

Evidence of Long-Term Period Variations in the Exoplanet Transit Database (ETD)

SIMONE R. HAGEY,¹ BILLY EDWARDS,^{2,3,4,5} AND AARON C. BOLEY^{1,6}

¹*The University of British Columbia*

6224 Agricultural Road Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1, Canada

²*AIM, CEA, CNRS, Université Paris-Saclay, Université de Paris, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France*

³*Blue Skies Space Ltd., 69 Wilson Street, London, EC2A 2BB, UK*

⁴*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, Gower Street, London, WC1E 6BT, UK*

⁵*Paris Region Fellow*

⁶*Canada Research Chair in Planetary Astronomy*

(Accepted September 9, 2022)

Submitted to The Astronomical Journal

ABSTRACT

We analyze a large number of citizen science data and identify eight Hot Jupiter systems that show evidence for deviations from a constant orbital period: HAT-P-19 b, HAT-P-32 b, TrES-1 b, TrES-2 b, TrES-5 b, WASP-4 b, WASP-10 b, and WASP-12 b. The latter system is already well known to exhibit strong evidence for tidal orbital decay and serves as an important control for this study. Several other systems we identify have disputed period drifts in the literature, allowing the results here to serve as an independent analysis. The citizen science data are from the Exoplanet Transit Database (ETD), which is a global project established in 2008 by the Variable Star and Exoplanet Section of the Czech Astronomical Society. With over 400 planets and 12,000 contributed observations spanning 15 years, the ETD is brimming with potential for studying the long-term orbital evolution of close-in Hot Jupiters. We use our results to discuss prioritization of targets for follow up investigations, which will be necessary to confirm the period drifts and their causes.

Keywords: Exoplanets (498) — Exoplanet dynamics (490) — Transit timing variation method (1710)

1. INTRODUCTION

Hot Jupiters (HJs) are gas giant planets that orbit their host stars with periods less than about 12 days. Their provenance remains debated, although several possible formation pathways exist, such as dynamical excitation followed by tidal circularization (Fabrycky & Tremaine 2007), large scale disc migration (Lin et al. 1996), and in situ formation (Boley et al. 2016; Batygin et al. 2016). Regardless of how they formed, HJs' proximity to their host stars leads to tidal interactions, which in turn should affect their orbital evolution. Specifically, many HJ orbits should be shrinking gradually over time due to a transfer of angular momentum from the

planet to the host star, eventually leading to planetary engulfment (Levrard et al. 2009; Matsumura et al. 2010). This situation occurs when the orbital period of a HJ is shorter than the rotational period of its host star (Penev et al. 2018) or if the angular momentum vectors are anti-aligned. For a given arrangement, the decay rate can vary depending on the magnitude of stellar tidal dissipation (Levrard et al. 2009; Matsumura et al. 2010). Directly measuring the orbital decay rate provides an estimate of the stellar tidal quality factor Q_* .

While theory predicts many HJs should be decaying, direct detection has remained difficult. Nonetheless, Patra et al. (2020) suggest that certain ensemble properties of HJs indirectly reveal evidence of orbital decay – properties such as the infrequency of planets with periods less than one day, the rapid rotation of some host stars, and the lack of short period planets around such stars.

In principle, careful observations of planetary transit centres over decade timescales should reveal direct evidence for orbital decay (Birkby et al. 2014), appearing as a quadratic timing variation. However, orbital decay is not the only possible scenario for HJ orbital evolution, and some processes cause transit variations that mimic decay. For instance, apsidal orbital precession causes a sinusoidal variation in transit times. Even for fast precession rates, predicted precession periods extend over many decades (Ragozzine & Wolf 2009), making the sinusoidal behaviour very difficult to detect. Because of this, the curvature of the transit timing variations from apsidal precession can be consistent with the signal of orbital decay over (relatively) short observing windows. It must be stressed that measuring the apsidal precession rate of a HJ is valuable on its own, as it provides an estimate of the planetary Love number which enables probing the interior density distribution (Ragozzine & Wolf 2009). Yet other effects may also cause observable transit time variations that do not reflect an inherent change in an HJ’s orbit. A line-of-sight acceleration is one such example, in which a wide-orbit companion causes the host star and its HJ to accelerate toward the observer, leading to an apparent decay of the orbital period (Bouma et al. 2020). Stellar activity may also lead to a perceived change in a planet’s orbital period on timescales comparable to current HJ observational baselines. A transit lightcurve is deformed if the planet passes over a starspot, which can affect the fitted transit center times. Ioannidis et al. (2016) found that in rare cases this periodic nature could mimic TTVs induced by planetary companions, and Patra et al. (2020) suggest that stellar activity cycles with very long periods could mimic orbital decay. Investigating the effects of stellar activity and line-of-sight acceleration on the transit timing of the ETD targets is beyond the scope of this work, but must be considered in follow-up studies.

Whatever the cause, the earliest known HJs have transit observational baselines that span over a decade, making it possible to detect orbital decay or other long-term transit timing variations. Though many systems of interest have been suggested (see Patra et al. 2020), only WASP-12 b has a clear signature of spiraling into its host star. Indeed, since Maciejewski et al. (2016) first suggested that WASP-12 b does not follow a constant period ephemeris, the accumulation of more transit and secondary eclipse data has continuously supported an orbital decay model (Patra et al. 2017; Yee et al. 2019; Turner et al. 2020). With the inclusion of observations from the Transiting Exoplanet Survey Satellite (TESS

Ricker et al. 2015), the apsidal precession model has largely been rejected as well (Turner et al. 2020). This work has sparked increased interest within the exoplanet community in searching for decaying HJs, but as of now no other systems have shown such compelling results.

Given the large number of transiting planets that have been discovered, regularly obtaining follow-up observations for each of them has become a difficult task given the limited resources of professional facilities and the perceived low science yield of such observations. However, given their large transit depth, high quality observations of HJs around bright stars can be achieved with relatively modest equipment. As such, citizen astronomers have for decades been able to observe exoplanetary transits; and importantly, projects such as the Exoplanet Transit Database (ETD), ExoClock (Kokori et al. 2021, 2022) and Exoplanet Watch (Zellem et al. 2020) provide platforms that allow these observers to collectively contribute to cataloguing light curves.

Amateur exoplanet transit observations further contribute to updating ephemerides and maximizing observing efficiency at major facilities by ensuring reliable timing. The TESS mission, in particular, has developed the TESS Follow-Up Observing Program (TFOP) to enlist amateur observers to aid in eliminating false-positives from TESS exoplanet candidates (Collins 2019). Furthermore, via the ORBYTS programme (Sousa-Silva et al. 2018) high-school students have contributed to refining the ephemerides of potential targets for the ESA Ariel mission (Tinetti et al. 2018, 2021) using the Las Cumbres Observatory Global Telescope (LCOGT) network of robotic telescopes (e.g. Edwards et al. 2020, 2021). There are also studies in the literature that use select citizen science transits for transit timing variation (TTV) studies (see e.g. Baluev et al. 2015; Petrucci et al. 2019; Sonbas et al. 2021). Nonetheless, the exclusive use of such amateur observations are rare, despite their potential for examining long-term orbital changes such as period decay. In this work, we analyze the wealth of citizen scientist observations spanning over a decade in the ETD to demonstrate these data sets can be used to identify HJ systems that are strong candidates for exhibiting observable orbital evolution. Such selections can then be followed-up using large facilities, making efficient use of resources.

In Section 2, we describe the ETD, and in Section 3 outline our target selection process. Section 4 introduces the transit timing models and model fitting processes. Our results are presented in Section 5 and discussed in detail, with an emphasis on prospects for future observations, in Section 6. This work would not be possible without the hundreds of citizen scientists who submitted

transit observations to the ETD and we ask the reader to take note of the acknowledgements at the end of this paper.

2. DATA

The data used in this study are from the Exoplanet Transit Database (ETD). The ETD was established in 2008 by the Variable Star and Exoplanet Section of the Czech Astronomical Society, and allows any observer to register and upload transit observations (Poddany et al. 2010, 2011). As of early 2022, there are 399 planets listed in the database and over 12,000 contributed observations.¹ The website also provides transit predictions and a lightcurve fitting tool, requiring users to upload their target flux, error, and timestamps. The user is able to upload data with either a geocentric or heliocentric JD format based on the UTC time standard. The fitted transit times are then provided by the database in HJD_{UTC} , which we convert to BJD_{TDB} for this study. For many systems, there are literature data mixed in with the citizen science observations – one of the initial goals of the ETD project was to have a single space for all amateur and professional transit observations (Poddany et al. 2010). The inclusion of literature results for any given planetary system in the database is nonetheless incomplete, with the majority posted in the earlier years of the project.

While the database is vast and thus brimming with potential, there are two reasons the ETD is limited in its immediate use: 1) the simplicity of its automatic transit fitting routine and 2) a submission process that allows for inconsistencies in the format of submitted data.

The light curve fitting is done via a Levenberg-Marquardt (L-M) nonlinear least squares algorithm; namely,

$$m(t_i) = A - 2.5 \log F(z[t_i, t_0, D, b], p, c_1) + B(t_i - t_{\text{mean}}) + C(t_i - t_{\text{mean}})^2, \quad (1)$$

where m_i is the relative magnitudes taken at time t_i , and $F(z, p, c_1)$ is the relative flux, which depends on the radius ratio p , projected planet-star separation z , and limb-darkening coefficient c_1 . Stellar limb-darkening is modeled linearly. The projected separation z depends on the mid-transit time t_0 , transit duration D , and impact parameter b . Systematic trends in the data are described by B and C , and the zero-point shift of the magnitudes by A . In the fitting algorithm, A , t_0 , D , p , B , and C are free parameters. The linear limb-darkening coefficient c_1 is fixed at a value of 0.5 (Poddany et al. 2010).

Many studies using ETD observations re-fit the light curves (e.g. Baluev et al. 2015; Mallonn et al. 2019; Davoudi et al. 2021; Edwards et al. 2021). However, the different formats of the observations, both in terms of the machine-readable table format (comma-separated, tab-separated, etc.) and the timestamps provided, make reformatting and refitting the data a very time consuming process, particularly when assessing a large number of observations. This work involves a total of 4792 transit observations, making refitting the lightcurves an impracticable course of action in many instances.

Hence, instead of refitting the data, we take the fitted transit centres at face value, as the intent is to show that the ETD, and citizen science more generally, can be an efficient and convenient way to flag planetary systems with nonlinear long-term timing trends.

The only data categories used in this study are the ETD times, the associated uncertainties on those times, and the epoch numbers. In doing this, there is an implicit assumption that the fitting routine used by ETD does not have a systematic bias and that the timestamps given are in the expected format of HJD_{UTC} . If this is the case, we argue that the main effect of taking the data at face value is to increase the noise. This approach must be used with caution, as the ETD lightcurve fitting routine is not immune to systematic bias. The Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm is at higher risk of becoming trapped in a local minimum than a more rigorous MCMC routine, and there is no correction for red noise. Systematic noise in the lightcurves are modeled quadratically (Eq. 1), though visual inspection of a subset of ETD transits implies that a higher-order approximation may improve the fitting. Additionally, limb-darkening is modeled linearly with a coefficient fixed at a value of 0.5 (Poddany et al. 2010), which Petrucci et al. (2013) found to be insufficient for the study of short term TTVs. Despite these potential sources of systematic bias, the agreement of our WASP-12 b analysis with the literature (Section 5) shows that our assumption holds for the purpose of an efficient analysis of potential targets.

The overall quality of observations within the ETD is highly variable. Despite this, when analyzed carefully and consistently, they can be used in independent work and to supplement observations from professional observatories. A good example of the latter is in Kipping & Bakos (2011), who directly compare TrES-2b transits from the ETD to high-precision Kepler observations of the same epoch number. The ETD observations were found to be in excellent agreement with the Kepler transits, with most of the transit centers matching to within $1 - \sigma$.

¹ <http://var2.astro.cz/ETD/index.php>

To aid in analyzing the data, transit observations in the ETD are ranked by a “data quality index” (DQ) from 1-5, with 1 being those of the highest quality. The DQ index α is calculated as

$$\alpha = \frac{\delta}{S} \sqrt{\frac{N}{l}}, \quad (2)$$

where δ is the minimum flux, S the mean absolute deviation from the best-fit transit model, N the number of data points, and l the length of the observing run. The greater the value of α , the better quality data. Poddaný et al. (2010) provides the thresholds used for ranking any given observation. For this study, only observations with data quality 1-3 were considered.

3. TARGET SELECTION

There are over 400 systems in the ETD,² each with varying numbers of observations, data quality, and observational baselines. We are interested in data that might reveal the long-term evolution of planets and, given the range in data quality, focus only on systems that have a large number of observations.

The analysis is restricted to planetary systems that have more than 80 contributed observations with a data quality index of 3 or better. We found that model fits on systems with fewer observations become too dependent on local variations in the data. While there is not a clear transition, and a unique value will not exist, in this scenario a value of 80 removes systems with this strong dependency. Based on this criteria, 30 systems were chosen for further analysis, described further in Section 4. These 30 systems are listed in Table 1.

4. METHODS

A multi-step process was used to search for trends in the transit centre times. The transit centres are taken directly from the Exoplanet Transit Database (ETD) without performing new fits on the individual transit observations. The timestamps, provided by the database in HJD_{UTC}, are converted to BJD_{TDB} for this study following the standard set by Eastman et al. (2010). This conversion is done because, for example, the UTC (Universal Coordinated Time) standard drifts with the addition of leap seconds. Thus, comparing only UTC times that span multiple years may introduce an artificial drift in the transit times that could mimic a true variation in the HJ’s orbit. The ETD includes long-term observations of WASP-12 b, which serves as a critical reference due to its comprehensive study in the literature (Maciejewski et al. 2016; Patra et al. 2017; Yee et al. 2019;

Turner et al. 2020; Wong et al. 2022). It is thus reassuring that the WASP-12 b results from this study are in agreement with literature values, showing a highly significant decay (Table A9). This alone highlights the value of the ETD observations and suggests that some of the other compelling targets found in the ETD should be investigated further. Observations of select systems from the database are run through a Python pipeline developed specifically for this project. The data, results, and code used for this project are publicly available on Zenodo.³

4.0.1. Transit Timing Models

Three different transit timing models are tested against the ETD transit centres using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods. Initial tests were conducted using the *emcee* package (Foreman-Mackey et al. 2013). However, as discussed below, one of the models developed unstable behaviour and did not converge in general. To have more direct control over the MCMC algorithm, we implemented a custom Metropolis-Hastings MCMC with a Gibbs sampler (Ford 2006). This latter approach is used for all of the results presented here. For the models, we consider the cases of (1) a planet on a constant orbital period, (2) a planet on a decaying, circular orbit, and (3) a planet that has a constant orbital period, but the orbit is precessing.

In the constant orbital period case, the transit center times increase linearly with the transit epoch E such that

$$t_{tra} = t_0 + PE \text{ and} \quad (3)$$

$$t_{occ} = t_0 + \frac{P}{2} + PE, \quad (4)$$

where t_0 is the reference epoch, P is the period, and t_{tra} and t_{occ} are the expected transit and occultation times, respectively.

The second model assumes a steady change in the orbital period with epoch. The simplest expression of this behaviour is to include a quadratic term in the expected transit centre times. If the fitted period derivative $\frac{dP}{dE}$ is negative, then the planet is decaying. The model is given by

$$t_{tra} = t_0 + PE + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dP}{dE} E^2 \text{ and} \quad (5)$$

$$t_{occ} = t_0 + \frac{P}{2} + PE + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dP}{dE} E^2. \quad (6)$$

The third timing model attempts to use apsidal precession to explain timing variations, which requires the

² 404 planets and 12,291 observations as of May 16, 2022

³ <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7098460>

1

Table 1. Model comparison for initial analysis of 30 targets from the ETD

Target	Decay Rate	1- σ Unc.	BIC _{linear}	BIC _{decay}	Δ BIC
	(ms/yr)	(ms/yr)			
WASP-12 b	-29.1	1.0	2693.4	2284.7	-408.7
TrES-2 b	-20.7	2.1	1334.1	1287.3	-46.8
WASP-10 b	-26.4	2.7	1890.9	1847.9	-43.0
HAT-P-32 b	-30.2	3.3	1084.2	1044.5	-39.7
TrES-5 b	-29.7	3.6	831.6	804.8	-26.8
TrES-3 b	-5.08	0.63	2459.9	2433.2	-26.7
HAT-P-19 b	-55.2	7.2	334.7	308.4	-26.3
TrES-1 b	-7.9	1.4	656.5	646.6	-9.9
XO-2 b	13.0	3.1	490.5	487.1	-3.4
Qatar-1 b	-6.1	1.4	1858.6	1855.3	-3.3
HAT-P-12 b	-13.2	3.6	395.6	393.6	-2.0
GJ-436 b	11.6	3.3	466.5	465.1	-1.4
XO-1 b	-13.3	3.9	265.6	264.5	-1.1
WASP-48 b	-24.6	8.0	426.6	426.4	-0.2
WASP-52 b	-11.8	3.7	513.6	513.4	-0.2
WASP-3 b	-9.0	2.8	503.3	503.2	-0.1
HAT-P-10 b	-15.3	1.8	636.0	636.9	0.9
HAT-P-23 b	-5.2	5.8	435.6	436.5	0.9
HD189733 b	2.5	1.1	2452.3	2454.7	2.4
WASP-2 b	-4.2	1.9	641.7	644.3	2.6
HAT-P-20 b	-9.3	4.8	579.4	582.1	2.7
WASP-4 b	-1.09	0.66	356.4	359.1	2.7
HAT-P-36 b	5.0	2.7	1099.5	1103.0	3.5
CoRoT-2 b	2.2	1.7	649.9	653.5	3.6
HAT-P-3 b	-5.1	4.0	755.0	759.0	4.0
GJ-1214 b	-0.9	1.8	563.1	567.3	4.2
HAT-P-37 b	6.6	6.8	431.6	435.9	4.2
Qatar-2 b	1.6	2.2	681.4	685.6	4.2
WASP-33 b	-1.4	1.5	2926.9	2931.5	4.6
WASP-43 b	-0.7	1.2	744.7	749.5	4.8

NOTE—Results from the first run of the analysis pipeline on the raw transit centre data of 30 systems from the ETD. Targets are ranked by the likelihood of orbital decay model over a constant period model. The Δ BIC values are such that a negative value favours the decay model.

HJ orbit to have a non-zero eccentricity – as we will see, even small eccentricities can give rise to measurable effects. To capture the system’s behaviour in this model, the argument of pericentre ω is assumed vary at a constant rate, leading to sinusoidal trends in the timing data. Following [Patra et al. \(2017\)](#), the transit and

occultation times can be expressed as

$$t_{tra} = t_0 + P_s E - \frac{eP_a}{\pi} \cos \omega, \quad (7)$$

$$t_{occ} = t_0 + \frac{P_a}{2} + P_s E \frac{eP_a}{\pi} \cos \omega, \quad (8)$$

$$\omega(E) = \omega_0 + \frac{d\omega}{dE} E, \text{ and} \quad (9)$$

$$P_s = P_a \left(1 - \frac{d\omega/dE}{2\pi} \right), \quad (10)$$

for argument of pericentre ω , phase ω_0 , and precession rate $d\omega/dE$. In these equations, P_s represents the planet’s sidereal period, which is assumed to be fixed, while P_a is the “anomalistic” period. This latter period is also fixed, but accounts for the additional period signal due to precession.

The MCMC is used to determine the posterior distributions for the model parameters. The constant period model only has two free parameters: the reference epoch and the period. The decay model has three parameters, adding the dP/dE term. Finally, the apsidal precession model has five parameters: the reference epoch, sidereal period, eccentricity, phase constant, and the precession rate.

Due to the different number of free parameters between the models, the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) is used to compare the relative accuracy and necessity of each model to describe the transit timing data. The BIC is defined as:

$$\text{BIC} = \chi^2 + k \log n, \quad (11)$$

where n is the number of data points and k is the number of free parameters. Thus, the BIC accounts for the accuracy of the model through the χ^2 statistic, while penalizing the model for the number of free parameters used to describe the data (i.e., the model’s complexity). The difference in BIC relates to the Bayesian posterior odds ratio such that a $\Delta\text{BIC} = 10$ corresponds to a 150:1 ratio for the stronger model, and a $\Delta\text{BIC} = 5$ to 13:1 ([Liddle 2007](#)).⁴ With this in mind, the evidence strongly supports the model with the lower BIC value over the one with the larger value when $\Delta\text{BIC} > 10$. For $5 < \Delta\text{BIC} < 10$, the evidence supports the model with the lower BIC value, and if $\Delta\text{BIC} < 5$, while the lower BIC model is favoured, the evidence in support of that distinction is weak.

4.0.2. Data Cleaning

⁴ It is important to note that the BIC is one of many valid model comparison statistics.

The transit observations in the ETD are of inconsistent quality and require at least some degree of cleaning. We note above that there is already a numerical data quality factor for each entry in the ETD, which can be used for making an initial selection of data.⁵ However, this alone is insufficient due to spurious data points, i.e., points that are well-removed from emergent trends, but with a wide range of reported uncertainties. To address this, an iterative sigma-clipping algorithm is integrated into the MCMC analysis. The process is monitored to avoid introducing an artificial trend in the transit timing curves.

The pipeline begins by finding a preliminary best-fit orbital decay model using 100,000 iterations of the MCMC code. The first ten percent of the resulting chain is discarded as burn-in, which is found to be sufficient for the given chain lengths. The resulting preliminary model is subtracted from the timing data. The variance of the residuals is then calculated and used to flag any datum whose nominal value lies outside a $3\text{-}\sigma$ deviation from the residual mean. Another round of fitting is then run, including the MCMC fitting, but with the flagged data excluded. This process is repeated until no points fall outside of the $3\text{-}\sigma$ range. Convergence is achieved on average after 3.6 iterations with an average number of 9 observations removed. After this is complete a final, longer run of the MCMC is performed for the orbital decay model (5,000,000 iterations with 10% discarded as burn-in) and, if desired, the precession model.

