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{N}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\top} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\curvearrowleft}{\stackrel{n}{\mathrm{i}}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{4}{x} \\ & \underset{a}{a} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{O}{\square} \\ & \underset{\sim}{r} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{r}}{\underset{m}{2}}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \because \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \stackrel{+}{-} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{-}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\Gamma}{o}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\stackrel{\sim}{\square}}$ |  | ¢ O － | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{2}{i} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{r}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{4} \\ & \stackrel{1}{4} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\circ}{6}}$ |  |
|  | 易 | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{N}{\sim} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\pi}{\underset{\sim}{i}}$ |  |  | $\underset{\sim}{7}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{m} \\ & - \\ & - \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{O} \\ & \ddot{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \vec{G} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \infty \\ \stackrel{\infty}{-} \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { ®}}{\stackrel{1}{*}}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { m } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { A } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\lambda} \\ & \stackrel{i}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\tilde{6}}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{6} \\ & \stackrel{0}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\Gamma}{\infty} \\ & \underset{-}{-} \\ & \underset{-}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \dot{\infty} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { } \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{N}{i}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{i}}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\pi}{\underset{\sim}{i}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\stackrel{\sim}{ \pm}}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ब } \\ & \text { H } \\ & \text { 品 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{m} \\ \underset{\sim}{r} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ñ } \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & \dot{6} \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{m}{n} \\ & \infty \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ๗ু } \\ & \dot{+} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \dot{n} \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{n} \\ & \stackrel{y}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ |  |
|  | 弱 | $\begin{gathered} \text { n} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{u} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6} \\ \vdots \end{gathered}$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\grave{\circ}}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{7}$ |  | $\stackrel{\curvearrowleft}{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \vec{~} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{セ}{0}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{1}{2}}{\stackrel{1}{-}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & m \\ & \sum_{幺}^{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\bullet}{\bullet} \\ & \dot{\tilde{m}} \\ & \stackrel{y}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{~ H}{0} \\ & \dot{~} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \stackrel{i}{ন} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{i}{n} \\ \underset{m}{2} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ \underset{\sim}{\overleftarrow{N}} \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\underset{\sim}{\underset{~}{~}}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{N}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ब } \\ & \text { 员 } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}} \stackrel{\text { 玉 }}{\substack{\infty \\ \sim}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\dot{\circ}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{N} \\ & \stackrel{1}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\mu}{m} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{n} \\ & \stackrel{2}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\sim}{\tilde{j}} \\ \underset{m}{2} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { サु } \\ & \dot{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{o}} \\ & \infty \\ & \stackrel{1}{N} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\prime} \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{N} \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { 「}}{\stackrel{\text { 「 }}{\sim}}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { d } \\ & \text { g } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{3} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{7}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{u} \\ & \underset{\sim}{3} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F } \\ & \text { H. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{7} \\ & 7 \\ & \mathcal{M} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{0}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{n} \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{-} \\ & \hdashline \\ & \hdashline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \overrightarrow{~ H} \\ & \text { H } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{7} \\ & \stackrel{1}{7} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{u} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in } \\ & \text { 邑 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{9} \\ & \underset{\sim}{3} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \underset{\sim}{B} \\ & \underset{\sim}{B} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\theta} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{O}{\underset{1}{1}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{M}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \underset{\sim}{\omega} \\ & \text { M } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{0} \\ & \cdots \\ & H \\ & \underset{\sim}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \sim \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | ¢ $\sim$ $\sim$ - U $\sim$ | ¢ $\sim$ $\sim$ $\cdots$ 0 |
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## Appendix A - Description of the CPM rating procedure:

- Four rating factors are used: Proper motion vector direction, proper motion vector length, size of position error in relation to proper motion vector length according to Knapp and Nanson 2017 with extension for relation separation to proper motion speed
- Proper motion vector direction ratings: "A" for identical direction within the error range (given by assuming the worst case of the position error pointing in right angle to the PM vector), " $B$ " for similar direction within the double error range, and "C" for outside
- Proper motion vector length ratings: "A" for identical length within the error range (given by assuming the worst case of the position error pointing in the direction if the PM vector), "B" for similar length within the double error range, and C for outside
- Error size ratings: "A" for error size of less than $5 \%$ of the proper motion vector length, "B" for less than $10 \%$, and "C" for a larger error size
- Relation separation to proper motion speed: "A" for less than 100 years, " B " for less than 1000 years and "C" for above
- To compensate for excessively large position errors resulting in an "A" rating despite rather high deviations an absolute upper limit is applied regardless of calculated error size:
- Proper motion vector direction: Max. $2.86^{\circ}$ difference for an "A" and $5.72^{\circ}$ for a "B"
- Proper motion vector length: Max. $5 \%$ difference for an "A" and $10 \%$ for a " $B$ "
- To compensate for any overly small error "allowance" (result of a combination of very small position error with large PM vector length) the following exceptions are applied:
- If the PM vector direction difference is larger than this calculated "allowed" error but still less than $0.5^{\circ}$ then an " $A$ " is given, a " $B$ " is given for larger than 0.5 but less than 1 degree, and a " $C$ " is given if above
- If the PM vector length difference is larger than this calculated "allowed" error but still less than $0.5 \%$ then an " $A$ " is given, $a$ " $B$ " is given for larger than 0.5 but less than 1 percent, and a " $C$ " is given if above


## Appendix B-Description of the Plx rating procedure:

- Two rating factors are used: Distance between the components calculated from the given Plx data and relationship of given Plx error in comparison with the given Plx data
- Distance rating: "A" for distance less than 200,000 AU assuming average star mass means Sun like and an assumed gravitational relationship border with Oort cloud distance, "B" for a distance of less than 300,000 AU, "C" for distance larger than 300,000 AU but best case scenario less than 200,000 AU and "D" if distance larger $300,000 \mathrm{AU}$ even in best case
- Plx error rating: "A" less than $5 \%$, " $B$ " less than $10 \%$, "C" less than $15 \%$ and " D" larger than $15 \%$ PM error size in relation to the given PM data
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#### Abstract

We observed 58 widely-separated ( $\rho>3^{\prime \prime}$ ) northern hemisphere neglected binary star systems listed in theWashington Double Star catalog. Our goal was to obtain current separations and position angles of binaries that had not been observed in years or decades, and compare them with historical data. For each system, we fit Gaussian models to each component to determine the celestial coordinates and the corresponding position angles and angular separations of the binary. We combined these data with proper motions for each component from the recently-published UCAC5 catalog to determine the likelihood that each system was a true binary. We found that 29 candidate binaries were likely bona fide binaries, while 17 systems had large proper motion differences between components and were therefore deemed unlikely to be binaries. The remaining 12 systems had no proper motion listed.


## 1. INTRODUCTION

A comprehensive list of binary systems is the Washington Double Star [hereafter WDS] catalog, which is maintained by the U.S. Naval Observatory (1). The catalog include a list of "neglected" binary systems, consisting of unconfirmed binaries as well as systems which have not been observed for many years.

These systems provide a fertile research area for observers with small dedicated telescopes, as their properties can only be deduced by combining careful synoptic measurements with historical observations. This, in turn, can be used to create an aggregate database spanning many years. As an example, consider two solar-mass stars in a visual binary system with an angular separation 3 " at a distance 100 pc . This system has an orbital period more than $1,000 \mathrm{yr}$, i.e. an annual position angle change less than 0.3 yr . Therefore, wellspaced observations are required over several decades to adequately sample the slow changes in position angle and angular separation.

In this paper, we report on observations of 59 visual doubles with angular separations exceeding 3" from the Northern Neglected WDS list. For all targets, we also retrieved proper motions from the recently-published UCAC5 proper motion catalog (2) based on GAIA data
release 1 . By combining our observation with proper motions for each component, we categorized the likelihood that each system is truly binary.

## 2. OBSERVATIONS

The observations were made using the Iowa Robotic Observatory (3) in southern Arizona. The IRO is a fully robotic telescope consisting of a $0.51 \mathrm{mf} / 6.8$ Cassegrain reflector, a 2 Kx 2 K back-thinned CCD imaging camera, and a 12 -position filter wheel. We used a Sloan r' filter with exposure times between $1-3 \mathrm{sec}$ depending on the apparent magnitude of the target stars. The observations were made at epoch 2017 March 30. Both nights had good observing conditions with clear skies and FWHM seeing between $1.8^{\prime \prime}-2.0^{\prime \prime}$. Prior to analysis, each image had both CCD calibration (bias subtraction, dark-subtraction, flat-fielding) and a WCS astrometric solution (4) applied automatically.

## 3. DATA ANALYSIS

We fit circular Gaussian model profiles to each component using a downhill-simplex algorithm (Python library Scipy.optimize). For example, Figure 1 shows the double $05210+3728 \mathrm{AB}$ with overlaid contours from the Gaussian fits to each component. Using the derived centroid coordinates, we calculated the resulting binary
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Figure 1. Image of binary system 05210+3728AB on March 2017 showing overlaid contours from Gaussian fits to primary (A) and secondary (B) components. Inset shows the location of $05210+3728$ in 3 ' $x$ 3'field.
angular separation $(\rho)$ and position angle $(\varphi)$. We also calculated the magnitude difference between primary and secondary components using the model-fit Gaussian peak amplitudes $\left(a_{p}, a_{s}\right)$ and the expression,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta m=2.51 \log \left(\frac{a_{s}}{a_{p}}\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Stars in systems with a separation less than $\sim 6^{\prime \prime}$ were deemed too close to reliably fit Gaussian model components due to component brightness overlap. For these systems we determined component centroid coordinates visually using the image display program DS9. This method did not yield peak amplitude, so magnitude difference was not calculated.

The uncertainties in $\rho$ and $\varphi$ were calculated in the following manner. We estimated that model-fit centroid positions had a $1 \sigma$ uncertainty $\pm 0.15$ arcsec based on comparison of the fitted centroids with cataloged positions of field stars (e.g., Sloan Digital Sky Survey). Using standard error propagation analysis, the resulting uncertainties in the separation and position angle are,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sigma_{\rho}=2 \sigma=0.3 "  \tag{2}\\
& \sigma_{\varphi}=\frac{\sigma_{\rho}}{\rho} \quad \text { radians. } \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

Most target binaries had angular separations between $3^{\prime \prime}-30^{\prime \prime}$, so the resulting position angle uncertainty was in the range $0.6^{\circ}-6^{\circ}$.

## 4. RESULTS

We determined the angular separations, position angles, and Sloan r' magnitude differences for 59 neglected binary systems at the heliocentric Julian date of 2457842. These are listed in Tables 1-2 along with measured J2000 coordinates of each primary component and proper motions from the UCAC5 proper motion catalog (2). The latter were used to categorize each system as a bona fide binary with high or low confidence, as described below.

For any binary, there will be two velocity components contributing to each component's total proper motion on the sky: the center of mass proper motion and the contribution from the component's orbital velocity in the binary system. For the long-period binaries considered in this survey, orbital speeds are a few km/s or less, corresponding to a differential angular speed between components $\Delta \mu_{\text {orb }} \lesssim 10 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$ for systems at a distance 100 pc , and correspondingly less at greater distance. Hence, if the proper motion difference in either right ascension or declination significantly exceeds this value, it is increasingly unlikely that the system is a true binary.

For Tables 1 and 2, columns are organized as: WDS listed binary system name, right ascension and declination of primary components at epoch J2000, difference in magnitude (secondary magnitude minus primary magnitude), observed position angle, change in position angle from 2017 to last cataloged position angle, observed angular separation, change in angular separation from 2017 to last cataloged separation, magnitude of the proper motion vector difference between primary and secondary stars, proper motion uncertainties of primary and secondary stars, heliocentric Julian date, and number of nights observed. Table 3 is organized the same as tables 1 and 2, but omits the columns for the magnitude of the proper motion vector difference between primary and secondary stars and the proper motion uncertainties of primary and secondary stars.

We assigned each binary a high confidence or low confidence label based on the proper motion difference between the primary and secondary stars. These are listed in Tables 1 and 2 respectively. To be considered a high confidence binary system, the proper motion difference between components in each coordinate must be less than three times the larger of the proper motion uncertainty in that coordinate or 10 mas (to account for
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Table 1. High Confidence Binaries

| Name | RA+Dec | $\Delta \mathrm{m}$ | $\phi$ | $\Delta \phi$ | $\rho$ | $\Delta \rho$ | $\Delta \mu$ | $\sigma$ _ ${ }^{\text {r }}$ | Date | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03467+4241 FOX 134 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 034645.013 \\ & +423927.45 \end{aligned}$ | 1.2 | $107.7 \pm 2.8$ | 3.7 | $5.9 \pm 0.2$ | -0.2 | 3.16 | 18.41, 9.68 | 2457842.612 | 1 |
| $04260+4515$ ES 567BC | $\begin{array}{r} 042602.179 \\ +451359.98 \end{array}$ | 0.2 | $128.1 \pm 3.0$ | -1.9 | $8.1 \pm 0.2$ | 0.0 | 3.08 | 11.51, 21.19 | 2457842.616 | 1 |
| 04477+3446 HJ 349 | $\begin{array}{r} 044740.621 \\ +344622.89 \end{array}$ | -0.4 | $266.7 \pm 1.6$ | -0.3 | $10.4 \pm 0.3$ | 0.0 | 1.42 | 24.2, 30.85 | 2457842.621 | 1 |
| 04484+4611 HJ 2239 | $\begin{aligned} & 044810.874 \\ & +461119.81 \end{aligned}$ | 1.1 | $163.7 \pm 2.8$ | 0.7 | $13.6 \pm 0.2$ | 0.5 | 0.85 | 34.46, 46.02 | 2457842.622 | 1 |
| 05177+3757 SEI 156 | $\begin{array}{r} 051742.932 \\ +375613.07 \end{array}$ | 0.1 | $244.0 \pm 2.1$ | 2.0 | $24.8 \pm 0.3$ | -0.1 | 2.55 | 15.87, 13.57 | 2457842.627 | 1 |
| 05210+3728 SEI 203AB | $\begin{array}{r} 052058.510 \\ +372830.81 \end{array}$ | 2.1 | $251.2 \pm 1.3$ | 0.2 | $21.5 \pm 0.2$ | 0.0 | 9.43 | 27.42, <0.01 | 2457842.630 | 1 |
| 05231+3802S EI 225 | $\begin{array}{r} 052308.984 \\ +380138.25 \end{array}$ | -0.8 | $88.0 \pm 0.4$ | 0.0 | $26.2 \pm 0.3$ | 0.0 | 3.05 | 18.41, 6.69 | 2457842.631 | 1 |
| 05275+3425 TOB 35 | $\begin{array}{r} 052729.322 \\ +342502.64 \end{array}$ | 0.7 | $328.4 \pm 2.9$ | -0.4 | $21.2 \pm 0.2$ | 0.4 | 0.30 | 46.02, 50.00 | 2457842.632 | 1 |
| 05279+4441 ES 1377 | $\begin{aligned} & 052754.793 \\ & +444108.24 \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $185.0 \pm 5.7$ | -0.8 | $4.0 \pm 0.2$ | -0.4 | 3.92 | $34.46,13.57$ | 2457842.633 | 1 |
| 05385+3201 J 901 | $\begin{array}{r} 053832.826 \\ +320124.28 \end{array}$ | N/A | $143.2 \pm 8.2$ | -5.6 | $2.8 \pm 0.3$ | -0.1 | 2.10 | 8.08, 46.02 | 2457842.635 | 1 |
| $05399+5145$ ES 893 | $\begin{array}{r} 053956.724 \\ +514518.05 \end{array}$ | 0.5 | $225.0 \pm 3.3$ | 0.0 | $7.2 \pm 0.2$ | 0.0 | 3.27 | 15.87, 42.08 | 2457842.637 | 1 |
| $05497+3146$ SEI 391AC | $\begin{array}{r} 054939.523 \\ +314629.74 \end{array}$ | 0.7 | $140.3 \pm 2.6$ | 0.3 | $27.5 \pm 0.3$ | -1.4 | 6.58 | $0.02,0.03$ | 2457842.639 | 1 |
| 05498+3127 SEI 392 | $\begin{array}{r} 054948.887 \\ +312637.03 \end{array}$ | 0.8 | $309.1 \pm 4.0$ | 2.1 | $8.7 \pm 0.3$ | 0.1 | 0.78 | 34.46, 38.21 | 2457842.641 | 1 |
| 05499+2259 POU 789 | $\begin{array}{r} 054953.621 \\ +225847.66 \end{array}$ | 1.6 | $251.3 \pm 2.6$ | -0.7 | $12.7 \pm 0.3$ | 0.0 | 6.53 | 24.20, 21.19 | 2457842.641 | 1 |
| 05523+3442 GYL 87 | $\begin{array}{r} 055214.353 \\ +344120.96 \end{array}$ | 0.5 | $327.2 \pm 4.4$ | 0.4 | $10.3 \pm 0.3$ | -0.6 | 1.53 | 46.02, 18.41 | 2457842.643 | 1 |
| 05525+3235 SEI 424 | $\begin{array}{r} 055230.662 \\ +323440.52 \end{array}$ | 0.7 | $265.7 \pm 1.0$ | 0.7 | $13.1 \pm 0.2$ | -0.2 | 1.42 | 27.42, 24.20 | 2457842.654 | 1 |
| 05553+2023 J 1914 | $\begin{array}{r} 055515.816 \\ +202322.20 \end{array}$ | 0.7 | $256.2 \pm 2.1$ | 6.2 | $7.8 \pm 0.2$ | 3.8 | 0.80 | 27.43, 50.00 | 2457842.656 | 1 |
| $05557+3127$ SEI 440 | $\begin{array}{r} 055542.074 \\ +312701.17 \end{array}$ | 0.8 | $333.0 \pm 2.6$ | -1.0 | $13.9 \pm 0.2$ | 0.2 | 2.10 | 46.02, 18.41 | 2457842.657 | 1 |
| 05559+3104 SEI 442 | $\begin{array}{r} 055548.964 \\ +310422.81 \end{array}$ | 1.2 | $186.5 \pm 2.1$ | 1.5 | $25.1 \pm 0.2$ | -0.2 | 7.11 | 42.07, <0.01 | 2457842.660 | 1 |
| 05585+2727 J 252 | $\begin{aligned} & 055825.581 \\ & +272201.36 \end{aligned}$ | 1.2 | $318.5 \pm 3.8$ | -0. 5 | $5.2 \pm 0.2$ | -0.3 | 2.05 | 15.87, 18.41 | 2457842.660 | 1 |
| $05589+3143$ SEI 450 | $\begin{array}{r} 055852.536 \\ +314229.21 \end{array}$ | -0.2 | $178.0 \pm 1.9$ | -1.8 | $28.8 \pm 0.2$ | -0.6 | 5.08 | 1.79, 4.46 | 2457842.660 | 1 |
| $06138+3509$ GCB 16 | $\begin{gathered} 061407.230 \& \\ 350532.36 \end{gathered}$ | 0.1 | $184.4 \pm 4.1$ | -0.6 | $6.4 \pm 0.2$ | -2.0 | 1.03 | $38.21,30.86$ | 2457842.664 | 1 |
| 06162+2051 J 1054 | $\begin{array}{r} 061610.209 \\ +205127.90 \end{array}$ | N/A | $138.8 \pm 7.5$ | -0.2 | $3.3 \pm 0.3$ | 0.3 | 2.20 | 46.02, 8.08 | 2457842.665 | 1 |
| $06279+3715$ MLB 1028 | $\begin{array}{r} 062758.609 \\ +371444.64 \end{array}$ | 3.2 | $297.5 \pm 2.3$ | 7.8 | $7.9 \pm 0.2$ | 1.6 | 5.30 | 42.09, 13.57 | 2457842.669 | 1 |
| $06301+2756$ J 2428 | $\begin{array}{r} 063003.892 \\ +275749.44 \end{array}$ | N/A | $178.9 \pm 5.7$ | 28.9 | $4.0 \pm 0.2$ | 0.0 | 1.77 | 21.19, 24.20 | 2457842.670 | 1 |
| $06368+2335$ GCB 20 | $\begin{array}{r} 063621.872 \\ +233818.56 \end{array}$ | 0.5 | $229.2 \pm 3.0$ | 2.2 | $8.2 \pm 0.2$ | 0.2 | 0.22 | 46.02, 46.02 | 2457842.672 | 1 |
| $06442+3822$ J 665 | $\begin{array}{r} 064405.904 \\ +382233.01 \end{array}$ | 2.8 | $66.5 \pm 3.0$ | -1.4 | $7.6 \pm 0.3$ | -0.8 | 2.55 | 8.08, 24.20 | 2457842.647 | 1 |
| 08036+4739 PKO 8 | $\begin{array}{r} 080346.120 \\ +473905.06 \end{array}$ | 0.1 | $249.8 \pm 2.8$ | -0.2 | $11.7 \pm 0.3$ | 3.9 | 0.54 | 46.02, 42.07 | 2457842.653 | 1 |
| 08334+3348 MLB 838 | $\begin{array}{r} 083325.805 \\ +335017.90 \end{array}$ | 0.0 | $18.2 \pm 6.8$ | -0.8 | $4.8 \pm 0.3$ | 0.6 | 3.22 | 6.69, 42.07 | 2457842.657 | 1 |
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Table 2. Low Confidence Binaries

