

Habitable Zones with Stable Orbits for Planets around Binary Systems

Luisa G. Jaime^{1*}, Luis Aguilar², and Barbara Pichardo¹

¹*Instituto de Astronomía, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Apdo. postal 70-264, Ciudad Universitaria, México*

²*Instituto de Astronomía, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Apdo. postal 877, 22800 Ensenada, México*

Accepted. Received ; in original form

ABSTRACT

A general formulation to compute habitable zones around binary stars is presented. A habitable zone in this context must satisfy two separate conditions: a radiative one and one of dynamical stability. For the case of single stars, the usual concept of circumstellar habitable zone is based on the radiative condition only, as the dynamical stability condition is taken for granted (assuming minimal perturbation from other planets). For the radiative condition, we extend the simple formulation of the circumstellar habitable zone for single stars, to the case of eccentric stellar binary systems, where two sources of luminosity at different orbital phases contribute to the irradiance of their planetary circumstellar and circumbinary regions. Our approach considers binaries with eccentric orbits and guarantees that orbits in the computed habitable zone remain within it at all orbital phases. For the dynamical stability condition, we use the approach of invariant loops developed by Pichardo et al. (2005) to find regions of stable, non-intersecting orbits, which is a robust method to find stable regions in binary stars, as it is based in the existence of integrals of motion. We apply the combined criteria to calculate habitable zones for 64 binary stars in the solar neighborhood with known orbital parameters, including some with discovered planets. Formulae and interpolating tables are provided, so the reader can compute the boundaries of the habitable zones for an arbitrary binary system, using the stellar flux limits they prefer. Together with the formulae provided for stable zones, these allow the computation of both regions of stability and habitability around any binary stellar system. We found 56% of the cases we consider can satisfy both restrictions, this is a very important constriction to binary systems. Nevertheless, we conclude that these systems where a dynamical and radiative safe zone exists, must be considered strong candidates in the search for habitable planets.

Key words: binaries: general, planets, habitability

1 INTRODUCTION

The discovery of hundreds of extrasolar planets has hurled the topic of planetary studies into centerstage: planet formation, planetary dynamics, planetary geology, etc.; among these studies, the question of planet habitability is of great interest, even if no hard data beyond Earth exists, yet. The quest for life on other planets started long ago when in the 60's, Frank Drake used the 85-foot radius telescope in West Virginia, hoping to detect an extraterrestrial signal (Drake 1961). However, extraterrestrial life, if it indeed exists in the neighborhood of the Sun, is most likely of a basic type (e.g. microbial). Although a new emerging view is that planets very different to Earth may have the right conditions for life, which increases future chances of discovering an inhabited world (Seager 2013), it is a good first step along this endeavor to find out if condi-

tions propitious to Earth-like planetary life (the only type we know for sure so far) exists.

Even in the case of Earth, life exists in many diverse environments, from scorching deserts to the eternal darkness of the ocean depths, and even deep within Earth's crust. Confronted with this bewildering diversity of environments, we must look for the most basic ingredients, like liquid water. On the other hand, our observational limitations to detect the most important habitability indicator: water vapor on terrestrial-like exoplanets, reduces our possibilities of finding habitable planets. Up to now, we have been able to characterize habitable zones mainly around single stars, consequently, the quest for habitable worlds has been mostly limited to this type of stars. But given the fact that most stars appear to be part of binary and multiple systems, we must extend the habitable-zone concept to those cases.

The condition for the existence of liquid water on the surface of a planet (Bains 2004), is the usual defining condition for what

* E-mail: luisa@nucleares.unam.mx (LGI)

is now called the circumstellar habitable zone (CHZ). Hart (1979) studied the limits of the CHZ in late type stars and concluded that K dwarfs have a narrow CHZ and later dwarfs have none at all. However, other studies that include among other things, atmospheric radiative transfer modeling, have come with a more optimistic and, rather complicated outlook (e.g. Doyle *et al.* (1998)). In this case, habitability seems to be a very planet-specific matter (Seager 2013). For example, the habitable zone calculations defined for a dry rocky planet, with a minimum inner edge of about 0.5 AU, for a solar-like host star (Zsom *et al.* (2013)), out to 10 AU for a planet with an H₂ atmosphere and no interior energy, around a solar-like host star (Pierrehumbert & Gaidos 2011), and even possibly out to free-floating habitable planets, with no host star, for planets with thick H₂ atmospheres (Stevenson 1999).