A worry of using the sigma-clipping method is that it may introduce a false signal, a potential issue that was recognized early on. To address this, during development of the fitting routines, the same overall method was tried but with a best-fit linear model subtracted from the data instead of the best-fit orbital decay model. It was found that the fitted parameters from both methods agreed within respective uncertainties and that the most likely timing model for any given system remained the same. Essentially, data that are better described by a linear trend just resulted in a quadratic best-fit model with very low curvature, and we did not “clip” the data into a quadratic trend. Given comparable results, we decided to focus on using the decay model for the sigma-clipping because it would be, in principle, more sensitive to trend detection. However, the linear model subtraction approach is still run to confirm strong timing trends and discussed as appropriate.

⁵ As a reminder, we automatically remove transit centres that have an associated data quality factor of 4 and 5 (1 is the best and 5 is the worst)

4.0.3. Model Fitting Approach

The data analysis pipeline described above is applied twice in total. For the first application, each of the 30 star-planet systems selected from the ETD (see Section 3) are processed in the pipeline. During this run, all transit centres that have a DQ of 1, 2, or 3 are included in model fitting. Eight systems show evidence of a nonlinear trend (Table 1) and are investigated further. Two additional targets are included due to potential nonlinear trends being previously reported in the literature (and with different studies reporting inconsistent results): WASP-4 b (see Bouma et al. 2019; Southworth et al. 2019; Baluev et al. 2019, 2020; Bouma et al. 2020; Ivshina & Winn 2022; Turner et al. 2022) and WASP-43 b (see Blečić et al. 2014; Murgas et al. 2014; Chen et al. 2014; Ricci et al. 2014; Jiang et al. 2016; Hoyer et al. 2016; Zhao et al. 2018).

The resulting ten systems are then manually cleaned before being run through the data pipeline a second time. This is a time-consuming process, which is why it is only done at this stage. Specifically, any observation in the database without a clear transit or a clear ingress and egress are manually flagged and excluded from further analysis. Entries without a reported uncertainty are also excluded, automatically. Because this project purposefully does not involve re-fitting light curves, the manual data inspection is necessary to filter out transits without clearly defined edges. It also demonstrates that relying on the DQs alone is insufficient, despite the intended use of DQs. For example, Poddaný et al. (2010) state that partial transits uploaded to the ETD would automatically be given a data quality index of 5, but this automated flagging appears to have stopped after some time. The transit observations that are included in these cleaned datasets are listed in Appendix B for reproducibility. With these ten systems now having been manually cleaned, the data are run through the pipeline a second time. At this point, the apsidal precession model is also included.

The orbital decay model fitting is well-behaved and consistently converges to a clear solution. Uniform prior distributions are placed on the 3 free parameters (t_0 , P , and dP/dE) and a wide parameter space can be explored. Fitting the precession model, however, proved to be non-trivial due to degeneracies between viable models, which we attribute to be due, in part, to the high variance of the data. In particular, the anti-correlations between the eccentricity, e , and the precession rate, $d\omega/dE$, as well as between e and the reference transit time, t_0 , lead to posterior solutions that show two

Table 2. MCMC Priors

Parameter	Symbol	Unit	Prior	Bounds
Constant Period Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	Uniform	$(t_{ref} - 0.5, t_{ref} + 0.5)$
Period	P	days	Uniform	$(P_{ref} - 0.5, P_{ref} + 0.5)$
Orbital Decay Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	Uniform	$(t_{best} - 0.5, t_{best} + 0.5)$
Period	P	days	Uniform	$(P_{best} - 0.5, P_{best} + 0.5)$
Decay Rate	dP/dE	days/epoch	Uniform	$(-1 \times 10^{-7}, 1 \times 10^{-7})$
Apsidal Precession Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	Uniform	$(t_{best} - a, t_{best} + a), a \in \{.01, .1\}$
Sidereal Period	P_s	days	Normal	$(P_{best} - 0.1, P_{best} + 0.1)$
Argument of Periastron	ω_0	rad	Uniform	$(0, 2\pi)$
Precession Rate	$d\omega/dE$	rad/epoch	Log-Uniform	$(1 \times 10^{-6}, 1 \times 10^{-3})$
Eccentricity	e		Log-Uniform	$(1 \times 10^{-5}, 1 \times 10^{-1})$

NOTE—The parameters t_{ref} and P_{ref} are the reference ephemeris from the literature, whereas t_{best} and P_{best} are the best-fit values from sampling the constant period model. For the constant period and orbital decay models the bounds on t_0 and P are generous to allow for exploration of a large parameter space, as there were no issues with converging on multiple solutions. The restrictions on the apsidal precession priors are discussed in section 4.0.3

or more strong peaks. After exploring many options, a selection of priors and bounds on parameters was determined to be necessary to derive converged results. Indeed, it is this issue that ultimately led to writing a custom MCMC routine. To ensure convergence of our posterior chains, we examined a number of outputs such as trace plots, corner plots, and the autocorrelation coefficient as a function of lag, all of which are consistent with convergence.

Table 2 summarizes the prior distributions and bounds placed on the parameters for all three transit timing models. A normal distribution prior is placed on the period, centered on the best-fit result from the constant period model fit. This is justified by the observation that this constant period can be viewed as an analog for the sidereal period in the apsidal precession model (Equation 10). A uniform prior distribution is appropriate for ω_0 , and log-uniform priors are used for e and $d\omega/dE$ to account for the wide range of possible parameter space.

Without placing a formal bound on the precession rate, the model tends to go to high frequencies in an attempt to fit the datum-to-datum variation, an unphysical situation. To address this, we use the results of Ragozzine & Wolf (2009), who estimate that WASP-12 b should have a precession rate of 19 deg/yr (roughly 0.001

radian/epoch). Out of all of the systems they studied, WASP-12 b has by far the highest predicted rate. With this in mind, an upper bound of 0.001 radian/epoch is placed on $d\omega/dE$ for all systems, even for WASP-12 b, as a higher bound on the precession rate does not result in a better fit to the data in this case (tests using a higher bound for WASP-12 b were conducted to confirm this result). A lower bound of 1×10^{-6} rad/epoch is also chosen to avoid the M-H algorithm becoming trapped in a local minimum, as very low values of $d\omega/dE$ and e cause the fitted precession model to approach a line even when the results of the orbital decay model indicate the presence of curvature in the data. The eccentricity is restricted to be less than 0.1, which is appropriate for the HJ population, and greater than 1×10^{-5} . Ragozzine & Wolf (2009) found that even eccentricities on the order of 10^{-5} can result in detectable transit timing variations, though measurements of eccentricities are essentially unconstrained by 10^{-3} .

The strictest requirement for convergence of the apsidal precession model is on the parameter bounds of the reference transit center time t_0 . The parameter t_0 is allowed to be within a range of ± 0.01 (just over 30 minutes) or ± 0.1 days around the best-fit value from the constant period model, depending on the system. This

final adjustment allows convergence on the solution, but only as a perturbation of the constant period case. To aid convergence, a non-linear least squares fit (*scipy* implementation) of the precession model was done within these bounds to select the best initial value of the model parameters. Altogether, this procedure facilitates convergence of the precession models with the given data sets, and with all of this in mind, we next discuss the results.

5. RESULTS

As noted above, the first run of the analysis pipeline includes all DQ 1-3 observations from all 30 of the initial targets (see Section 3). Table 1 ranks the star-planet systems by the difference in their Bayesian Information Criterion (ΔBIC), with a negative value favouring the decay model. The best-fit period decay rates, along with the corresponding $1\text{-}\sigma$ uncertainties, are given in ms yr^{-1} . For some systems, such as GJ 436 b and XO-2 b, the period derivative is positive. In such cases, we found the scatter in the data to be very high, and did not investigate such systems further in this study. They will nonetheless need to be examined in future studies as better data are acquired.

From Table 1, the top eight candidates from this first analysis are selected for the second, deeper analysis described in Section 4.0.3. Those top eight candidates, in order of evidence for decay, are WASP-12 b, TrES-2 b, WASP-10 b, HAT-P-32 b, TrES-5 b, TrES-3 b, HAT-P-19 b, and TrES-1 b. With the exception of TrES-1 b, all of these systems yield a $\Delta\text{BIC} > 10$ (Section 4.0.1). The evidence for TrES-1 b is still compelling, with $\Delta\text{BIC} = 9.9$. In addition to these eight targets, WASP-4 b and WASP-43 b are selected due to their relevance in the literature, for a total of ten targets.

The results of the second round of analysis is summarized in Table 3. In the following sub-sections, each of these star-planet systems is presented individually, with an expanded discussion of that system’s model fitting. The cleaned data sets for the top ten systems are further provided in the tables listed in Appendix B, including the epoch number, transit centres and respective uncertainty, data quality index, and observer name(s). The full MCMC outputs from the analyses can be found in the tables in Appendix A, which include the best-fit model parameters and their $1\text{-}\sigma$ uncertainties, as well as metrics such as the χ^2 , number of data, etc.

Out of the eight highest-ranked systems from Table 1, all but TrES-3 b maintain statistically significant evidence of orbital decay in the ETD transit centres. WASP-4 b and WASP-43 b, both of which favoured a constant period transit timing model in the first analy-

sis (Table 1), exhibit varying results. For WASP-43 b, the second analysis maintains that the planet’s transits follow a linear ephemeris (see Section 5.0.10), whereas for WASP-4 b the favoured model changes to orbital decay with a decay rate of $-6.21 \pm 0.70 \text{ ms/yr}$ (see Section 5.0.2).

As a cautionary approach, the secondary analysis was repeated under the assumption that the transit centre uncertainties in the ETD are underestimated, thus replacing them with the standard deviation of the spread of the timing residuals – i.e., the observed transit centres minus the times calculated from the best-fit linear ephemeris. In general, using a nonlinear least squares algorithm can lead to optimistic parameter uncertainties. In addition, when describing the ETD lightcurve fitting routine, Poddaný et al. (2010) acknowledge that the errors of their L-M fit may be underestimated due to the lack of red noise correction and a fixed impact parameter. Substituting the ETD uncertainties in this way allow for an examination of the curvature in the data unbiased by the uncertainties given by the ETD lightcurve fitting tool (Table 4).

It is notable that, with the exception of HAT-P-32 b and WASP-10 b, all of the resulting decay rates agree within the respective uncertainties with those in Table 3. However, as to be expected, the uncertainties are much larger, and only three systems (WASP-12 b, HAT-P-19 b, and TrES-1 b) still exhibit statistical evidence for departure from a linear ephemeris, using a fixed variance of the data (4).

5.0.1. WASP-12 b

WASP-12 b is a $1.4 M_J$, $1.8 R_J$ Hot Jupiter discovered in 2008 on a 1.09142090 ± 0.0000002 day orbit (Hebb et al. 2008; Bonomo et al. 2017). The transit timing variations of WASP-12 b have been extensively studied, as it is the only exoplanet for which orbital decay has been unambiguously detected. The first suggestion of a period drift was from Maciejewski et al. (2016), who found that the WASP-12 b transit times diverged from a linear ephemeris. Various studies have since confirmed this finding, all with compatible decay rates (see e.g. Patra et al. 2017; Yee et al. 2019; Turner et al. 2020), the most recent result being $-30.27 \pm 1.11 \text{ ms/yr}$ from Ivshina & Winn (2022).

At the time of writing, the ETD hosts 295 observations of WASP-12 b spanning the years 2008 to 2021, 257 of which have DQ 1-3. The curvature of the transit

2

Table 3. Model comparison for secondary analysis of top 10 targets

Target	Decay Rate	1- σ Unc.	BIC _{linear}	BIC _{decay}	Δ BIC	BIC _{precession}
	(ms/yr)	(ms/yr)				
WASP-12 b	-31.6	1.0	2353.1	1911.8	-441.3	1929.4
WASP-4 b	-6.21	0.70	404.9	369.5	-35.4	378.8
WASP-10 b	-21.9	2.4	1011.3	976.0	-35.3	984.6
HAT-P-19 b	-57.7	7.3	270.4	243.1	-27.3	251.5
TrES-5 b	-34.5	4.6	541.1	518.9	-22.2	529.0
TrES-1 b	-10.9	2.0	190.9	181.2	-9.7	190.2
TrES-2 b	-12.6	2.4	878.9	870.6	-8.3	882.4
HAT-P-32 b	-7.3	1.5	677.2	669.8	-7.4	679.2
TrES-3 b	-2.75	0.78	939.8	938.9	-0.9	982.7
WASP-43 b	-1.0	1.2	576.2	580.6	4.4	593.1

NOTE—Transit timing model comparison for the second run of the analysis pipeline on the reduced data of the top 10 systems of interest. The Δ BIC is calculated for the comparison of the constant-period and orbital decay transit timing models, where a negative value favours the latter. The BIC values for the apsidal precession model fits are provided for further comparison.

3

Table 4. Model comparison for secondary analysis - data variance for ETD transit times

Target	Decay Rate	1- σ Unc.	BIC _{linear}	BIC _{decay}	Δ BIC
	(ms/yr)	(ms/yr)			
WASP-12 b	-34.8	4.9	223.7	202.7	-21.0
HAT-P-19 b	-64	17	80.6	78.2	-2.4
TrES-1 b	-16.0	3.7	73.3	68.3	-5.0
WASP-4 b	-6.7	2.4	62.6	62.7	0.1
TrES-2 b	-22.0	8.0	159.0	160.3	1.3
TrES-5 b	-25	11	118.3	120.5	2.2
HAT-P-32 b	-32	12	95.5	96.7	1.2
WASP-10 b	-10.1	7.6	131.6	135.5	3.9
WASP-43 b	3.5	4.0	126.5	130.9	4.4
TrES-3 b	0.01	1.9	227.8	233.1	5.3

NOTE—Model comparison of the results from the reduced data of the top 10 systems after replacing the ETD transit centre uncertainties with the standard deviation of the nominal timing residuals. A negative Δ BIC value favours the orbital decay model.




Figure 1. Timing residuals of WASP-12 b (top) and WASP-4 b (bottom) with future projections of the three transit timing models shown with 150 random draws from the MCMC posterior chains. Note that for aesthetic reasons, the scaling of the y-axis varies for each plot. Each datum is the difference between an observed time and the time predicted by the best-fit constant period model. The size of the data points correspond to the data quality index from 1-3, with the higher-quality transits being larger. The red crosses represent observations removed during the sigma-clipping process.

timing residuals is clear when looking at the ETD generated O-C plot.⁶ Prior to any data cleaning, the ETD transit times fit an orbital decay model with a period derivative of -29.1 ± 1.0 ms/yr, preferred over a linear ephemeris by ΔBIC of 408.7 (Table 1). This is by far the greatest ΔBIC of all of the targets, with the next best being 46.8 for TrES-2 b.

After removing partial and duplicate transits, 218 WASP-12 b transit times remain (Table B9), five of which are from published literature studies. The final analysis of the cleaned WASP-12 b data increases the ΔBIC to 441.3 favouring orbital decay at a rate of -31.6 ± 1.0 ms/yr (see Figure 1). The quadratic trend is also favoured over apsidal precession by a ΔBIC of 17.6. The best-fit precession rate is $0.000336^{+0.000026}_{-0.000013}$ rad per epoch with an eccentricity of $0.0287^{+0.0022}_{-0.0039}$ (Table A9).

5.0.2. WASP-4 b

The Hot Jupiter WASP-4 b has an orbital period of $1.338231624 \pm 0.000000068$ days and a radius and mass of $1.42 R_J$ and $1.22 M_J$, respectively (Wilson et al. 2008; Bonomo et al. 2017). The first suggestion of a period variation in WASP-4 b in the literature was from Bouma et al. (2019), who added 18 TESS transits to a collection of observations going back to 2007 and found the period to be changing at a rate of -12.6 ± 1.2 ms/yr. Later in the same year, Southworth et al. (2019) included their own data from the years 2009-2019 and found that WASP-4 b is decaying at a rate of -9.2 ± 1.1 ms/yr, while Baluev et al. (2019) conducted a homogeneous analysis and found no statistically significant evidence of a nonlinear timing trend. In 2020, Baluev et al. (2020) detected a nonlinear trend with $3.4\text{-}\sigma$ significance and Bouma et al. (2020) reported a period change of -8.64 ± 1.26 ms/yr for WASP-4 b from transit observations. However, after an analysis of new radial velocity data, they found that the Doppler effect from WASP-4 b accelerating toward the earth has the effect of decreasing the period by -5.94 ± 0.39 ms/yr. Thus, they conclude the period change is ‘mostly or entirely’ due to acceleration of the system along the line of sight (Bouma et al. 2020). However, a recent comprehensive analysis from Turner et al. (2022) did not detect this acceleration in the RV data, instead finding evidence of an additional planet in the system with a period of approximately 7000 days in addition to TTVs that are consistent with orbital decay at a rate of -7.33 ± 0.71 ms/yr. Another recent study from Ivshina & Winn (2022) measured the

period of WASP-4 b to be changing at a compatible rate of -5.81 ± 1.58 ms/yr.

Like WASP-43 b, WASP-4 b was selected for further investigation in this study because of this interest in the literature. The ETD lists 68 transit observations of WASP-4 b from the years 2009-2021, 63 of which are DQ 1-3. As many of the transits are high quality, this is a valuable resource for contributing to our understanding of the WASP-4 star-planet system. The initial analysis of the ETD transit centres does not support a departure from a linear ephemeris, with the ΔBIC favouring the constant period model by 2.7 and the best-fit decay rate being -1.09 ± 0.66 ms/yr (Table 1). After the exclusion of partial and duplicate transits for the second analysis, 55 observations of WASP-4 b remain (Table B7), ten of which are from published literature studies.

The analysis of the cleaned WASP-4 b data changes the favoured transit timing model (Figure 1). In the second analysis, orbital decay at a rate -6.21 ± 0.70 ms/yr is strongly favoured for WASP-4 b over the constant period model by a ΔBIC of 35.4 (Table 3). The apsidal precession model is also a clear contender by a ΔBIC of 26.1 when compared to a constant period, but orbital decay is still strongly favoured over precession by $\Delta\text{BIC} = 9.3$. The best-fit precession rate is $0.00048^{+0.00040}_{-0.00024}$ with an eccentricity of $0.0027^{+0.0079}_{-0.0017}$ (Table A7). This study does not evaluate the likelihood or directly model a line-of-sight acceleration of the WASP-4 b system, but in this context, the orbital decay rate can be treated as a constant period derivative within a different physical context. Whatever the underlying reason, the evidence in the data support a timing variation.

5.0.3. WASP-10 b

WASP-10 b is a $3.2 M_J$, $1.1 R_J$ Hot Jupiter discovered on a $3.09272932 \pm 0.00000032$ day orbit in 2009 (Christian et al. 2009; Bonomo et al. 2017). It has been the subject of multiple timing studies in the past due to a measured periodic TTV, with proposed explanations including starspot occultations (Barros et al. 2013) and a $0.1 M_J$ companion with a period of about 5.23 days (Maciejewski et al. 2011b,a). A second planet in the system has never been confirmed, and we have not found further discussion in the literature of other studies looking for long-term trends in the transit times of WASP-10 b, such as orbital decay or apsidal precession.

The ETD hosts 202 observations of WASP-10 b spanning the years 2007-2021, 174 of which are DQ 1-3. An initial examination of the WASP-10 b data gave a best-fit orbital decay rate near -130 ms/yr, largely driven by a single data point from Johnson et al. (2009). Removing this observation from the data set gave a more con-

⁶ <http://var2.astro.cz/ETD/etd.php?STARNAME=WASP-12&PLANET=b>




Figure 2. Similar to Figure 1, but for WASP-10 b (top) and HAT-P-19 b (bottom).

servative period derivative of -26.4 ± 2.7 ms/yr, which is the value reported in the initial round of analyses (Table 1). WASP-10 b was selected for further analysis, with the orbital decay model being strongly favoured over a constant period by a ΔBIC of 43.0.

During the data reduction process it was revealed that the observation in Johnson et al. (2009) was corrected in an erratum (Johnson et al. 2010). In addition to this, the transit centres published in Christian et al. (2009) and Maciejewski et al. (2011b) had to be converted to BJD_{TDB} from BJD_{UTC} and BJD_{TT} , respectively. After removing all partial and duplicate transits, there are 129 observations of WASP-10 b remaining, including 19 measurements from the literature (Table B8). The final analysis of the cleaned WASP-10 b data retained the strong preference for the orbital decay model (Figure 2) by a ΔBIC of 35.3 with a best-fit decay rate of -21.9 ± 2.4 ms/yr (Table 3). The apsidal precession model is also a better fit to the data than a constant period, but orbital decay is favoured by ΔBIC of 8.6. The best-fit apsidal precession model gives an eccentricity $0.0037^{+0.0027}_{-0.0011}$ and precession rate $0.00078^{+0.00015}_{-0.00020}$ rad per epoch (Table A8).

5.0.4. *HAT-P-19 b*

HAT-P-19 b is a Saturn-mass ($0.29 M_{\text{J}}$) planet with a $1.1 R_{\text{J}}$ radius on a 4.008778 ± 0.000006 day orbit (Hartman et al. 2011a; Bonomo et al. 2017). In the discovery paper, Hartman et al. (2011a) detected a linear trend in the radial velocity residuals, indicating the presence of a another body in the planetary system. This observation led to multiple studies seeking periodic TTVs (Seeliger et al. 2015; Maciejewski et al. 2018; Baştürk et al. 2020), but we have not found further discussion in the literature on testing for long-term trends in the timing residuals.