| Name | RA+Dec | $\Delta \mathrm{m}$ | $\phi$ | $\Delta \phi$ | $\rho$ | $\Delta \rho$ | $\Delta \mu$ | $\sigma$ _ ${ }^{\text {r }}$ | Date | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $03493+2424$ HL 30AB | $\begin{array}{r} 034916.805 \\ +242346.35 \end{array}$ | 3.9 | $13.4 \pm 1.2$ | 1.4 | $69.8 \pm 0.2$ | -2.4 | 57.03 | <0.01, <0.01 | 2457842.612 | 1 |
| 04020+6231 SLE 43AD | $\begin{array}{r} 040158.322 \\ +623050.42 \end{array}$ | 2.2 | $277.9 \pm 1.5$ | -1.1 | $19.9 \pm 0.2$ | 0.8 | 16.05 | <0.01, <0.01 | 2457842.614 | 1 |
| 04076+3804 ALC 1AE | $\begin{array}{r} 040734.354 \\ +380428.37 \end{array}$ | 0.0 | $99.6 \pm 0.1$ | N/A | $746.0 \pm 0.2$ | 26.0 | 68.04 | <0.01, <0.01 | 2457842.613 | 1 |
| 04125+3538 HJ 341 | $\begin{array}{r} 041231.205 \\ +354359.23 \end{array}$ | 0.2 | $333.4 \pm 2.6$ | 2.4 | $13.8 \pm 0.2$ | 1.0 | 12.25 | 24.20, <0.01 | 2457842.615 | 1 |
| 05179+3724 SEI 162 | $\begin{array}{r} 051754.782 \\ +372336.09 \end{array}$ | 1.6 | $223.5 \pm 3.6$ | -0. 5 | $24.1 \pm 0.4$ | 2.9 | 28.62 | <0.01, 0.02 | 2457842.627 | 1 |
| 05161+3632 SEI 132 | $\begin{array}{r} 051606.174 \\ +363141.65 \end{array}$ | -0.1 | $113.6 \pm 2.8$ | -5.6 | $25.0 \pm 0.2$ | 0.4 | 9.51 | <0.01, <0.01 | 2457842.626 | 1 |
| 05380+3643 SEI 358 | $\begin{aligned} & 053758.715 \\ & +364234.70 \end{aligned}$ | 0.6 | $196.8 \pm 3.6$ | 0.8 | $17.8 \pm 0.3$ | -0.4 | 9.97 | $6.68,<0.01$ | 2457842.637 | 1 |
| 05463+3152 SEI 384 | $\begin{array}{r} 054616.199 \\ +315220.59 \end{array}$ | 1.5 | $175.4 \pm 4.1$ | -0.6 | $13.9 \pm 0.3$ | 0.2 | 11.15 | <0.01, <0.01 | 2457842.639 | 1 |
| 06050+2913 MLB 750 | $\begin{array}{r} 060458.089 \\ +291122.01 \end{array}$ | 0.9 | $236.5 \pm 3.2$ | -0.5 | $6.6 \pm 0.2$ | 0.3 | 10.67 | 0.07, <0.01 | 2457842.663 | 1 |
| 06125+2025 J 1926 | $\begin{array}{r} 061227.013 \\ +202437.67 \end{array}$ | N/A | $0.2 \pm 5.8$ | 5.2 | $6.1 \pm 0.2$ | 5.0 | 46.35 | <0.01, <0.01 | 2457842.663 | 1 |
| 06204+2331 J 1822 | $\begin{array}{r} 062037.252 \\ +232819.31 \end{array}$ | 0.5 | $2.9 \pm 3.9$ | -1.1 | $7.0 \pm 0.2$ | 2.0 | 23.90 | <0.01, <0.01 | 2457842.665 | 1 |
| 06335+6712 MLB 457 | $\begin{array}{r} 063335.777 \\ +671138.78 \end{array}$ | N/A | $307.2 \pm 5.9$ | 18.2 | $4.5 \pm 0.3$ | -1.7 | 22.61 | <0.01, <0.01 | 2457800.678 | 1 |
| $06383+2427$ HO 625AC | $\begin{aligned} & 063818.901 \\ & +242701.71 \end{aligned}$ | 4.4 | $352.2 \pm 1.4$ | -0.8 | $50.5 \pm 0.2$ | 0.4 | 42.47 | 1.07, 0.02 | 2457842.674 | 1 |
| 07208+3151 SEI 478 | $\begin{array}{r} 072051.463 \\ +315102.00 \end{array}$ | N/A | $16.6 \pm 5.5$ | -8.2 | $4.2 \pm 0.2$ | -1.8 | 23.36 | 2.27, <0.01 | 2457842.650 | 1 |
| $09251+2933$ BU 1423AC | $\begin{array}{r} 092507.977 \\ +293249.02 \end{array}$ | 2.7 | $51.7 \pm 0.6$ | -0.3 | $155.2 \pm 0.2$ | 0.8 | 47.79 | <0.01, <0.01 | 2457842.682 | 1 |
| 09390+3017 ARY 51 | $\begin{array}{r} 093859.331 \\ +301631.56 \end{array}$ | 0.7 | $273.0 \pm 0.2$ | 0.0 | $118.7 \pm 0.2$ | -0.9 | 37.89 | <0.01, 5.48 | 2457842.692 | 1 |
| $11125+3549$ STTA108BD | $\begin{array}{r} 111244.285 \\ +354947.96 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0.0 | $247.8 \pm 0.7$ | 19.9 | $159.9 \pm 0.4$ | 7.0 | 245.82 | <0.01, <0.01 | 2457842.759 | 1 |

Table 3. Systems without UCAC5 Proper Motion

| Name |  | RA+Dec | $\Delta \mathrm{m}$ | $\phi$ | $\Delta \phi$ | $\rho$ | $\Delta \rho$ | Date | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03267+4110 | J 889 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 032646.903 \\ & +410850.52 \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $61.0 \pm 9.2$ | -36.0 | $2.1 \pm 0.3$ | -0.8 | 2457842.609 | 1 |
| 03495+5239 | ES 12DE | $\begin{array}{r} 034924.675 \\ +524019.45 \end{array}$ | N/A | $223.9 \pm 9.0$ | -6.1 | $2.4 \pm 0.3$ | -0.3 | 2457842.611 | 1 |
| $04113+2630$ | LDS5514BC | $\begin{array}{r} 041113.457 \\ +262952.35 \end{array}$ | 0.0 | $305.2 \pm 2.3$ | 5.2 | $11.0 \pm 0.2$ | 0.0 | 2457842.614 | 1 |
| 05119+3631 | SEI 93 | $\begin{array}{r} 051149.163 \\ +363028.70 \end{array}$ | N/A | $146.7 \pm 5.5$ | 21.7 | $3.9 \pm 0.2$ | -0.7 | 2457842.625 | 1 |
| 05225+6011 | LEO 11 | $\begin{array}{r} 052232.232 \\ +601123.64 \end{array}$ | N/A | $215.6 \pm 6.4$ | 4.6 | $2.9 \pm 0.2$ | -0.5 | 2457842.631 | 1 |
| 06212+2108 | S 513BE | $\begin{array}{r} 062110.309 \\ +210745.216 \end{array}$ | 1.7 | $327.8 \pm 1.5$ | 0.8 | $40.6 \pm 0.2$ | -0.5 | 2457842.666 | 1 |
| 06214+3402 | MLB1044 | $\begin{array}{r} 062126.528 \\ +340155.550 \end{array}$ | 1.3 | $126.0 \pm 3.1$ | 1.0 | $7.4 \pm 0.2$ | 0.5 | 2457842.667 | 1 |
| 06377+6129 | BUP 91AC | $\begin{array}{r} 063741.334 \\ +612854.14 \end{array}$ | -0.2 | $92.3 \pm 0.2$ | -1.7 | $397.5 \pm 0.4$ | 17.6 | 2457842.673 | 1 |
| 07018+6617 | MLB 400 | $\begin{array}{r} 070140.898 \\ +661654.20 \end{array}$ | N/A | $214.0 \pm 9.9$ | 24.0 | $2.1 \pm 0.3$ | 0.0 | 2457842.647 | 1 |
| 07059+3603 | STF1013 | $\begin{array}{r} 070551.903 \\ +360255.17 \end{array}$ | N/A | $56.6 \pm 4.6$ | 1.6 | $4.4 \pm 0.2$ | -0.3 | 2457842.649 | 1 |
| 08010+3454 | MLB 932 | $\begin{array}{r} 080101.534 \\ +345310.10 \end{array}$ | 0.7 | $56.0 \pm 4.8$ | 4.0 | $4.6 \pm 0.3$ | 0.2 | 2457842.652 | 1 |
| $10432+3849$ | MLB 933 | $\begin{array}{r} 104316.264 \\ +384840.83 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | N/A | $246.1 \pm 5.0$ | -1.9 | $3.5 \pm 0.2$ | -0.1 | 2457842.738 | 1 |

## Neglected Northern Hemisphere Binary Star Systems with Updated Separations and Position Angles

(Continued from page 363) possible orbital motion contribution).

Twelve candidate systems did not have proper motions listed for both the primary and secondary star. These systems are listed in Table 3, where their binary status is indeterminate due to the lack of knowledge on their proper motions.
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#### Abstract

The LSPM catalog (Lepine and Shara 2005) is a rich source for CPM pairs we thought already exhausted - but as we found during research for our report "A New Concept for Counter-Checking of Assumed CPM Pairs" (Knapp and Nanson 2017), there are still many potential CPM pairs indicated in LSPM not listed in the WDS catalog. After our first three reports on about 100 such objects (Knapp and Nanson 2017 - CPM pairs from LSPM so far not WDS listed - Part I/II/III), this report with 30 additional potential common proper motion pairs is presented here.


## Introduction

Similar to our first three reports on common proper motion pairs not listed so far in the WDS the selection from LSPM was done by sorting all LSPM objects by RA and then checking if the next LSPM object is nearer than 30 arc-seconds and so far not included in the WDS catalog. As a second criterion we selected all objects with an altitude suitable for imaging during the time of the research for this report with the intention of taking images with V - and I-filters in order to be able to determine as far as possible not only RA/Dec coordinates, separation, position angle, magnitudes and proper motion values, but also the spectral class range of all components according to the V-I color index.

Since GAIA DR1 coordinates are now available for most of the selected objects our most important CPM check analysis was done on the basis of comparison of 2MASS to GAIA DR1 positions. Because proper motion data listed directly in GAIA is still scarce and thus not available for both components of our objects, it was necessary to do our own calculations, which allowed a CPM rating according to Knapp/Nanson 2017 (see description Appendix A).

We also checked as many other sources as possible via Aladin for data for these CPM candidates beginning with visual comparison of POSS I and POSS II images. If the Aladin centroid feature did not work (as was usually the case) we then resorted to visual estimation of
the centroids to determine separation, position angle and proper motion from POSS I to POSS II. Next came the check of other existing catalog data for the given field of view, especially URAT1, SDSS, WISE, UCAC4 and GSC.

Besides measuring Vmags in our own images we tried also to get the visual magnitudes for each of the components from the various catalogs we used.

When the 2MASS data with J- and K-band values were available, we used a spreadsheet to estimate Vmags with formulas found on the website of Bruce Gary (http://brucegary.net/dummies/method0.html) provided $-0.1<(\mathrm{J}-\mathrm{K})<1.0$. For SDSS objects fainter than 15 mag in g-band we estimated Vmag as (gmag+rmag)/2 based on advice from Brian Skiff that this might work rather well.

Spectral class data was scarce in the available catalogs so as already mentioned we had to resort to deriving the spectral class of the objects in question using the B-V color index provided we had these values listed in the same catalog. For this purpose we used a table provided by the Space Telescope Science Institute (http://www.stsci.edu/~inr/intrins.html).

Additionally we took images with I-filter to get Icmags to be able to estimate the spectral class range of the components on base of own image material again using the above mentioned table.

The image processing followed our usual proce-
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dure: Stacking with AAVSO VPhot, plate solving and measuring positions and Vmags with Astrometrica using URAT1 as reference catalog and calculating Sep and PA with the formulas provided by Buchheim 2008. Due to the faintness of some objects we had to use exposure times up to 300 seconds and even then some components were too faint to be resolved. The I-filter images were first also plate solved with URAT1 as reference catalog for the astrometry results and then again plate solved using Astrometrica with USNO B1 as reference catalog for Ic-mags for the I-band photometry results.

In total we got in this way an observation history of each object beginning in most cases in the year $\sim 1950$ with POSS I and ending in 2017 with own new images.

## Results of Our Research

In Table 1 we present for the selected objects as much data as we could find in the catalogs available to us including our own measurements based on images taken with remote telescope iT24. Given below is a description of the table content per column:

- Name gives the discoverer ID of the selected object with a running number in the header line
- RA and Dec give the recent precise coordinates of the A component (if available from GAIA DR1) in the header line in the traditional HH:MM:SS DD:MM:SS format and in the data lines for the sources referred to in the Notes column in decimal degrees format as these values are directly usable for calculating Sep and PA
- Sep gives separation in arcseconds in the data lines calculated as

$$
S e p=\sqrt{\left[\left(\cos \left(R A_{1}-R A_{2}\right) \cos \left(D e c_{1}\right)\right)^{2}+\left(D e c_{2}-D e c_{1}\right)^{2}\right]}
$$

in radians

- PA gives position angle in degrees in the data lines calculated as

$$
P A=\arctan \left[\frac{\left(R A_{2}-R A_{1}\right) \cos \left(D e c_{1}\right)}{D e c_{2}-D e c_{1}}\right]
$$

in radians depending on quadrant

- M1 and M2 give measured Vmags in the header line for A and B and if available also in the data lines where we had often to resort to estimated values based on calculation from the J - and K-band values if available
- pmRA1 and pmDE1 with e_pm1 give the proper motion data for A and pmRA2, pmDE2 and e_pm2 for B in the header line as well as in the data lines
calculated by comparison of positions between catalogs or directly from the catalogs (specified in the Notes column)
- Spc 1 and Spc 2 give the spectral class range for A and B usually based on the V-I color index taking into consideration also the error range of the measured Imags
- Ap indicates in the data lines the aperture used for the observation listed (for GAIA calculated equivalent circular surface diameter) and Me indicates the WDS code for the used observation method
- Date is the Julian epoch of the (averaged) observation date given in the data lines
- CPM Rat gives the rating of the CPM assessment based on comparison of positions (in most cases between 2MASS and GAIA DR1 if available) in the header line and the corresponding data line
- Source/Notes finally indicates in the header line the LSPM ID and the overall assessment for the object in question and in the data lines the source used (images and catalogs) and additional explanations if considered necessary.


## Summary

From 30 objects checked for CPM

- 22 objects received a solid or at least good CPM candidate rating based on position comparison, in most cases between 2MASS and GAIA DR1 (according to the method presented in Knapp/ Nanson 2017)
- 4 objects could not be rated due to missing precise catalog positions for calculating CPM speed and direction - but in all cases visual evidence by comparing existing image material strongly suggested CPM
- 3 objects got a CPM rating for being most certainly not CPM
- 1 object remained unclear due to even missing visual evidence.

The issue of I-band photometry and using it for estimating the spectral class range was handled similarly to our part II\&III report.

## Follow Up

This report is our last one on this topic although we are convinced that there might be a lot more CPM pairs hidden in the LSPM catalog but with separations larger than 30 arcseconds thus not covered by our selection criterion up to this limit.

But we found in our image material for this report a number of WDS objects and will provide historical re-
(Text continues on page 385)
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Table 1：Research results for potential common proper motion pairs found in the LSPM catalog．Headline object position based on the most precise J2000 coordinates cur－ rently available for A（in most cases from the GAIA DR1 catalog）

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { y } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{y}{z} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \tilde{y} \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & i \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت} \\ & \text { G } \\ & \text { 号 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \underset{H}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & z \\ & z \\ & H \\ & u \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & . \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline y_{0}^{N} \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \text { 采 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \text { 采 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 委 } \\ & \text { 采 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 氐 } \\ & \text { 宏 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\text { 』 }}{\text { an }} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{N} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\lambda} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \dot{m} \\ & \dot{1} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ $\stackrel{n}{n}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{n} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \dot{\alpha} \\ & \dot{O} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}{ } \\ & \stackrel{1}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \text { n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{c} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\stackrel{1}{+}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{o}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{+}$ $\stackrel{-}{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N} \\ & \stackrel{1}{+} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\stackrel{0}{2}$ |  | $\stackrel{2}{4}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{M}$ | 㑭 | 畄 | \％ | $\bigcirc$ | ט |  | ～ | 留 | 㽞 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\sim}$ | ； | ט | u |  |
| 号 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{\wedge} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}}}{\underset{\sim}{\prime}}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}}}{\underset{-}{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{o}} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{O}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}}}{\substack{- \\ \hline}}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{0} \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}}{\stackrel{1}{+}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{0} \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { í } \end{aligned}$ | 笑 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{\sim}{\text { 艺 }}$ | 完岢 |  |  |  |  | 六 |  | $\underset{\sim}{\text { ¢ }}$ |  |  |  |  | $\underset{\sim}{\text { 2 }}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت} \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\text { 艺 }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{\sim}{\text { N }}$ | $\underset{\sim}{2}$ |  |  |  |  | 茭 |  | $\underset{\sim}{~}$ |  |  |  |  | $\underset{\sim}{~}$ |  |
| $\underset{\sim}{N_{1}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \circ \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { N}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}}{\stackrel{1}{2}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { E. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{y} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{N}} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \dot{\text { I }} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{u} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\tilde{I}} \\ & \underset{i}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{u} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\underset{~}{1}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\tilde{n}}{\stackrel{1}{n}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\xrightarrow[\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}]{\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\sim}}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N్ } \\ & \text { M } \\ & \text { R1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{O} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\dot{1}} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\text { g}}{1} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{E} \\ { }_{0} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { è } \\ & \stackrel{1}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { è } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{N}}}{\stackrel{1}{2}}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{J}}}{\stackrel{1}{2}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { そ } \\ & 0 \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { E, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ \underset{-}{-} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{-}{0} \\ & \dot{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{m} \\ & \dot{\vdots} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ & \underset{-}{-} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \underset{1}{-1} \\ & \underset{i}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \underset{1}{1} \\ & \underset{i}{1} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{m} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{1}{1} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت̆ } \\ & \text { 息 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{+} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \underset{1}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{u} \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{I}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{c} \\ & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\stackrel{1}{1}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\stackrel{1}{1}}$ |  |  |  |  |
| N | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { og } \\ & \stackrel{0}{6} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8 \\ & \hline \dot{\infty} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\top} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{\infty} \\ & \cdots \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{N} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\dot{~}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{0} \\ & \dot{6} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\dot{~}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{u} \\ & \underset{\sim}{r} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| E | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\underset{\sim}{4}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{ }{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\bullet}{\bullet} \\ & \dot{\underset{y}{2}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\top} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\underset{y}{y}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \sim_{\Omega} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{M} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{-}{7} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{9} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \\ & \dot{\gamma} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \vdots \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{r} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 出 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{~} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\underset{N}{2}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{c} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\dot{N}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\prime} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\dot{N}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \sim \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \stackrel{\alpha}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{2} \\ & \stackrel{1}{6} \\ & \dot{1} \\ & \infty \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\infty} \\ & \dot{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N̈ } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\dot{o}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \cdots \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{i}{~} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{r} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\text { N}}{N} \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{d} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{o}} \\ & \stackrel{y}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ل} \\ & \stackrel{y}{r} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cong}{0} \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \\ & \dot{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\mathrm{I}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{I} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\tilde{N}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{m}{\tilde{\sim}} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{Z} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \dot{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \stackrel{-}{m} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\stackrel{\text { ®̈ }}{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ & \stackrel{1}{n} \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \infty \\ & \stackrel{ }{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{+}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{-} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{O}{N} \\ & \tilde{N} \\ & N \\ & N \\ & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\lambda} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{m}{n} \\ & \dot{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \\ & \stackrel{n}{\sim} \\ & \underset{m}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & \tilde{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}\right.$ |  |  | $\stackrel{-}{0}$ $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\infty$ $\underset{\sim}{0}$ $\stackrel{m}{m}$ | $\stackrel{\sigma}{m}$ $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ $\underset{m}{7}$ $\dot{m}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{m} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n} \\ & \infty \\ & \omega_{n}^{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{m} \\ & \stackrel{m}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \text { m } \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{r} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{N} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{m} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 宸 | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{4} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & n \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & n \\ & \\ & \vdots \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{y}{7} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{7} \\ & \stackrel{0}{6} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \\ & \underset{1}{2} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | O | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\circ$ <br> $\circ$ <br> $\circ$ <br> $\circ$ <br>  <br> $\infty$ <br> $\circ$ <br> N． <br> N |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & N_{1} \\ & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & \dot{N} \\ & \dot{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \dot{\Omega} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ñ } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{\infty} \\ & \dot{\Omega} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { m } \\ & \text { m } \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \dot{\infty} \\ & \dot{\Omega} \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{c}{f} \\ & \underset{c}{2} \\ & \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\xrightarrow{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 1 (continued). Research results for potential common proper motion pairs found in the LSPM catalog. Headline object position based on the most precise J2000 coordinates currently available for A (in most cases from the GAIA DR1 catalog)