For the case of planets in binary stellar systems, the usual radiative condition used to define habitable zones around single stars must be extended to the case of two sources of illumination whose relative positions change in time. Additionally, a condition of dynamical stability must be added, as the more complex and time varying potential turns unstable whole swaths of phase space. For a planet to be a possible adobe of life, both conditions must be satisfied, and for a long time, enough for life to develop.

In the present work we will use Kopparapu *et al.* (2013) definition of habitable zone around single stars and extend it to the case of binary stars. As such, this is a simple definition of the habitable zone based on stellar flux limits. Some of the more complicated (and realistic) effects that pertain to particular situations, can be incorporated into this simple criterion by the use of “corrective factors” applied to the stellar fluxes that define the limits of the habitable zones. An example of this is provided by e.g. Kaltenegger & Haghighipour (2013), who introduce a factor called “spectrally weighted flux”.

Studies like the previous ones, have been applied traditionally to single stars or brown dwarfs, however, most low-mass main-sequence stars are members of binary or multiple systems (Duquennoy & Mayor (1991); Fischer & Marcy (1992)), and in particular in the Solar Neighborhood, the fraction goes up to 50% (Abt (1983) Raghavan *et al.* (2010)). This suggests that binary formation is at least as probable as single star formation processes (Mathieu 1994). Additionally, several types of planets have been discovered in circumstellar orbits, even in close binary systems, where the effect of the stellar companion might be of great importance (Dumusque *et al.* (2012); Chauvin *et al.* (2011); Muterspaugh *et al.* (2010); Correia *et al.* (2005); Zucker *et al.* (2004); Hatzes *et al.* (2003); Queloz *et al.* (2000), and also in circumbinary discs (Doyle *et al.* (2011); Welsh *et al.* (2012); Orosz *et al.* (2012a); Orosz *et al.* (2012b); Schwamb *et al.* (2013)). For a review on the subject see Haghighipour (2010); and Kaltenegger & Haghighipour (2013).

We provide in this work a general theoretical formulation to calculate the equivalent of the Kopparapu *et al.* (2013) habitable zone for single stars, but for binary systems (see section 2). This formulation is expressed in formulae and interpolating tables that the reader can apply to any specific case. Our work also considers binary systems with no restriction on the eccentricity of the binary orbits and guarantees that orbits within the computed habitable zones remain so, at all binary orbital phases. We only consider approximately circular habitable zones. For the dynamical stability condition, we use the work of Pichardo *et al.* (2005) and Pichardo *et al.* (2009), who found the extent of stable, non-intersecting orbits around binary systems, based on the existence of sturdy structures in the extended phase-space of the system (the so called “invariant loops”). We have then applied both conditions to a sample of main

sequence binary systems in the solar neighborhood with known orbital parameters and present our results. These constitute regions where we think it is most likely to find planets suitable for life in these binary systems.

Several other interesting papers have been submitted on this subject recently, for circular binary systems (Cuntz (2013)), and for the general case of elliptical binary systems (Eggl *et al.* (2012); Eggl *et al.* (2013); Haghighipour (2010); Haghighipour & Kaltenegger (2013); Kaltenegger & Haghighipour (2013); Müller & Haghighipour (2014); Kane & Hinkel (2013)). However all these formulations take as the stability criterion that of Holman & Wiegert (1999). The empirical approximation of Holman & Wiegert to the stability problem in binaries, was an excellent and fundamental first approximation to the solution. Their work was based on a detailed trial and error technique to find the most stable (long-term) orbits in disks around binaries. The authors defined as stable orbits mostly those that would keep in their orbits for about 10^4 binary periods (in general not enough to ensure life emergency and development though). On the other hand, and as the authors point out explicitly in their work, their formulation for stability regions breaks toward higher eccentricity binaries due to the rapidly increasing difficulty to recover stable orbits from this methodology.