HAT-P-19 b was selected as a target of interest after the first round of analyses showed a preference for orbital decay ($\Delta\text{BIC} = 26.3$) at a rate of -55.2 ± 7.2 ms/yr (Table 1). The ETD has 98 observations of HAT-P-19 b spanning the years 2009-2021, 88 of which are DQ 1-3. The only literature observation is the discovery epoch, which had to be converted from BJD_{UTC} to BJD_{TDB} (Hartman et al. 2011a). After the exclusion of partial and duplicate transits, 75 observations of HAT-P-19 b remain (Table B1). The second analysis of HAT-P-19 b on this cleaned data set (Figure 2) yields a period derivative of -57.7 ± 7.3 ms/yr, this time favouring the decay model by a ΔBIC of 27.3 (Table 3). The orbital decay model is also favoured over apsidal precession by a ΔBIC of 8.4. The best-fit precession model yields an eccentric-

ity of $0.0068^{+0.0009}_{-0.0010}$ and precession rate $0.000905^{+0.000059}_{-0.000068}$ rad per epoch (Table A1).

5.0.5. *TrES-5 b*

TrES-5 b is a $1.8 M_{\text{J}}$, $1.2 R_{\text{J}}$ Hot Jupiter discovered in 2011 on a $1.48224460 \pm 0.00000070$ day orbit (Mandushev et al. 2011; Bonomo et al. 2017). The first suggestion of transit timing variations in the literature was by Sokov et al. (2018), who detected periodic timing variations indicative of a second planet in the system with a mass of $0.24 M_{\text{J}}$ in the 1:2 resonance orbit. Maciejewski et al. (2021) were not able to confirm or reject the existence of an additional body in the system via short-term TTVs. However, they found a long-term variation of the orbital period of -20.4 ± 4.7 ms/yr and conclude it is most likely a line-of-sight acceleration of the system induced by a massive, wide-orbiting companion. At the time of writing, the most recent timing study of TrES-5 b is from Ivshina & Winn (2022). Their analysis, which includes TESS data, found the period to be changing at a rate -17.47 ± 3.79 ms/yr.

The first analysis of the TrES-5 b ETD transit centres indicates the period could be changing at a rate of -29.7 ± 3.6 ms/yr, with the quadratic orbital decay model favoured over a constant period by a ΔBIC of 26.8 (Table 1). The ETD hosts 268 transits of TrES-5 b from the years 2012-2021, 233 of which are DQ 1-3. There are no literature observations of TrES-5 b on the database. After removal of partial and duplicate transits there are 110 remaining (Table B6). The analysis of these cleaned data showed an increase in the best-fit period derivative to -34.5 ± 4.6 ms/yr in the orbital decay model, favoured over a constant period by a ΔBIC of 22.2 (Table 3). The quadratic model is also a better fit to the data than the apsidal precession model by a difference $\Delta\text{BIC} = 10.1$ (see Figure 3). The best-fit precession rate is $0.00058^{+0.00021}_{-0.00014}$ rad per epoch with an eccentricity $0.0098^{+0.0068}_{-0.0045}$ (Table A6).

5.0.6. *TrES-1 b*

TrES-1 b is a $0.7 M_{\text{J}}$, $1.1 R_{\text{J}}$ Hot Jupiter on a $3.03006973 \pm 0.00000018$ day orbit (Alonso et al. 2004; Bonomo et al. 2017). TrES-1 b was discovered in 2004, the first of the Trans-Atlantic Exoplanet Survey (TrES), and thus has one of the longest potential observational baselines in this study. It has been the subject of various short-term TTV studies in the past (Rabus et al. 2008, 2009; Baluev et al. 2015), but no significant variations were detected. Most recently Ivshina & Winn (2022) have included TESS data and found the TrES-1 b period to be changing at a rate -18.36 ± 3.73 ms/yr. As this was part of a much larger study they did not




Figure 3. Similar to Figure 1, but for TrES-5 b (top) and TrES-1 b (bottom).

go into further detail, but suggest the system is worth monitoring.

The ETD hosts 223 observations of TrES-1 b spanning the years 2004–2021, 169 of which are DQ 1–3. Prior to any data cleaning, the ETD transit times fit an orbital decay model with a period derivative of -7.9 ± 1.4 ms/yr, preferred over a linear ephemeris by ΔBIC of 9.9 (Table 1). The TrES-1 b system has the weakest evidence of a nonlinear timing trend out of the top eight systems picked from Table 1, but the results still fit the criteria for strong evidence with a $\Delta\text{BIC} > 5$. Nineteen of the TrES-1 b transit times on the database are from published literature studies, though it was discovered that five of them are duplicates and were excluded. In addition, the observations from Hrudková et al. (2008) had to be converted from BJD_{UTC} to BJD_{TDB} . After these considerations, there are 68 remaining observations (Table B3).

The final analysis of the cleaned TrES-1 b data (see Figure 3) yields a best-fit period derivative of -10.9 ± 2.1 ms/yr with the orbital decay model being favoured over a constant period by a ΔBIC of 9.7 (Table 3). Thus, the results of the second analysis are consistent with the first, which contained data duplicates and observations with inconsistent timestamps, suggesting the fit results are robust. The BIC values for the constant period and apsidal precession models are almost indistinguishable (Table A3). The best-fit apsidal precession model gives an eccentricity $0.0030^{+0.0037}_{-0.0015}$ and precession rate $0.00057^{+0.00024}_{-0.00019}$ rad per epoch.

5.0.7. *TrES-2 b*

TrES-2 b is a $1.2 M_{\text{J}}$, $1.2 R_{\text{J}}$ Hot Jupiter discovered in 2006 on a $2.470613374 \pm 0.000000019$ day, near grazing orbit (O’Donovan et al. 2006; Bonomo et al. 2017). As TrES-2 b lies within the Kepler field, it was extensively studied in the years following its discovery. Early publications suggest evidence of short-term transit timing and duration variations, with explanations including a third body in the system or the existence of a moon (Rabus et al. 2009; Mislis & Schmitt 2009). Later studies, however, were not able to support these claims, thus citing no evidence of short or long-term transit timing variations for TrES-2 b (Kipping & Bakos 2011; Schröter et al. 2012; Raetz et al. 2014). We have not found any TTV studies of TrES-2 b in years since.

The initial analysis of the TrES-2 b ETD data showed a strong preference for the orbital decay model with a period derivative of -20.7 ± 2.1 ms/yr (Table 1). The ΔBIC favours the decay model over a constant period by a significant value of 46.8. Because of this, TrES-2 b was selected as a target of interest for further analysis.

The ETD hosts 331 transits of TrES-2 b spanning the years 2006–2021, 270 of which are DQ 1–3. After removal of partial and duplicate transits 152 remain (Table B4), as many were partial transits. The analysis of these cleaned data yields a less convincing, but still notable, argument for the decay scenario. It is worth highlighting that the first few epochs are mostly literature observations, which may be driving the model due to their generally higher precision and having been measured several years before the ETD observations begin (Figure 4). The ΔBIC favours the decay model over a linear ephemeris by 8.3, with the best-fit decay rate being -12.6 ± 2.4 ms/yr (Table 3).

Though the ΔBIC metric favours the orbital decay model over a constant period, it does not favour the apsidal precession model over a constant period. If there is statistically significant curvature in the timing residuals, it is reasonable to expect that the apsidal precession model should be a better fit than a constant period. Looking at only the χ^2 values, the constant period model ($\chi^2 = 868.8$) is a worse fit than both apsidal precession ($\chi^2 = 857.4$) and orbital decay ($\chi^2 = 855.6$) models. The distinction between the two timing models is less clear in the case of TrES-2 b than for the other systems explored here due to the large spread in the ETD data and the high number of DQ 3 observations (Figure 4). We found that TrES-2 b was the only target that could not pass the MCMC convergence criteria for the apsidal precession model. The resulting best-fit apsidal precession rate and eccentricity are $0.00061^{+0.00023}_{-0.00022}$ rad per epoch and $0.0030^{+0.0039}_{-0.0014}$, respectively (Table A4).

5.0.8. *HAT-P-32 b*

HAT-P-32 b is a $0.8 M_{\text{J}}$, $1.8 R_{\text{J}}$ Hot Jupiter discovered in 2011 on a $2.15000825 \pm 0.000000012$ day orbit (Hartman et al. 2011b; Bonomo et al. 2017). In 2014 it was the subject of a TTV study seeking evidence of an additional body in the system, but amplitudes of greater than 1.5 minutes were ruled out (Seeliger et al. 2014). The contributed observations on the ETD span the years 2007–2021, though there is a 633 orbit gap after the discovery transit. During a preliminary examination of the HAT-P-32 b transit centres it was noted that, without the discovery epoch, there is visual curvature in the timing residuals.⁷ This point was removed for the initial round of analysis so that the significance of the curvature could be examined and compared with other systems. HAT-P-32 b was selected for further analysis, as orbital decay at a rate of -30.2 ± 3.3 ms/yr is favoured

⁷ <http://var2.astro.cz/ETD/etd.php?STARNAME=HAT-P-32&PLANET=b>




Figure 4. Similar to Figure 1, but for TrES-2 b (top) and HAT-P-32 b (bottom).

over a constant period ephemeris by $\Delta\text{BIC} = 39.7$ (Table 1).

The ETD hosts 167 transits of HAT-P-32 b, 142 of which are DQ 1-3. After the exclusion of partial and duplicate transits, 88 observations remain (Table B2). This includes the discovery epoch, which was added back to the data set as it was found that the transit time was not converted from BJD_{UTC} to HJD_{UTC} when listed on the database (Hartman et al. 2011b). Results from the final analysis of the cleaned HAT-P-32 b data maintain a preference for the orbital decay model over a constant period by a ΔBIC of 7.4, as well as the apsidal precession model by a ΔBIC of 9.4 (Figure 4). However, the χ^2 of the orbital decay and apsidal precession models are indistinguishable. The best-fit period derivative for the decay model is -7.3 ± 1.5 ms/yr, and the apsidal precession model yields an eccentricity of $0.0022^{+0.0049}_{-0.0012}$ and precession rate $0.00054^{+0.00028}_{-0.00024}$ rad/epoch (Table A2).

5.0.9. *TrES-3 b*

TrES-3 b is a $1.8 M_{\text{J}}$, $1.3 R_{\text{J}}$ Hot Jupiter with an orbital period of $1.306186483 \pm 0.00000007$ days that was discovered in 2007 (O’Donovan et al. 2007; Bonomo et al. 2017). It has been extensively studied in the search for periodic TTVs indicating the presence of another planet, but no conclusive evidence of such variations have been found (Sozzetti et al. 2009; Gibson et al. 2009; Jiang et al. 2013; Vanko et al. 2013; Püsküllü et al. 2017). Zhao et al. (2018) and Mannaday et al. (2020) have investigated the possibility of orbital decay, both concluding that TrES-3 b transit times are consistent with a constant period. However, Mannaday et al. (2020) found the difference in BIC values of the orbital decay and constant period models to be very similar and recommend further observations.

The ETD hosts 556 observations of TrES-3 b from the years 2007–2021, 465 of which are DQ 1-3. This is one of the longest and most complete observational baselines in this study. In the initial round of analysis the orbital decay model was favoured for TrES-3 b by a ΔBIC of 26.7 when compared to the linear model (Table 1). The best-fit decay rate is small at -5.08 ± 0.63 ms/yr, but it was selected for further analysis. Many of the observations of TrES-3 b on the ETD do not have a clear ingress or egress and many of the early observations do not have a recorded timing uncertainty, resulting in their immediate exclusion. After the removal of partial transits and duplicates (including the first literature observation) there are 231 observations remaining (Table B5). The second, follow up analysis on this cleaned data set is more favourable toward a constant period model (Figure 5). The best-fit decay rate is -2.75 ± 0.78 ms/yr,

consistent with a constant period when considering the variance in the data. The BIC values for the decay and constant period models are indistinguishable (Table 3). The precession model is strongly disfavoured by its BIC, which can be explained by the apparent lack of curvature in the timing residuals. Indeed, the precession model is driven to a very low eccentricity of 0.0005 and a slow precession rate of 0.00013 rad per epoch, and is ultimately a poor fit (Table A5).

5.0.10. *WASP-43 b*

WASP-43 b is a $2.1 M_{\text{J}}$, $1.0 R_{\text{J}}$ Hot Jupiter on a $0.81347437 \pm 0.00000013$ day orbit (Hellier et al. 2011; Bonomo et al. 2017). The WASP-43 b system has been monitored since 2014 for signs of long-term transit timing variations because its ultra-short orbital period is thought to make it a good candidate for exhibiting orbital decay (Blecic et al. 2014; Murgas et al. 2014; Chen et al. 2014; Ricci et al. 2014). In 2016, Jiang et al. (2016) detected evidence of orbital decay at a rate of $-0.02890795 \pm 0.00772547$ s/year. Later that same year, Hoyer et al. (2016) published a homogeneous analysis including new data that showed no indication of a period variation. Two years later, Zhao et al. (2018) found that orbital decay is slightly preferred over a constant period, but at a rate of -0.005248 ± 0.001714 s/yr. In this study, the initial analysis of ETD transit centres strongly favours a constant period (Table 1), but the system was selected for further analysis due to the interest in the literature.

The ETD hosts 186 transits of WASP-43 b spanning the years 2010–2021, with 162 being DQ 1-3. After the exclusion of partial and duplicate transits there are 126 remaining observations (Table B10). Analysis of the cleaned data supports the constant period model for WASP-43 b over orbital decay by ΔBIC of 4.4 (Figure 5). In addition to this, the best-fit orbital decay rate is -1.0 ± 1.2 ms/yr, which is consistent with a constant orbital period (Table 3). Like TrES-3 b, apsidal precession results in poor fit due to the sinusoidal nature of the model and the strong linearity of the data (Table A10).

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has utilized the wealth of citizen science observations on the Exoplanet Transit Database (ETD) to identify Hot Jupiter systems that are candidates for the detection of orbital decay, or more precisely, detectable period drifts. In the process, we have demonstrated the potential of citizen scientists to contribute to the detection of long-term orbital evolution signatures of close-in giant planets.




Figure 5. Similar to Figure 1, but for TrES-3 b (top) and WASP-43 b (bottom).

We highlight systems in the ETD that should be prioritized for further study in Table 3. We find that eight star-planet systems in the ETD show statistically compelling quadratic trends in the transit times and particularly recommend future follow-up of HAT-P-19 b, HAT-P-32 b, TrES-1 b, and WASP-10 b.

For an additional approach, we purposefully take a pessimistic view of the data’s predictive power and assume that the uncertainties of the ETD transit centres are generally unreliable. In this case, we use the variance of the timing residuals during fitting and find that three of the targets (WASP-12 b, HAT-P-19 b, and TrES-1 b) still show evidence of a negative period derivative.

In addition to orbital decay, we consider apsidal precession as a source of timing variations – in no case is this model preferred over orbital decay. In many cases, however, the χ^2 value of the orbital decay and apsidal precession models are similar. We further note that only the low-eccentricity ($e \ll 0.1$) expansion for precession is used in this work (as well as typically in others). Preliminary analysis of WASP-12 b using the higher-order eccentricity expansion for precession, up to e^5 as presented in [Ragozzine & Wolf \(2009\)](#), does show promise in fitting the data, but only if a high eccentricity ($e \approx 0.1$) is used. The overall results are also not clearly better than the orbital decay model and so are not pursued further here.

Confirmation of period drifts, regardless of the cause, would provide additional constraints on the system. For orbital decay, the period derivative can be used to infer properties such as the planet’s remaining lifetime and the stellar tidal dissipation rate. For precession, the model could constrain the interior density distribution of Hot Jupiters and potentially yield an upper limit on orbital eccentricities (of course, radial velocity data, if available, provide independent eccentricity constraints). Other possible effects, such as line-of-sight acceleration and stellar activity, will also need to be considered in understanding the underlying cause of observed timing deviations.

As our study aims to aid in selecting systems for long-term observing campaigns, in addition to extending the observed baselines of those systems, a next step is to conduct in-depth analyses into the identified candidates. Such studies should combine all available data sets for the system of interest, homogeneously refitting them where possible. We will aim to conduct such studies, also seeking to obtain further observations of these systems, particularly by collaborating with citizen scientists.

The exoplanet WASP-12 b has proved to be critical as a control for this study and serves as an important

test case for orbital decay searches in general. The consistency between the results using citizen science data and those in the literature demonstrates the feasibility of such work. The ETD offers a rich history of transit times for hundreds of star-planet systems that can make the search for evidence of long-term dynamical evolution, orbital decay in this case, more efficient. While this work does not suggest that any of the identified systems, apart from WASP-12 b, are indeed undergoing orbital decay or other period deviations, the work does suggest that there is sufficient evidence to keep looking.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work would not be possible without the dedication and skill of the Exoplanet Transit Database (ETD) coordinators and observers, and we sincerely thank them all for their ongoing contributions. The names of observers of the data used for this study – as given on ETD with minor formatting changes – can be found in the supplementary data tables on Zenodo at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7098460> and in Appendix B. As of May 13, 2022 there are 625 ETD contributors consisting of universities, teams, and individuals from around the world. Additionally, this network of observers expands with the inclusion of the ExoClock and Exoplanet Watch programmes. We emphasize the science potential of such a large community of ground-based observers, and encourage continued collaboration and the inclusion of new observers. Having identified key systems to follow-up in further depth, we look forward to collaborating with the participants of these programmes as we continue to investigate the potential for non-linear ephemerides.

We thank Darin Ragozzine for helpful comments on the draft of this paper. This work is supported, in part, by an NSERC Discovery Grant, an NSERC CREATE grant, and the Canada Research Chairs program. BE is a Laureate of the Paris Region fellowship programme which is supported by the Ile-de-France Region and has received funding under the Horizon 2020 innovation framework programme and the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement no. 945298.

REFERENCES

- Alonso, R., Brown, T. M., Torres, G., et al. 2004, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 613, L153, doi: [10.1086/425256](https://doi.org/10.1086/425256)
- Baştürk, Ö., Yalçinkaya, S., Esmer, E. M., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 496, 4174, doi: [10.1093/mnras/staa1758](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa1758)
- Baluev, R. V., Sokov, E. N., Shaidulin, V. S., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 450, 3101, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stv788](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv788)
- Baluev, R. V., Sokov, E. N., Jones, H. R. A., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 490, 1294, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stz2620](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz2620)
- Baluev, R. V., Sokov, E. N., Hoyer, S., et al. 2020, *MNRAS. Letters*, 496, L11, doi: [10.1093/mnrasl/slaa069](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnrasl/slaa069)
- Barros, S. C. C., Boué, G., Gibson, N. P., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 430, 3032, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stt111](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stt111)
- Batygin, K., Bodenheimer, P. H., & Laughlin, G. P. 2016, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 829, 114, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/829/2/114](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/829/2/114)
- Birkby, J. L., Cappetta, M., Cruz, P., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 440, 1470, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stu343](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu343)
- Blecic, J., Harrington, J., Madhusudhan, N., et al. 2014, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 781, 116, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/781/2/116](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/781/2/116)
- Boley, A. C., Granados Contreras, A. P., & Gladman, B. 2016, *Astrophysical journal. Letters*, 817, L17, doi: [10.3847/2041-8205/817/2/L17](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8205/817/2/L17)
- Bonomo, A. S., Desidera, S., Benatti, S., et al. 2017, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 602, A107, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201629882](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201629882)
- Bouma, L. G., Winn, J. N., Howard, A. W., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 893, L29, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ab8563](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab8563)
- Bouma, L. G., Winn, J. N., Howard, A. W., et al. 2020, *Astrophysical journal. Letters*, 893, L29, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ab8563](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab8563)
- Bouma, L. G., Winn, J. N., Baxter, C., et al. 2019, *The Astronomical Journal*, 157, 217, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ab189f](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ab189f)
- Chen, G., van Boekel, R., Wang, H., et al. 2014, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 563, A40, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201322740](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201322740)
- Christian, D. J., Gibson, N. P., Simpson, E. K., et al. 2009, *MNRAS*, 392, 1585, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2008.14164.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2008.14164.x)
- Collins, K. 2019, in *American Astronomical Society Meeting Abstracts*, Vol. 233, American Astronomical Society Meeting Abstracts #233, 140.05
- Davoudi, F., MirshafieKhozani, P., Paki, E., et al. 2021, *Astronomy Letters*, 47, 638, doi: [10.1134/S1063773721090024](https://doi.org/10.1134/S1063773721090024)
- Eastman, J., Siverd, R., & Gaudi, B. S. 2010, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, 122, 935, doi: [10.1086/655938](https://doi.org/10.1086/655938)
- Edwards, B., Anisman, L., Changeat, Q., et al. 2020, *Research Notes of the AAS*, 4, 109, doi: [10.3847/2515-5172/aba42b](https://doi.org/10.3847/2515-5172/aba42b)
- Edwards, B., Ho, C. S. K., Osborne, H. L. M., et al. 2021, *ATOM*, 2, 25, doi: [10.32374/atom.2020.2.4](https://doi.org/10.32374/atom.2020.2.4)
- Edwards, B., Changeat, Q., Yip, K. H., et al. 2021, *MNRAS*, 504, 5671, doi: [10.1093/mnras/staa1245](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa1245)
- Fabrycky, D., & Tremaine, S. 2007, *ApJ*, 669, 1298, doi: [10.1086/521702](https://doi.org/10.1086/521702)
- Ford, E. B. 2006, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 642, 505, doi: [10.1086/500802](https://doi.org/10.1086/500802)
- Foreman-Mackey, D., Hogg, D. W., Lang, D., & Goodman, J. 2013, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, 125, 306, doi: [10.1086/670067](https://doi.org/10.1086/670067)
- Gibson, N. P., Pollacco, D., Simpson, E. K., et al. 2009, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 700, 1078, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/700/2/1078](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/700/2/1078)
- Hartman, J. D., Bakos, G. Á., Sato, B., et al. 2011a, *ApJ*, 726, 52, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/726/1/52](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/726/1/52)
- Hartman, J. D., Bakos, G. Á., Torres, G., et al. 2011b, *ApJ*, 742, 59, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/742/1/59](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/742/1/59)
- Hebb, L., Collier-Cameron, A., Loeillet, B., et al. 2008, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/693/2/1920](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/693/2/1920)
- Hellier, C., Anderson, D. R., Collier Cameron, A., et al. 2011, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 535, L7, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201117081](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201117081)
- Hoyer, S., Pallé, E., Dragomir, D., & Murgas, F. 2016, *The Astronomical Journal*, 151, 137, doi: [10.3847/0004-6256/151/6/137](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-6256/151/6/137)
- Hrudková, M., Skillen, I., Benn, C., et al. 2008, *Proceedings of the International Astronomical Union*, 4, 446, doi: [10.1017/S1743921308026896](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743921308026896)
- Ioannidis, P., Huber, K. F., & Schmitt, J. 2016, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 585, A72, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201527184](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201527184)
- Ivshina, E. S., & Winn, J. N. 2022, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 259, 62, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/ac545b](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/ac545b)
- Jiang, I.-G., Lai, C.-Y., Savushkin, A., et al. 2016, *The Astronomical Journal*, 151, 17, doi: [10.3847/0004-6256/151/1/17](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-6256/151/1/17)
- Jiang, I.-G., Yeh, L.-C., Thakur, P., et al. 2013, *The Astronomical Journal*, 145, 68, doi: [10.1088/0004-6256/145/3/68](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-6256/145/3/68)
- Johnson, J., Winn, J., Cabrera, N., & Carter, J. 2010, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 712, L122, doi: [10.1088/2041-8205/712/1/L122](https://doi.org/10.1088/2041-8205/712/1/L122)