| Name | RA | Dec | Sep | PA | M1 | M2 | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | e_pm1 | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Spc1 | Spc2 | ${ }^{\text {Ap }}$ | Me | Date | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { CPM } \\ & \text { Rat } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Source/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NSN n+2 | 063852.448 | 225511.29 |  |  | 13.43 | 17.05 | -143.37 | -312.03 | 5.70 | -152.51 | -313.39 | 5.70 | >M4 | >M4 |  |  |  | AAAA | J0638+2255: Solid CPM candidate |
|  | 99.72125 | 22.92580556 | 3.922 | 173.934 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1949.900 |  | POSS I.O estimates |
|  | 99.71920833 | 22.9215 | 4.502 | 178.241 |  |  | -141 | -323 |  | -146.76 | -335.36 |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1997.908 |  | POSS II.N estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.O |
|  | 99.71923200 | 22.9212040 | 4.792 | 173.245 | 11.85 | 14.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.30 | E2 | 1998.833 |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band |
|  | 99.71853295 | 22.9198028 | 4.799 | 175.026 | 12.07 | 15.58 | -143.37 | -312.03 | 5.70 | -152.51 | -313.39 | 5.70 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS |
|  | 99.71843333 | 22.9196306 | 4.692 | 175.947 | 13.43 | 17.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.209 |  | iT24 1x300s V-filter. SNR B <20. Heavily overlapping star disks |
|  | 99.71848333 | 22.9196417 | 4.876 | 177.239 | 10.58 | 13.91 |  |  |  |  |  |  | >M4 | >M4 | 0.61 | C | 2017.084 |  | iT24 1x180s I-filter. SNR B <20. Heavily overlapping star disks. Spc based on V-I color index |
| KPP n+3 | 064439.062 | $28 \quad 55 \quad 26.32$ |  |  | 14.05 | 16.28 | 194.37 | -10.10 | 5.68 | 188.74 | -14.20 | 5.68 | M2-M4 | M3-M4 |  |  |  | AAAA | J0644+2855: Solid CPM candidate |
|  | 101.15866667 | 28.9241111 | 4.561 | 239.717 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1953.933 |  | POSS I.O estimates |
|  | 101.16120833 | 28.9240000 | 4.561 | 233.704 |  |  | 191 | -10 |  | 198 | -19 |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1995.797 |  | POSS II.N estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.O |
|  | 101.16175800 | 28.9240230 | 5.625 | 234.698 | 12.88 | 14.63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.30 | E2 | 1998.762 |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band |
|  | 101.16275963 | 28.9239774 | 5.738 | 234.683 | 13.00 | 15.00 | 194.37 | -10.10 | 5.68 | 188.74 | -14.20 | 5.68 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS |
|  | 101.16288750 | 28.9239389 | 5.590 | 238.749 | 14.05 | 16.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.076 |  | iT24 1x60s V-filter |
|  | 101.16289583 | 28.9239944 | 5.796 | 235.773 | 11.88 | 13.86 |  |  |  |  |  |  | M2-M4 | M3-M4 | 0.61 | C | 2017.076 |  | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Spc based on V-I color index |
| NSN $\mathrm{n}+3$ | 064600.821 | 521411.26 |  |  | 15.97 | 16.15 |  |  |  |  |  |  | K5-M0 | K7-M1 |  |  |  |  | J0646+5214: DSS and 2MASS images show elongation but none of the checked catalogs showed an object for B. Comparison POSS I:O and II.J images shows clearly common proper motion |
|  | 101.50370833 | 52.2395000 | 2.102 | 357.495 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1954.148 |  | POSS I.O estimates |
|  | 101.50370833 | 52.2380278 | 2.108 | 355.000 |  |  | 0.00 | -143.31 |  | -2.48 | -143.31 |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1991.131 |  | POSS II.N estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.O |
|  | 101.50342083 | 52.2364611 | 2.301 | 357.941 | 15.97 | 16.15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.209 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { iT24 } 1 \times 300 \mathrm{~s} \text { V-filter. Over- } \\ & \text { lapping star disks } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 101.50340000 | 52.2363556 | 2.381 | 358.231 | 14.56 | 14.55 |  |  |  |  |  |  | K5-M0 | K7-M1 | 0.61 | C | 2017.209 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { iT24 } 1 \times 300 \mathrm{~s} \text { I-filter. Over- } \\ & \text { lapping star disks } \end{aligned}$ |
| KPP n+4 | 065437.555 | 170803.57 |  |  | 15.22 | 16.36 | -79.01 | -141.89 | 7.18 | -78.68 | -143.10 | 7.18 | M1-M3 | M3-M4 |  |  |  | AAAA | J0654+1708: Solid CPM candidate |
|  | 103.65787500 | 17.1371667 | 3.031 | 8.157 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1951.849 |  | POSS I.O estimates |
|  | 103.65687500 | 17.1348056 | 3.229 | 7.654 |  |  | -71.64 | -177.01 |  | -71.64 | -172.85 |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1999.868 |  | POSS II.N estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.O |
|  | 103.65684300 | 17.1349470 | 3.692 | 8.250 | 13.12 | 11.73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.30 | E2 | 2000.854 |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band |
|  | 103.65648118 | 17.1343261 | 3.674 | 8.373 | 14.08 | 15.18 | -79.01 | -141.89 | 7.18 | -78.68 | -143.10 | 7.18 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS |
|  | 103.65641667 | 17.1341917 | 3.768 | 6.992 | 15.22 | 16.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.084 |  | iT24 1x180s V-filter. Touching star disks |
|  | 103.65640000 | 17.1342417 | 3.334 | 8.157 | 13.61 | 14.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  | M1-M3 | M3-M4 | 0.61 | C | 2017.076 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { iT24 } 1 \times 60 \text { s I-filter. Touching } \\ & \text { star disks } \end{aligned}$ |

## CPM Pairs from LSPM so Far Not WDS Listed - Part IV

Table 1 (continued). Research results for potential common proper motion pairs found in the LSPM catalog. Headline object position based on the most precise J2000 coordinates currently available for A (in most cases from the GAIA DR1 catalog)

| Name | RA | Dec | Sep | PA | M1 | M2 | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | e_pm1 | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Spc1 | Spc2 | Ap | Me | Date | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { CPM } \\ \text { Rat } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Source/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NSN +4 | 065903.303 | 563100.57 |  |  | 15.64 | 18.57 | -32.61 | -139.66 | 5.31 | -33.89 | -138.09 | 5.31 | K7-M1 | M2-M4 |  |  |  | AAAA | J0659+5631: Solid CPM candidate |
|  | 104.76458333 | 56.5192500 | 9.017 | 82.352 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1954.072 |  | POSS I.O estimates |
|  | 104.76370833 | 56.5174722 | 8.935 | 82.282 |  |  | -40.56 | -149.37 |  | -42.49 | -149.37 |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1996.919 |  | POSS II.N estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.O |
|  | 104.76402500 | 56.5174450 | 8.622 | 82.684 | 14.88 | 16.72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.30 | E2 | 1999.011 |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band |
|  | 104.76376245 | 56.5168247 | 8.605 | 82.501 | 14.75 | 17.15 | -32.61 | -139.66 | 5.31 | -33.89 | -138.09 | 5.31 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS |
|  | 104.76374167 | 56.5167556 | 8.380 | 84.522 | 15.64 | 18.57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | c | 2017.209 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { iT24 } 1 \times 300 \text { s V-filter. SNR B } \\ & <20 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 104.76369167 | 56.5167611 | 8.703 | 84.594 | 14.06 | 16.31 |  |  |  |  |  |  | K7-M1 | M2-M4 | 0.61 | C |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { iT24 1x60s I-filter. SNR B } \\ & <20 \end{aligned}$ |
| KPP n+5 | 070526.916 | 340016.06 |  |  | 13.19 | 17.94 | -62.12 | -191.02 |  | -73.08 | -170.45 |  | M1-M3 | F1-G8 |  |  |  |  | J0705+3400: DSS image shows the secondary but not 2MASS and none of the checked catalogs but GAIA DR1 showed an object for B. Comparison POSS I:O to II.J images suggests clearly common proper motion |
|  | 106.36279167 | 34.0075000 | 7.730 | 150.087 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1953.862 |  | POSS I.O estimates |
|  | 106.36208333 | 34.0056944 | 6.937 | 149.874 |  |  | -62.12 | -191.02 |  | -73.08 | -170.45 |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1987.890 |  | POSS II.J estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.O |
|  | 106.36215056 | 34.0044621 | 7.179 | 150.642 | 12.29 | 17.83 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 |  | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband |
|  | 106.36215000 | 34.0043889 | 7.221 | 150.266 | 13.19 | 17.94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | c | 2017.084 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { iT24 } 1 \times 180 \text { s V-filter. SNR B } \\ & <20 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 106.36210417 | 34.0043528 | 6.378 | 151.594 | 11.18 | 17.51 |  |  |  |  |  |  | M1-M3 | F1-G8 | 0.61 | C | 2017.209 |  | iT24 1x300s I-filter. Touching star disks. SNR B $<10$. Spc based on V-I color index |
| NSN n+5 | 072143.377 | 255458.82 |  |  | 10.11 | 13.53 | 58.15 | -164.33 |  | 29.08 | -164.33 |  | K2-K5 | >M4 |  |  |  |  | J0721+2555: No catalog data <br> for CPM assessment available. <br> Comparison POSS images <br> suggests common proper motion |
|  | 110.429125 | 25.91922222 | 5.688 | 95.043 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1954.970 |  | POSS I.O estimates |
|  | 110.42979167 | 25.9175278 | 4.614 | 96.221 |  |  | 58.15 | -164.33 |  | 29.08 | -164.33 |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1992.090 |  | POSS II.N estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.O |
|  | 110.43036800 | 25.9171160 | 3.354 | 87.785 | 10.06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.30 | E2 | 1998.888 |  | 2MASS. M1 estimated from Jand K -band |
|  | 110.43073750 | 25.9163389 | 4.778 | 88.441 | 10.11 | 13.53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.084 |  | ```iT24 1x180s V-filter. Heavily overlapping star disks``` |
|  | 110.43070833 | 25.9163583 | 4.252 | 87.979 | 9.12 | 10.98 |  |  |  |  |  |  | K2-K5 | >M4 | 0.61 | C | 2017.076 |  | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Heavily overlapping star disks. Spc based on V-I color index |

## CPM Pairs from LSPM so Far Not WDS Listed - Part IV

Table 1 (continued). Research results for potential common proper motion pairs found in the LSPM catalog. Headline object position based on the most precise J2000 coordinates currently available for A (in most cases from the GAIA DR1 catalog)

| Name | RA | Dec | Sep | PA | M1 | M2 | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | e_pm1 | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Spc1 | Spc2 | Ap | Me | Date | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPM } \\ & \text { Rat } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Source/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KPP n+6 | 072320.006 | 253609.88 |  |  | 16.56 | 18.45 | -103.30 | -218.28 | 5.01 | -105.36 | -219.07 | 5.44 | M1-M3 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { M2- } \\ & >\text { M4 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | AAAA | J0723+2536: Solid CPM candidate |
|  | 110.8352083 | 25.60658333 | 5.315 | 39.516 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1954.970 |  | POSS I.O estimates |
|  | 110.83391667 | 25.6042222 | 5.230 | 38.373 |  |  | -113 | -229 |  | -117 | -229 |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1992.090 |  | POSS II.N estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.O |
|  | 110.83389900 | 25.6037710 | 5.571 | 38.273 | 15.9 | 17.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.30 | E2 | 1998.066 |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band |
|  | 110.83377300 | 25.6035930 | 5.520 | 38.137 | 16.58 | 18.62 | -132.99 | -208.34 | 27.59 | -146.71 | -218.87 | 29.97 |  |  | 2.50 | Es | 2001.142 | ABCA | SDSS DR9. M1 and M2 are gmag+rmag/2 (used when gmag > 15.0). PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS |
|  | 110.83336020 | 25.6027442 | 5.539 | 38.074 | 15.60 | 17.37 | -103.30 | -218.28 | 5.01 | -105.36 | -219.07 | 5.44 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS |
|  | 110.83332917 | 25.6026056 | 5.179 | 35.809 | 16.56 | 18.45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.209 |  | iT24 $<20$ 1x300s V-filter. SNR B |
|  | 110.83342500 | 25.6026833 | 5.179 | 36.925 | 14.49 | 16.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | M1-M3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M2- } \\ & >\text { M4 } \end{aligned}$ | 0.61 | C | 2017.076 |  | iT24 1x60s I-filter. SNR B <20. Spc based on V-I color index |
| NSN $\mathrm{n}+6$ | 073022.917 | 271607.25 |  |  | 11.85 | 17.08 | 34.06 | -199.43 | 5.43 | 68.11 | -248.59 | 5.84 | G8-K4 | K4-K7 |  |  |  | CCAA | J0730+2716: Seems rather optical despite significant very fast proper motion of both components |
|  | 112.5946667 | 27.27219444 | 5.602 | 349.025 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1953.124 |  | POSS I.O estimates |
|  | 112.59516667 | 27.2698889 | 5.015 | 347.719 |  |  | 41 | -213 |  | 41 | -228 |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1992.090 |  | POSS II.N estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.O |
|  | 112.59532300 | 27.2695480 | 6.252 | 345.202 | 11.9 | 17.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.30 | E2 | 1998.066 |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band |
|  | 112.59537400 | 27.2693830 | 6.198 | 344.366 |  | 16.30 | 53.01 | -192.96 | 27.56 | 29.11 | -217.52 | 29.95 |  |  | 2.50 | Es | 2001.145 | CBCA | SDSS DR9. M1 and M2 are gmag+rmag/2 (used when gmag > 15.0). PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS . |
|  | 112.59548940 | 27.2686819 | 5.343 | 348.622 | 11.86 |  | 34.06 | -199.43 | 5.43 | 68.11 | -248.59 | 5.84 |  |  | 0.20 | Eu | 2013.777 | CCAA | URAT1. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS |
|  | 112.59549167 | 27.2685222 | 5.365 | 346.637 | 11.85 | 17.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.075 |  | iT24 1x60s V-filter. SNR B <10. Heavily overlapping star disks |
|  | 112.59545417 | 27.2685000 | 5.741 | 340.461 | 11.05 | 15.78 |  |  |  |  |  |  | G8-K4 | K4-K7 | 0.61 | C | 2017.075 |  | iT24 1x60s I-filter. SNR B <10. Heavily overlapping star disks. Spc based on V-I color index |
| KPP n+7 | 073425.791 | $2315 \quad 30.28$ |  |  | 15.58 | 17.24 | -230.22 | -136.24 | 5.80 | -225.98 | -135.95 | 5.80 | $\begin{gathered} \text { M3- } \\ >\text { M } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { M3- } \\ >\text { M4 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | AAAA | J0734+2315: Solid CPM candidate |
|  | 113.6115 | 23.26105556 | 4.694 | 35.953 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 1954.970 |  | POSS I.O estimates |
|  | 113.60841667 | 23.2592500 | 4.744 | 27.699 |  |  | -226 | -144 |  | -239 | -135 |  |  |  | 1.20 | Pp | 2000.027 |  | POSS II.N estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.O |
|  | 113.60865000 | 23.2590580 | 5.181 | 32.995 | 13.9 | 15.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.30 | E2 | 1997.924 |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band |
|  | 113.60746139 | 23.2584118 | 5.225 | 33.631 | 14.28 | 15.87 | -230.22 | -136.24 | 5.80 | -225.98 | -135.95 | 5.80 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS |
|  | 113.60732083 | 23.2583000 | 5.473 | 37.184 | 15.58 | 17.24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.076 |  | iT24 1x60s V-filter. SNR B <10. Identification of $B$ a bit difficult due to a foreor background star involved |
|  | 113.60728750 | 23.2583167 | 4.942 | 38.453 | 13.16 | 14.83 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { M3- } \\ >\text { M } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M3- } \\ & >\text { M4 } \end{aligned}$ | 0.61 | C | 2017.076 |  | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Touching star disks with B obviously optical double. SNR B <20. Spc based on V-I color index |

## CPM Pairs from LSPM so Far Not WDS Listed－Part IV

Table 1 （continued）．Research results for potential common proper motion pairs found in the LSPM catalog．Headline object position based on the most precise J2000 coor－

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { y } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{2}{z} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{cc} \left.\begin{array}{c} A_{0} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \right\rvert\, \end{array}\right\|$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{U}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{U}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{U}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{U}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{-} \\ & \underset{\sim}{-} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{\circ} \\ & \infty \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{~N}} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ $\stackrel{n}{n}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\text { a }}$ | $\begin{gathered} o \\ \stackrel{0}{0} \\ \dot{r} \\ \dot{1} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{c} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{0}{0}} \\ & \stackrel{1}{+} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \underset{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\text { I}}{\text { N }} \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{J}} \\ & \dot{N} \\ & \stackrel{\text { N }}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{N}{1} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \stackrel{y}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ |
| $\stackrel{0}{2}$ |  | $\stackrel{4}{4}$ | Q | 䍃 | $\stackrel{1}{\sim}$ | 留 | 裼 | 垵 | \％ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | 箇 | $\sim_{\sim}^{2}$ | 嵒 | 裼 | 3 | 画 | 垵 |
| 年 |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\because$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{0} \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { m }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \pi \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { y } \\ & \substack{1 \\ \infty \\ 0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { - } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { ! } \\ & \text { O} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\sqrt{3}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\Sigma}_{1} \\ & \text { O} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underset{\substack{i\\}}{\substack{1 \\ \hline}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\lambda}$ |  |  |  | $\sim$ |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \tilde{N}_{1} \\ { }_{1} \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ $\stackrel{-}{-}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\bullet}{N} \\ & \stackrel{O}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{\gtrless} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\square} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { N } \\ \text { 0 } \\ \text { E, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{1}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{4} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \vec{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nै } \\ & \text { 触 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{~} \\ \underset{\sim}{\top} \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\dot{6}} \\ & \dot{\oplus} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢े }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\bullet$ $\overleftarrow{+}$ $\stackrel{+}{+}$ | $\stackrel{セ}{~+1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \overbrace{E_{1}} \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\gtrless}{2} \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \stackrel{i}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{2}{0} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \text { 0. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { m} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\dot{0}} \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{1}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{+}{i} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ \underset{i}{1} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{m}{0} \\ & \dot{\alpha} \\ & \infty \\ & \stackrel{1}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{+}$ $\underset{\sim}{\top}$ |  |  |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\stackrel{\sim}{1}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { تِ } \\ & \text { W. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{\gamma} \\ & \dot{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\tilde{m}} \\ & \stackrel{-}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\sim}{0} \\ \stackrel{1}{\sigma} \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \\ & \underset{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| N | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{\infty} \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{8}{6} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { İ } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\square} \\ & \dot{~} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \bullet \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { no } \\ & \stackrel{+}{\bullet} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{m} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\Sigma}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \\ & \stackrel{\bullet}{-} \\ & \stackrel{-}{-} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & -\quad \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{+}{1} \\ & \underset{-}{7} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{-} \\ & \underset{-}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{i}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\square} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \dot{7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N. } \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{7} \\ & \dot{\square} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{Y}} \\ & \stackrel{-}{-1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \dot{O} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\sigma}{2} \end{aligned}$ |
| ¢ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i}} \underset{\sim}{2}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \overleftarrow{ே} \\ & \dot{( } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\bullet}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{7}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \text { n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\dot{y}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{m} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\dot{m}} \\ & \underset{m}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{\underset{m}{n}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\dot{y}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & \dot{y} \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{D}_{\infty} \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{M} \\ & \underset{m}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\curvearrowleft} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\circ}{0}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{m}{n} \\ & \dot{\omega} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\dot{b}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \vec{\infty} \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{o}} \\ & \stackrel{-}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{o}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\ & \stackrel{-}{-} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { ロ́ } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \circ \\ \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \\ \underset{\sim}{1} \\ \underset{\sim}{0} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\infty} \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\sim}$ $\sim$ $\sim$ $\sim$ $\underset{\sim}{0}$ $\underset{\sim}{1}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \underset{\sim}{\underset{~}{y}} \\ \underset{\sim}{\underset{y}{y}} \\ \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{array}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ $\underset{\sim}{U}$ $\underset{\sim}{u}$ $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\overleftarrow{ }} \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{+} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ O $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\stackrel{1}{0}$ $\stackrel{\sim}{m}$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\grave{H}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\omega} \\ & \underset{\omega}{o} \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{O}{O} \\ & \underset{\sim}{-} \\ & \underset{-}{7} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { © } \\ & \underset{\sim}{\pi} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Y } \\ & \text { z } \\ & \text { z } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## CPM Pairs from LSPM so Far Not WDS Listed - Part IV

| Name | RA | Dec | Sep | PA | M1 | M2 | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | e_pm1 | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Spc1 | Spc2 | Ap | Me | Date | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { CPM } \\ & \text { Rat } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Source/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 117.1495333 | 37.2024806 |  |  | 10.41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.209 |  | iT24 1x300s V-filter. No resolution of $B$ |
|  | 117.1494958 | 37.2024667 |  |  | 8.83 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | K7-M1 |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.209 |  | iT24 $1 \times 300$ s I-filter. No resolution of B. Spc based on VI color index |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes: There are five markers for the primary in SDSS-DR9, located 482 mas apart, so there's no way to be sure which is the primary - all values are similar - and the secondary is not identified. Not possible to locate secondary in the POSSI and POSSII images. |
| NSN n+8 | 075101.841 | +40 066.48 |  |  | 16.60 | 18.96 | -126.61 | -157.92 | 5.07 | -122.78 | -154.09 | 5.07 | >M4 | >M4 |  |  |  | AAAA | J0751+4006: Solid CPM candidate. |
|  | 117.7604580 | 40.1044440 | 7.769 | 187.638 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1953.198 |  | POSS I.E estimates. |
|  | 117.7589620 | 40.1030200 | 7.107 | 185.782 | 15.68 | 17.86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1986.905 |  | GSC 2.2. M1 and M2 are GSC 2.2 Rmags. Note: The GSC 2.2 Rmags are identical to the GSC 2.3 Fmags. |
|  | 117.7589620 | 40.1030200 | 7.107 | 185.782 | 16.27 | 17.86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1986.905 |  | GSC 2.3. M1 is GSC 2.3 Vmag , M2 is GSC 2.3 Fmag. |
|  | 117.7584380 | 40.1025350 | 7.431 | 186.233 | 14.70 | 16.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | E2 | 1998.272 |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band |
|  | 117.7581250 | 40.0124440 | 7.100 | 180.000 |  |  | -150.00 | -168.00 |  | -126.00 | -154.00 |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1999.172 |  | POSS II.N estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.E. |
|  | 117.7583310 | 40.1024470 | 7.373 | 185.680 | 16.68 | 19.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | Es | 2000.244 |  | SDSS DR9. M1 and M2 are gmag+rmag/2 (used when gmag > 15.0). |
|  | 117.7583310 | 40.1024470 | 7.373 | 185.680 | 16.68 | 19.04 | -149.39 | -160.62 | 43.02 | -110.30 | -135.07 | 43.02 |  |  | 2.5 | Es | 2000.244 | BCCA | SDSS DR9. M1 and M2 are gmag+rmag/2 (used when gmag > 15.0). PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS . |
|  | 117.7576689 | 40.1018011 |  |  | 14.71 |  | -103.30 | -146.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2002.118 |  | UCAC5 with GAIA coordinates. Secondary not identified in UCAC5. M1 is from J and K values. PmRA1 and pmDec1 are from UCAC5 data. |
|  | 117.7581522 | 40.1023253 |  |  | 15.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2002.118 |  | UCAC5 coordinates used here. Secondary not identified. M1 is UCAC5 Gmag value. |
|  | 117.7578630 | 40.1020400 | 7.032 | 185.573 | 14.70 | 16.20 | -132.10 | -148.60 | 9.90 | -121.70 | -116.20 | 21.70 |  |  | 0.4 | Hw | 2010.500 | BCCA | WISE. M1 from WISE J and K magnitudes. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 117.7576872 | 40.1018531 | 7.352 | 185.746 | 14.71 | 16.16 | -132.98 | -157.90 | 5.46 | -128.28 | -153.09 | 5.45 |  |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2013.828 | AAAA | URAT1. M1 and M2 from URAT1 $J$ and $K$ values. $P M$ data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 117.7576688 | 40.1018012 | 7.361 | 185.791 | 15.04 | 16.97 | -126.61 | -157.92 | 5.07 | -122.78 | -154.09 | 5.07 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS . |
|  | 117.7575292 | 40.1016639 | 7.558 | 186.450 | 16.60 | 18.96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.209 |  | iT24 1x300s V-filter |
|  | 117.7575542 | 40.1018056 | 7.365 | 186.350 | 13.86 | 15.78 |  |  |  |  |  |  | >M4 | >M4 | 0.61 | C | 2017.075 |  | iT24 1x60s I-filter. SNR B <20. Spc based on V-I color index |

## CPM Pairs from LSPM so Far Not WDS Listed - Part IV

| Name | RA | Dec | Sep | PA | M1 | M2 | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | e_pm1 | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Spc1 | Spc2 | Ap | Me | Date | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPM } \\ & \text { Rat } \end{aligned}$ | Source/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes: Secondary not identified in WISE, M1 J and $K$ data in WISE appears to be unreliable since it results in a visual equivalent magnitude of 7.136. Only one object identified in URAT1, which doesn't appear to be either component based on URAT1 PM data. |
| KPP n+9 | 07544.665 | +13 0553.48 |  |  | 15.50 | 16.09 | 170.41 | -231.51 | 8.81 | 182.58 | -241.61 | 6.06 | G5-K3 | K5-M0 |  |  |  | BCAB | J0754+1305: Very difficult pair due to $13^{\text {th }}$ magnitude star which overwhelms the $15^{\text {th }}$ magnitude LSPM primary to the extent that most surveys fail to pick up the primary. Possibly a better PM candidate than the rating indicates. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 15.43 |  |  |  | 178.20 | -247.50 |  |  |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2000.923 |  | UCAC5. Primary not identified in UCAC5. M2 is UCAC5 Gmag, pmRA2 and pmDec2 are UCAC5 PM data. |
|  | 118.5189490 | 13.0988340 | 11.457 | 225.287 | 16.30 | 16.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | Es | 2004.941 |  | SDSS DR7. Vmags estimated from (gmag+rmag)/2. Three super-imposed objects at both primary and secondary positions, took the northernmost of the primary and used the object with the same epoch at the secondary location. |
|  | 118.5189590 | 13.0988730 | 11.571 | 224.916 | 16.10 | 16.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | Es | 2004.951 |  | SDSS DR9. M1 and M2 are gmag+rmag/2 (used when gmag > 15.0). Five superimposed objects at both primary and secondary locations, took the northernmost in each case (with same epoch). |
|  | 118.5194374 | 13.0981878 | 11.442 | 224.496 | 15.63 | 15.43 | 170.41 | -231.51 | 8.81 | 182.58 | -241.61 | 6.06 |  |  | 1.0 | Hg | 2015.000 | BCAB | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with SDSS DR7. |
|  | 118.5194374 | 13.0981878 | 11.442 | 224.496 | 15.63 | 15.43 | 166.92 | -245.48 | 6.76 | 181.88 | -242.33 | 0.16 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | CCAB | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with SDSS DR9. |
|  | 118.5192792 | 13.0982639 | 11.311 | 220.035 | 15.50 | 16.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.076 |  | iT24 1x60s V-filter. Star disk A overlaps with background star |
|  | 118.5196458 | 13.0979972 | 11.729 | 227.194 | 14.78 | 14.61 |  |  |  |  |  |  | G5-K3 | K5-M0 | 0.61 | C | 2017.076 |  | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Star disk A overlaps with background star. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes: Primary not identified in 2MASS, WISE, GSC 2.2 and 2.3, and URAT1. Not possible to detect primary in POSSI and POSSII images - southeasterly motion of secondary is obvious, but no indication of an object moving southeasterly across the face of the $13^{\text {th }}$ magnitude star that overwhelms the primary. |

## CPM Pairs from LSPM so Far Not WDS Listed - Part IV

Table 1 (continued). Research results for potential common proper motion pairs found in the LSPM catalog. Headline object position based on the most precise J2000 coordinates currently available for A (in most cases from the GAIA DR1 catalog)

| Name | RA | Dec | Sep | PA | M1 | M2 | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | e_pm1 | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Spc1 | Spc2 | Ap | Me | Date | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { CPM } \\ & \text { Rat } \end{aligned}$ | Source/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NSN n+9 | 085810.034 | +52 2714.55 |  |  | 17.04 | 17.56 | -130.92 | -135.43 | 5.59 | -131.43 | -130.54 | 5.59 | >M4 | >M4 |  |  |  | AAAA | J0858+5227: Solid CPM candidate. |
|  | 134.5453750 | 52.4559170 | 5.480 | 288.071 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1954.146 |  | POSS I.E estimates. |
|  | 134.5432620 | 52.4549340 | 5.542 | 280.516 | 16.90 | 17.57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1991.110 |  | GSC 2.3. M1 and M2 are GSC 2.3 Vmag values. |
|  | 134.5426250 | 52.4550830 | 5.126 | 281.250 |  |  | -141.00 | -70.00 |  | -137.00 | -87.00 |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1997.908 |  | POSS II.J estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.E. |
|  | 134.5427150 | 52.4546130 | 5.742 | 280.329 | 15.20 | 15.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | E2 | 1999.825 |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band. |
|  | 134.5426720 | 52.4546280 | 5.773 | 281.001 | 17.10 | 17.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | Es | 2000.245 |  | SDSS DR9. M1 and M2 are gmag+rmag/2 (used when gmag > 15.0). |
|  | 134.5418925 | 52.4540978 | 5.756 | 280.956 | 15.56 | 15.22 | -129.97 | -133.59 | 6.11 | -130.15 | -128.96 | 6.11 |  |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2013.708 | AAAA | URAT1. M1 and M2 from URAT1 $J$ and $K$ values. $P M$ data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 134.5418093 | 52.4540421 | 5.763 | 281.041 | 15.52 | 16.00 | -128.26 | -142.94 | 0.19 | -127.58 | -142.79 | 0.19 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with SDSS DR9. |
|  | 134.5418093 | 52.4540421 | 5.763 | 281.041 | 15.52 | 16.00 | -130.92 | -135.43 | 5.59 | -131.43 | -130.54 | 5.59 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 134.5415583 | 52.4539611 | 5.596 | 282.802 | 17.04 | 17.56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.084 |  | iT24 1x180s V-filter |
|  | 134.5417708 | 52.4539750 | 5.728 | 281.071 | 14.16 | 14.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  | >M4 | >M4 | 0.61 | C | 2017.076 |  | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes: Primary not identified in WISE. Neither of the components is identified in UCAC5. |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { KPP } \\ \mathrm{n}+10 \end{gathered}$ | 091444.527 | +18 0615.48 |  |  | 15.89 | 19.20 | -131.44 | -94.38 | 5.89 | -129.93 | -94.32 | 5.89 | M2-M4 | M1-m3 |  |  |  | AAAA | J0914+1806: Solid CPM candidate. M2 estimated as being 0.1 magnitude fainter than faintest stars resolved in V-filter image. |
|  | 138.6880000 | 18.1060000 | 11.300 | 112.917 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1950.214 |  | POSS I.O estimates. |
|  | 138.6861250 | 18.1051390 | 11.547 | 115.660 |  |  | -150.00 | -73.00 |  | -150.00 | -87.00 |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1990.088 |  | POSS II.N estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.O. |
|  | 138.6862500 | 18.1047450 | 11.177 | 112.258 | 16.08 | 19.37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1997.187 |  | GSC 2.3. M1 is GSC 2.3 Vmag , M2 is GSC 2.3 f.mag. |
|  | 138.6861830 | 18.1047460 | 10.932 | 113.317 | 14.50 | 17.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | E2 | 1998.031 |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band. |
|  | 138.6859340 | 18.1045600 | 10.915 | 113.293 | 16.00 | 20.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | Es | 2005.053 |  | SDSS DR9. M1 and M2 are gmag+rmag/2 (used when gmag > 15.0). |
|  | 138.6855836 | 18.1043353 | 10.977 | 113.052 | 15.80 | 17.42 | -130.36 | -93.97 | 6.36 | -129.05 | -93.97 | 6.48 | >M4 |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2013.610 | AAAA | URAT1. M1 is URAT1 Vmag, M2 is from URAT1 J and K values. Spc1 is URAT1 B-V value. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 138.6855312 | 18.1043011 | 10.955 | 113.258 | 14.66 | 18.30 | -138.57 | -93.69 | 0.16 | -134.62 | -94.66 | 3.02 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | BBAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with SDSS DR9. |
|  | 138.6855312 | 18.1043011 | 10.955 | 113.258 | 14.66 | 18.30 | -131.44 | -94.38 | 5.89 | -129.93 | -94.32 | 5.89 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
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Table 1 (continued). Research results for potential common proper motion pairs found in the LSPM catalog. Headline object position based on the most precise J2000 coordinates currently available for A (in most cases from the GAIA DR1 catalog)

| Name | RA | Dec | Sep | PA | M1 | M2 | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | e_pm1 | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Spc1 | Spc2 | Ap | Me | Date | CPM | Source/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 138.6854333 | 18.1042194 |  |  | 15.89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | $\left.\begin{gathered} 2017.21 \\ 0 \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ |  | iT24 $1 \times 300$ s $V$-filter. No resolution of $B$, has to be fainter than 19.1Vmag |
|  | 138.6854667 | 18.1042667 | 10.942 | 112.514 | 13.66 | 17.11 |  |  |  |  |  |  | M2-M4 | M1-M3 | 0.61 | C | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 2017.21 \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ |  | iT24 1x300s I-filter. Spc based on V-I color index. Vmag2 estimated 19.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes: Neither of the components is identified in UCAC5 and WISE. |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { NSN } \\ \mathrm{n}+10 \end{gathered}$ | 092527.696 | +21 0231.22 |  |  | 14.53 | 19.60 | -138.70 | -76.95 | 6.02 | -146.97 | -75.47 | 6.02 | K7-M1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { M3- } \\ >\text { M4 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | AAAB | J0925+2102: Solid CPM Candidate. M2 estimated as being 0.1 magnitude fainter than faintest stars resolved in V -filter image. |
|  | 141.3672500 | 21.0436940 | 17.760 | 17.904 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | $\begin{gathered} 1951.09 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ |  | POSS I.E estimates. |
|  | 141.3657500 | 21.0425830 | 17.654 | 15.642 |  |  | -118.00 | -94.00 |  | -134.00 | -91.00 |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | $\begin{gathered} 1999.20 \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | POSS II.F estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.E. |
|  | 141.3660550 | 21.0423600 | 17.341 | 14.566 | 14.27 | 19.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | $\begin{gathered} 1999.20 \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  | GSC 2.3. M1 is GSC 2.3 Vmag , M2 is GSC 2.3 f.mag. |
|  | 141.3659800 | 21.0423070 | 17.394 | 14.293 | 13.90 | 17.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | E2 | $\begin{gathered} 2000.91 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band |
|  | 141.3657950 | 21.0422230 | 17.432 | 14.169 | 14.80 | 20.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | Es | $\left.\begin{gathered} 2005.04 \\ 7 \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ |  | SDSS DR9. M1 and M2 are gmag+rmag/2 (used when gmag > 15.0). |
|  | 141.3656100 | 21.0421410 | 17.494 | 14.299 | 13.90 | 17.30 | -132.00 | -63.50 | 11.40 | -129.20 | -53.10 | 20.10 |  |  | 0.4 | Hw | $\begin{gathered} 2010.33 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | BACB | WISE. M1 and M2 from WISE J and K magnitudes. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 141.3654563 | 21.0420264 | 17.412 | 14.069 | 14.92 | 17.32 | -135.81 | -77.97 | 6.55 | -139.64 | -74.80 | 6.51 | >K4 |  | 0.2 | Eu | $\begin{gathered} 2013.91 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | AAAB | URAT1. M1 is URAT1 Vmag, M2 is from URAT1 J and K values. Spc1 is URAT1 B-V value. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 141.3653985 | 21.0420059 | 17.385 | 13.903 | 13.66 | 18.35 | -133.84 | -78.51 | 7.27 | -142.85 | -81.12 | 7.85 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | $\begin{gathered} 2015.00 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | BCAB | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with SDSS DR9. |
|  | 141.3653985 | 21.0420059 | 17.385 | 13.903 | 13.66 | 18.35 | -138.70 | -76.95 | 6.02 | -146.97 | -75.47 | 6.02 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | $\begin{gathered} 2015.00 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | AAAB | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 141.3653333 | 21.0419028 |  |  | 14.53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | $\left.\begin{gathered} 2017.20 \\ 9 \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ |  | iT24 1x300s V-filter. No resolution of $B$, has to be fainter than 19.5 V mag |
|  | 141.3653333 | 21.0419528 | 17.309 | 14.473 | 12.79 | 17.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  | K7-M1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { M3- } \\ >\mathrm{M} \end{gathered}$ | 0.61 | C | $\left.\begin{gathered} 2017.20 \\ 9 \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ |  | iT24 1x300s I-filter. Spc based on V-I color index. Vmag2 estimated 19.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes: Neither of the components is identified in UCAC5. |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{KPP} \\ \mathrm{n}+11 \end{gathered}$ | 094743.251 | +38 2008.27 |  |  | 16.71 | 17.53 | 103.82 | -298.99 | 5.07 | 104.24 | 297.76 | 5.07 | >M4 | >M4 |  |  |  | AAAA | $\begin{aligned} & \text { J0947+3820: Solid CPM } \\ & \text { candidate. } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 146.9280000 | 38.3412220 | 4.929 | 291.420 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | $\begin{gathered} 1953.10 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | POSS I.O estimates |
|  | 146.9293400 | 38.3376020 | 5.267 | 291.534 | 15.62 | 16.29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | $\begin{gathered} 1992.09 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | GSC 2.3. M1 and M2 are GSC 2.3 f.mag values. |
|  | 146.9292920 | 38.3374170 | 5.115 | 289.413 |  |  | 85.00 | -320.00 |  | 80.00 | -323.00 |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | $\begin{gathered} 1997.16 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  | POSS II.J estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.O. |
|  | 146.9295970 | 38.3370210 | 5.376 | 291.282 | 14.90 | 15.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | E2 | $\begin{gathered} 1998.25 \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band. |