- Johnson, J. A., Winn, J. N., Cabrera, N. E., & Carter, J. A. 2009, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 692, L100, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/692/2/L100](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/692/2/L100)
- Kipping, D., & Bakos, G. 2011, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 733, 36, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/733/1/36](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/733/1/36)
- Kokori, A., Tsiaras, A., Edwards, B., Rocchetto, M., & Tinetti, G. 2022, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 258, 40, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/ac3a10](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/ac3a10)
- Kokori, A., Tsiaras, A., Edwards, B., et al. 2021, *Experimental Astronomy*, 53, 547, doi: [10.1007/s10686-020-09696-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10686-020-09696-3)
- Levrard, B., Winisdoerffer, C., & Chabrier, G. 2009, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 692, L9, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/692/1/L9](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/692/1/L9)
- Liddle, A. R. 2007, *MNRAS. Letters*, 377, L74, doi: [10.1111/j.1745-3933.2007.00306.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3933.2007.00306.x)
- Lin, D. N. C., Bodenheimer, P., & Richardson, D. C. 1996, *Nature (London)*, 380, 606, doi: [10.1038/380606a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/380606a0)
- Maciejewski, G., Fernández, M., Aceituno, F., et al. 2021, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 656, A88, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202142424](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202142424)
- Maciejewski, G., Raetz, S., Nettelmann, N., et al. 2011a, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 535, A7, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201117127](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201117127)
- Maciejewski, G., Stangret, M., Ohlert, J., et al. 2018, *Information bulletin on variable stars*, doi: [10.22444/IBVS.6243](https://doi.org/10.22444/IBVS.6243)
- Maciejewski, G., Dimitrov, D., Neuhäuser, R., et al. 2011b, *MNRAS*, 411, 1204, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.17753.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.17753.x)
- Maciejewski, G., Dimitrov, D., Fernández, M., et al. 2016, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 588, L6, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201628312](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201628312)
- Mallonn, M., von Essen, C., Herrero, E., et al. 2019, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 622, A81, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201834194](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201834194)
- Mandushev, G., Dunham, E. W., Quinn, S. N., & Latham, D. W. 2011, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 741
- Mannaday, V. K., Thakur, P., Jiang, I.-G., et al. 2020, *The Astronomical Journal*, 160, 47, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ab9818](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ab9818)
- Matsumura, S., Peale, S. J., & Rasio, F. A. 2010, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 725, 1995, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/725/2/1995](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/725/2/1995)
- Mislis, D., & Schmitt, J. H. M. M. 2009, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 500, L45, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/200811424](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/200811424)
- Murgas, F., Pallé, E., Zapatero Osorio, M. R., et al. 2014, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 563, A41, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201322374](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201322374)
- O'Donovan, F. T., Charbonneau, D., Bakos, G. Á., et al. 2007, *ApJ*, 663, L37, doi: [10.1086/519793](https://doi.org/10.1086/519793)
- O'Donovan, F. T., Charbonneau, D., Mandushev, G., et al. 2006, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 651, L61, doi: [10.1086/509123](https://doi.org/10.1086/509123)
- Patra, K. C., Winn, J. N., Holman, M. J., Gillon, M., & Burdanov, A. 2020, *The Astronomical Journal*, 159, 150, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ab7374](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ab7374)
- Patra, K. C., Winn, J. N., Holman, M. J., et al. 2017, *The Astronomical Journal*, 154, 4, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aa6d75](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aa6d75)
- Penev, K., Bouma, L. G., Winn, J. N., & Hartman, J. D. 2018, *The Astronomical Journal*, 155, 165, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aaaf71](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aaaf71)
- Petrucchi, R., Jofré, E., Gómez Maqueo Chew, Y., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stz3034](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz3034)
- Petrucchi, R., Jofré, E., Schwartz, M., et al. 2013, *Astrophysical journal. Letters*, 779, L23
- Poddaný, S., Brat, L., & Pejcha, O. 2011, *EPJ Web of Conferences*, 11, 6008, doi: [10.1051/epjconf/20101106008](https://doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/20101106008)
- Poddaný, S., Brát, L., & Pejcha, O. 2010, *New Astronomy*, 15, 297, doi: [10.1016/j.newast.2009.09.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newast.2009.09.001)
- Püsküllü, Ç., Soyduğan, F., Erdem, A., & Budding, E. 2017, *NewA*, 55, 39, doi: [10.1016/j.newast.2017.04.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newast.2017.04.001)
- Rabus, M., Alonso, R., Deeg, H. J., et al. 2008, *Proceedings of the International Astronomical Union*, 4, 432, doi: [10.1017/S1743921308026859](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743921308026859)
- Rabus, M., Deeg, H. J., Alonso, R., Belmonte, J. A., & Almenara, J. M. 2009, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 508, 1011, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/200912252](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/200912252)
- Raetz, S., Maciejewski, G., Ginski, C., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 444, 1351, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stu1505](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu1505)
- Ragozzine, D., & Wolf, A. S. 2009, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 698, 1778, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/698/2/1778](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/698/2/1778)
- Ricci, D., Ramón-Fox, F. G., Ayala-Loera, C., et al. 2014, doi: [10.1086/680233](https://doi.org/10.1086/680233)
- Ricker, G. R., Winn, J. N., Vanderspek, R., et al. 2015, *Journal of astronomical telescopes, instruments, and systems*, 1, 014003, doi: [10.1117/1.JATIS.1.1.014003](https://doi.org/10.1117/1.JATIS.1.1.014003)
- Schröter, S., Schmitt, J. H. M. M., & Müller, H. M. 2012, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 539, A97, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201118536](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201118536)
- Seeliger, M., Dimitrov, D., Kjurkchieva, D., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 441, 304, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stu567](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu567)
- Seeliger, M., Kitze, M., Errmann, R., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 451, 4060, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stv1187](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv1187)
- Sokov, E. N., Sokova, I. A., Dyachenko, V. V., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 480, 291, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty1615](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty1615)
- Sonbas, E., Karaman, N., Özdönmez, A., et al. 2021, *MNRAS*, 509, 5102, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stab3270](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab3270)

- Sousa-Silva, C., McKemmish, L. K., Chubb, K. L., et al. 2018, *Physics Education*, 53, 015020, doi: [10.1088/1361-6552/aa8f2a](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6552/aa8f2a)
- Southworth, J., Dominik, M., Jørgensen, U. G., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 490, 4230, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stz2602](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz2602)
- Sozzetti, A., Torres, G., Charbonneau, D., et al. 2009, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 691, 1145, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/691/2/1145](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/691/2/1145)
- Tinetti, G., Drossart, P., Eccleston, P., et al. 2018, *Experimental Astronomy*, 46, 135, doi: [10.1007/s10686-018-9598-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10686-018-9598-x)
- Tinetti, G., Eccleston, P., Haswell, C., et al. 2021, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2104.04824. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.04824>
- Turner, J. D., Flagg, L., Ridden-Harper, A., & Jayawardhana, R. 2022, *The Astronomical Journal*, 163, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ac686f](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ac686f)
- Turner, J. D., Ridden-Harper, A., & Jayawardhana, R. 2020, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/abd178](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/abd178)
- Vanko, M., Maciejewski, G., Jakubík, M., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 432, 944, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stt502](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stt502)
- Wilson, D. M., Gillon, M., Hellier, C., et al. 2008, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 675, L113, doi: [10.1086/586735](https://doi.org/10.1086/586735)
- Wong, I., Shporer, A., Vissapragada, S., et al. 2022, *The Astronomical Journal*, 163, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ac5680](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ac5680)
- Yee, S. W., Winn, J. N., Knutson, H. A., et al. 2019, *Astrophysical journal. Letters*, 888, L5, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ab5c16](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab5c16)
- Zellem, R. T., Pearson, K. A., Blaser, E., et al. 2020, *PASP*, 132, 054401, doi: [10.1088/1538-3873/ab7ee7](https://doi.org/10.1088/1538-3873/ab7ee7)
- Zhao, S., Jiang-hui, J., & Yao, D. 2018, *Chinese Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 42, 101, doi: [10.1016/j.chinastron.2018.01.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chinastron.2018.01.007)

APPENDIX

A. FULL MCMC RESULTS

The results of the Metropolis-Hastings MCMC sampling of the constant period, orbital decay, and apsidal precession transit timing models are presented below. The top ten targets of interest, as discussed in section 5, are listed alphabetically.

Table A1. HAT-P-19 b Results

Parameter	Symbol	Unit	Value	Uncertainty (1- σ)
Constant Period Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2455091.53464	+0.00010 −0.00010
Period	P	days	4.00878388	+0.00000015 −0.00000014
Number of Data	n		72	
Degrees of Freedom	k		2	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		261.8	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		270.4	
Orbital Decay Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2455091.53382	+0.00014 −0.00015
Period	P	days	4.00878805	+0.00000055 −0.00000054
Decay Rate	dP/dE	days/epoch	-7.33×10^{-9}	+0.92 $\times 10^{-9}$ −0.93 $\times 10^{-9}$
Decay Rate	dP/dt	ms/yr	−57.7	+7.2 −7.3
Degrees of Freedom	k		3	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		230.3	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		243.1	
Apsidal Precession Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2455091.5263	+0.0013 −0.0011
Sidereal Period	P_s	days	4.00878386	+0.00000014 −0.00000014
Argument of Periastron	ω_0	rad	2.623	+0.046 −0.043
Precession Rate	$d\omega/dE$	rad/epoch	0.000905	+0.000059 −0.000068
Eccentricity	e		0.0068	+0.0009 −0.0010
Degrees of Freedom	k		5	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		230.1	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		251.5	

Table A2. HAT-P-32 b Results

Parameter	Symbol	Unit	Value	Uncertainty (1- σ)
Constant Period Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2454420.447196	+0.000052 −0.000051
Period	P	days	2.150008203	+0.000000038 −0.000000038
Number of Data	n		87	
Degrees of Freedom	k		2	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		668.3	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		677.2	
Orbital Decay Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2454420.447035	+0.000061 −0.000061
Period	P	days	2.15000874	+0.00000012 −0.00000012
Decay Rate	dP/dE	days/epoch	-0.50×10^{-9}	+0.10 $\times 10^{-9}$ −0.10 $\times 10^{-9}$
Decay Rate	dP/dt	ms/yr	−7.3	+1.5 −1.5
Degrees of Freedom	k		3	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		656.4	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		669.8	
Apsidal Precession Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2454420.4458	+0.0008 −0.0034
Sidereal Period	P_s	days	2.150008198	+0.000000037 −0.000000037
Argument of Periastron	ω_0	rad	2.55	+0.27 −0.34
Precession Rate	$d\omega/dE$	rad/epoch	0.00054	+0.00028 −0.00024
Eccentricity	e		0.0022	+0.0049 −0.0012
Degrees of Freedom	k		5	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		656.8	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		679.2	

Table A3. TrES-1 b Results

Parameter	Symbol	Unit	Value	Uncertainty (1- σ)
Constant Period Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2453898.874169	+0.000038 -0.000038
Period	P	days	3.030069676	+0.000000042 -0.000000042
Number of Data	n		66	
Degrees of Freedom	k		2	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		182.6	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		190.9	
Orbital Decay Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2453898.874084	+0.000041 -0.000041
Period	P	days	3.03007055	+0.00000017 -0.00000017
Decay Rate	dP/dE	days/epoch	-1.05×10^{-9}	+0.20 $\times 10^{-9}$ -0.20 $\times 10^{-9}$
Decay Rate	dP/dt	ms/yr	-10.9	+2.1 -2.0
Degrees of Freedom	k		3	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		168.6	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		181.2	
Apsidal Precession Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2453898.8715	+0.0015 -0.0035
Sidereal Period	P_s	days	3.030069678	+0.000000042 -0.000000042
Argument of Periastron	ω_0	rad	2.67	+0.15 -0.20
Precession Rate	$d\omega/dE$	rad/epoch	0.00057	+0.00024 -0.00019
Eccentricity	e		0.0030	+0.0037 -0.0015
Degrees of Freedom	k		5	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		169.2	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		190.2	

Table A4. TrES-2 b Results

Parameter	Symbol	Unit	Value	Uncertainty ($1-\sigma$)
Constant Period Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2453957.635474	$+0.000020$ -0.000020
Period	P	days	2.47061340	$+0.000000042$ -0.000000042
Number of Data	n		149	
Degrees of Freedom	k		2	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		868.8	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		878.9	
Orbital Decay Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2453957.635119	$+0.000069$ -0.000070
Period	P	days	2.47061447	$+0.000000020$ -0.000000020
Decay Rate	dP/dE	days/epoch	-0.99×10^{-9}	$+0.18 \times 10^{-9}$ -0.19×10^{-9}
Decay Rate	dP/dt	ms/yr	-12.6	$+2.4$ -2.4
Degrees of Freedom	k		3	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		855.6	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		870.6	
Apsidal Precession Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2453957.6333	$+0.0011$ -0.0031
Sidereal Period	P_s	days	2.470613392	$+0.000000042$ -0.000000042
Argument of Periastron	ω_0	rad	2.47	$+0.24$ -0.26
Precession Rate	$d\omega/dE$	rad/epoch	0.00061	$+0.00023$ -0.00022
Eccentricity	e		0.0030	$+0.0039$ -0.0014
Degrees of Freedom	k		5	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		857.4	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		882.4	

Table A5. TrES-3 b Results

Parameter	Symbol	Unit	Value	Uncertainty ($1-\sigma$)
Constant Period Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2454538.581479	$+0.000027$ -0.000027
Period	P	days	1.306186320	$+0.000000014$ -0.000000014
Number of Data	n		218	
Degrees of Freedom	k		2	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		929.0	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		939.8	
Orbital Decay Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2454538.581437	$+0.000030$ -0.000030
Period	P	days	1.306186497	$+0.000000050$ -0.000000052
Decay Rate	dP/dE	days/epoch	-0.11×10^{-9}	$+0.032 \times 10^{-9}$ -0.031×10^{-9}
Decay Rate	dP/dt	ms/yr	-2.75	$+0.78$ -0.76
Degrees of Freedom	k		3	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		922.8	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		938.9	
Apsidal Precession Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2454538.58143	$+0.00010$ -0.00055
Sidereal Period	P_s	days	1.306186320	$+0.000000011$ -0.000000011
Argument of Periastron	ω_0	rad	2.5	$+2.0$ -1.0
Precession Rate	$d\omega/dE$	rad/epoch	0.00013	$+0.00052$ -0.00012
Eccentricity	e		0.0005	$+0.0027$ -0.0005
Degrees of Freedom	k		5	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		955.8	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		982.7	

Table A6. TrES-5 b Results

Parameter	Symbol	Unit	Value	Uncertainty (1- σ)
Constant Period Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2455443.25340	$+0.00012$ -0.00012
Period	P	days	1.482246663	$+0.000000064$ -0.000000064
Number of Data	n		109	
Degrees of Freedom	k		2	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		531.8	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		541.1	
Orbital Decay Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2455443.25109	$+0.00033$ -0.00032
Period	P	days	1.48224954	$+0.00000038$ -0.00000039
Decay Rate	dP/dE	days/epoch	$-1.6e - 09$	$+0.22 \times 10^{-9}$ -0.21×10^{-9}
Decay Rate	dP/dt	ms/yr	-34.5	$+4.6$ -4.5
Degrees of Freedom	k		3	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		504.9	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		518.9	
Apsidal Precession Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2455443.2490	$+0.0021$ -0.0032
Sidereal Period	P_s	days	1.482246666	$+0.000000064$ -0.000000064
Argument of Periastron	ω_0	rad	2.11	$+0.24$ -0.37
Precession Rate	$d\omega/dE$	rad/epoch	0.00058	$+0.00021$ -0.00014
Eccentricity	e		0.0098	$+0.0068$ -0.0045
Degrees of Freedom	k		5	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		505.6	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		529.0	

Table A7. WASP-4 b Results

Parameter	Symbol	Unit	Value	Uncertainty ($1-\sigma$)
Constant Period Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2455880.794607	+0.000018 −0.000018
Period	P	days	1.338231560	+0.000000016 −0.000000015
Number of Data	n		55	
Degrees of Freedom	k		2	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		396.9	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		404.9	
Orbital Decay Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2455880.794814	+0.000029 −0.000029
Period	P	days	1.338231695	+0.000000022 −0.000000022
Decay Rate	dP/dE	days/epoch	-0.263×10^{-9}	+0.029 $\times 10^{-9}$ −0.029 $\times 10^{-9}$
Decay Rate	dP/dt	ms/yr	−6.21	+0.70 −0.70
Degrees of Freedom	k		3	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		357.4	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		369.5	
Apsidal Precession Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2455880.7937	+0.0007 −0.0033
Sidereal Period	P_s	days	1.338231569	+0.000000018 −0.000000017
Argument of Periastron	ω_0	rad	2.95	+0.074 −0.089
Precession Rate	$d\omega/dE$	rad/epoch	0.00048	+0.00040 −0.00024
Eccentricity	e		0.0027	+0.0079 −0.0017
Degrees of Freedom	k		5	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		358.8	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		378.8	

Table A8. WASP-10 b Results

Parameter	Symbol	Unit	Value	Uncertainty ($1-\sigma$)
Constant Period Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2454357.857968	+0.000031 −0.000031
Period	P	days	3.092728113	+0.000000044 −0.000000044
Number of Data	n		122	
Degrees of Freedom	k		2	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		1001.7	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		1011.3	
Orbital Decay Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2454357.857571	+0.000054 −0.000054
Period	P	days	3.09272986	+0.000000020 −0.000000020
Decay Rate	dP/dE	days/epoch	-2.15×10^{-9}	+0.24 $\times 10^{-9}$ −0.24 $\times 10^{-9}$
Decay Rate	dP/dt	ms/yr	−21.9	+2.4 −2.4
Degrees of Freedom	k		3	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		961.6	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		976.0	
Apsidal Precession Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2454357.8547	+0.0010 −0.0026
Sidereal Period	P_s	days	3.092728117	+0.000000044 −0.000000044
Argument of Periastron	ω_0	rad	2.51	+0.16 −0.12
Precession Rate	$d\omega/dE$	rad/epoch	0.00078	+0.00015 −0.00020
Eccentricity	e		0.0037	+0.0027 −0.0011
Degrees of Freedom	k		5	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		960.6	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		984.6	

Table A9. WASP-12 b Results

Parameter	Symbol	Unit	Value	Uncertainty ($1-\sigma$)
Constant Period Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2454508.978942	+0.000046 −0.000047
Period	P	days	1.091419487	+0.000000020 −0.000000020
Number of Data	n		213	
Degrees of Freedom	k		2	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		2342.4	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		2353.1	
Orbital Decay Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2454508.977198	+0.000074 −0.000074
Period	P	days	1.091421946	+0.000000084 −0.000000084
Decay Rate	dP/dE	days/epoch	-1.093×10^{-9}	+0.036 $\times 10^{-9}$ −0.036 $\times 10^{-9}$
Decay Rate	dP/dt	ms/yr	−31.6	+1.0 −1.0
Degrees of Freedom	k		3	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		1895.7	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		1911.8	
Apsidal Precession Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2454508.9700	+0.0014 −0.0008
Sidereal Period	P_s	days	1.091419481	+0.000000020 −0.000000020
Argument of Periastron	ω_0	rad	2.382	+0.031 −0.059
Precession Rate	$d\omega/dE$	rad/epoch	0.000336	+0.000026 −0.000013
Eccentricity	e		0.0287	+0.0022 −0.0039
Degrees of Freedom	k		5	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		1902.6	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		1929.4	

Table A10. WASP-43 b Results

Parameter	Symbol	Unit	Value	Uncertainty ($1-\sigma$)
Constant Period Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2455528.868421	+0.000054 −0.000054
Period	P	days	0.813474243	+0.000000017 −0.000000017
Number of Data	n		116	
Degrees of Freedom	k		2	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		566.6	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		576.2	
Orbital Decay Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2455528.868381	+0.000072 −0.000072
Period	P	days	0.813474304	+0.000000077 −0.000000072
Decay Rate	dP/dE	days/epoch	-0.026×10^{-9}	+0.031 $\times 10^{-9}$ −0.031 $\times 10^{-9}$
Decay Rate	dP/dt	ms/yr	−1.0	+1.2 −1.2
Degrees of Freedom	k		3	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		566.3	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		580.6	
Apsidal Precession Model				
Transit Center	t_0	BJD _{TDB}	2455528.86842	+0.00015 −0.00013
Sidereal Period	P_s	days	0.813474243	+0.000000013 −0.000000013
Argument of Periastron	ω_0	rad	3.1	+2.2 −2.1
Precession Rate	$d\omega/dE$	rad/epoch	0.000015	+0.00015 −0.00001
Eccentricity	e		0.00024	+0.0037 −0.0002
Degrees of Freedom	k		5	
Chi-Square Statistic	χ^2		569.3	
Bayesian Information Criterion	BIC		593.1	

B. EXOPLANET TRANSIT DATABASE (ETD) OBSERVATIONS

The final cleaned data sets for the ten targets of interest (section 5) are highlighted in the following tables to ensure reproducibility of these results. Observer names are also listed, as-given in the ETD with minor formatting changes. For entries where there are more than two observers, the full list of names is given in the table notes.