Table 1 continues on next page.
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| Name | RA | Dec | Sep | PA | M1 | M2 | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | e_pm1 | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Spc1 | Spc2 | Ap | Me | Date | CPM | Source/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 146.9297780 | 38.3366220 | 5.373 | 291.540 | 16.80 | 17.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | Es | 2002.999 |  | SDSS DR9. M1 and M2 are gmag+rmag/2 (used when gmag > 15.0). |
|  | 146.9300320 | 38.3360650 | 5.321 | 290.061 |  |  | 101.70 | -285.00 | 12.00 | 102.70 | -295.50 | 17.60 |  |  | 0.4 | Hw | 2010.331 | AABA | WISE. J and K magnitudes not listed in WISE. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 146.9301661 | 38.3357169 | 5.337 | 291.238 | 14.95 | 15.62 | 103.00 | -300.90 | 5.44 | 104.83 | -300.87 | 5.42 |  |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2013.889 | AAAA | URAT1. M1 and M2 from URAT1 f.mag values. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 146.9302127 | 38.3356303 | 5.377 | 291.513 | 15.33 | 16.00 | 102.27 | -297.48 | 0.13 | 101.92 | -297.57 | 0.24 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with SDSS DR9. |
|  | 146.9302127 | 38.3356303 | 5.377 | 291.513 | 15.33 | 16.00 | 103.82 | -298.99 | 5.07 | 104.24 | 297.76 | 5.07 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 146.9303333 | 38.3354778 | 5.317 | 290.246 | 16.71 | 17.53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.084 |  | iT24 $1 \times 180 \mathrm{~s}$ V-filter. SNR B $<20$ |
|  | 146.9302917 | 38.3350583 | 5.422 | 289.276 | 13.69 | 14.37 |  |  |  |  |  |  | >M4 | >M4 | 0.61 | C | 2017.076 |  | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes: Neither of the components is identified in UCAC5. |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { NSN } \\ \mathrm{n}+11 \end{gathered}$ | 095439.40 | +24 2754.07 |  |  | 19.00 |  | -191.64 | -26.29 | 49.23 | -191.35 | -26.86 | 50.02 | >M4 |  |  |  |  | ABCA | J0954+2427: Possible PM candidate, but limited ability to reach a conclusion because secondary not identified in 2MASS, URAT1, and GAIA DR1. POSSI and POSSII data promising, but certainly not conclusive. |
|  | 148.6695000 | 24.4658060 | 4.460 | 199.676 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1955.216 |  | POSS I.E estimates. |
|  | 148.6675000 | 24.4653330 | 4.366 | 200.118 |  |  | -153.00 | -40.00 |  | -153.00 | -37.00 |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1990.209 |  | POSS II.J estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.E. |
|  | 148.6677960 | 24.4652080 | 4.740 | 194.944 | 18.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1990.737 |  | GSC 2.3. M1 is GSC 2.3 Vmag, no Vmag or f.mag shown for secondary. |
|  | 148.6669950 | 24.4651080 | 4.828 | 197.089 | 18.98 | 20.54 | -191.64 | -26.29 | 49.23 | -191.35 | -26.86 | 50.02 |  |  | 2.5 | Es | 2004.957 | ABCA | SDSS DR9. M1 and M2 are gmag+rmag/2 (used when gmag > 15.0). PM data calculated from position comparison with GSC 2.3. |
|  | 148.6664914 | 24.4650306 |  |  | 16.26 |  | -193.60 | -40.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2013.714 |  | URAT1. M1 is from URAT1 J and K values, $P M$ data is directly from URAT1 data. Secondary not identified in URAT1. |
|  | 148.6664176 | 24.4650203 |  |  | 17.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 |  | GAIA DR1. M1 is from GAIA Gband. Secondary not identified in GAIA. |
|  | 148.6663417 | 24.4650333 |  |  | 19.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.210 |  | iT24 1x300s V-filter. SNR A <10. No resolution of $B$, has to be fainter than 19.5 V mag |
|  | 148.6663375 | 24.4649889 |  |  | 15.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | >M4 |  | 0.61 | c | 2017.210 |  | iT24 $1 \times 300$ s I-filter. No resolution of $B$, has to be fainter than 18.9 Imag. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes: Secondary not identified in 2MASS and WISE, neither of the components is identified in UCAC5. |
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Table 1 (continued). Research results for potential common proper motion pairs found in the LSPM catalog. Headline object position based on the most precise J2000 coordinates currently available for A (in most cases from the GAIA DR1 catalog)

| Name | RA | Dec | Sep | PA | M1 | M2 | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | e_pm1 | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Spc1 | Spc2 | Ap | Me | Date | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPM } \\ & \text { Rat } \end{aligned}$ | Source/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 155.8153175 | 54.6687317 |  |  | 15.56 |  | -66.10 | -77.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2003.123 |  | UCAC5 coordinates used here. Secondary not identified. M1 is UCAC5 f.mag value. PmRA1 and pmDec1 are from UCC5 data. |
|  | 155.8151230 | 54.6685940 | 8.765 | 259.612 | 14.50 | 15.90 | -59.10 | -71.30 | 10.70 | -57.10 | -47.10 | 19.80 |  |  | 0.4 | Hw | 2010.326 | CCCB | WISE. M1 and M2 from WISE J and K magnitudes. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 155.8149631 | 54.6685119 | 8.873 | 258.317 | 15.77 | 15.90 | -68.31 | -74.68 | 7.87 | -71.72 | -72.31 | 7.87 | K7 |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2013.820 | AABA | URAT1. M1 is URAT1 Vmag, M2 is visual estimate from URAT1 J and K values; Spc1 is URAT1 B-V value. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 155.8149405 | 54.6684759 | 8.867 | 258.354 | 14.63 | 16.27 | -61.43 | -81.80 | 0.11 | -61.83 | -81.31 | 0.33 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with SDSS DR9. |
|  | 155.8149405 | 54.6684759 | 8.867 | 258.354 | 14.63 | 16.27 | -66.05 | -77.45 | 7.25 | -68.91 | -74.85 | 7.25 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AABA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 155.8148083 | 54.6684806 | 8.915 | 259.335 | 15.86 | 17.73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.155 |  | iT24 1x180s V-filter |
|  | 155.8148125 | 54.6684806 | 8.982 | 257.265 | 13.21 | 14.79 |  |  |  |  |  |  | >M4 | >M4 | 0.61 | C | 2017.081 |  | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Spc based on V-I color index |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { KPP } \\ \mathrm{n}+13 \end{gathered}$ | 103449.131 | +01 5840.54 |  |  | 14.71 | 14.78 | 125.03 | -150.88 | 5.70 | 123.58 | -151.00 | 5.70 | M1-M3 | M1-M3 |  |  |  | AAAB | J1034+0158: Solid CPM Candidate. |
|  | 158.7021250 | 1.9807222 | 8.762 | 124.974 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1952.079 |  | POSS I.O estimates |
|  | 158.7038900 | 1.9788790 | 8.888 | 124.742 | 13.67 | 13.68 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1991.050 |  | GSC 2.3. M1 and M2 are GSC 2.3 f.mag values. |
|  | 158.7040417 | 1.9787222 | 8.640 | 125.361 |  |  | 161.00 | -168.00 |  | 158.00 | -168.00 |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1995.091 |  | POSS II.J estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.O. |
|  | 158.7041930 | 1.9785520 | 8.989 | 124.940 | 13.60 | 13.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | E2 | 2000.106 |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band |
|  | 158.7041430 | 1.9785340 | 8.984 | 124.935 | 14.80 | 14.90 | 97.95 | -133.65 | 51.76 | 104.53 | -142.17 | 51.76 |  |  | 2.5 | Es | 2000.343 | ABCB | SDSS DR9. M1 and M2 are gmag+rmag/2 (used when gmag > 15.0). PM data calculated from position comparison with GSC 2.3. |
|  | 158.7045610 | 1.9781410 | 8.812 | 124.927 | 13.60 | 13.80 | 128.60 | -143.80 | 12.60 | 114.30 | -134.30 | 11.50 |  |  | 0.4 | Hw | 2010.399 | ABBB | WISE. M1 and M2 from WISE J and K magnitudes. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 158.7046803 | 1.9779633 | 9.000 | 125.068 | 14.18 | 13.79 | 125.68 | -151.92 | 6.08 | 124.57 | -152.41 | 6.04 | >M4 |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2014.110 | AAAB | URAT1. M1 is URAT1 Vmag, M2 is visual estimate based on URAT1 J and K magnitudes, Spcl is URAT1 $B-V$ value. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 158.7047106 | 1.9779278 | 8.972 | 125.028 | 13.70 | 13.75 | 139.32 | -148.90 | 1.16 | 138.19 | -149.26 | 1.30 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAC | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with SDSS DR9. |
|  | 158.7047106 | 1.9779278 | 8.972 | 125.028 | 13.70 | 13.75 | 125.03 | -150.88 | 5.70 | 123.58 | -151.00 | 5.70 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAB | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS . |
|  | 158.7048000 | 1.9778278 | 9.000 | 125.295 | 14.71 | 14.78 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.305 |  | iT24 1x60s V-filter |
|  | 158.7048250 | 1.9778694 | 8.986 | 125.669 | 12.59 | 12.65 |  |  |  |  |  |  | M1-M3 | M1-M3 | 0.61 | C | 2017.305 |  | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes: Neither of the components is identified in UCAC5. |
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Table 1 (continued). Research results for potential common proper motion pairs found in the LSPM catalog. Headline object position based on the most precise J2000 coordinates currently available for A (in most cases from the GAIA DR1 catalog)

| Name | RA | Dec | Sep | PA | M1 | M2 | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | e_pm1 | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Spc1 | Spc2 | Ap | Me | Date | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPM } \\ & \text { Rat } \end{aligned}$ | Source/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { NSN } \\ \mathrm{n}+13 \end{gathered}$ | 111109.689 | +02 2106.80 |  |  | 16.14 | 19.20 | -150.62 | -143.33 | 8.24 | -151.51 | -143.44 | 8.98 | >M4 | $\underset{\substack{\text { M2- } \\>\text { M4 }}}{ }$ |  |  |  | AAAA | J1111+0221: Solid CPM candidate. M2 estimated as being 0.1 magnitude fainter than faintest stars resolved in $V$-filter image. |
|  | 167.7924170 | 2.3548610 | 7.830 | 282.539 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1955.285 |  | POSS I.E estimates. |
|  | 167.7910000 | 2.3530000 | 7.901 | 284.663 |  |  | -119.00 | -157.00 |  | -110.00 | -150.00 |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1995.151 |  | POSS II.F estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.E. |
|  | 167.7911910 | 2.3526890 | 7.883 | 285.088 | 15.13 | 19.45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1995.154 |  | GSC 2.3. M1 and M2 are GSC 2.3 f.mag values. |
|  | 167.7909820 | 2.3524660 | 8.036 | 283.973 | 14.20 | 17.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | E2 | 2000.234 |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band. |
|  | 167.7903706 | 2.3518881 |  |  | 14.62 |  | -154.90 | -139.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2000.262 |  | UCAC5 with GAIA coordinates. M1 is UCAC5 Gmag value. Secondary not identified. PmRA1 and pmDecl are from UCAC5 data. |
|  | 167.7910053 | 2.3524589 |  |  | 14.21 |  | -154.90 | -139.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2000.262 |  | UCAC5 coordinates used here. M1 is from J and K values. Secondary not identified. PmRA1 and pmDec1 are from UCAC5 data. |
|  | 167.7909700 | 2.3524270 | 8.119 | 284.534 | 16.20 | 20.90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | Es | 2000.979 |  | SDSS DR9. M1 and M2 are gmag+rmag/2 (used when gmag > 15.0). |
|  | 167.7905740 | 2.3520690 | 8.003 | 282.153 | 14.20 | 17.20 | -144.10 | -140.30 | 70.80 | -146.50 | -165.40 | 45.80 |  |  | 0.4 | Hw | 2010.423 | BBCA | WISE. M1 and M2 from WISE J and K magnitudes. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 167.7904069 | 2.3519192 | 8.011 | 284.352 | 16.21 | 17.16 | -155.93 | -140.74 | 1.80 | -152.18 | -148.47 | 5.11 | K7 |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2013.805 | BAAA | URAT1. M1 is URAT1 Vmag, M2 is visual estimate from URAT1 J and K magnitudes; Spc1 is URAT1 B-V value. PM data calculated from position comparison with SDSS DR9. |
|  | 167.7904069 | 2.3519192 | 8.011 | 284.352 | 16.21 | 17.16 | -150.62 | -143.33 | 8.24 | -151.51 | -143.44 | 8.98 | K7 |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2013.805 | AAAA | URAT1. M1 is URAT1 Vmag, M2 is visual estimate from URAT1 J and K magnitudes; Spc1 is URAT1 B-V value. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 167.7902042 | 2.3518306 |  |  | 16.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.324 |  | iT24 1x300s V-filter. No resolution of $B$, has to be fainter than 19.1 Vmag |
|  | 167.7902958 | 2.3517139 | 7.075 | 287.182 | 13.41 | 16.87 |  |  |  |  |  |  | >M4 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{M} 2- \\ >\mathrm{M} 4 \end{gathered}$ | 0.61 | C | 2017.324 |  | iT24 1x300s I-filter. Touching star disks. Spc based on V-I color index with Vmag2 assumed 19.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes: Secondary not identified in GAIA DR1. |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { KPP } \\ \mathrm{n}+14 \end{gathered}$ | 113958.062 | +34 5421.18 |  |  | 15.15 | 17.23 | 176.72 | -141.90 | 9.13 | 178.10 | -143.32 | 9.13 | >M4 | >M4 |  |  |  | AAAB | $\begin{aligned} & \text { J1139+3454: Solid CPM } \\ & \text { candidate. } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 174.9885420 | 34.9083890 | 8.275 | 101.149 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1950.365 |  | POSS I.E estimates. |
|  | 174.9905420 | 34.9072220 | 7.773 | 101.127 |  |  | 138.00 | -98.00 |  | 127.00 | -96.00 |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1998.326 |  | POSS II.N estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.E. |
|  | 174.9911550 | 34.9064770 | 8.120 | 99.467 | 14.73 | 16.91 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1999.346 |  | GSC 2.3. M1 and M2 are GSC 2.3 Vmag values. |
|  | 174.9910420 | 34.9064640 | 8.247 | 100.360 | 13.60 | 15.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | E2 | 2000.262 |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band. |
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Table 1 （continued）．Research results for potential common proper motion pairs found in the LSPM catalog．Headline object position based on the most precise J2000 coor－ dinates currently available for A（in most cases from the GAIA DR1 catalog）

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { M } \\ & \text { 㩊 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 栄 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 学 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 委 } \\ & \text { 苃 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 委 } \\ & \text { 品 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 采 } \\ & \text { 年 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{\text { ® }} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & \dot{N} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{v} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{1}{N} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{o}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\infty$ $\stackrel{\infty}{N}$ $\stackrel{+}{\circ}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n} \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{~N}} \\ & \stackrel{y}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{v}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} n \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \underset{v}{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{u}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{4} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\pi}{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{n} \\ \mu \\ \\ \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{+}{\circ} \\ & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{-} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{+} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{J} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{8} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\bullet}{1} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{+} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{v} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \dot{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{v}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ |
| $\stackrel{N}{2}$ | 品 | 品 | 留 | 3 | 品 | 寝 | 家 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | Q | N | $\stackrel{\square}{4}$ | 品 | 需 | 留 | 定 | 定 |
| 号 | $\because$ | $\because$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\because$ | $\bigcirc$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{0} \\ & \dot{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\because$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\circ}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { ín } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 芥 | $$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{-}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { 关 }}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jy } \\ & \text { y } \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${\underset{\sim}{N}}_{\substack{N}}$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{+}{\infty}$ $\stackrel{+}{\sim}$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\text { a }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\underset{N}{0}}{\substack{2}}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\stackrel{m}{2}}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty}$ | $n$ $\square$ $\stackrel{+}{\square}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { U. } \\ & \text { é } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \dot{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{1}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\omega} \\ & \stackrel{1}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{m} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\infty} \\ & \underset{1}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\Omega}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \dot{i} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | ت $\stackrel{\text { İ }}{ }$ İ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |
|  |  |  |  | ㅇ․ $\stackrel{\text { N}}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{-}{7} \\ & \stackrel{6}{7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{I}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\square} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 0 $\underset{\sim}{1}$ $\stackrel{\sim}{0}$ $\vdots$ |  |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\stackrel{0}{\circ}$ $\stackrel{0}{1}$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ | 0 $\vdots$ $\stackrel{1}{0}$ $\underset{1}{3}$ |
| $\vec{N}_{0}^{\tilde{E}_{1}}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\gamma} \\ & \dot{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \stackrel{n}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{n}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { m } \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { - } \\ & \text { 0. } \\ & \text { é } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\underset{~}{+}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{+} \\ & \underset{i}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{1}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{+} \\ & \underset{1}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{1} \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{n} \\ & \stackrel{6}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\text { a }} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت̆ } \\ & \text { 炭 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{n} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\dot{~}} \\ & \stackrel{1}{c} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\lambda} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \Omega_{0} \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \stackrel{-}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\square} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{m}{n} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \underset{1}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{8}{\stackrel{0}{0}} \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \\ & \stackrel{1}{n} \\ & \underset{1}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $n$ $\underset{\sim}{n}$ $\underset{\sim}{0}$ $\underset{\sim}{3}$ |
| N |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n}}{\stackrel{1}{i}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{m} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{7} \\ & \stackrel{i}{i} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\subsetneq} \\ & \stackrel{i}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} n \\ \\ \underset{\sim}{n} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\infty} \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ザ } \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \infty \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N్ } \\ & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ñ } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ |
| $\underset{\Sigma}{\text { I }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { } \\ & \dot{\infty} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{n} \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \dot{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \dot{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\sim} \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \text { n } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} n \\ \vdots \\ \dot{n} \\ r \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \infty \\ \stackrel{\circ}{\dot{\sim}} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{-} \\ & \vdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{m} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\infty$ $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ $\underset{\sim}{+}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\square} \\ & \underset{\sim}{4} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\dot{\sim}} \end{aligned}$ |
| 世 |  |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\stackrel{0}{\circ}$ $\cdots$ | $\xrightarrow[\sim]{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{0}{7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{+} \\ & \dot{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\square} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \underset{\sim}{y} \\ \underset{\sim}{0} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n} \\ & \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \infty \\ \infty \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \\ \sim \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ñ } \\ & \text { N. } \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\dot{~}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { H} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\dot{\sim}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\dot{N}} \end{aligned}$ |
| $\stackrel{\circ}{0}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\tilde{n}}{\stackrel{N}{N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\circ}{n}}{\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}}$ | $\underset{\substack{\underset{\sim}{N} \\ \hline}}{ }$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{\underset{~}{~}} \underset{\sim}{\infty}}{ }$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\sim}{n} \\ \\ \cdots \\ \infty \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \underset{N}{\hat{N}} \\ \underset{\sim}{r} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{7} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \dot{\gamma} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ |
| ه́ | $\stackrel{-}{\infty}$ $\infty$ $\infty$ 0 $o$ $\vdots$ $\dot{m}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{-}{\infty}$ $\infty$ $\infty$ 0 $o$ $\stackrel{\sim}{n}$ $\dot{m}$ | $\stackrel{-}{\infty}$ <br> $\infty$ <br> $\infty$ <br> 0 <br> 0 <br>  <br> $\dot{m}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \\ & \hat{n} \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \dot{m} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}\right.$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{c} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ - \\ - \\ \hline \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \text { iे } \end{aligned}$ | － $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}$ - - |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \hat{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{m} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ |
| 出 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\ & \\ & \hline \end{aligned}\right.$ |  |  | 0 <br> $\infty$ <br> 0 <br>  <br>  <br> 0 <br> $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1}$ <br> - <br> - |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{y}{m} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\underset{~}{\lambda}} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { d } \\ & \underset{\sim}{5} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ¢ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Table 1 (continued). Research results for potential common proper motion pairs found in the LSPM catalog. Headline object position based on the most precise J2000 coordinates currently available for $A$ (in most cases from the GAIA DR1 catalog)

| Name | RA | Dec | Sep | PA | M1 | M2 | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | e_pm1 | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Spc1 | Spc2 | Ap | Me | Date | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPM } \\ & \text { Rat } \end{aligned}$ | Source/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 177.6616792 | 31.7067611 | 4.976 | 256.401 | 11.90 | 15.54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.330 |  | iT24 1x300s V-filter. Heavily overlapping star disks. SNR B <10 |
|  | 177.6617000 | 31.7067389 | 4.969 | 256.737 | 11.02 | 14.41 |  |  |  |  |  |  | K0-K4 | K3-K5 | 0.61 | C | 2017.330 |  | iT24 1x300s I-filter. Overlapping star disks. SNR B <20. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes: Secondary not identified in GSC 2.3 and WISE, M1 $J$ and $K$ data in WISE appears to be unreliable since it results in a visual equivalent magnitude of 7.136. Only one object identified in URAT1, which doesn't appear to be either component based on URAT1 PM data. |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { KPP } \\ \mathrm{n}+15 \end{gathered}$ | 120703.579 | +00 $12 \begin{array}{ll}51.35\end{array}$ |  |  | 15.36 | 20.88 | -172.32 | 25.40 | 6.73 | -170.31 | 19.83 | 6.73 | M2-M4 | >M4 |  |  |  | AAAA | J1207+0012: Solid CPM candidate. |
|  | 181.7677080 | 0.2137500 | 6.958 | 187.431 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1955.296 |  | POSS I.E estimates. |
|  | 181.7657500 | 0.2142220 | 7.031 | 191.070 |  |  | -165.00 | 40.00 |  | -175.00 | 40.00 |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1996.287 |  | POSS II.F estimates. PM estimates based on comparison with POSS I.E. |
|  | 181.7658970 | 0.2140850 | 7.093 | 192.456 | 14.35 | 18.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | Pp | 1996.290 |  | GSC 2.3. M1 and M2 are GSC 2.3 f.mag values. |
|  | 181.7657090 | 0.2141180 | 7.358 | 193.064 | 15.40 | 20.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | Es | 1999.221 |  | SDSS DR9. M1 and M2 are gmag+rmag/2 (used when gmag > 15.0). |
|  | 181.7656240 | 0.2141590 | 7.302 | 193.543 | 14.20 | 17.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | E2 | 2000.134 |  | 2MASS. M1 and M2 estimated from J- and K-band. |
|  | 181.7649125 | 0.2142639 |  |  | 14.19 |  | -184.20 | 35.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2000.392 |  | UCAC5 with GAIA coordinates. M1 is UCAC5 Gmag value. Secondary not identified. PmRA1 and pmDec1 are from UCAC5 data. |
|  | 181.7656597 | 0.2141208 |  |  | 14.18 |  | -184.20 | 35.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2000.392 |  | UCAC5 coordinates used here. M1 is from J and K values. Secondary not identified. PmRA1 and pmDec1 are from UCAC5 data. |
|  | 181.7649672 | 0.2142397 | 7.347 | 193.186 | 15.31 | 17.38 | -173.93 | 21.37 | 7.36 | -173.19 | 17.60 | 7.43 |  |  | 0.2 | Eu | 2013.659 | AAAA | URAT1. M1 is URAT1 Vmag, M2 estimated from URAT1 J and K values. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 181.7649124 | 0.2142639 | 7.376 | 193.167 | 14.19 | 18.03 | -181.74 | 33.28 | 0.17 | -182.81 | 32.37 | 3.66 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with SDSS DR9. |
|  | 181.7649124 | 0.2142639 | 7.376 | 193.167 | 14.19 | 18.03 | -172.32 | 25.40 | 6.73 | -170.31 | 19.83 | 6.73 |  |  | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AAAA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 are Gband. PM data calculated from position comparison with 2MASS. |
|  | 181.7647208 | 0.2143444 | 7.077 | 194.861 | 15.36 | 20.88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 | C | 2017.330 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { iT24 1x300s V-filter. Barely } \\ & \text { resolved, SNR B }<5 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 181.7646417 | 0.2144056 | 7.532 | 188.474 | 13.15 | 16.90 |  |  |  |  |  |  | M2-M4 | >M4 | 0.61 | C | 2017.330 |  | iT24 $1 \times 300$ s I-filter. SNR B <20. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Notes: Secondary not identified in WISE. |
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Table 1 (conclusion). Research results for potential common proper motion pairs found in the LSPM catalog. Headline object position based on the most precise J2000 coor-
dinates currently available for $A$ (in most cases from the GAIA DR1 catalog)
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search and measurements for these in a separate paper.
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## Appendix A

Description of the CPM assessment scheme according to Knapp/Nanson 2017 with extensions Four rating factors are used: Proper motion vector direction, proper motion vector length, size of position error in relation to proper motion vector length and relationship of proper motion speed to angular separation:

- Proper motion vector direction ratings: "A" for within the error range of identical direction, "B" for similar direction within the double error range, and "C" for outside
- Proper motion vector length ratings: "A" for within the error range of identical length, "B" for similar length within the double error range, and C for outside
- Error size ratings: "A" for error size of less than $5 \%$ of the proper motion vector length, "B" for less than $10 \%$, and "C" for a larger error size
- Relationship PM speed to angular separation: "A" for less than 100 years, " $B$ " for less than 1000 years and "C" for above

To compensate for excessively large position errors resulting in an "A" rating despite rather high deviations an absolute upper limit is applied regardless of calculated error size:

- Proper motion vector direction: Max. $2.86^{\circ}$ difference for an "A" and $5.72^{\circ}$ for a "B"
- Proper motion vector length: Max. $5 \%$ difference for an "A" and $10 \%$ for a "B"

In some cases we could use SDSS DR9 coordinates instead of 2MASS with much smaller position errors with the consequence that the requirements to get an A or even B CPM rating were unreasonably hard so we had to modify our process somewhat:

- The position error resulting from the error estimation for proper motion vector direction and length is in this case calculated as root mean square from both position errors (instead of for only the larger 2MASS one)
- If the PM vector direction difference is larger than this calculated "allowed" error but still less than $0.5^{\circ}$ then an " $A$ " is given, $a$ " $B$ " is given for larger than 0.5 but less than 1 degree, and a " $C$ " is given if above
- If the PM vector length difference is larger than this calculated "allowed" error but still less than $0.5 \%$ then an " $A$ " is given, a " $B$ " is given for larger than 0.5 but less than 1 percent, and a " $C$ " is given if above.
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## Appendix B

The following Table 2 gives the plate solving errors for the used iT24 images and error information derived therefrom for the measurements provided in Table 1 and also the measured positions for both components:

Table 2. Error estimations for the in table 1 provided measurements for the given objects:
$d R A$ and $d$ Dec $=$ average $R A$ and Dec plate solving errors in arcseconds
Err_Sep $=$ separation error estimation in arcseconds calculated as $\operatorname{SQRT}\left(d R A^{\wedge} 2+d D e c^{\wedge} 2\right)$
Err_PA = position angle error estimation in degrees calculated as arctan (Err_Sep/Sep) assuming the worst case that Err_Sep points perpendicular to the separation vector
dmag as average mag plate solving error (Vmag for images with made V-filter and Imag for images made with I-filter)
Err_Mag $=$ magnitude error estimation calculated as $\operatorname{SQRT}\left(\right.$ dVmag $\left.^{\wedge} 2+\left(2.5^{*} \operatorname{LOG1O}(1+1 / S N R)\right)^{\wedge} 2\right)$
SNR as signal to noise ratio for the given object

| Name |  | RA | Dec | dRA | dDec | Err Sep | Err PA | Err Mag | SNR | dmag | Date | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J0544+2120 | A | 054441.215 | 212051.62 | 0.080 | 0.090 | 0.120 | 1.138 | 0.052 | 76.45 | 0.050 | 2017.081 | iT24 1x60s V-filter. SNR B <20 |
|  | B | 054440.893 | 212047.56 |  |  |  |  | 0.112 | 10.33 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 054441.219 | 212051.56 | 0.090 | 0.080 | 0.120 | 1.240 | 0.120 | 111.16 | 0.120 | 2017.081 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 054440.943 | 212047.55 |  |  |  |  | 0.124 | 36.62 |  |  |  |
| J0611+3325 | A | 061156.172 | 332543.09 | 0.130 | 0.110 | - | - | 0.101 | 80.28 | 0.100 | 2017.209 | iT24 1x300s V-filter. No resolution of $B$, has to be fainter than 18.5 Vmag |
|  | B | - | - |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |
|  | A | 061156.185 | $33 \quad 2543.37$ | 0.110 | 0.120 | 0.163 | 0.758 | 0.121 | 98.38 | 0.120 | 2017.076 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. SNR B <20. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 061156.018 | 332531.24 |  |  |  |  | 0.129 | 22.43 |  |  |  |
| J0612+3721 | A | 061220.416 | $37 \quad 21 \quad 06.94$ | 0.120 | 0.120 | 0.170 | 3.361 | 0.092 | 58.74 | 0.090 | 2017.209 | iT24 1x300s V-filter. Heavily overlapping star disks |
|  | B | 061220.415 | $37 \quad 2104.05$ |  |  |  |  | 0.101 | 22.94 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 061220.444 | $37 \quad 21 \quad 06.91$ | 0.110 | 0.120 | 0.163 | 3.006 | 0.121 | 86.34 | 0.120 | 2017.327 | iT24 2x300s I-filter. Touching/ overlapping star disks |
|  | B | 061220.447 | $37 \quad 21 \quad 03.81$ |  |  |  |  | 0.121 | 62.23 |  |  |  |
| J0638+2255 | A | 063852.424 | $22 \quad 55 \quad 10.67$ | 0.100 | 0.120 | 0.156 | 1.907 | 0.051 | 134.58 | 0.050 | 2017.209 | ```iT24 1x300s V-filter. Heavily overlapping star disks. SNR B <20``` |
|  | B | 063852.448 | 225505.99 |  |  |  |  | 0.090 | 14.06 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 063852.436 | 225510.71 | 0.110 | 0.110 | 0.156 | 1.827 | 0.111 | 91.46 | 0.110 | 2017.084 | iT24 1x180s I-filter. SNR B <20. Heavily overlapping star disks. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 063852.453 | $22 \quad 5505.84$ |  |  |  |  | 0.133 | 14.19 |  |  |  |
| J0644+2855 | A | 064439.093 | 285526.18 | 0.120 | 0.120 | 0.170 | 1.739 | 0.061 | 90.07 | 0.060 | 2017.076 | iT24 1x60s V-filter |
|  | B | 064438.729 | 285523.28 |  |  |  |  | 0.079 | 20.41 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 064439.095 | $28 \quad 5526.38$ | 0.120 | 0.110 | 0.163 | 1.609 | 0.121 | 95.44 | 0.120 | 2017.076 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Spc based on $\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{I}$ color index |
|  | B | 064438.730 | $28 \quad 55 \quad 23.12$ |  |  |  |  | 0.125 | 29.84 |  |  |  |
| J0646+5214 | A | 064600.821 | $52 \quad 14 \quad 11.26$ | 0.120 | 0.110 | 0.163 | 4.046 | 0.112 | 55.65 | 0.110 | 2017.209 | iT24 1x300s V-filter. Overlapping star disks |
|  | B | 064600.812 | $52 \quad 14 \quad 13.56$ |  |  |  |  | 0.112 | 47.20 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 064600.816 | $\begin{array}{llll}52 & 14 & 10.88\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | 0.142 | 45.61 | 0.140 | 2017.209 | iT24 1x300s I-filter. Overlapping star disks. Spc based on $V$ -I color index |
|  | B | 064600.808 | $52 \quad 14 \quad 13.26$ |  |  |  |  | 0.142 | 44.37 |  |  |  |
| J0654+1708 | A | 065437.540 | 170803.09 | 0.110 | 0.120 | 0.163 | 2.474 | 0.073 | 50.54 | 0.070 | 2017.084 | ```iT24 1x180s V-filter. Touching star disks``` |
|  | B | 065437.572 | $17 \quad 08 \quad 06.83$ |  |  |  |  | 0.084 | 22.77 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 065437.536 | $17 \quad 0803.27$ | 0.130 | 0.120 | 0.177 | 3.038 | 0.142 | 47.80 | 0.140 | 2017.076 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Touching star disks. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 065437.569 | $17 \quad 08 \quad 06.57$ |  |  |  |  | 0.145 | 28.37 |  |  |  |
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Table 2 (continued). Error estimations for the in table 1 provided measurements for the given objects

| Name |  |  |  | RA |  | De |  | dRA | dDec | Err Sep | Err PA | Err Mag | SNR | dmag | Date | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J0659+5631 | A | 06 | 590 | 03.298 | 56 | 31 | 00.32 | 0.070 | 0.080 | 0.106 | 0.727 | 0.051 | 103.84 | 0.050 | 2017.209 | iT24 1x300s V-filter. SNR B <20 |
|  | B | 06 | 590 | 04.306 | 56 | 31 | 01.12 |  |  |  |  | 0.077 | 17.94 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 065 | 59 | 03.286 | 56 | 31 | 00.34 | 0.130 | 0.110 | 0.170 | 1.121 | 0.112 | 55.91 | 0.110 | 2017.076 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. SNR B <20. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 06 | 590 | 04.333 | 56 | 31 | 01.16 |  |  |  |  | 0.141 | 11.83 |  |  |  |
| J0705+3400 | A | 07 | 052 | 26.916 | 34 | 00 | 15.80 | 0.110 | 0.090 | 0.142 | 1.128 | 0.051 | 146.52 | 0.050 | 2017.084 | iT24 1x180s V-filter. SNR B <20 |
|  | B | 07 | 052 | 27.204 | 34 | 00 | 09.53 |  |  |  |  | 0.082 | 16.27 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 07 | 052 | 26.905 | 34 | 00 | 15.67 | 0.100 | 0.110 | 0.149 | 1.335 | 0.120 | 184.16 | 0.120 | 2017.209 | iT24 1x300s I-filter. Touching star disks. SNR B $<10$. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 07 | 052 | 27.149 | 34 | 00 | 10.06 |  |  |  |  | 0.256 | 4.33 |  |  |  |
| J0721+2555 | A | 07 | 21 | 43.377 | 25 | 54 | 58.82 | 0.120 | 0.120 | 0.170 | 2.034 | 0.081 | 92.85 | 0.080 | 2017.084 | iT24 1x180s V-filter. Heavily overlapping star disks |
|  | B | 07 | 214 | 43.731 | 25 | 54 | 58.95 |  |  |  |  | 0.088 | 29.09 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 07 | 21 | 43.370 | 25 | 54 | 58.89 | 0.110 | 0.100 | 0.149 | 2.002 | 0.101 | 84.89 | 0.100 | 2017.076 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Heavily overlapping star disks. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 07 | 214 | 43.685 | 25 | 54 | 59.04 |  |  |  |  | 0.105 | 34.76 |  |  |  |
| J0723+2536 | A | 07 | 231 | 19.999 | 25 | 36 | 09.38 | 0.120 | 0.110 | 0.163 | 1.800 | 0.092 | 61.61 | 0.090 | 2017.209 | iT24 1x300s V-filter. SNR B <20 |
|  | B | 07 | 2320 | 20.223 | 25 | 36 | 13.58 |  |  |  |  | 0.134 | 10.47 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 07 | 232 | 20.022 | 25 | 36 | 09.66 | 0.120 | 0.110 | 0.163 | 1.800 | 0.116 | 29.57 | 0.110 | 2017.076 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. SNR B <20. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 07 | 232 | 20.252 | 25 | 36 | 13.80 |  |  |  |  | 0.134 | 13.66 |  |  |  |
| J0730+2716 | A | 07 | 302 | 22.918 | 27 | 16 | 06.68 | 0.100 | 0.110 | 0.149 | 1.587 | 0.120 | 109.56 | 0.120 | 2017.075 | iT24 1x60s V-filter. SNR B <10. Heavily overlapping star disks |
|  | B | 07 | 302 | 22.825 | 27 | 16 | 11.90 |  |  |  |  | 0.176 | 7.91 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 07 | 302 | 22.909 | 27 | 16 | 06.60 | 0.090 | 0.080 | 0.120 | 1.202 | 0.120 | 111.77 | 0.120 | 2017.075 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. SNR B <10. Heavily overlapping star disks. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 07 | 302 | 22.765 | 27 | 16 | 12.01 |  |  |  |  | 0.163 | 9.30 |  |  |  |
| J0734+2315 | A | 07 | 342 | 25.757 | 23 | 15 | 29.88 | 0.110 | 0.100 | 0.149 | 1.556 | 0.058 | 37.33 | 0.050 | 2017.076 | iT24 1x60s V-filter. SNR B <10. Identification of B a bit difficult due to a fore- or background star involved |
|  | B | 07 | 342 | 25.997 | 23 | 15 | 34.24 |  |  |  |  | 0.123 | 9.14 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 07 | 342 | 25.749 | 23 | 15 | 29.94 | 0.110 | 0.110 | 0.156 | 1.803 | 0.121 | 82.86 | 0.120 | 2017.076 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Touching star disks with B obviously optical double. SNR B <20. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 07 | 342 | 25.972 | 23 | 15 | 33.81 |  |  |  |  | 0.147 | 12.38 |  |  |  |
| J0735+4814 | A | 07 | 352 | 26.959 | 48 | 14 | 32.79 | 0.110 | 0.110 | 0.156 | 0.822 | 0.050 | 160.95 | 0.050 | 2017.075 | iT24 1x60s V-filter |
|  | B | 07 | 352 | 26.625 | 48 | 14 | 43.11 |  |  |  |  | 0.068 | 23.11 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 07 | 352 | 26.968 | 48 | 14 | 32.83 | 0.110 | 0.110 | 0.156 | 0.878 | 0.130 | 116.94 | 0.130 | 2017.076 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. SNR B <20. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 07 | 352 | 26.686 | 48 | 14 | 42.58 |  |  |  |  | 0.164 | 10.45 |  |  |  |
| J0748+3712 | A | 07 | 48 | 35.888 | 37 | 12 | 08.93 | 0.050 | 0.060 | - | - | 0.040 | 354.40 | 0.040 | 2017.209 | iT24 1x300s V-filter. No resolution of $B$ |
|  | B |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |
|  | A | 07 | 483 | 35.879 | 37 | 12 | 08.88 | 0.060 | 0.070 | - | - | 0.140 | 307.49 | 0.140 | 2017.209 | iT24 1x300s I-filter. No resolution of $B$. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |
| J0751+4006 | A | 07 | 510 | 01.807 | 40 | 06 | 05.99 | 0.080 | 0.110 | 0.136 | 1.031 | 0.043 | 69.54 | 0.040 | 2017.209 | iT24 1x300s V-filter |
|  | B | 07 | 510 | 01.733 | 40 | 05 | 58.48 |  |  |  |  | 0.065 | 20.49 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 075 | 510 | 01.813 | 40 | 06 | 06.50 | 0.120 | 0.110 | 0.163 | 1.266 | 0.132 | 47.14 | 0.130 | 2017.075 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. SNR B <20. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 07 | 510 | 01.742 | 40 | 05 | 59.18 |  |  |  |  | 0.152 | 13.16 |  |  |  |
| J0754+1305 | A | 075 | 540 | 04.627 | 13 | 05 | 53.75 | 0.120 | 0.110 | 0.163 | 0.825 | 0.074 | 24.54 | 0.060 | 2017.076 | iT24 1x60s V-filter. Star disk A overlaps with background star |
|  | B | 07 | 540 | 04.129 | 13 | 05 | 45.09 |  |  |  |  | 0.066 | 39.55 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 07 | 54 | 04.715 | 13 | 05 | 52.79 | 0.120 | 0.110 | 0.163 | 0.795 | 0.127 | 25.12 | 0.120 | 2017.076 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Star disk A overlaps with background star. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 07 | 540 | 04.126 | 13 | 05 | 44.82 |  |  |  |  | 0.121 | 75.13 |  |  |  |
| J0858+5227 | A | 08 | 58 | 09.974 | 52 | 27 | 14.26 | 0.100 | 0.110 | 0.149 | 1.522 | 0.070 | 21.49 | 0.050 | 2017.084 | iT24 1x180s V-filter |
|  | B | 08 | 58 | 09.377 | 52 | 27 | 15.50 |  |  |  |  | 0.067 | 24.24 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 08 | 581 | 10.025 | 52 | 27 | 14.31 | 0.120 | 0.110 | 0.163 | 1.628 | 0.104 | 39.32 | 0.100 | 2017.076 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Spc based on V -I color index |
|  | B | 085 | 58 | 09.410 | 52 | 27 | 15.41 |  |  |  |  | 0.112 | 20.97 |  |  |  |
| J0914+1806 | A | 09 | 14 | 44.504 | 18 | 06 | 15.19 | 0.070 | 0.080 | - | - | 0.061 | 107.01 | 0.060 | 2017.210 | iT24 1x300s V-filter. No reso- |
|  | B |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  | than 19.1 Vmag |
|  | A | 09 | 14 | 44.512 | 18 | 06 | 15.36 | 0. 060 | 0.090 | 0.108 | 566 | 0.100 | 197.22 | 0.100 | 17.210 | iT24 1x300s I-filter. Spc based |
|  | B | 09 | 144 | 45.221 | 18 | 06 | 11.17 | 0.060 | - 0.0 |  |  | 0.109 | 24.36 |  | 2017.210 | estimated 19.2 |
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Table 2 (conclusion) Error estimations for the in table 1 provided measurements for the given objects