Table B1. HAT-P-19 b ETD Transit Centers

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
0	2455091.534936	0.00034	1	Hartman et al. (2010)
97	2455480.388138842	0.00082	3	Ioannidis P., Avdellidou
97	2455480.388168842	0.00077	3	Lomoz F.
101	2455496.4200886358	0.00089	3	Naves R.
101	2455496.420158636	0.00072	3	Vanhuyse M.
108	2455524.482118315	0.00036	1	Muler G.
108	2455524.482168315	0.00103	3	Husar D.
109	2455528.492328273	0.00043	2	Ruiz J.
198	2455885.274367737	0.00056	2	Ayiomamitis A.
202	2455901.312667875	0.0013	3	Vyvlečka M.*
207	2455921.35074807	0.00087	3	Naves R.
207	2455921.3524580705	0.00075	2	Corfini G.
211	2455937.384608243	0.00146	3	Naves R.
212	2455941.395928289	0.00039	3	Emering F.
263	2456145.8438230567	0.00056	2	Shadic S.
264	2456149.8527831356	0.00073	3	Shadic S.
270	2456173.9060636275	0.00052	2	Garlitz J.
294	2456270.1159558822	0.0006	2	Liyun Zhang**
448	2456887.472524667	0.00116	3	Horta F. G.
451	2456899.4953250396	0.00103	3	Barbieri L.
458	2456927.5578159047	0.0004	1	Gillier C.
462	2456943.5935563957	0.00049	2	Benni P.
463	2456947.600836518	0.00061	2	Ian
463	2456947.602516518	0.00072	2	Horta F. G.
464	2456951.6101066396	0.00097	3	Samantha Segall
470	2456975.6658073682	0.0016	3	Stan Shadick***
547	2457284.3391969916	0.00047	2	Yenal Ogmen
549	2457292.355997161	0.00112	3	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
555	2457316.409147663	0.0005	1	Mark Salisbury
558	2457328.4357879097	0.00029	1	Marc Bretton
558	2457328.4374679103	0.00096	3	Enrique Díez Alonso
560	2457336.416918072	0.00155	3	F. L. Juan, V.S. Antoni
560	2457336.454158073	0.00057	2	Marc Bretton
560	2457336.454948073	0.00055	2	David Molina

Table B1 *continued*

Table B1 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
561	2457340.462168153	0.00067	2	David Molina
657	2457725.3067425108	0.00022	1	Marc Bretton
657	2457725.307742511	0.00045	1	Marc Bretton
658	2457729.3135025227	0.00049	2	Marc Bretton
658	2457729.314712522	0.00067	2	Marc Bretton
659	2457733.324552533	0.00056	2	Marc Bretton
659	2457733.324672533	0.00076	3	Eric Girardin
662	2457745.350042562	0.00026	1	Marc Bretton
664	2457753.366662579	0.00113	3	Marc Bretton
664	2457753.367362579	0.00056	2	Matthieu Bachschmidt
664	2457753.368102579	0.00104	3	Manfred Raetz
667	2457765.3924741726	0.00106	3	Alfonso Carreño
903	2458711.4655538127	0.00155	3	Didier Laloum
903	2458711.467523813	0.00055	2	Yves Jongen
905	2458719.481983491	0.00089	3	Pavel Pintr
906	2458723.4938333295	0.00054	2	Manfred Raetz
907	2458727.5021631676	0.00072	2	Pavel Pintr
908	2458731.5068830056	0.00058	2	Francesco Scaggianti ^{**†}
910	2458739.5285526793	0.00066	2	Marc Deldem
910	2458739.5293526794	0.00123	3	Bruno Christmann
911	2458743.5357525167	0.0008	3	Bruno Christmann
911	2458743.5379125164	0.00054	2	Yves Jongen
912	2458747.5450223526	0.0006	2	Thomas Grunge
912	2458747.5460923524	0.00068	2	Francesco Scaggianti ^{**†}
914	2458755.562742024	0.00038	1	Yves Jongen
917	2458767.589451529	0.00043	1	Yves Jongen
1004	2459116.353526361	0.00061	2	Gabriel Murawski
1005	2459120.3633561833	0.00093	3	F. Lomoz
1009	2459136.397005479	0.00035	1	L.Betti F.Mortari
1010	2459140.405125303	0.00113	3	Francois Regembal
1010	2459140.405615303	0.0006	2	Vicenc Ferrando (AAS)
1010	2459140.4060153035	0.00051	1	Pedro Martorell
1010	2459140.411775303	0.00047	1	Yves Jongen
1015	2459160.447924431	0.00053	2	Manfred Raetz
1015	2459160.4485744312	0.00144	3	Francesco Scaggianti ^{**†}
1015	2459160.451024431	0.00054	2	Snaevarr Gudmundsson
1016	2459164.460244257	0.00048	1	Yves Jongen
1113	2459553.3095287136	0.00045	1	Snaevarr Gudmundsson
1117	2459569.344788184	0.00061	2	Snaevarr Gudmundsson
1117	2459569.3456081836	0.00122	3	Rudi Bjorn Rasmussen
1117	2459569.3461581836	0.00074	2	Jens Jacobsen

Table B1 *continued*

Table B1 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
NOTE— [*] Mikulecká B., Henych T. ^{**} Qingfeng Pi, Aiying Zhou ^{***} Ryan Cooney, Taylor Bell				
^{**†} Danilo Zardin, Marco Fiaschi				

Table B2. HAT-P-32 b ETD Transit Centers

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
0	2454420.44712443	9e-05	1	Hartman et al. (2011)
640	2455796.449701029	0.001	3	Moudrá M., Sobotka P.
640	2455796.454151029	0.00085	3	Zibar M.
640	2455796.454951029	0.00058	2	Trnka J.
666	2455852.351390598	0.00072	2	Brosio A.
668	2455856.651900572	0.00026	1	Dax T.
668	2455856.6520805717	0.00029	1	Shadic S.
668	2455856.6526905717	0.00058	2	Yafunyaev M.
669	2455858.802490559	0.00027	1	Shadic S.
670	2455860.952690547	0.00035	1	Shadick S.
679	2455880.301930445	0.0004	1	Corfini G.
689	2455901.8030603575	0.0007	3	Parijat Singh
694	2455912.549210324	0.00125	3	Naves R.
708	2455942.6541902665	0.00059	2	Zaharevitz D.
820	2456183.452702922	0.00063	2	Arena C.
820	2456183.4537929217	0.00044	1	Ayiomamitis A.
821	2456185.606372944	0.00106	3	Naves R.
833	2456211.408503233	0.00087	3	Emering F.
841	2456228.6035034466	0.0006	2	Carreño A.
843	2456232.9047635035	0.00031	1	Kehusmaa P., Harlinton C.
846	2456239.3550435896	0.00054	1	Horta F. G.
853	2456254.4021838	0.00058	2	Naves R.
873	2456297.399644462	0.00067	2	Ramon Naves
873	2456297.4045044617	0.00094	3	Ferran Grau Horta
974	2456514.556068827	0.00065	2	Horta F. G.
980	2456527.456019134	0.0003	1	Hentunen V. P.
994	2456557.555119869	0.00055	2	Salto J. L.
994	2456557.555199869	0.00053	2	E. Herrero, G. Pascual
1007	2456585.5048705796	0.00028	1	Benishek V.
1014	2456600.555720974	0.0004	1	Benni P.
1021	2456615.6078013796	0.00034	1	Perchak M.
1022	2456617.755701438	0.00047	2	Shadic S.
1033	2456641.4053020943	0.00055	2	Naves R.
1040	2456656.455432522	0.00042	1	Zibar M.

Table B2 *continued*

Table B2 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
1040	2456656.457572522	0.0006	2	Naves R.
1066	2456712.356464164	0.00052	2	Zibar M.
1168	2456931.6559308483	0.00064	2	Andrew Wilson
1180	2456957.455951669	0.00063	2	Audejean M.
1181	2456959.606411738	0.00025	1	Coline Guyot, Julien Dibon
1187	2456972.50589215	0.00068	2	Ferran Grau Horta
1199	2456998.3068829775	0.00031	1	Mark Salisbury
1206	2457013.3573834603	0.00039	1	Fran Campos
1314	2457245.55843226	0.00034	1	Marc Bretton
1341	2457303.6066339314	0.00046	1	Florian Signoret
1359	2457342.3043250386	0.00056	2	Marc Bretton
1359	2457342.3091750382	0.00051	1	Marc Bretton
1373	2457372.408995888	0.0007	2	David Molina
1379	2457385.306216248	0.00088	3	Marc Bretton
1379	2457385.309306247	0.00019	1	Marc Bretton
1379	2457385.309576248	0.00022	1	Marc Bretton
1483	2457608.913251586	0.00068	2	Sean Curry
1483	2457608.9137915857	0.00057	2	Sean Curry
1507	2457660.5091125686	0.0005	2	Rene Roy
1507	2457660.5096525685	0.00048	1	Marc Deldem
1509	2457664.8103326466	0.0018	3	Martin Fowler
1520	2457688.4585830644	0.00024	1	Mark Salisbury
1522	2457692.762053138	0.00049	2	Michael Fleenor
1522	2457692.764633138	0.00162	3	Martin Fowler
1537	2457725.009333676	0.00018	1	Wonseok Kang
1553	2457759.4088157923	0.0005	1	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1559	2457772.310505986	0.00025	1	Marc Bretton
1667	2458004.511648076	0.0005	1	Ferran Grau Horta
1675	2458021.7109581344	0.00025	1	O. Cooper*
1706	2458088.361148248	0.00034	1	Pere Guerra
1840	2458376.4630261525	0.00051	1	Gerald Rousseau
1853	2458404.412495722	0.00077	3	Patrick Sogorb
1854	2458406.5629056883	0.00043	1	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1856	2458410.8630956193	0.00031	1	Brennan Rodgers, Rina Rast
1873	2458447.417845008	0.00056	2	Yves Jongen
1893	2458490.411764231	0.00048	1	Stephanie Ferratfiat Dagot
1899	2458503.3130439823	0.00034	1	Yves Jongen
1906	2458518.3625036813	0.00069	3	Didier Laloum
2007	2458735.514808019	0.00029	1	Yves Jongen
2047	2458821.513585249	0.00044	1	Yves Jongen
2059	2458847.3117443733	0.00047	1	Juergen Dirscherl

Table B2 *continued*

Table B2 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
2060	2458849.464224299	0.00035	1	Yves Jongen
2066	2458862.3639038536	0.0004	1	Yves Jongen
2180	2459107.461904331	0.00086	3	Roman Ehrenberger
2180	2459107.465784331	0.00058	2	Jordi Lopesino
2186	2459120.3638937897	0.00056	2	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
2201	2459152.616462434	0.00038	1	Yves Jongen
2213	2459178.415271348	0.00079	2	Fabio Mortari
2213	2459178.416191348	0.00038	1	Nicholas Dahlke**
2219	2459191.3146808017	0.00028	1	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
2222	2459197.7630805285	0.00135	3	Roger Dymock
2233	2459221.414159522	0.00073	2	Snaevarr Gudmundsson
2354	2459481.56350817	0.00055	2	Yves Jongen
2366	2459507.3662070585	0.00018	1	Anaël Wünsche

NOTE—*E. Helou, J. Lowenthal, R. O'Connor, E. Papineau, A. Peck, L. Stephens, K. Walker

**Johanna Hipp, Annalotta Hipp

Table B3. TrES-1 b ETD Transit Centers

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
-344	2452856.5293562952	0.0015	1	Charbonneau et al. (2005)
-340	2452868.6510561793	0.0022	1	Charbonneau et al. (2005)
-239	2453174.6871521757	0.0004	1	Charbonneau et al. (2005)
-236	2453183.775952023	0.0005	1	Charbonneau et al. (2005)
-235	2453186.806851972	0.0003	1	Charbonneau et al. (2005)
-234	2453189.8361519207	0.0019	1	Charbonneau et al. (2005)
-215	2453247.4082509303	0.0004	1	Charbonneau et al. (2005)
-208	2453268.6206305576	0.00073	3	Walsh B.*
-1	2453895.8437196026	0.00018	1	Winn et al. (2007)
0	2453898.8741595424	0.00014	1	Winn et al. (2007)
1	2453901.904469481	0.00019	1	Winn et al. (2007)
3	2453907.9648193605	0.00034	1	Narita et al. (2007)
148	2454347.3239720967	0.00028	1	Andreev M.**
149	2454350.3537120596	0.00036	1	Andreev M.**
151	2454356.41492443	0.0001	1	Hrudkova et al. (2008)
152	2454359.44506443	0.00015	1	Hrudkova et al. (2008)
153	2454362.47499443	0.0002	1	Hrudkova et al. (2008)
353	2454968.4888713406	0.00053	3	Trnka J.
384	2455062.4200319457	0.00037	1	LB***
384	2455062.420881945	0.00046	2	Dřevěný R., Kalisch T.
384	2455062.4216419454	0.00053	2	Sauer T.

Table B3 *continued*

Table B3 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
626	2455795.698733075	0.00055	2	Walter B. ^{**†}
626	2455795.6997930747	0.00064	2	Walter B. ^{**†}
626	2455795.700673075	0.00053	1	Walter B. ^{**†}
717	2456071.4345378657	0.00055	2	Carreño A.
718	2456074.463297911	0.00112	3	Emering F.
729	2456107.794528403	0.00032	1	Shadic S.
777	2456253.2406419395	0.00105	3	Sokov E. N.
832	2456419.892113591	0.00051	2	Hose K.
852	2456480.493183976	0.00028	1	Nicolas E.
852	2456480.493443976	0.00035	1	Salisbury M.
854	2456486.5557740084	0.00039	1	Schteinman G. M.
879	2456562.3030643417	0.00081	1	Bahar E. ^{*††}
952	2456783.5003144294	0.00043	1	Zibar M.
952	2456783.500524429	0.00055	2	Marchini A.
952	2456783.5016644294	0.00079	3	Dittler U.
985	2456883.4922939567	0.00064	2	Horta F. G.
986	2456886.522203938	0.00056	2	Antonio Zanardo
990	2456898.6428938615	0.00049	2	Alton K. B.
1087	2457192.5608708654	0.00039	1	David Molina
1188	2457498.5967773143	0.00047	1	Marc Bretton
1217	2457586.4680355466	0.00038	1	Marc Bretton
1217	2457586.4689355465	0.00053	2	Ramon Naves
1350	2457989.4687585095	0.00046	2	Mario Morales
1450	2458292.4783824445	0.00038	1	Yves Jongen
1482	2458389.4359507435	0.00111	3	Rene Roy
1490	2458413.6778503587	0.00047	3	Benjamin Smith
1581	2458689.414436853	0.00039	1	Yves Jongen
1583	2458695.473676796	0.00042	1	Alberto Tomatis
1583	2458695.4738267963	0.0005	2	Massaro Salvatore
1584	2458698.504006768	0.00056	2	Mario Morales
1584	2458698.5042267684	0.0005	2	Aleksandra Selezneva
1584	2458698.5047567682	0.0004	1	Yves Jongen
1585	2458701.5347167403	0.00056	2	Yves Jongen
1585	2458701.53555674	0.00051	2	Vicenç Ferrando
1682	2458995.451815497	0.0003	1	Stephane Ferratfiat
1682	2458995.4520054967	0.00036	1	Stephane Ferratfiat
1683	2458998.4816754963	0.00046	2	Anaël Wünsche
1684	2459001.511775497	0.00018	1	Marc Bretton
1713	2459089.3832856687	0.00046	2	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1713	2459089.383555669	0.00044	1	Yves Jongen
1815	2459398.4497184516	0.00032	1	Anaël Wünsche

Table B3 *continued*

Table B3 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
1817	2459404.5098685343	0.00045	1	Samuel Diaz Lopez
1817	2459404.5103085344	0.00073	2	Javier de Elias
1844	2459486.32228978	0.00053	1	Alessandro Marchini
1845	2459489.350529831	0.00108	3	Giuseppe Conzo, Zlatko Orbanić
1845	2459489.352429831	0.00047	2	Francesco Scaggiante ^{††}
1845	2459489.3524598307	0.00038	1	Ivo Peretto

NOTE—^{*}Balonek T., Iadanza K. ^{**}Kuznietsova Y., Krushevska V. ^{***}JT, MK, RD, TK, BH, MM, HK, JS (names unknown) [†]Strickland W., Soriano R. ^{††}Sevim K., Bastuk O. ^{†††}Danilo Zardin, Marco Fiaschi

Table B4. TrES-2 b ETD Transit Centers

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
0	2453957.6355417324	0.00038	1	Holman et al. (2007)
13	2453989.7536113295	0.00029	1	Holman et al. (2007)
15	2453994.694681268	0.00031	1	Holman et al. (2007)
34	2454041.6365406993	0.0003	1	Holman et al. (2007)
242	2454555.5269558984	0.00123	3	Brát L.
268	2454619.760645541	0.0013	2	Gary
281	2454651.876345383	0.0007	2	Moon
293	2454681.523145253	0.0021	3	Naves
316	2454738.3511950565	0.0009	3	Kocián R.
391	2454923.644556494	0.0007	2	AXA
393	2454928.588676497	0.00112	3	Přibík V.
399	2454943.4139565085	0.00138	3	Brát L.
404	2454955.76324952	5e-05	1	Kepler
405	2454958.233956523	5.1e-05	1	Kepler
406	2454960.704515526	5e-05	1	Kepler
407	2454963.1751195285	5e-05	1	Kepler
408	2454965.6456875317	5e-05	1	Kepler
409	2454968.1163725345	5e-05	1	Kepler
410	2454970.586968538	5e-05	1	Kepler
410	2454970.587256538	0.001	2	Gregorio
411	2454973.057587541	5.1e-05	1	Kepler
412	2454975.5282265446	0.00074	2	Marino G.
412	2454975.5282355445	5.1e-05	1	Kepler
413	2454977.998809548	5e-05	1	Kepler
414	2454980.4652565513	0.0013	3	naves
414	2454980.4686565516	0.0017	3	Srdoc
414	2454980.4689565515	0.0013	2	Gregorio

Table B4 *continued*

Table B4 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
414	2454980.4693715516	5.1e-05	1	Kepler
415	2454982.9399685552	5.1e-05	1	Kepler
416	2454985.4106815592	5e-05	1	Kepler
417	2454987.881248563	5e-05	1	Kepler
418	2454990.3518565674	5.1e-05	1	Kepler
419	2454992.8225505715	5e-05	1	Kepler
420	2454995.2930915756	5.1e-05	1	Kepler
421	2454997.7636165805	0.00035	1	Scuderi et al. (2009)
421	2454997.7636835803	5.1e-05	1	Kepler
429	2455017.525956621	0.001	2	Gregorio
433	2455027.408156644	0.0019	3	Srdoc
438	2455039.7613566765	0.0011	3	Garlitz
438	2455039.7655566763	0.0007	2	Norby
438	2455039.766826676	0.00096	3	Vander Haagen G.
440	2455044.70385669	0.0008	3	Norby
442	2455049.6501567042	0.00085	3	Vander Haagen G.
446	2455059.5231967345	0.00076	3	Lomoz F.
446	2455059.530516735	0.00137	3	Manfred Raetz
450	2455069.411906767	0.00069	3	Šárka Dyčková
548	2455311.5317081646	0.00077	2	Brát L.
550	2455316.4772882015	0.00094	2	Zambelli R.
555	2455328.8263382935	0.00093	3	Shadick S.
557	2455333.764658331	0.00107	3	Shadick S., Patrick M.
567	2455358.47312852	0.00071	3	Trnka J.
582	2455395.536908818	0.00071	2	Naves R.
589	2455412.8277789643	0.00064	2	Hose K.
605	2455452.358239319	0.00134	3	Lopresti C.
610	2455464.7104694373	0.00101	3	Shadick S.
612	2455469.6508994848	0.00115	3	Wiggins P.
701	2455689.536021845	0.00134	3	Brát L.
708	2455706.830652037	0.00072	3	Garlitz J.
712	2455716.715242147	0.00064	3	Dax T.
720	2455736.4814623673	0.00111	3	Rui B.
737	2455778.4785528374	0.00124	3	Centenera F.
742	2455790.8312829765	0.0008	3	Shadic S.
744	2455795.7746130326	0.00117	3	Shadic S.
758	2455830.3589634267	0.00083	3	Dangl G.
758	2455830.362813427	0.00078	3	Brát L.
767	2455852.5972936843	0.00086	3	Fountain Ch.
777	2455877.3005739725	0.00022	1	Fernand Emering
837	2456025.5398756764	0.00067	2	Carreño A.