| Name |  | RA | Dec | dRA | dDec | Err Sep | Err PA | Err Mag | SNR | dmag | Date | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J0925+2102 | A | 092527.680 | 210230.85 | 0.060 | 0.120 | - | - | 0.031 | 164.66 | 0.030 | 2017.209 | iT24 1x300s V-filter. No resolution of $B$, has to be fainter than 19.5Vmag |
|  | B | - | - |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |
|  | A | 092527.680 | 210231.03 | 0.070 | 0.080 | 0.106 | 0.352 | 0.120 | 240.45 | 0.120 | 2017.209 | iT24 1x300s I-filter. Spc based on V-I color index. Vmag2 estimated 19.6 |
|  | B | 092527.989 | 210247.79 |  |  |  |  | 0.124 | 32.64 |  |  |  |
| J0947+3820 | A | 094743.280 | 382007.72 | 0.110 | 0.110 | 0.156 | 1.676 | 0.069 | 22.41 | 0.050 | 2017.084 | iT24 1x180s V-filter. SNR B <20 |
|  | B | 094742.856 | 382009.56 |  |  |  |  | 0.109 | 10.77 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 094743.270 | 382006.21 | 0.040 | 0.010 | 0.041 | 0.436 | 0.131 | 69.60 | 0.130 | 2017.076 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 094742.835 | 382008.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.132 | 42.50 |  |  |  |
| J0954+2427 | A | 095439.922 | 242754.12 | 0.070 | 0.090 | - | - | 0.061 | 20.05 | 0.030 | 2017.210 | iT24 1x300s V-filter. SNR A <10. No resolution of $B$, has to be fainter than 19.5 Vmag |
|  | B | - | - |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |
|  | A | 095439.921 | 242753.96 | 0.080 | 0.090 | - | - | 0.131 | 57.69 | 0.130 | 2017.210 | iT24 1x300s I-filter. No resolution of $B$, has to be fainter than 18.9 Imag. Spc based on V I color index |
|  | B | - | - |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |
| J1001+3627 | A | 100119.914 | 362722.43 | 0.070 | 0.060 | 0.092 | 0.933 | 0.089 | 14.17 | 0.050 | 2017.081 | iT24 1x60s V-filter. SNR A and B $<20$ |
|  | B | 100119.987 | 362728.02 |  |  |  |  | 0.093 | 13.33 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 100119.929 | 362722.25 | 0.080 | 0.060 | 0.100 | 1.053 | 0.148 | 21.73 | 0.140 | 2017.081 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Spc based on V -I color index |
|  | B | 100119.938 | 362727.69 |  |  |  |  | 0.154 | 16.43 |  |  |  |
| J1023+5440 | A | 102315.554 | 544006.53 | 0.080 | 0.100 | 0.128 | 0.823 | 0.042 | 92.13 | 0.040 | 2017.155 | iT24 1x180s V-filter |
|  | B | 102314.544 | 544004.88 |  |  |  |  | 0.051 | 34.32 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 102315.555 | 544006.53 | 0.110 | 0.110 | 0.156 | 0.992 | 0.112 | 55.67 | 0.110 | 2017.081 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Spc based on V -I color index |
|  | B | 102314.545 | 544004.55 |  |  |  |  | 0.117 | 26.57 |  |  |  |
| J1034+0158 | A | $\begin{array}{llll}10 & 3449.152\end{array}$ | 015840.18 | 0.070 | 0.080 | 0.106 | 0.677 | 0.062 | 69.36 | 0.060 | 2017.305 | iT24 1x60s V-filter |
|  | B | 103449.642 | 015834.98 |  |  |  |  | 0.062 | 73.92 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 103449.158 | 015840.33 | 0.090 | 0.110 | 0.142 | 0.906 | 0.130 | 126.17 | 0.130 | 2017.305 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 103449.645 | 015835.09 |  |  |  |  | 0.130 | 139.16 |  |  |  |
| J1111+0221 | A | 111109.649 | 022106.59 | 0.120 | 0.120 | - | - | 0.046 | 47.22 | 0.040 | 2017.324 | iT24 1x300s V-filter. No resolution of $B$, has to be fainter than 19.1 Vmag |
|  | B | - | - |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |
|  | A | 111109.671 | 022106.17 | 0.120 | 0.120 | 0.170 | 1.374 | 0.131 | 56.67 | 0.130 | 2017.324 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { iT24 1x300s I-filter. Touching } \\ & \text { star disks. Spc based on V-I } \\ & \text { color index with Vmag2 assumed } \\ & 19.2 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | B | 111109.220 | 022108.26 |  |  |  |  | 0.175 | 8.81 |  |  |  |
| J1139+3454 | A | 113958.101 | 345420.81 | 0.090 | 0.080 | 0.120 | 0.848 | 0.061 | 85.55 | 0.060 | 2017.305 | iT24 1x60s V-filter |
|  | B | 113958.752 | 345419.38 |  |  |  |  | 0.073 | 25.84 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 113958.088 | 345420.92 | 0.080 | 0.090 | 0.120 | 0.833 | 0.120 | 165.32 | 0.120 | 2017.305 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 113958.750 | 345419.40 |  |  |  |  | 0.121 | 75.03 |  |  |  |
| J1150+3142 | A | 115038.803 | 314224.34 | 0.120 | 0.120 | 0.170 | 1.953 | 0.130 | 157.75 | 0.130 | 2017.330 | iT24 1x300s V-filter. Heavily overlapping star disks. SNR B <10 |
|  | B | 115038.424 | 314223.17 |  |  |  |  | 0.231 | 5.21 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 115038.808 | 314224.26 | 0.110 | 0.090 | 0.142 | 1.638 | 0.140 | 106.20 | 0.140 | 2017.330 | iT24 1x300s I-filter. Overlapping star disks. SNR B <20. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 115038.429 | 314223.12 |  |  |  |  | 0.170 | 10.69 |  |  |  |
| J1207+0012 | A | 120703.533 | 001251.64 | 0.120 | 0.090 | 0.150 | 1.214 | 0.100 | 123.07 | 0.100 | 2017.330 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { iT24 1x300s V-filter. Barely } \\ & \text { resolved, SNR B }<5 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | B | 120703.412 | 001244.80 |  |  |  |  | 0.472 | 1.89 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 120703.514 | 001251.86 | 0.120 | 0.100 | 0.156 | 1.188 | 0.150 | 102.27 | 0.150 | 2017.330 | iT24 1x300s I-filter. SNR B <20. Spc based on V-I color index |
|  | B | 120703.440 | 001244.41 |  |  |  |  | 0.162 | 17.38 |  |  |  |
| J1245+0101 | A | 124522.922 | 010104.67 | 0.100 | 0.100 | 0.141 | 1.578 | 0.061 | 120.61 | 0.060 | 2017.305 | iT24 1x60s V-filter. SNR B <10 |
|  | B | 124522.770 | 010109.27 |  |  |  |  | 0.121 | 9.88 |  |  |  |
|  | A | 124522.932 | 010104.52 | 0.080 | 0.090 | 0.120 | 1.180 | 0.130 | 194.45 | 0.130 | 2017.305 | iT24 1x60s I-filter. Spc based on V -I color index |
|  | B | 124522.754 | 010109.72 |  |  |  |  | 0.131 | 59.25 |  |  |  |
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#### Abstract

The WDS catalog contains (as of August 2017) more than $20,000 \mathrm{~V}$-coded objects which are considered to be physical pairs because of their common proper motion (CPM) or other attributes. For 4,937 of these objects both components were identified in the UCAC5 catalog and counter-checked with UCAC5 proper motion data using a CPM assessment scheme according to Knapp and Nanson 2017. A surprisingly large number of these pairs seem to be optical rather than physical. Additionally GAIA DR1 positions are given for all components, and precise separation and position angle based on GAIA DR1 coordinates were calculated for all of the 4,937 pair


## 1. Introduction

The WDS catalog contains (per the August 2017 release) more than 20,000 double stars listed with their V-code declaring them as possibly physical pairs, usually based on assumed common proper motion or other indicators. The most recently available precise proper motion data in the GAIA DR1 catalog allows for a very reliable counter-check of this assumption, but the TGAS subset of GAIA DR1 with only about 2,000,000 stars covers only a small number of the WDS stars. The next reliable source of precise proper motion data we consulted is the UCAC5, as it contains data for more than $100,000,000$ stars with data based on rereduction of the UCAC images which used the TGAS objects as positional references and compared these positions with those in the GAIA DR1. This gave us a huge increase in the number of objects available to check against the WDS V-code entries.

## 2. Selection and Identification of the Objects

Given the above, a program to scan the WDS for "V" type objects that were likely to be included in the UCAC5 was written. This program eliminated all pairs whose primary was brighter than 6.0 mv (the halation spot on the image being large enough to throw off the scanning software that creates the UCAC5 catalog) or
fainter than 16.0 mv (the approximate limit of the UCAC5). It also eliminated pairs that were less than 4 arc seconds in separation or greater than 60 arc seconds in separation, as the former are likely to be within the primary's halation spot and the latter are more likely to be optical. Of the 20,000+ "V" pairs listed in the WDS, this program found 6,742 pairs that met these criteria.

A second program was written that takes the 6,742 "V" pairs and tries to find stars in the UCAC5 that correspond to both the primary and secondary of the WDS pair. Of the 6,742 pairs only 4,937 were found that had UCAC5 stars associated with them. The criteria used to select these were:

- The UCAC5 stars could only be brighter than the WDS star by one magnitude, or fainter by two magnitudes.
- The separation of the UCAC5 stars needed to be within 4 " of that listed by the WDS's most recent measurement.
- The position angle of the UCAC5 stars needed to be within 4 degrees of that listed by the WDS's most recent measurement.

Similar to visual observations there is the question of possible false positives. We did a counter-check with two different approaches: First we selected the
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objects with the largest difference in separation and position angle between WDS and GAIA DR1 as such differences are either the result of very different proper motions as reported by the WDS and UCAC5 or of a misidentification. Second, we ran a program that searched all 4,937 pairs with UCAC5 stars associated with them, looking for objects close to these pairs as potential sources for misidentifications. We then checked these suspect objects manually with the help of Aladin using 2MASS images with WDS and UCAC5 catalog overlays and found a few misidentifications of primaries and secondaries. However, we kept the data set, as the error rate was less than one in a thousand, and further refinement of our search programs would not yield significantly better results. The misidentifications that we found are listed in "Appendix A - Errata" and include the correct data for these objects.

These 4,937 pairs were then analyzed by a spreadsheet that implemented the CPM assessment (see Appendix B) and calculated separation and position angle from the GAIA DR1 positions provided with the UCAC5 data rows.

## 3. Results

290 objects were found to be listed in the UCAC5 catalog with an unexpected large proper motion error range for at least one component. To avoid questionable CPM ratings we decided to split the results into two subsets to isolate the objects with pm data considered suspect. The spreadsheet with the results is far too large to be given here in print so we list only the first 25 items in table 1 as an example. The full data set with all data for all objects, including content description can be downloaded as spreadsheet from http://www.jdso.org/.

The programs used to find V pairs in the WDS, and then couple those stars with ones in the UCAC5, and then check for misidentifications are posted here: https://sourceforge.net/projects/codefromwdsvsucac5/
files/?source=navbar.
The following data are given in Table 1:

- WDS ID
- Name = Discoverer ID
- GAIA DR1 coordinates for the primary (observation epoch 2015)
- Separation and position angle calculated from the GAIA DR1 positions for primary and secondary
- Proper motion vector direction for both components calculated from UCAC5 proper motion data in degrees.
- Proper motion vector length for both components calculated from UCAC5 proper motion data in mas/ yr
- CPM rating (see Appendix B)
- Notes with comments.

The full data set available for download also contains additional columns to provide full information on all counter-checked objects.

## 4. Summary

From 4,937 V-coded WDS objects counter-checked with UCAC5 proper motion data (using the CPM assessment scheme according to Appendix B):

- Only 68 qualified as perfect AAAA CPM candidates with (within the given error range) ident proper motion vector direction and length, a PM error size of less than $5 \%$ of the PM vector length and a relationship of angular separation to PM speed of less than 100 years. This means the pair is almost certainly physical.
- 1,880 qualified as solid CPM candidates with (within the given error range) ident proper motion vector direction and length but with minor issues regarding PM error size and relationship of angular separation to PM speed. These are almost certainly physical.
- 1,005 qualified as good CPM candidates with proper motion vector direction and length differences within twice the given error range and with only minor issues regarding their PM error size and relationship of their angular separation to PM speed. Some differences in PM vector length and direction might be caused by an orbit depending on the plane of the orbit with respect to the sky so this class of objects might contain doubles with orbit. Overall there is a good chance that these pairs are physical.
- 168 objects qualified as weak CPM candidates, as they have a rather small probability for being physical.
- 197 objects are probably optical as their proper motion vector is more than twice but less than triple the given error range, as well as showing some PM vector length differences
- 1,329 objects (nearly $30 \%$ of the total number) are almost certainly optical pairs. Over 600 of them are UC pairs demonstrating the remarkable change of proper motion data from UCAC4 to UCAC5 by rendering these pairs from "probably physical" based on UCAC4 proper motion data to "almost certainly optical" based on the UCAC5 proper motion data.
- Additionally we have 290 objects with somewhat suspect UCAC5 proper motion data to be considered separately (see Addendum).

We would have expected that all V-coded WDS
(Text continues on page 392)
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Table 1. The first 25 objects from the data set

| WDS ID | Name | RA A | DE A | GAIA Sep | GAIA PA | PMVD ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$ | PMVD ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{B}$ | PMVL A | PMVL B | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPM } \\ & \text { Rat } \end{aligned}$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00001-2432 | UC 301 | 0.02117861 | -24.52940000 | 47.024 | 283.37 | 231.49 | 232.05 | 92.66 | 89.92 | ABAB | Good CPM candidate |
| 00004+3549 | CRB 23 | 0.09759917 | 35.81139000 | 37.243 | 154.53 | 84.38 | 84.40 | 67.42 | 67.62 | AABB | Solid CPM candidate |
| 00006+4539 | UC 303 | 0.14172670 | 45.65775000 | 52.176 | 311.43 | 79.36 | 77.91 | 65.53 | 69.24 | ABBB | Good CPM candidate |
| 00013+0504 | UC 304 | 0.32828920 | 5.07007700 | 15.342 | 53.63 | 247.39 | 244.64 | 67.38 | 67.95 | BAAB | Good CPM candidate |
| 00013+0742 | DU 4AB | 0.33342190 | 7.70133900 | 15.209 | 264.10 | 205.54 | 205.15 | 80.24 | 79.76 | AAAB | Solid CPM candidate |
| $00020+2347$ | TVB 2 | 0.50731720 | 23.78087000 | 28.116 | 292.27 | 76.57 | 74.94 | 27.55 | 25.79 | ABBC | Good CPM candidate |
| $00020+4530$ | J 864AC | 0.50702940 | 45.52219000 | 18.012 | 8.37 | 20.56 | 255.00 | 1.71 | 10.04 | DDDC | Almost certainly optical |
| 00023+1609 | BPM 1 | 0.58341170 | 16.14635000 | 30.686 | 185.11 | 168.27 | 104.44 | 5.41 | 20.86 | DDDC | Almost certainly optical |
| 00029-7436 | BVD 30AB, C | 0.71324250 | -74.59810000 | 37.832 | 11.44 | 172.63 | 152.18 | 67.86 | 59.14 | DDAB | Almost certainly optical |
| $00042+3732$ | UC 310 | 1.04570400 | 37.53939000 | 30.980 | 14.80 | 76.06 | 88.31 | 72.23 | 64.43 | DCAB | Almost certainly optical |
| 00043-4304 | UC 311 | 1.07507200 | -43.07456000 | 8.686 | 141.95 | 54.01 | 55.37 | 74.03 | 74.26 | AAAB | Solid CPM candidate |
| 00047+4049 | UC 312 | 1.18156600 | 40.81849000 | 39.448 | 157.18 | 97.99 | 101.85 | 47.46 | 54.05 | BCAB | Weak CPM candidate |
| 00049-1811 | UC 313 | 1.23707800 | -18.17912000 | 18.133 | 239.72 | 191.08 | 191.42 | 96.29 | 96.00 | AAAB | Solid CPM candidate |
| 00053-0523 | UC 315 | 1.32045300 | -5.37600800 | 19.679 | 257.19 | 203.84 | 208.22 | 66.80 | 65.14 | BABB | Good CPM candidate |
| 00053-1857 | UC 316 | 1.31539700 | -18.95130000 | 25.494 | 278.04 | 35.31 | 50.47 | 63.84 | 46.03 | DDBB | Almost certainly optical |
| 00063+6851 | CBL 559 | 1.58039100 | 68.85215000 | 19.432 | 209.67 | 92.65 | 95.48 | 58.46 | 57.56 | AAAB | Solid CPM candidate |
| 00070-1837 | UC 322 | 1.73973600 | -18.61536000 | 44.707 | 63.35 | 211.58 | 211.42 | 71.60 | 73.47 | AAAB | Solid CPM candidate |
| 00081+2029 | AZC 2 | 2.02307600 | 20.47806000 | 25.761 | 146.83 | 106.95 | 106.01 | 86.45 | 83.02 | AAAB | Solid CPM candidate |
| 00085-0419 | UC 324BC | 2.14046700 | -4.29685400 | 53.485 | 117.77 | 103.12 | 102.15 | 62.12 | 64.14 | AABB | Solid CPM candidate |
| 00091-5649 | UC 327 | 2.27667000 | -56.80847000 | 44.487 | 181.99 | 102.04 | 102.31 | 67.59 | 70.83 | ABAB | Good CPM candidate |
| 00092+3201 | UC 328 | 2.30533600 | 32.01432000 | 9.955 | 172.25 | 243.01 | 237.65 | 65.65 | 60.37 | BBBB | Good CPM candidate |
| 00093+2517 | GIC 2AB | 2.31640300 | 25.28135000 | 29.602 | 237.15 | 131.84 | 130.82 | 230.87 | 223.33 | BCAB | Weak CPM candidate |
| 00099+0827 | STF 4 | 2.46544400 | 8.45311900 | 5.232 | 275.69 | 103.17 | 101.52 | 59.26 | 65.62 | ACBA | Weak CPM candidate |
| 00100-5028 | CBL 561 | 2.50342600 | -50.47068000 | 21.011 | 83.90 | 240.87 | 238.52 | 149.97 | 152.43 | BAAB | Good CPM candidate |
| 00105+4524 | CBL 1 | 2.62025200 | 45.39443000 | 22.982 | 229.57 | 323.13 | 322.85 | 85.00 | 86.94 | AAAB | Solid CPM candidate |
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objects show significantly large proper motion but 260 from the 1,526 objects rated as probably or most certainly optical are listed in the UCAC5 catalog for both components with proper motion values far too small to allow for an assessment as "common". As a threshold we used the root mean square over all e_pm values larger than $30 \%$ of the proper motion vector length of both components - this means that the given proper motion values are insignificant in comparison with the large proper motion error range. In some cases the UCAC5 proper motion errors are even larger than the proper motion values themselves.

This result shows the need for a critical CPM assessment of the remaining $\sim 16,000$ WDS objects not covered by our report. If our sample is representative, then there are about $5,000 \mathrm{~V}$-coded objects that are probably optical pairs.
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## Appendix A - Errata:

Checking about 50 of the most suspect objects regarding identification with unusual large difference in separation or position angle compared with the WDS catalog we found the following errors in the data set:

Table 2. Errors found in the data set

| WDS ID | Name | RA A | DE A | RA B | DE B | CPM Rat | Notes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15079-4019$ | UC 2935 | 226.980500 | -40.319590 | 226.960600 | -40.320340 | DDDC | Almost certainly optical | Wrong secondary |
| $09024+1226$ | GWP 1131 | 135.599300 | 12.432740 | 135.605800 | 12.434150 | DADB | Almost certainly optical | Wrong secondary |
| $17197-8520$ | UC 3324 | 259.912700 | -85.337790 | 259.832700 | -85.339490 | DDDB | Almost certainly optical | Wrong secondary |
| $17329-0129$ | UC 3366AC | 263.225800 | -1.490887 | 263.224900 | -1.504463 | DDDC | Almost certainly optical | Wrong primary |

Table 3. Correct data for objects listed in Table 1.

| Name | RA | Dec | Sep " | PA ${ }^{\circ}$ | M1 (G) | M2 (G) | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | e_pm1 | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Ap | Me | Date | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { CPM } \\ & \text { Rat } \end{aligned}$ | Source/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UC 2935 | 226.9805089 | -40.3195914 | 58.545 | 268.682 | 15.855 | 16.049 | -35.80 | -11.20 | 5.445 | -19.20 | -7.90 | 11.322 | 0.96 | Hg | 2015 | BCCC | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 GAIA DR1 Gmag. PM data from UCAC5 catalog |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { GWP } \\ & 1131 \end{aligned}$ | 135.5992506 | 12.4327389 | 26.345 | 80.871 | 12.432 | 15.705 | 14.70 | -47.50 | 1.414 | 32.20 | -49.50 | 30.689 | 0.96 | Hg | 2015 | CCCB | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 GAIA DR1 Gmag. PM data from UCAC5 catalog |
| UC 3324 | 259.9127372 | -85.3377903 | 25.788 | 263.364 | 14.016 | 16.119 | -31.00 | 22.60 | 1.838 | 9.90 | 9.60 | 10.615 | 0.96 | Hg | 2015 | CCCC | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 GAIA DR1 Gmag. PM data from UCAC5 catalog |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { UC } \\ & 3366 \mathrm{AC} \end{aligned}$ | 263.2254975 | -1.4901794 | 51.462 | 182.249 | 10.298 | 15.138 | -62.30 | -4.00 | 1.414 | -2.70 | $-4.40$ | 3.471 | 0.96 | Hg | 2015 | CCCC | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 GAIA DR1 Gmag. PM data from UCAC5 catalog |

Counter-Check of 4,937 WDS Objects for Being Physical Double Stars

The AB pair of UC3366 is J 453, obviously a good CPM candidate:

Table 4. Data for J 435

| Name | RA | Dec | Sep " | PA ${ }^{\circ}$ | M1 (G) | M2 (G) | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | e_pm1 | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Ap | Me | Date | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { CPM } \\ \text { Rat } \end{array}$ | Source/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J 453 AB | 363.2254975 | -1.4901794 | 2.789 | 155.933 | 10.298 | 10.761 | -62.30 | -4.00 | 1.414 | -66.70 | -5.80 | 3.536 | 0.96 | Hg | 2015 | ABBA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 GAIA DR1 Gmag. PM data from UCAC5 catalog |

It is remarkable that the errors found did not have a real impact on the CPM rating of the objects in question. A few more errors might still exist but we would not expect them to be more than one or two if any. On the other hand we found several UC objects from Hartkopf et al. 2013 as well as one BPM object from Gavras et al. 2010 with incorrect or at least unclear positions for the primary or secondary caused by very close objects covered by the data range between first and last observation:

Table 5. Data for correctly identified WDS objects with questionable data.

| WDS ID | Name | RA A | DE A | RA B | DE B | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPM } \\ & \text { Rat } \end{aligned}$ | Notes | Error |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07599-7511 | UC 1632 | 119.9753 | -75.18118 | 119.9733 | -75.18758 | DADB | Almost certainly optical | Correctly identified according to WDS, but most probably WDS error for primary - see difference first/last observation |
| 14574-3908 | UC 2879 | 224.3548 | -39.13891 | 224.3479 | $-39,14464$ | DDDC | Almost certainly optical | Correctly identified according to WDS, but most probably WDS error for primary - see difference first/last observation |
| 18375-4736 | UC 3627 | 279.3780 | -47.5943 | 279.3886 | -47.60707 | DDDC | Almost certainly optical | Correctly identified according to WDS, but most probably WDS error for primary - see difference first/last observation |
| 15314-2908 | UC 3020 | 232.8475 | -29.14083 | 232.8366 | -29.14693 | DDCB | Almost certainly optical | Correctly identified according to WDS, but most probably WDS error for secondary - see difference first/last observation |
| 18349-4746 | UC 3617 | 278.7222 | -47.7727 | 278,7324 | -47.78019 | DDDC | Almost certainly optical | Correctly identified according to WDS, but most probably WDS error for primary - see difference first/last observation |
| $19400+1542$ | BPM1269 | 295.0003 | 15.70334 | 294,9916 | 15.69306 | DDDC | Almost certainly optical | Correctly identified according to WDS, but most probably WDS error for secondary - see difference first/last observation |

To avoid such unclear situations we suggest that the nearby objects be included in the WDS catalog as additional components of these objects, even if they are only optical.

As a side effect of our error search we found the primary of UC 3020 to be a common proper motion pair:

Table 6. Data for a newly detected CPM pair

| Name | RA | Dec | Sep | PA ${ }^{\circ}$ | M1 (G) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M2 } \\ & (G) \end{aligned}$ | pmRA1 | pmDec1 | ${ }_{1}^{\text {e_pm }}$ | pmRA2 | pmDec2 | e_pm2 | Ap | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{e} \end{gathered}$ | Date | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPM } \\ & \text { Rat } \end{aligned}$ | Source/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \mathrm{UC} 3020 \\ \mathrm{Aa} / \mathrm{Ab} \end{gathered}\right.$ | 232.8474981 | -29.1408275 | 3.093 | 267.445 | 12.062 | 13.928 | -47.30 | -45.70 | 1.345 | -51.30 | -45.30 | 3.607 | 0.96 | Hg | 2015.000 | AABA | GAIA DR1. M1 and M2 GAIA DR1 Gmag. PM data from UCAC5 catalog |
|  | 232.8477345 | -29.1406278 | 3.030 | 267.255 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.20 | Eu | 1999.270 |  | UCAC5 |

## Counter-Check of 4,937 WDS Objects for Being Physical Double Stars

## Appendix B - Description of the CPM Rating Procedure

Four rating factors are used: Proper motion vector direction, proper motion vector length, size of the position error in relation to the proper motion vector length according to Knapp and Nanson, with an extension for relating separation to proper motion speed

- Proper motion vector direction ratings: "A" for identical direction within the error range (calculated by assuming the worst case of the position error pointing in the right angle to the PM vector), "B" for similar direction within the double error range, "C" for similar direction within the triple error range, and "D" for outside the triple error range.
- Proper motion vector length ratings: "A" for identical length within the error range (calculated by assuming the worst case of the position error pointing in the direction of the PM vector), "B" for similar length within the double error range, "C" for similar length within the triple error range, and "D" for errors outside of this.
- Error size ratings: "A" for an error size of less than $5 \%$ of the proper motion vector length, "B" for less than $10 \%$, "C" for less than $15 \%$, and "D" for an error size larger than $15 \%$.
- Relation of separation to proper motion speed: "A" for less than 100 years, "B" for less than 1,000 years, "C" for less than 10,000 years and " D " for greater than 10.000 years.

To compensate for excessively large position errors resulting in an "A" rating despite high deviations proper motion direction and/or angle, an absolute upper limit is applied regardless of the calculated error size:

- Proper motion vector direction: Upper limit $2.86^{\circ}$ difference for an " A ".
- Proper motion vector length: Upper limit $5 \%$ difference for an "A".


## Addendum Regarding UCAC5 Proper Motion Data

After finishing the first draft of this report we became aware of a reasonably large number of UCAC5 objects identified with WDS binaries having a surprisingly large proper motion error range making CPM assessment with UCAC5 proper motion data less reliable than assumed. While most UCAC5 objects are listed with e_pm values around $2 \mathrm{mas} / \mathrm{yr}$ some are listed with a tenfold or even higher error size. These were initially considered as rare outliers but with more detailed checking it became clear that the number of such objects is larger than assumed. This is somewhat surprising as the UCAC5 data is based on re-reduction of UCAC image data with TGAS reference stars and the proper motion data is calculated by comparing UCAC5 and GAIA DR1 positions - this setup suggests a very high data quality. But as proper motion data calculated from comparison of 2MASS to GAIA DR1 positions is in many cases within an e_pm range of less than 6 mas all UCAC5 objects with e_pm larger than that are to be viewed with caution.

As an example of this we checked a small sample of our data in Table 1 in detail.
Table 7: Counter-check UCAC5 based CPM rating for some of the objects with RMS e_pm larger than 12mas

|  |  |  |  |  | Rating with UCAC5 |  | Rating with 2MASS to GAIA DR1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Name | RA A | DE A | Sep | PA | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPM } \\ & \text { Rat } \end{aligned}$ | Notes | CPM Rat | Notes |
| UC 317 | 1.39717000 | -47.5694100 | 10.564 | 176.88 | DDCB | Almost certainly optical | CBBB | Probably optical |
| MRI 53 | 1.68339000 | 57.27257000 | 6.624 | 307.50 | BACB | Good CPM candidate | AABB | Solid CPM candidate |
| UC 329 | 2.33485900 | -41.5343300 | 31.526 | 326.12 | DDCB | Almost certainly optical | CACB | Probably optical |
| UC 3968 | 292.969700 | 52.01293000 | 11.412 | 159.54 | DBDB | Almost certainly optical | CCCC | Almost certainly optical |
| GRV1087 | 200.531300 | 67.81200000 | 28.268 | 8.30 | BDCB | Almost certainly optical | AABC | Solid CPM candidate |
| GWP2029 | 202.026600 | 16.31330000 | 10.401 | 265.24 | DDCB | Almost certainly optical | CBBB | Probably optical |

This comparison shows that in most cases the difference in the CPM assessment might be minor but that there are also a few cases with very different results. For example we have changed an "Almost certainly optical" designation to "Solid CPM candidate". These counter-checks are easily done manually for a few pairs, but this is impracticable for larger data sets. The only solution for this current work is to simply eliminate such suspect objects from the data set and postpone for these objects the CPM assessment for a subsequent paper probably based on GAIA DR2 proper motion data.
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Brad Timerson, IOTA North American Coordinator<br>T. George, IOTA Analyst<br>Ted Blank, Paul Maley, Steve Messner, John Moore, observers


#### Abstract

An occultation of TYC 5780-308-1 by the asteroid (834) Burnhamia on August 23, 2017 (UT) showed this star to be a double star. Both components of the double star were occulted as recorded by four observers. The separation of the two components is $0.0143 \pm$ 0.0004 arcseconds at a position angle of $73.8 \pm 2.7$ degrees. The magnitude of the primary component is estimated to be $9.8+/-0.03$ (Tycho2 VT). The magnitude of the secondary component is estimated to be $9.92+/-0.03$ (Tycho2 VT).


## Observation

On August 23, 2017 (UT), four observers occupying or operating sites across the United States observed the asteroid (834) Burnhamia occult the star TYC 5780-308-1. See Figure 1 for the path map of the event. All four sites observed two step events. All recorded occultation times and data from the observers can be found in archived IOTA records for the event. The observations were made by the observers located at the sites and with the equipment shown in Table 1.

The target star is magnitude 9.103 (Tycho2 VT). This magnitude is derived from the Tycho system magnitude VT given in the Tycho-2 Catalogue contained in the VizieR database [1]. The asteroid magnitude as predicted by the Minor Planet Center as reported in Occult4 [2] was $13.1(\mathrm{~V})$. The combined magnitude of the
asteroid and the star was calculated to be 9.08 (using both Tycho2 VT and MPC V). The expected magnitude drop at occultation was calculated to be 4.02 magnitudes. The star is not listed in the Washington Double Star Catalog. The star is listed the Fourth Catalog of Interferometric Measurements of Binary Stars [3]. The data from that inquiry are shown in Table 2 [headings were derived from format descriptions].

## Analysis

The observations were analysed in the standard manner described by IOTA [4].

The finished plot of the double star fit to the data is shown in Figure 6. The double star has a separation of $0.0143 \pm 0.0004$ arcseconds at a position angle of 73.8 $\pm 2.7$ degrees.

Of the data sets that recorded the occultation, Blank

Table 1. Observers, site locations, equipment, methods, and results

| Chords | Observer(s) | City/ <br> Location | State | Country | Telescope <br> Type | Telescope <br> Dia (cm) | Method | Result |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,2 | S Messner | Big Lake | MO | USA |  |  | Video+GPS Time Inst | Two Events |
| 3,4 | P Maley | Hiawatha | KS | USA | Ref | 8 | Video+GPS Time Inst | Two Events |
| 5,6 | J Moore | Turpin | OK | USA |  |  | Video+GPS Time Inst | Two Events |
| 8,9 | T Blank | Tipton | IA | USA |  |  | Video+GPS Time Inst | Two Events |

# TYC 5780-308-1 Discovery of Stellar Duplicity During Asteroidal Occultation by (834) Burnhamia 

Table 2


Table 3

| Observer | Baseline | 1st <br> Drop | Bottom | 1st <br> Reapp | Baseline |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blank | 181.56 | 100.54 | 4.77 | 86.66 | 183.07 |
| Maley | 115.14 | 47.73 | 2.75 | 44.4 | 114.98 |
| Maley <br> Normalized | 181.56 | 75.26 | 4.34 | 70.01 | 181.31 |
| Average | 181.56 | 87.90 | 4.55 | 78.34 | 182.19 |

and Maley recorded video without saturated stars. Therefore, the Blank and Maley events were suitable for calculating the stellar component magnitudes. The original videos for both observers were recorded with cameras using 0.45 gamma brightness compensation. This makes dim objects brighter and bright objects dimmer. This also affects the linearity of the light curve which also affects the magnitudes derived from the data. As a result, both videos were processed with inverse gamma correction to make the resulting light curve linear [5, 6]. Using the light curve data from these two observers, the magnitude drops of the two events were calculated using the brightness measurements derived by R-OTE [7], the Magnitude calculator routine in Occult $4^{2}$ (Method 3 - Magnitudes from light curve values), the combined VT magnitude from the Tycho-2 Catalogue and the predicted V magnitude of the asteroid as explained above. The results are shown in Table 3 and Table 4. Note that the measured brightness are $\mathrm{ADU}^{\dagger}$ values with no filters. The assumption is they are not much different from those in VT in calculating the magnitude of each component of the double star.

## Magnitude Drops from R-OTE analysis

Based on the total magnitude drop estimates for the two components shown in Table 4, the average magnitude drop measured by both observers is within 0.015
$广$ Analog-to-Digital-Unit - the digital equivalent of the brightness of the analog star on the video screen as process through Limovie.

Table 4

| Observer | Magnitude Change |  |  |  | Total <br> Magnitude <br> Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1st D | 2nd D | 1st R | 2nd R | (shan |  |
| Blank | 0.64 | 3.31 | 3.15 | 0.81 | 3.95 | 3.96 |
| Maley | 0.96 | 3.10 | 3.02 | 1.03 | 4.05 | 4.05 |
| Average | 0.80 | 3.20 | 3.09 | 0.92 | 4.00 | 4.01 |

of the predicted magnitude drop. This is excellent agreement from both observer light curves.

The magnitudes of the two component stars were derived by inputting the 'average' ADU brightness values into the Occult4 Magnitude Calculator. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 5.

The magnitudes of the two stars are estimated to be $9.8 \pm 0.03$ (VT) primary star and $9.92 \pm 0.03$ (VT) secondary star, and their magnitude difference is estimated to be $0.12 \pm 0.04$ (VT). The event was a BABA, with the secondary occulted first, then the primary, then the secondary reappearing and then the primary.

Based on the data presented in this report, the double star characteristics as shown in the plot in Figure 6 are shown in Table 6

Table 5. Occult4 Analysis of Average Brightness Changes

| Assuming: |
| :--- |
| $*$ a combined magnitude of 9.10 |
| $*$ Light levels at D of $182 \Rightarrow 88 \Rightarrow 5$ |
| Magnitudes for sequence $B-A-B-A:$ |
| Mag $B=9.92$, Mag $A=9.80$ |

(Text continues on page 400)
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Table 6. Double Star Characteristics



Figure 1. Occultation Path


Figure 2. S. Messner light curve. Star was saturated, causing brightness fluctuations in the baseline and abnormal noise in the event bottom. Figure $2-S$. Messner light curve. Star was saturated, causing brightness fluctuations in the baseline and abnormal noise in the event bottom. Figure $2-S$. Messner light curve. Star was saturated, causing brightness fluctuations in the baseline and abnormal noise in the event bottom.


Figure 3. P. Maley light curve. Star was not saturated. Light curve is inverse gamma corrected. First step down is brighter than third step up. Noise in baseline and event bottom is normally distributed.


Figure 4. J. Moore light curve. Star was saturated, causing brightness fluctuations in the baseline and abnormal noise in the event bottom.
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Figure 5. T. Blank light curve. Star was not saturated. Light curve is inverse gamma corrected. First step down is brighter than third step up. Noise in baseline and event bottom is normally distributed.


Figure 6. Occultation of TYC 5780-308-1 by (834) Burnhamia
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(Continued from page 396)
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[^0]:    $\dagger$ http://vizier.u-strasbg.fr/viz-bin/VizieR-3?-source=I/239/h_dm_com

[^1]:    Explanations regarding the content of the Notes column:
    "Touching star disks" indicates that the rims of the star disks are touching and that the measurement results might be a bit less precise than with clearly separated star disks
    "Touching/Overlapping star disks" indicates that the star disks overlap to the degree of an elongation and that the measurement results is probably
    "SNR <20" indicates that the measurement result might be a bit less precise than desired due to a low SNR value but this is already included in the
    "SNR <10" indicates that the measurement result is probably a bit less precise than desired due to a very low SNR value but this is already included in
    "Image quality questionable" or similar indicates rather large average errors for the reference stars used for plate solving for different reasons (mostly atmospheric influences). But this is at least to some degree already included in the calculation of the error range estimation