Table B4 *continued*

Table B4 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
856	2456072.4799661622	0.00063	2	Polák J.
856	2456072.4802761623	0.00109	3	Audejean M.
856	2456072.480326162	0.00092	3	Trnka J.
858	2456077.4086262123	0.00115	3	Horta F. G.
858	2456077.4195762123	0.00187	3	Brosio A.
858	2456077.4247762123	0.00077	3	Ayiomamitis A.
863	2456089.7739363355	0.00069	3	Garlitz J.
890	2456156.478508559	0.00063	2	Scarmato T.
892	2456161.4233086067	0.00098	3	Scarmato T.
992	2456408.482470656	0.00053	2	Hentunen V. P.
997	2456420.8365307315	0.00073	2	Hose K.
1024	2456487.5435710857	0.00055	2	Nicolas E.
1026	2456492.488911109	0.00089	3	Haro J. L.
1028	2456497.430391132	0.00087	3	Ulus Uludag [*]
1037	2456519.66110123	0.00059	2	Benni P.
1045	2456539.424881313	0.001	3	Bruno F.
1050	2456551.7776513626	0.00088	3	Shadic S.
1052	2456556.721061382	0.00102	3	Majewski R.
1052	2456556.724111382	0.00076	3	Shadic S.
1056	2456566.6042414205	0.00094	3	Benni P.
1066	2456591.3104915125	0.00174	3	Mravik J., Grnja J.
1075	2456613.5446215896	0.00103	3	Benni P.
1124	2456734.604261845	0.00098	3	Horta F. G.
1164	2456833.429091803	0.00067	2	Nicolas E.
1167	2456840.8393617924	0.00055	2	Shadic S.
1177	2456865.54566175	0.00146	3	Horta F. G.
1200	2456922.373301617	0.00074	3	Bachschmidt M.
1200	2456922.3744416167	0.00109	3	Marc Bretton
1215	2456959.430871506	0.00072	3	Coline Guyot, Julien Dibon
1219	2456969.309031474	0.0008	3	Josep M. Bosch
1238	2457016.2567713037	0.00064	2	Marc Bretton
1260	2457070.6079210625	0.0005	1	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1284	2457129.902910724	0.00064	3	Stan Shadick
1296	2457159.5531805228	0.00045	1	Juanjo Gonzalez
1313	2457201.5510102087	0.00088	3	David Molina
1330	2457243.5522714444	0.00199	3	F. Martinelli, M. Monaci
1332	2457248.4959314037	0.00127	3	Ferran Grau Horta
1334	2457253.434261363	0.00092	3	Luca Rizzuti
1336	2457258.374221322	0.00059	2	Giuseppe Marino
1466	2457579.5552980425	0.00087	3	David Molina
1468	2457584.4953679815	0.00085	3	David Molina

Table B4 *continued*

Table B4 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
1470	2457589.4390679193	0.00056	2	Marc Bretton
1485	2457626.495617455	0.00065	2	David Molina
1485	2457626.496167455	0.00091	3	Martin Mašek, Petr Mrňák
1487	2457631.437037392	0.00064	2	David Molina
1508	2457683.321076738	0.00035	1	Marc Bretton
1508	2457683.321246738	0.00044	1	Marc Bretton
1621	2457962.500754582	0.00028	1	Marc Bretton
1723	2458214.502671218	0.00109	3	Eric Girardin
1723	2458214.5035112184	0.00131	3	Yves Jongen
1740	2458256.501560668	0.00047	1	Marc Bretton
1752	2458286.149110282	0.0011	3	Wonseok Kang
1755	2458293.5594901857	0.00116	2	David Molina
1757	2458298.505780122	0.00077	3	Yves Jongen
1776	2458345.4450595295	0.0007	2	David Molina
1791	2458382.5033190865	0.00078	2	Pere Guerra
1793	2458387.445629029	0.00036	1	Marc Bretton
1795	2458392.386858972	0.00066	2	Mario Morales
1802	2458409.6819687765	0.00093	3	Rina Rast
1872	2458582.624527017	0.00063	2	Yves Jongen
1874	2458587.564286971	0.0006	2	Yves Jongen
1878	2458597.4470168785	0.00072	3	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1880	2458602.393456833	0.0005	1	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1893	2458634.506636544	0.00102	3	Bruno Christmann
1895	2458639.448856501	0.00098	3	Yves Jongen
1895	2458639.449196501	0.0008	2	Anael Wunsche
1912	2458681.4450561474	0.0009	2	Riccardo Papini
1927	2458718.5081258593	0.00072	2	Yves Jongen
1944	2458760.5085155675	0.00073	2	Yves Jongen
1948	2458770.390205505	0.00053	1	Marc Bretton
2012	2458928.5119447894	0.00124	3	Yves Jongen
2065	2459059.449774492	0.00037	1	Ferran Grau Horta
2080	2459096.5095544807	0.00101	3	Yves Jongen
2082	2459101.4532344816	0.00039	1	Anaël Wünsche
2084	2459106.3934644833	0.00058	2	Yves Jongen
2084	2459106.3955944832	0.00086	3	Thomas Grunge
2086	2459111.3326244857	0.00104	3	Francesco Scaggiante**
2163	2459301.5743450187	0.00063	2	Yves Jongen
2180	2459343.569035228	0.00071	2	Giorgio Baj
2199	2459390.5132154953	0.00095	3	Alberto García Sánchez
2199	2459390.514115495	0.00098	3	Enrique Arce Mansego
2201	2459395.4489055253	0.00085	2	Javier de Elias

Table B4 *continued*

Table B4 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
2201	2459395.4549155254	0.00076	2	Giuseppe Marino
2254	2459526.393296553	0.00054	2	Rene Roy

NOTE—^{*}Cihan Tugrul Tezcan, Ozgur Basturk ^{**}Danilo Zardin, Marco Fiaschi

Table B5. TrES-3 b ETD Transit Centers

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
-270	2454185.911171321	0.000198	1	Sozzetti et al. (2009)
-260	2454198.97388822	0.000223	1	Sozzetti et al. (2009)
-248	2454214.6470391033	0.00028	1	Sozzetti et al. (2009)
-247	2454215.952821094	0.000214	1	Sozzetti et al. (2009)
-229	2454239.462400929	0.00047	2	Fabjan T. et al.
-13	2454521.5984502416	0.00131	3	Brát L.
-3	2454534.663170264	0.00017	1	RISE telescope
-2	2454535.9689862663	0.000166	1	Sozzetti et al. (2009)
11	2454552.9497113023	0.000147	1	Sozzetti et al. (2009)
24	2454569.929829345	0.000153	1	Sozzetti et al. (2009)
43	2454594.7466834197	0.000253	1	Sozzetti et al. (2009)
59	2454615.6462704926	0.00017	1	RISE telescope
68	2454627.4033405394	0.0015	3	Srdoc
72	2454632.6268705605	0.00011	1	RISE telescope
78	2454640.4645405933	0.0009	3	Naves
79	2454641.769740599	0.0008	3	Foote
85	2454649.6070806347	0.00013	1	RISE telescope
86	2454650.9127406403	0.0008	2	Moon
88	2454653.525440653	0.0018	3	Mendez
88	2454653.525780653	0.00037	1	RISE telescope
95	2454662.6697006966	0.00034	1	RISE telescope
101	2454670.4979407364	0.0012	3	Naves
101	2454670.5070407363	0.00033	1	RISE telescope
104	2454674.4249707568	0.00052	1	RISE telescope
111	2454683.568080806	0.00018	1	RISE telescope
114	2454687.4885408278	0.0016	3	Mendez
294	2454922.599484535	0.00079	3	Brát L.
294	2454922.6002645353	0.00054	2	Trnka J.
297	2454926.5188245806	0.00075	3	Přibík V.
306	2454938.274124717	0.00038	1	Cao Ch.
310	2454943.499854779	0.0012	3	Wardak
311	2454944.8055747943	0.00136	3	Tieman B.
311	2454944.806154794	0.0013	3	Dvorak

Table B5 *continued*

Table B5 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
313	2454947.416364825	0.00071	2	Trnka J.
313	2454947.4169648252	0.00089	3	Fabjan T., Mihelčič M.
313	2454947.417434825	0.00158	3	Marek P.
313	2454947.417494825	0.00078	3	Brát L.
319	2454955.2550449194	0.00063	2	Cao Ch.
333	2454973.541655144	0.0008	2	Gregorio
336	2454977.460565193	0.00089	3	Brát L.
336	2454977.4606551933	0.001	2	Gregorio
336	2454977.4606651934	0.00029	1	Gajdoš Š., Jakšová I.
336	2454977.4610851933	0.00067	3	Trnka J.
340	2454982.6839552596	0.0007	2	Norby
349	2454994.4399554105	0.0007	2	Naves
363	2455012.726155651	0.0005	2	Norby
372	2455024.4880558103	0.001	3	Srdoc
372	2455024.48895581	0.0009	2	Naves
385	2455041.4638560433	0.001	3	Naves
385	2455041.4642160437	0.00112	3	Benishek V.
388	2455045.3823360982	0.00062	3	Hynek T.
389	2455046.6894461173	0.001	3	Tieman B.
389	2455046.689976117	0.00058	2	Vander Haagen G.
411	2455075.422316529	0.0006	2	Gajdoš Š., Jakšová I.
428	2455097.629506857	0.00108	3	Shadick S.
578	2455293.5568600697	0.0006	3	Dangl G.
579	2455294.8645900916	0.00038	1	Jae Woo Lee et al. (2010)
591	2455310.5381603586	0.00068	3	Trnka J.
591	2455310.538200359	0.00067	3	Brát L.
595	2455315.7620004476	0.00061	2	Westall K.
598	2455319.6814405145	0.00037	2	Vanhuyse M.
604	2455327.5166506474	0.00054	3	Saral G.
628	2455358.867121182	0.00018	1	Jae Woo Lee et al. (2010)
631	2455362.7861512485	0.00045	2	Garlitz I.
633	2455365.396041293	0.0007	3	Saral G.
654	2455392.8274417645	0.00042	2	Ken Hose
695	2455446.3814127035	0.00037	1	Scarmato T.
709	2455464.6684130295	0.00059	2	Shadick S.
834	2455627.941185886	0.00045	2	Shadic S.
837	2455631.8583559515	0.00027	1	Tanya Dax*
847	2455644.919696168	0.00093	3	Shadic S.
862	2455664.5143364887	0.00065	3	Jánov R.
876	2455682.8004767834	0.00032	1	Garlitz J.
886	2455695.8620169912	0.0006	2	Shadic S., Tuplip C.

Table B5 *continued*

Table B5 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
891	2455702.3935770947	0.00065	3	Ayiomamitis A.
924	2455745.4979577563	0.00043	2	Gillier Ch., Montaigut R.
940	2455766.3966180654	0.00118	3	Ruocco N.
993	2455835.6262490456	0.00046	2	Shadic S.
1005	2455851.29864926	0.00045	1	Sauer T.
1127	2456010.6533011654	0.00034	1	Horta F. G.
1130	2456014.5716912034	0.00052	2	Horta F. G.
1130	2456014.5725812037	0.00044	1	Martineli F.
1159	2456052.4534515436	0.00073	3	Lomoz F.
1169	2456065.5130416513	0.00043	2	Polák J.
1173	2456070.738331693	0.00084	3	Carroll J. G.
1209	2456117.7616236177	0.00031	1	Hutcheson M.
1218	2456129.5160036976	0.00033	1	Marino G.
1218	2456129.5166736976	0.0006	3	Arena C.
1219	2456130.8231337066	0.00064	2	Curry S.
1221	2456133.433113724	0.00061	2	Romanyuk Y.
1221	2456133.4348537237	0.00104	3	Emering F.
1222	2456134.7410537326	0.00062	2	L. Shannon ^{**}
1245	2456164.783843919	0.00051	2	Connall J.
1260	2456184.3737040292	0.00079	3	Flehsig G.
1415	2456386.834894545	0.00061	3	Kehusmaa P., Harlängen C.
1427	2456402.509924532	0.00047	2	Romanyuk Y.
1427	2456402.5104345316	0.00068	2	Horta F. G.
1438	2456416.877084512	0.00031	1	Shadic S.
1441	2456420.796114505	0.00062	3	Shadic S.
1443	2456423.4085645	0.00071	2	Carreño A.
1464	2456450.8378044358	0.00066	2	Shadic S.
1464	2456450.838564436	0.00047	2	Kehusmaa P., Harlängen C.
1479	2456470.4304043753	0.00052	2	Marino G.
1489	2456483.492974329	0.00039	1	Salisbury M.
1489	2456483.496254328	0.00062	2	Naves R.
1515	2456517.455024188	0.00057	2	Marino G.
1518	2456521.3718141704	0.0003	1	Marino G.
1518	2456521.3720741705	0.00039	2	Scaggiante F., Zardin D.
1531	2456538.3525040895	0.00084	3	Mollica M., Laudisio F.
1532	2456539.6582840835	0.00047	2	Benni P.
1541	2456551.412894024	0.0005	2	Garcia F.
1554	2456568.3934539333	0.0005	2	Pagel L.
1570	2456589.2942738147	0.00033	1	Salisbury M.
1685	2456739.506592602	0.00058	2	Kleschonok V.
1725	2456791.7512520305	0.00091	3	Shadic S., Aziz U.

Table B5 *continued*

Table B5 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
1728	2456795.6714519854	0.00076	3	Benni P.
1734	2456803.5081218933	0.00051	2	Zibar M.
1773	2456854.452751263	0.00046	2	Gonzalez J.
1838	2456939.3499600985	0.00049	1	Bretton M.
1950	2457085.644847847	0.00085	2	David Molina Alonso
1980	2457124.8286271747	0.00057	2	Drew Nikirk
1980	2457124.829207175	0.00061	3	Tatiana Kopchuk
1980	2457124.8298971746	0.00059	3	Matt B
1980	2457124.8309971746	0.00073	2	Kirsti Long
1980	2457124.831517175	0.00045	2	Sara Wisk
2002	2457153.566776662	0.00042	1	Marc Deldem
2008	2457161.4013765194	0.00046	2	Marc Bretton
2008	2457161.4016965195	0.00075	3	Francesco Scaggiante, Danilo Zardin
2016	2457171.8535663285	0.00041	2	Stan Shadick, Ashley Stock
2031	2457191.446515968	0.00046	1	Faustino Garcia
2041	2457204.5094073005	0.00086	3	David Molina
2042	2457205.8134472766	0.00023	1	Oleg Mazurenko
2044	2457208.426267228	0.00069	2	Marc Bretton
2044	2457208.4290972278	0.00028	1	Marc Bretton
2051	2457217.5705770585	0.00049	2	Marc Bretton
2052	2457218.8748970344	0.00054	2	Duane Lee, Sophia Dragowsky
2055	2457222.793576961	0.00032	1	Oleg Mazurenko
2074	2457247.611346499	0.00057	3	Dennis Conti
2093	2457272.4293260365	0.00024	1	Marc Bretton
2093	2457272.4295060365	0.0004	1	Mark Salisbury
2135	2457327.2897050064	0.00027	1	Marc Bretton
2260	2457490.562961855	0.00068	3	Marcos Michel
2276	2457511.4615814444	0.00051	2	Marc Bretton
2290	2457529.747891084	0.00044	2	Oleg Mazurenko
2315	2457562.40261044	0.00065	3	Francesco Scaggiante, Danilo Zardin
2315	2457562.4050604394	0.00041	1	Marc Bretton
2327	2457578.07526013	0.00033	1	Wonseok Kang
2351	2457609.4260295145	0.00031	1	Marc Bretton
2351	2457609.4291395145	0.00072	3	Ramon Naves
2547	2457865.4380364544	0.00024	1	Marc Bretton
2555	2457875.8861362766	0.00062	2	Martin Fowler
2570	2457895.479235946	0.00085	3	Ferratfiat Stephanie
2570	2457895.4804859464	0.00018	1	Marc Bretton
2583	2457912.460325666	0.00042	2	Jean-Luc Martin
2596	2457929.44031539	0.00042	1	Mario Morales Aimar
2603	2457938.5839852435	0.00039	1	David Molina

Table B5 *continued*

Table B5 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
2609	2457946.422665119	0.00017	1	Marc Bretton
2609	2457946.423585119	0.00048	1	David Molina
2621	2457962.095454874	0.00018	1	Wonseok Kang
2623	2457964.7088248334	0.00075	3	Serge Bergeron
2642	2457989.525624457	0.00084	3	Rafael Castillo
2658	2458010.424194148	0.00041	1	Mark Salisbury
2802	2458198.5157017983	0.00045	2	Roman Ponča
2825	2458228.556611485	0.00072	2	Derek O’Keeffe
2825	2458228.5578814847	0.00065	2	Matthieu Bachschmidt
2838	2458245.5304113147	0.00093	3	Adam Nowak
2841	2458249.4591012765	0.00044	2	Yves Jongen
2863	2458278.192341003	0.0003	1	Wonseok Kang
2864	2458279.5022409908	0.00038	1	Yves Jongen
2867	2458283.4174509556	0.00048	1	David Molina
2867	2458283.4201409556	0.0004	1	Yves Jongen
2877	2458296.483640839	0.0004	1	Yves Jongen
2887	2458309.5413207286	0.00022	1	Marc Bretton
2887	2458309.5447507286	0.00034	1	Yves Jongen
2890	2458313.462190696	0.00046	1	Yves Jongen
2892	2458316.0719906753	0.00022	1	Wonseok Kang
2897	2458322.603670623	0.00086	3	David Molina
2899	2458325.215280602	0.00028	1	Wonseok Kang
2903	2458330.4397405623	0.00109	3	F. Lomoz
2914	2458344.809140457	0.00076	3	Ram Goel
2929	2458364.4008903247	0.00019	1	Marc Bretton
2929	2458364.401270325	0.00042	1	Yves Jongen
2942	2458381.3818202205	0.0005	2	Yves Jongen
3054	2458527.6744596735	0.00029	1	Yves Jongen
3057	2458531.5942996666	0.00056	2	Yves Jongen
3083	2458565.5540296226	0.00042	1	Pere Guerra
3083	2458565.554309623	0.00039	1	Yves Jongen
3122	2458616.493019618	0.00063	2	Anael Wunsche
3132	2458629.5572196287	0.00035	1	Yves Jongen
3135	2458633.476209633	0.00036	1	Yves Jongen
3138	2458637.394659637	0.00038	1	Yves Jongen
3146	2458647.8428396513	0.00016	1	Brennan Rodgers, Rina Rast
3158	2458663.5175896776	0.0006	2	Alessandro Marchini
3158	2458663.5181596777	0.00067	3	Bruno Christmann
3174	2458684.4154097247	0.00051	2	F. Salvaggio ^{***}
3174	2458684.416349725	0.00033	1	Yves Jongen
3174	2458684.4175497247	0.00034	1	Anael Wunsche

Table B5 *continued*

Table B5 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
3187	2458701.3968897727	0.00032	1	Yves Jongen
3187	2458701.4002997726	0.00102	3	Juan Martínez Sánchez
3197	2458714.459789816	0.00039	1	Yves Jongen
3210	2458731.4375198805	0.00074	2	Josep Gaitan
3210	2458731.439279881	0.00059	2	Alberto Tomatis
3213	2458735.357599897	0.00039	1	Alberto García Sánchez
3213	2458735.357859897	0.00039	1	Yves Jongen
3240	2458770.6236100714	0.00072	2	N. Thomas
3252	2458786.3000701647	0.00091	3	Jens Jacobsen
3252	2458786.300100165	0.00046	2	Anael Wunsche
3252	2458786.300140165	0.00039	1	Manfred Raetz
3377	2458949.5718215886	0.00027	1	Manfred Raetz
3377	2458949.573211589	0.00039	1	Yves Jongen
3377	2458949.5733115887	0.00068	3	Etienne Bertrand
3378	2458950.8789316025	0.00057	2	Yves Jongen
3390	2458966.5522717745	0.00028	1	Manfred Raetz
3406	2458987.4505720134	0.00063	3	Francois Regembal
3406	2458987.4508820134	0.00104	3	Jens Hennig
3406	2458987.4520520135	0.00089	3	Guy Brabant
3407	2458988.7580320286	0.00067	2	N. Thomas, S. Dahlke
3468	2459068.4314830746	0.00105	3	Ehrenberger R.
3468	2459068.435843074	0.00054	2	Alberto García Sánchez
3478	2459081.498203266	0.00024	1	Marc Bretton
3494	2459102.3963535833	0.0014	3	Martin Tylšar
3632	2459282.6490468206	0.0004	2	Etienne Bertrand
3632	2459282.6503368206	0.00035	1	Yves Jongen
3635	2459286.565336899	0.00062	2	Serguei Jourba
3635	2459286.569526899	0.00057	2	Yves Jongen
3648	2459303.550437244	0.00053	2	Yves Jongen
3664	2459324.448087675	0.00042	2	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
3690	2459358.4083683873	0.00047	2	Giuseppe Marino
3710	2459384.533928947	0.00085	3	Alessandro Marchini
3723	2459401.5131093175	0.00051	2	Samuel Diaz Lopez

NOTE—* Stacy Irwin, and Karissa Haire. ** R. Campbell, D. Russell, and W. Strickland. *** M. Banfi, R. Papini, and G. Marino.

Table B6. TrES-5 b ETD Transit Centers

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
544	2456249.595185279	0.00108	3	Shadic S.

Table B6 *continued*

Table B6 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
558	2456270.3438554914	0.0006	2	Garcia F.
640	2456391.8897667313	0.00075	3	Shadic S.
646	2456400.78382682	0.00056	2	Shadic S.
671	2456437.8403671817	0.00102	3	Kehusmaa P., Harlinton C.
720	2456510.471477866	0.00086	3	Ayiomamitis A.
724	2456516.4012579215	0.00081	3	Benishek V.
741	2456541.5966481552	0.00089	3	Horta F. G.
762	2456572.723468446	0.00056	3	Garlitz J.
857	2456713.5387597503	0.00137	3	Sokov E. N.
944	2456842.4986407286	0.00109	3	Haro J. L.
963	2456870.654530917	0.00082	3	Benni P.
986	2456904.749251136	0.00076	3	Benni P.
992	2456913.6422311915	0.00076	3	Benni P.
1017	2456950.6979614194	0.00091	3	Shadic S.
1019	2456953.660541437	0.00118	3	Shadic S.
1019	2456953.663741437	0.00099	3	Stan Shadick
1033	2456974.4165215595	0.00065	2	Juan Lozano de Haro
1097	2457069.2777920663	0.00059	2	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1116	2457097.4400221915	0.00073	2	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1159	2457161.1758024134	0.00046	2	Yuri Karavaev
1164	2457168.5903624333	0.00067	3	Juanjo Gonzalez
1166	2457171.550952441	0.001	3	David Molina
1166	2457171.552392441	0.00071	3	Ramon Naves
1166	2457171.552632441	0.00061	2	Marc Bretton
1166	2457171.553562441	0.00044	2	Marc Bretton
1168	2457174.518442448	0.00055	2	Marc Bretton
1170	2457177.483542456	0.0007	3	Marc Bretton
1178	2457189.338762483	0.00068	3	Yenal Ogmen
1195	2457214.537394109	0.0012	3	David Molina
1195	2457214.539984109	0.00028	1	Marc Bretton
1197	2457217.502844114	0.00067	2	Ramon Naves
1199	2457220.46694412	0.00039	1	Bernd Gährken
1210	2457236.7699641474	0.00108	3	Stan Shadick
1218	2457248.629434165	0.00073	3	Paul Benni
1220	2457251.59350417	0.00073	2	Dennis Conti
1222	2457254.5580841745	0.00068	2	Marc Bretton
1226	2457260.4908241825	0.00109	3	Ferran Grau Horta
1230	2457266.4164341907	0.00049	2	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1261	2457312.3670942453	0.00064	2	Marc Bretton
1263	2457315.330474248	0.00082	3	Marc Bretton
1290	2457355.355014282	0.00072	3	Marc Bretton

Table B6 *continued*

Table B6 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
1292	2457358.317884283	0.00092	3	Marc Bretton
1363	2457463.554524246	0.00062	2	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1371	2457475.4124742285	0.00055	2	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1375	2457481.343554218	0.00085	3	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1419	2457546.56186406	0.00125	3	David Molina
1421	2457549.5267740507	0.00039	1	Marc Bretton
1432	2457565.828953998	0.00056	2	Oleg Mazurenko
1446	2457586.5831739255	0.0008	3	David Molina
1452	2457595.4753238917	0.00085	3	David Molina
1481	2457638.4573837165	0.00112	3	David Molina
1487	2457647.3534436775	0.00042	2	Š. Gajdoš, J. Šubjak
1489	2457650.3178736647	0.0012	3	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1516	2457690.339813482	0.00052	2	ESSEIVA Nicolas
1518	2457693.304213468	0.00028	1	Marc Bretton
1547	2457736.2894932576	0.00025	1	Marc Bretton
1585	2457792.6119745243	0.00074	3	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1651	2457890.4441538425	0.00035	1	Marc Bretton
1682	2457936.391023461	0.00052	2	Yenal Ogmen
1686	2457942.3198134094	0.00053	2	Yenal Ogmen
1693	2457952.6964833187	0.00038	1	Michael Fleenor
1700	2457963.0729932273	0.00047	2	Wonseok Kang
1734	2458013.4698527735	0.00059	3	Ferran Grau Horta
1741	2458023.8438126785	0.00057	3	J Garlitz
1746	2458031.2557226103	0.00045	2	Yenal Ogmen
1749	2458035.701562569	0.00063	3	JGarlitz
1765	2458059.419232348	0.00078	3	Mark Salisbury
1769	2458065.3475322914	0.00083	3	Mario Morales
1842	2458173.5505112167	0.00119	3	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1909	2458272.864280099	0.00114	3	Joe Garliz
1929	2458302.50680974	0.00055	2	Mark Salisbury
1933	2458308.436299667	0.00059	2	Yves Jongen
1933	2458308.436689667	0.00042	1	Marc Bretton
1935	2458311.3995296303	0.0005	2	Yenal Ogmen
1945	2458326.2240494466	0.00044	2	Wonseok Kang
1956	2458342.5263592442	0.0004	1	Marti Poch
1964	2458354.3845690964	0.00058	3	Yenal Ogmen
1987	2458388.4777786722	0.00026	1	Marc Bretton
2016	2458431.462358143	0.00056	2	Mark Salisbury
2153	2458634.5293655614	0.00059	2	Pere Guerra
2153	2458634.5294755613	0.00063	2	Anael Wunsche
2155	2458637.495375522	0.00024	1	Marc Bretton

Table B6 *continued*

Table B6 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
2155	2458637.4954055217	0.00051	2	Yves Jongen
2182	2458677.5164949866	0.00087	3	Ramon Naves
2184	2458680.478934947	0.00099	3	Bruno Christmann
2186	2458683.4463249077	0.00054	2	Yves Jongen
2215	2458726.430114338	0.00046	2	Yves Jongen
2217	2458729.3947442994	0.00041	2	Yves Jongen
2217	2458729.3952342994	0.00026	1	Marc Bretton
2221	2458735.3223542213	0.00042	2	Yenal Ogmen
2238	2458760.5221838932	0.00058	2	Anaël Wünsche
2279	2458821.2931831274	0.00045	2	Mark Salisbury
2352	2458929.4972218275	0.00074	3	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
2414	2459021.394720729	0.00074	2	Nello Ruocco
2433	2459049.5604904005	0.0005	2	Vicenç Ferrando
2437	2459055.487410333	0.00053	2	Yves Jongen
2460	2459089.5777099533	0.00072	3	Yves Jongen
2466	2459098.473869858	0.00032	1	Marc Bretton
2468	2459101.4400298265	0.00054	2	Yves Jongen
2472	2459107.3671997637	0.00035	1	Manfred Raetz
2474	2459110.333919733	0.00041	1	Manfred Raetz
2493	2459138.4938994455	0.00061	2	Ferran Grau Horta
2605	2459304.503627991	0.00052	2	Snaevarr Gudmundsson
2611	2459313.398387921	0.00068	3	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
2727	2459485.3388267807	0.00032	1	Mark Salisbury
2727	2459485.338856781	0.00052	2	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
2752	2459522.3984666145	0.00049	2	Anaël Wünsche
2775	2459556.487556493	0.00064	2	Snaevarr Gudmundsson
2785	2459571.308756449	0.0004	2	Snaevarr Gudmundsson

Table B7. WASP-4 b ETD Transit Centers

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
-1433	2453963.108629995	0.00081	1	Gillon et al. (2008)
-1133	2454364.5772199957	0.00075	1	Gillon et al. (2008)
-1132	2454365.9153884756	0.00025	3	Wilson et al. (2008)
-1130	2454368.5924399947	0.00022	1	Gillon et al. (2008)
-1128	2454371.2681200043	0.00033	1	Gillon et al. (2008)
-1109	2454396.6954099988	5.1e-05	1	Gillon et al. (2008)
-884	2454697.7981701	5.5e-05	1	Winn et al. (2009)
-846	2454748.65111103	7.2e-05	1	Winn et al. (2009)
-843	2454752.6659099977	0.00071	1	Dragomir et al. (2011)

Table B7 *continued*

Table B7 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
-594	2455085.886044746	0.0038	1	Dragomir et al. (2011)
-586	2455096.59164467	0.0008	3	Tifner
-370	2455385.6495647277	0.00027	1	Sauer T.
-340	2455425.7960650325	0.00011	1	Eduardo Fernández-Lajús *
-304	2455473.9723555245	0.00034	1	Milne G.
-301	2455477.9863855722	0.00057	2	Curtis I.
-283	2455502.075825877	0.00039	2	Tan TG
-280	2455506.090525931	0.00044	2	Curtis I.
-61	2455799.1626514993	0.0004	1	TG Tan
225	2456181.897293772	0.00066	3	Evans P.
505	2456556.6021742392	0.00019	1	Colazo C.A., Schneider, E.M.
517	2456572.659514626	0.00028	1	Miler E.
567	2456639.5727661964	0.00033	1	Miler E.
742	2456873.763190332	0.00027	1	Eduardo Fernández-Lajús *
751	2456885.8073904864	0.00035	1	Mašek M. **
754	2456889.820350537	0.00021	1	Eduardo Fernández-Lajús *
754	2456889.821500537	8e-05	1	Colazo C. A., Villarreal C.
768	2456908.5547107635	0.00038	1	Quiñones C.
768	2456908.5560507635	0.00059	2	Quiñones C.
804	2456956.7325712824	0.00079	2	Quiñones C.
804	2456956.7344312826	0.0006	2	Quiñones C.
1023	2457249.8046937543	0.00014	1	Eduardo Fernández-Lajús *
1555	2457961.745391956	0.00069	2	Phil Evans
1587	2458004.567670575	0.00047	2	Phil Evans
1599	2458020.6263900483	0.00044	2	H. Durantini Luca
1599	2458020.6268100482	0.0005	1	Phil Evans
1840	2458343.1408083774	0.00024	1	Carl R Knight
1887	2458406.038555963	0.00031	1	Carl R Knight
2202	2458827.5814704555	0.0003	1	Yves Jongen
2389	2459077.829033093	0.00037	1	Yves Jongen
2409	2459104.595852447	0.00039	1	Yves Jongen
2412	2459108.6087323534	0.00061	2	Yves Jongen
2415	2459112.622142261	0.00056	2	Yves Jongen
2424	2459124.668001988	0.00038	1	Yves Jongen
2474	2459191.577950603	0.0004	1	Yves Jongen
2483	2459203.623060375	0.00055	2	Yves Jongen
2652	2459429.784257368	0.0004	1	Yves Jongen
2658	2459437.814577308	0.0004	1	Yves Jongen
2670	2459453.8723172	0.00038	1	Anaël Wünsche
2675	2459460.56482716	0.00057	2	Yves Jongen
2690	2459480.6370270588	0.00041	2	Anaël Wünsche

Table B7 *continued*

Table B7 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
2690	2459480.637467059	0.00047	2	Yves Jongen
2693	2459484.6515770415	0.00036	1	Yves Jongen
2696	2459488.667047026	0.00026	1	Yves Jongen
2699	2459492.680807011	0.00028	1	Yves Jongen
2746	2459555.5779369324	0.00027	1	Yves Jongen

NOTE— * and Romina P. Di Sisto ** Hoňková K., Juryšek J.

Table B8. WASP-10 b ETD Transit Centers

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
0	2454357.85878443	0.00042	1	Christian et al. (2008)
99	2454664.0380455623	8.2e-05	1	John J. A. et al. (2008)
103	2454676.4088701825	0.00055	2	Brát L.
126	2454747.550048031	0.0006	3	Kalajian
135	2454775.378447218	0.0008	3	Krejčova T. et al. (2010)
138	2454784.6544469516	0.0004	2	Gary
139	2454787.7453468633	0.0007	2	Foote
155	2454837.231160002	0.00037	1	Maciejewski et al. (2010)
222	2455044.444150002	0.0004	1	Maciejewski et al. (2010)
222	2455044.444270002	0.00032	1	Maciejewski et al. (2010)
223	2455047.536960003	0.00028	1	Maciejewski et al. (2010)
226	2455056.8133515376	0.0008	2	Norby
227	2455059.9075514697	0.0005	2	Wiggins
231	2455072.278610003	0.00053	1	Maciejewski et al. (2010)
232	2455075.3696511383	0.0001	3	Krejčova T. et al. (2010)
232	2455075.3719811384	0.00038	2	Dyčková Š.
232	2455075.3712899983	0.00024	1	Maciejewski et al. (2010)
232	2455075.3721111384	0.00055	2	Trnka J.
233	2455078.4648500034	0.00044	1	Maciejewski et al. (2010)
234	2455081.5562510085	0.0008	2	Gregorio J.
242	2455106.2968099993	0.00021	1	Maciejewski et al. (2010)
243	2455109.3920504483	0.0003	3	Krejčova T. et al. (2010)
244	2455112.4841503883	0.0003	3	Krejčova T. et al. (2010)
245	2455115.575930329	0.00044	1	P.Farissier*
245	2455115.581950329	0.0011	2	Cordiale
246	2455118.667380269	0.00013	1	Dittmann et al. (2010)
257	2455152.689230005	0.00039	1	Maciejewski et al. (2010)
258	2455155.78174959	0.0007	2	Wiggins
264	2455174.3345792717	0.00047	2	Puig X., Girbau P.
341	2455412.47860999	0.00013	1	Maciejewski et al. (2011)

Table B8 *continued*

Table B8 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
342	2455415.57155999	0.00014	1	Maciejewski et al. (2011)
344	2455421.7550263945	0.00041	3	Irwin S.
345	2455424.849066375	0.0008	2	Shadick S.
345	2455424.849346375	0.00038	2	Garlitz I.
345	2455424.849636375	0.00029	1	Shadick S.
351	2455443.4043662706	0.00044	2	Zambelli R.
352	2455446.49881998	7e-05	1	Maciejewski et al. (2011)
355	2455455.776476213	0.00034	1	Wiggins P.
356	2455458.8707562	0.00035	1	Shadick S.
362	2455477.4253761363	0.0005	2	Hynek T.
362	2455477.4259561365	0.00087	2	Gaitan J.
364	2455483.6104761204	0.00041	2	Shadick S.
364	2455483.61177612	0.00075	3	Gordon S.
365	2455486.7029261133	0.00057	2	Hall G.
366	2455489.7971661063	0.00036	1	Hose K.
373	2455511.445926078	0.00052	2	Brát L.
479	2455839.2736483924	0.00136	3	Sun G.
490	2455873.295088923	0.0014	3	Uhlař R.
501	2455907.312009513	0.00059	2	Lopesino J.
579	2456148.54907641	0.00056	2	Gonzalez J.
589	2456179.4731572126	0.00119	3	Magris M.
589	2456179.474647213	0.00101	3	Emering F.
589	2456179.4749472127	0.00077	2	Bachschmidt M.
589	2456179.4757372127	0.00051	1	Piehler M. G.
589	2456179.475827213	0.00048	1	Trnka J.
592	2456188.7527574603	0.00114	3	Aupperle M.
599	2456210.4008980505	0.00065	2	Trnka J.
600	2456213.496958136	0.00076	3	René R.
610	2456244.419379005	0.00172	3	Tremosa L.
610	2456244.4211290055	0.00057	2	Naves R.
697	2456513.490666964	0.00087	2	Angel T., Harlinton C.
698	2456516.583007056	0.00077	3	Velasco J. L. M.
706	2456541.32383779	0.00037	1	Benishek V.
707	2456544.4170578816	0.00042	1	Benishek V.
707	2456544.418067882	0.00055	1	Marino G.
707	2456544.418117882	0.00092	2	Horta F. G.
721	2456587.7168691736	0.00024	1	Logan V., Lewis K.
738	2456640.2906207587	0.00057	2	Dittler U.
751	2456680.496301962	0.00068	2	Benni P.
816	2456881.524027361	0.00056	1	Naves R.
826	2456912.450528112	0.00054	2	Bretton M.

Table B8 *continued*

Table B8 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
846	2456974.307049545	0.00034	1	Mark
857	2457008.32546029	0.00065	2	Carreño A.
857	2457008.32774029	0.00103	2	Marc Bretton
924	2457215.539025483	0.00038	1	Fran Campos
934	2457246.46817586	0.00064	1	Marc Bretton
934	2457246.46850586	0.00042	1	Marc Bretton
938	2457258.8375460017	0.00033	1	Stan Shadick
955	2457311.411576557	0.0009	2	Lycée**
955	2457311.415736557	0.00085	3	Enrique Díez Alonso
958	2457320.6913866475	0.00044	1	Robert Mutel
966	2457345.4328868734	0.00069	2	Juan Lozano de Haro
1042	2457580.480927536	0.00045	1	Marc Bretton
1053	2457614.499907405	0.00075	2	Ramon Naves
1053	2457614.501257405	0.00047	2	Bernd Gährken
1053	2457614.501307405	0.00067	2	FONTAINE Bruno
1063	2457645.429107239	0.00119	3	David Néel
1066	2457654.706067182	0.00048	2	Michael Fleenor
1066	2457654.706327182	0.00025	1	O. Cooper***
1171	2457979.442244392	0.00132	3	Gabriel Murawski
1173	2457985.6304442617	0.0012	3	Jesús Delgado Casal
1181	2458010.370283732	0.0008	2	Marc Deldem
1184	2458019.647653529	0.00081	2	Serge Bergeron
1191	2458041.296873043	0.00027	1	Marc Bretton
1195	2458053.666332757	0.00028	1	Horace Dale
1195	2458053.6669227574	0.00021	1	Mengxiao Li
1202	2458075.3174922434	0.00025	1	Marc Bretton
1202	2458075.320212243	0.00125	3	Francesco Scaggiante, Danilo Zardin
1203	2458078.409522169	0.00051	1	Mario Morales
1280	2458316.5498652905	0.00036	1	Pere Guerra
1290	2458347.4776242375	0.00095	3	M. Mašek, M. Tylšar
1301	2458381.5018430576	0.00046	1	Yves Jongen
1302	2458384.58804295	0.00074	1	Ferran Grau Horta
1302	2458384.59485295	0.0005	1	Yves Jongen
1310	2458409.331402082	0.0005	1	Manfred Raetz
1398	2458681.4928917442	0.00082	3	Francesco Scaggiante, Danilo Zardin
1408	2458712.417980492	0.00064	2	Francesco Scaggiante, Danilo Zardin
1408	2458712.418340492	0.00047	1	G. Marino***†
1418	2458743.346969236	0.00045	1	Yves Jongen
1419	2458746.43804911	0.00059	2	Pavel Pintr
1419	2458746.44162911	0.00056	2	Grunge Thomas
1431	2458783.548867601	0.00085	3	F. Lomoz

Table B8 *continued*

Table B8 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
1450	2458842.306615231	0.0023	3	Jean Plazas
1450	2458842.3124452312	0.0004	1	Yves Jongen
1527	2459080.4521757816	0.00075	2	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
1527	2459080.4541857815	0.00032	1	Yves Jongen
1530	2459089.7315554284	0.00046	1	Yves Jongen
1537	2459111.385484616	0.00058	2	Pavel Pintr
1538	2459114.475044502	0.00043	1	Vojtěch Školník
1540	2459120.6585942735	0.0004	1	Yves Jongen
1558	2459176.3277522773	0.00187	3	Valere Perroud
1558	2459176.328612277	0.00033	1	Yves Jongen
1568	2459207.254571207	0.00049	1	Snaevarr Gudmundsson
1636	2459417.5608246773	0.00037	1	TJMS GST
1658	2459485.6009329166	0.00064	2	Kaeouach Aziz
1667	2459513.4359022724	0.00034	1	Mark salisbury
1667	2459513.4376022723	0.00042	1	M. Popescu ^{*††}
1677	2459544.3634616127	0.00062	2	Snaevarr Gudmundsson
1678	2459547.454961551	0.00024	1	Mark Salisbury

NOTE—^{*}M. Gaude, C. Gillier, J. Michelet, JP.Roux ^{**}Lycée Notre Dame de Toutes Aides, France N.
^{***}Ferreira, E. Helou, J. Lowenthal, R. O ^{***}M. Banfi, R. Papini, F. Salvaggio ^{*††}B.A. Dumitru, D.
Bertesteanu

Table B9. WASP-12 b ETD Transit Centers

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
0	2454508.97685446	0.0002	1	Hebb et al. (2008)
300	2454836.4033931005	0.0006	2	Hentunen
304	2454840.7686030436	0.00047	1	Tucker et al. (2011)
304	2454840.771193043	0.001	3	Gary
366	2454908.437992057	0.001	3	Naves
387	2454931.3581816694	0.00098	3	Brát L.
601	2455164.923956134	0.00149	3	Shadick S.
601	2455164.9243161334	0.00129	3	Stan Shadick
608	2455172.561815919	0.00044	1	Tucker et al. (2011)
608	2455172.562785919	0.00014	1	Ingemyr M.
632	2455198.756735166	0.00141	3	Tieman B.
661	2455230.4067300046	0.00011	1	Maciejewski et al. (2011)
683	2455254.418869997	0.00014	1	Maciejewski et al. (2011)
685	2455256.596033418	0.00059	3	Latham C., Schwieterman E.
693	2455265.3340531443	0.00129	3	Kučáková H.
914	2455506.53328486	0.00112	3	Naves R.

Table B9 *continued*

Table B9 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
917	2455509.808914742	0.00087	3	Dvorak S.
926	2455519.632074388	0.0007	2	Naves R.
938	2455532.729963918	0.00035	1	Irwin S.
946	2455541.461083606	0.0005	2	Zambelli R.
978	2455576.387242368	0.00135	3	Ayiomamitis A.
979	2455577.4751723297	0.00038	2	Garcia R.
979	2455577.4767823294	0.00069	2	Naves R.
979	2455577.4771123296	0.00085	3	Salvaggio F., Marino G.
980	2455578.5684222914	0.00082	3	Poddany S.
994	2455593.850191754	0.00047	2	Stan Shadick and Hao He
1000	2455600.398281524	0.00042	1	Cagas P.
1001	2455601.4892114857	0.00109	3	Brát L.
1003	2455603.671161409	0.00094	3	Griffith J., Condon I.
1011	2455612.4008011026	0.00083	3	Karashevich S.V., Sokov E.N.
1011	2455612.4013211024	0.00078	3	Sokov E.N.
1014	2455615.675910987	0.00054	2	E. Rich, S. Irwin
1043	2455647.3287598747	0.00173	3	Zinoviev S. , Sokov E.
1236	2455857.9737826996	0.00071	2	Shadic S.
1236	2455857.9737826996	0.00071	2	Shadic S.
1245	2455867.7978323917	0.00075	3	Shadic S.
1250	2455873.2536122217	0.00126	3	Ivanov K.
1254	2455877.618482087	0.00092	3	Hoeven A.
1254	2455877.6191620864	0.00129	3	Hoeven A.
1265	2455889.623301718	0.00073	3	Naves R.
1274	2455899.4484414198	0.00063	2	Ayiomamitis A.
1274	2455899.4512514197	0.00057	3	Romas E., Sokov E.
1275	2455900.539781387	0.00038	2	Romas E., Sokov E.
1279	2455904.9052712554	0.00103	3	Stan Shadick
1280	2455905.995241223	0.00135	3	Shadic S.
1286	2455912.5445610285	0.00057	2	Romas E., Sokov E.
1286	2455912.5445610285	0.00057	2	Romas E., Sokov E.
1287	2455913.636130995	0.00078	2	Lopesino J.
1288	2455914.7267409633	0.00047	2	Shadic S.
1295	2455922.370120738	0.0009	3	Sokov E.N.
1301	2455928.913320548	0.00073	3	Shadic S.
1308	2455936.5525603276	0.00091	3	Naves R.
1308	2455936.561520327	0.00123	3	Lopesino J.
1309	2455937.6454302957	0.00119	3	Naves R.
1310	2455938.738730265	0.00072	3	Shadic S.
1317	2455946.383030047	0.00077	2	Ruben Garcia
1318	2455947.4684800166	0.00102	3	Naves R.

Table B9 *continued*

Table B9 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
1320	2455949.650899955	0.00059	3	Shadic S.
1320	2455949.650899955	0.00059	3	Shadic S.
1321	2455950.7425099243	0.00066	2	Stan Shadick
1327	2455957.2875997415	0.0011	3	Lomoz F.
1327	2455957.294399741	0.00104	3	Lomoz F.
1327	2455957.296779741	0.00057	2	Eugene Sokov
1327	2455957.296779741	0.00057	2	Sokov E.N.
1331	2455961.65912962	0.00107	3	Shadic S.
1332	2455962.74992959	0.00132	3	Shadic S.
1339	2455970.39236938	0.00086	3	Ivanov A.V., Sokov E. N.
1350	2455982.394919057	0.00116	3	Aceti P.
1360	2455993.3098687683	0.0006	2	Rusov S., Sokov E.
1360	2455993.3131187684	0.00076	3	Kouprianov V.V., Sokov E.N.
1361	2455994.3987187403	0.00068	2	Marchini A.
1361	2455994.39935874	0.00076	3	Sokov E. N.
1369	2456003.129688514	0.00063	2	Ivanov K.
1369	2456003.130168514	0.0006	2	Ivanov K.
1371	2456005.3153284574	0.00044	2	Romas E., Sokov E.
1570	2456222.5096953874	0.00081	3	Rusov S., Sokov E.
1592	2456246.516835025	0.00074	3	Ivanov A. V., Sokov E.N.
1595	2456249.793844979	0.00067	3	Shadic S.
1613	2456269.4251947156	0.0009	3	Horta F. G.
1615	2456271.6232646876	0.00055	2	Salisbury M.
1638	2456296.724384389	0.00052	2	Shadic S.
1645	2456304.3645343054	0.00146	3	Bourdanov A.
1645	2456304.3658043053	0.00089	3	Salisbury M.
1645	2456304.3674543053	0.00156	3	Bourdanov A.
1645	2456304.367784305	0.00058	2	Naumov K.N., Sokov E.N.
1668	2456329.4692940502	0.00164	3	Gudmundsson S.
1700	2456364.392543749	0.00117	3	Horta F.G.
1902	2456584.8601733795	0.00051	2	Benni P.
1912	2456595.7728134315	0.00096	3	Shadick S.
1913	2456596.8663834375	0.00051	2	Benni P.
1920	2456604.503073479	0.00092	3	Albiréo 78
1924	2456608.8695635046	0.00071	3	Shadic S.
1931	2456616.511353553	0.0009	3	Salisbury M.
1940	2456626.333236203	0.00051	2	Karavaev Y., Loginovskaj A.
1941	2456627.4290336287	0.00105	3	Scaggiante F., Zardin D.
1942	2456628.515003636	0.00097	3	René R.
1942	2456628.5170736364	0.00088	3	Bachschmidt M.
1944	2456630.6997536523	0.00044	2	Benni P.

Table B9 *continued*

Table B9 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
1952	2456639.430343721	0.00074	2	Nicolas E.
1952	2456639.4328937214	0.00068	3	Dittler U.
1953	2456640.5225537303	0.00082	3	Sokov E. N., Naumov K.
1954	2456641.610273739	0.0008	3	CAAT
1962	2456650.3415838145	0.00104	3	Gaitan J.
1974	2456663.4436139367	0.00076	3	René R.
1997	2456688.544734204	0.00054	2	Benni P.
2028	2456722.3725346276	0.00089	3	Gaitan J.
2028	2456722.3826146275	0.00108	3	René R.
2039	2456734.3835047917	0.00112	3	Carreño A.
2039	2456734.388674792	0.00073	2	Horta F. G.
2050	2456746.3855149634	0.00139	3	Bachschmidt M.
2050	2456746.391884963	0.00141	3	Trnka J.
2216	2456927.546138298	0.00164	3	Bachschmidt M.
2237	2456950.4851188404	0.00074	2	Zibar M.
2246	2456960.3068690808	0.00057	2	Karavaev Y.
2249	2456963.578439162	0.00093	3	Francesco Scaggiante, Danilo Zardin
2249	2456963.578959162	0.00089	3	Francesco Scaggiante*
2249	2456963.582479162	0.00061	2	Matthieu Bachschmidt
2270	2456986.501139745	0.00051	2	Mark Salisbury
2281	2456998.50818006	0.00145	3	Marc Bretton
2281	2456998.50818006	0.00145	3	Marc Bretton
2312	2457032.3333109776	0.00113	3	Josep Gaitan
2313	2457033.433561009	0.00046	1	Marc Bretton
2346	2457069.448912041	0.00051	2	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
2356	2457080.3675723644	0.00119	3	Jaroslav Trnka
2356	2457080.3675723644	0.00119	3	Jaroslav Trnka
2367	2457092.3683527256	0.0006	2	Mark Salisbury
2598	2457344.486722873	0.00065	2	Luis Tremosa
2598	2457344.4886928727	0.00107	3	Fran Campos
2599	2457345.578812914	0.00109	3	Miroslav Smolka
2599	2457345.5798329143	0.00049	2	David Molina
2609	2457356.4937333274	0.00061	2	David Molina
2610	2457357.5850133696	0.00052	2	David Molina
2610	2457357.586493369	0.00043	1	Marc Bretton
2620	2457368.4989637877	0.00058	2	Enrique Díez Alonso
2620	2457368.499653788	0.00046	1	Marc Bretton
2621	2457369.5894738296	0.00034	1	Esseiva Nicolas
2630	2457379.41442421	0.00089	3	David Molina
2630	2457379.41442421	0.00089	3	David Molina
2662	2457414.33472558	0.00131	3	Francesco Scaggiante, Danilo Zardin

Table B9 *continued*

Table B9 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
2673	2457426.343356056	0.00065	2	Marc Bretton
2696	2457451.4472370553	0.00086	2	David Molina
2717	2457474.3640779685	0.00077	2	Marc Bretton
2717	2457474.3643479683	0.00055	2	Marc Bretton
2728	2457486.371248447	0.00135	3	Marc Bretton
2895	2457668.6377857854	0.00082	2	David Molina
2948	2457726.484138119	0.00055	2	Vrašák M.
2969	2457749.405049043	0.00084	3	Claudio Arena
2970	2457750.494949087	0.00053	2	Matthieu Bachschmidt
2971	2457751.585649131	0.00094	3	Matthieu Bachschmidt
2971	2457751.586939131	0.00072	2	David Molina
2976	2457757.043280925	0.00037	1	Wonseok Kang
2977	2457758.134850969	0.00052	1	Wonseok Kang
2979	2457760.3174710576	0.00067	2	Marc Bretton
2979	2457760.318171058	0.00103	3	Marc Bretton
2980	2457761.4089511014	0.00063	2	David Molina
2988	2457770.1403614543	0.00033	1	Wonseok Kang
2990	2457772.327371543	0.00099	3	David Molina
2991	2457773.4151615873	0.00055	2	Franky Dubois
2992	2457774.506521631	0.00062	2	Esseiva Nicolas
3024	2457809.4312730418	0.00072	2	David Molina
3024	2457809.435043042	0.00094	3	Marc Bretton
3045	2457832.3508739625	0.00058	2	Marc Bretton
3279	2458087.7458433444	0.00035	1	O. Cooper**
3287	2458096.474133639	0.00057	2	Claudio Arena
3299	2458109.571734078	0.00138	3	Mattia Spagnol
3319	2458131.4003147967	0.00064	2	Mario Morales
3562	2458396.6151619162	0.00118	3	Esseiva Nicolas
3562	2458396.617561916	0.0007	2	Yves Jongen
3576	2458411.8960522227	0.0007	3	Riley Larochelle
3616	2458455.5545930467	0.00071	3	Ferran Grau Horta
3618	2458457.734253086	0.00055	2	James Mazur
3638	2458479.568743471	0.00058	2	Yves Jongen
3647	2458489.383453638	0.00068	2	Fran Campos
3647	2458489.387803638	0.00103	3	Snaevarr Gudmundsson
3648	2458490.477903656	0.00086	2	Ramon Naves
3648	2458490.4828236564	0.00085	3	Yves Jongen
3658	2458501.391673836	0.0003	1	Marc Bretton
3658	2458501.392013836	0.00076	2	Anaël Wünsche
3658	2458501.396543836	0.00068	2	Yves Jongen
3669	2458513.402254027	0.00082	3	Francesco Scaggiante, Danilo Zardin

Table B9 *continued*

Table B9 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
3691	2458537.407634385	0.00061	2	Anaël Wünsche
3692	2458538.5077344007	0.00145	3	Jean Plazas
3966	2458837.5501557584	0.00073	2	Manfred Raetz
3976	2458848.4616857045	0.0007	2	Yves Jongen
3986	2458859.375955644	0.00135	3	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
3987	2458860.4658756377	0.00082	3	Yves Jongen
3987	2458860.4696156373	0.00067	2	Ferran Grau Horta
3997	2458871.379135569	0.00094	3	Anaël Wünsche
3997	2458871.382555569	0.00049	2	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
3998	2458872.470795562	0.00113	3	Valère Perroud
4008	2458883.3871654863	0.00054	2	Yves Jongen
4008	2458883.3895554864	0.00054	2	Anaël Wünsche
4009	2458884.478175478	0.0007	2	Pere Guerra
4009	2458884.478425478	0.00079	3	Sibil-La LlorEt GómeZ
4009	2458884.479455478	0.00084	3	Sibil-la Lloret Gómez
4029	2458906.3069253047	0.0006	2	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
4051	2458930.332215082	0.00052	1	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
4250	2459147.5102512357	0.00073	3	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
4272	2459171.5229206374	0.00064	2	Vicenç Ferrando
4273	2459172.6087406105	0.00102	3	F. Lomoz
4273	2459172.61785061	0.00078	3	F. Lomoz
4283	2459183.5319103287	0.00061	2	Jordi Lopesino
4292	2459193.3524800707	0.00133	3	Yves Jongen
4293	2459194.4423400415	0.00077	2	Anaël Wünsche
4293	2459194.4436100414	0.00061	2	Thomas Mollier
4295	2459196.6239499836	0.00052	2	Yves Jongen
4296	2459197.719249954	0.00113	3	Yves Jongen
4317	2459220.632699325	0.00113	3	Yves Jongen
4337	2459242.461498697	0.00053	2	Snaevarr Gudmundsson
4358	2459265.384258006	0.00078	2	Ferratfiat Stephane
4358	2459265.3843180058	0.00042	1	Ferran Grau Horta
4578	2459505.4956089947	0.00125	3	Giuseppe Conzo
4622	2459553.5146268737	0.00038	1	Snaevarr Gudmundsson
4622	2459553.5151368733	0.00072	3	Veli-Pekka Hentunen
4632	2459564.4277463825	0.00086	2	Fabio Salvaggio
4633	2459565.520376333	0.00047	1	Yves Jongen
4634	2459566.615006284	0.00095	3	Alessandro Marchini
4643	2459576.438095839	0.00054	2	Snaevarr Gudmundsson

NOTE— *Danilo Zardin, Marco Fiaschi **E. Helou, J. Lowenthal, R. O'Connor, E. Papineau, A. Peck, L. Stephens, K. Walker

Table B10. WASP-43 b ETD Transit Centers

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
0	2455528.8685292783	0.00014	1	Hellier et al. (2011)
497	2455933.16473013	0.00025	1	Starr P.
505	2455939.674749933	0.00052	2	Naves R.
506	2455940.487439908	0.0005	2	Ayiomamitis A.
511	2455944.554679785	0.00106	3	René R.
527	2455957.567029386	0.00156	3	František Lomoz
554	2455979.533498702	0.0004	2	Gonzalez J.
554	2455979.5339987027	0.00044	2	Nicolas E.
560	2455984.414718549	0.00071	3	Lomoz F.
560	2455984.4148985487	0.00047	2	Martineli F.
560	2455984.415478549	0.00126	3	Lomoz F.
560	2455984.4193885485	0.00064	3	Horta F. G.
576	2455997.429808138	0.00068	3	Gonzalez J.
576	2455997.4300781377	0.0004	2	Nicolas E.
576	2455997.431048138	0.00051	3	Garcia F.
576	2455997.4350781376	0.00086	3	René R.
581	2456001.4953080085	0.00019	1	Emering F.
581	2456001.4966180087	0.00035	1	Schteinman G. M.
581	2456001.498588009	0.00156	3	Carreño A.
587	2456006.3780978536	0.00109	3	Lomoz F.
587	2456006.3807078535	0.00101	3	Lomoz F.
623	2456035.664886917	0.0005	2	Hall G.
981	2456326.8871087003	0.00072	3	Evans P.
983	2456328.5142586464	0.00039	2	Haro J. L.
992	2456335.834518403	0.00113	3	Evans P.
1056	2456387.8978466815	0.00046	2	Evans P.
1080	2456407.41971604	0.00102	3	Dittler U.
1080	2456407.42696604	0.00097	3	Alonso E. D.
1121	2456440.772504954	0.00037	1	Evans P.
1389	2456658.784688519	0.00032	2	Benni P.
1394	2456662.850088412	0.00053	3	Benni P.
1416	2456680.747577949	0.00036	2	Benni P.
1455	2456712.4740371625	0.00045	2	Marino G.
1471	2456725.4885568535	0.00077	3	Bachschmidt M.
1477	2456730.3666067393	0.00091	3	Lomoz F.
1477	2456730.3724867394	0.00119	3	Lomoz F.
1482	2456734.4366666446	0.00059	3	Marino G.
1520	2456765.3487759503	0.00045	2	Corfini G.
1520	2456765.35011595	0.00076	3	Barbieri L.
1823	2457011.83198177	0.00034	2	Paul Benni
1824	2457012.6451517614	0.00032	1	Christophe Andre*

Table B10 *continued*

Table B10 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
1889	2457065.5208612466	0.0006	3	Marc Bretton
1889	2457065.521821247	0.00024	1	Marc Bretton
1927	2457096.4316610065	0.00071	3	Francesco Scaggianti, Danilo Zardin
1932	2457100.5001209774	0.00031	2	Marc Bretton
1965	2457127.3476808136	0.00054	3	Marc Bretton
2343	2457434.8379232166	0.00038	2	Jacob Isbell, Jack Dolde
2360	2457448.6635433757	0.00088	3	John L
2376	2457461.683103535	0.00089	3	Jacob Isbell, Jack Dolde
2377	2457462.4965135455	0.00061	2	Enrique Díez Alonso
2386	2457469.817993638	0.00132	3	Jacob Isbell, Jack Dolde
2392	2457474.698293701	0.00047	2	Jacob Isbell, Jack Dolde
2399	2457480.3942837757	0.00095	3	František Lomoz
2399	2457480.395233776	0.00085	3	František Lomoz
2730	2457749.653559059	0.00063	3	Blois Sologne Astronomie
2781	2457791.13953174	0.00047	2	Koji Shimizu
2790	2457798.458611944	0.0006	3	František Lomoz
2790	2457798.463121944	0.00085	3	František Lomoz
2828	2457829.372302833	0.00051	2	Marc Bretton
2828	2457829.372322833	0.00085	3	Josep Gaitan
2828	2457829.372432833	0.00101	3	Josep Gaitan
2828	2457829.373092833	0.00106	3	M. Höcherl
2828	2457829.373342833	0.0003	1	Arar Ravenna
2828	2457829.373592833	0.00082	3	Francesco Scaggianti, Danilo Zardin
2842	2457840.7653831714	0.00074	3	Martin Fowler
2844	2457842.3893732205	0.00042	2	Francesco Scaggianti, Danilo Zardin
3251	2458173.467545005	0.00085	3	F. Lomoz
3267	2458186.4884655327	0.00034	1	Jongen Yves
3273	2458191.369875731	0.00034	1	Jongen Yves
3289	2458204.3920362624	0.00079	3	Yves Jongen
3316	2458226.354147166	0.00032	1	Yves Jongen
3320	2458229.6027373	0.00073	3	Serge Bergeron
3321	2458230.4166873344	0.0003	1	Nico Montigiani, Massimiliano Mannucci
3321	2458230.4191273344	0.00121	3	Stéphane Montchaud
3593	2458451.6818168447	0.00104	3	Sjoerd Dufoer
3604	2458460.6293972363	0.00044	2	Yves Jongen
3636	2458486.6636283807	0.00042	2	Yves Jongen
3658	2458504.557299171	0.00039	2	Yves Jongen
3680	2458522.4557099654	0.00041	2	Yves Jongen
3685	2458526.5213801456	0.00036	2	Yves Jongen
3685	2458526.5217801454	0.00028	1	Marc Bretton
3691	2458531.4013103624	0.00055	2	Claudio Lopresti

Table B10 *continued*

Table B10 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
3691	2458531.4087303625	0.00057	3	M.Hoecherl
3701	2458539.5372807235	0.00049	2	Yves Jongen
3707	2458544.4181609405	0.00053	2	Yves Jongen
3734	2458566.379741915	0.00063	3	F. Lomoz
3734	2458566.3799919146	0.00055	3	Francesco Scaggianti, Danilo Zardin
3734	2458566.3813219145	0.00076	3	F. Lomoz
3734	2458566.381761915	0.00032	1	Josep Gaitan
3734	2458566.381761915	0.00058	3	Yves Jongen
3739	2458570.4508720953	0.00055	2	Anael Wunsche
3761	2458588.345442886	0.00032	1	Yves Jongen
4022	2458800.6616218826	0.00042	2	Yves Jongen
4081	2458848.6562138046	0.00062	2	Pavel Pintr
4082	2458849.4636638365	0.00057	1	Yves Jongen
4092	2458857.6040141555	0.00034	1	Yves Jongen
4103	2458866.5532945036	0.00041	2	Yves Jongen
4118	2458878.7570249746	0.00034	1	Yves Jongen
4129	2458887.702945317	0.00026	1	Yves Jongen
4135	2458892.5826055026	0.00074	3	F. Lomoz
4135	2458892.5840655025	0.0006	3	F. Lomoz
4141	2458897.463935687	0.00027	1	Stephen Futcher
4151	2458905.599755994	0.00031	1	Yves Jongen
4173	2458923.495126663	0.00023	1	Marc Bretton
4179	2458928.376456844	0.00042	2	Francesco Scaggianti **
4184	2458932.4479069947	0.00136	3	Michael Theusner
4204	2458948.7145075905	0.00026	1	Yves Jongen
4205	2458949.52776762	0.00027	1	Yves Jongen
4206	2458950.33983765	0.00096	3	Francesco Scaggianti **
4206	2458950.34175765	0.00046	2	Yves Jongen
4211	2458954.407617797	0.00028	1	Marc Bretton
4211	2458954.408787797	0.00054	2	Anaël Wünsche
4232	2458971.491648412	0.00037	1	Yves Jongen
4237	2458975.5584385563	0.00038	2	Yves Jongen
4248	2458984.5075488724	0.00031	1	Yves Jongen
4275	2459006.471379637	0.00034	1	Yves Jongen
4493	2459183.808424963	0.0003	1	Yves Jongen
4526	2459210.6528656483	0.0005	2	Jean-Claude Mario
4552	2459231.8035161644	0.00035	2	Yves Jongen
4563	2459240.7516963757	0.00029	1	Yves Jongen
4579	2459253.767396674	0.00024	1	Yves Jongen
4595	2459266.7822069637	0.00106	3	Roger Dymock
4613	2459281.4243472773	0.00098	3	Jens Jacobsen

Table B10 *continued*

Table B10 (*continued*)

Epoch	Transit Center (BJD _{TDB})	Error	Data Quality	Observer
4613	2459281.4245372773	0.00029	1	MarSEC***
4623	2459289.5593274455	0.0005	2	Paul Benni
4629	2459294.4405775447	0.00046	2	Yves Jongen

NOTE— * Jacques Clement, Jean-Philippe Nougayrede ** Danilo Zardin, Marco Fiaschi *** Marana Space Explorer Center