In this paper, we rely on the invariant loops theory, which by definition are invariant structures in the extended phase-space of the system. The existence of invariant loops guarantees the stability of orbits for all times and not just during the integration span, as long as the binary parameters (stellar masses, semi-major axis and orbital eccentricity) do not change. Their stability is given by the constants of motion that support them. The orbit integration is only used to identify these structures in extended phase-space (for details see Pichardo *et al.* (2005); Maciejewski & Sparke (2000); Maciejewski & Sparke (1997); Arnold (1984); Lichtenberg & Leiberman (1992)). Because of its nature, this formulation has no restrictions in eccentricity or mass ratio. With this criterion we search for the intersection between the stable regions for planets and a short, straightforward, and also general formulation for habitability. Additionally, it is relevant to mention here, that the use of the invariant loops criterion shows, for example in the circumbinary disks case, important differences in the position of stable regions (Pichardo *et al.* 2009) with respect to previous work, that should be taken into account in habitability calculations. We explain this in detail along this paper.

In the second part of this work we also provide a sample of binary systems of the solar neighborhood (the whole sample of binary stars, in the main sequence, with all orbital parameters known at the present time in literature), with their habitable zones computed using the approach in this work for habitability and planetary orbital stability.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 the radiative condition for habitability is extended from the usual circumstellar case, and a detailed description of the formulation used to calculate the radiative safe zones is provided. In section 3 we present the dynamical stability condition for habitability used in this work. 4, the combined conditions are used to compute habitability zones for particular cases and the construction of a table of binaries, with known orbital parameters, for stars in the main sequence. Finally, our conclusions are given in Section 5.

2 RADIATIVE CONDITION FOR HABITABLE ZONES IN BINARY STARS

A common definition of the CHZ uses limits in the radiative stellar flux at the planet (e.g. Kopparapu *et al.* (2013)):

$$I_o \leq I(r) \leq I_i, \quad (1)$$

where the local flux is given by the stellar luminosity divided by distance squared: $I = L/r^2$, and I_o , I_i , define the outer and inner boundaries of the CHZ, respectively.

The CHZ thus defined is a thick spherical shell that surrounds the star, whose thickness and size depend on the star's luminosity. However, an important fraction of stars in the solar neighborhood are part of binary systems. The fact that planets have already been discovered within binary systems, makes it necessary to extend the simple definition of the CHZ to the stellar binary case.

In this section we extend the simple CHZ condition for single stars given by the previous equation, to the case of stellar binary systems. In this case we have two sources of luminosity at positions that change with the binary orbital phase. It may be thought that in this case it is simply a matter of applying the equation twice, once for each star. However, this naive approach is not correct, since there may be regions where, although within the individual CHZ for each star, the combined irradiance of both stars may push the region out of the combined habitable zone. Additionally, it is fundamental to add the condition of orbital stability, as both, the correct irradiance and orbital stable regions should have a non-empty intersection during the entire binary orbital phase, for planets to be able to exist within a proper binary habitable zone. In Figure 1, we present a schematic figure that shows the combined concept to construct habitable zones in a binary star: the radiative safe zone in gray circles (upper half of the diagram), and the stable regions for orbits to settle down (lower half of the diagram). Notice how the demand that both conditions (radiative and dynamical) are met, severely restricts the resulting BHZ.

Since what matters is the total combined irradiance at a given point, we should add the individual stellar fluxes in the CHZ condition given by equation (1), to arrive at the condition for the radiative safe zone. The total stellar flux is given by:

$$I(x, y) = L_T \left[\frac{(1 - \lambda_s)}{(x - r_p)^2 + y^2} + \frac{\lambda_s}{(x - r_s)^2 + y^2} \right], \quad (2)$$

here L_T is the total binary luminosity and λ_s is the fractional contribution of the secondary star to it. x and y are Cartesian coordinates in the binary orbital plane and r_p and r_s are the primary and secondary star distances to their barycenter. The x -axis contains both stars.

To illustrate the concept of binary habitable zone, we show in fig. 1 a schematic diagram that presents the radiative condition (upper half) and dynamical condition (lower half). The stars are the black dots on the x -axis, whose size is proportional to the assumed luminosity (upper half), or mass (lower half). In the upper half, isopleths of constant combined stellar flux are shown, with those corresponding to the boundaries of the radiative safe zone shown with thick black lines. The radiative safe zone is shaded in gray. Likewise, in the lower half of the diagram, equipotentials are shown with the circumbinary and two circumstellar dynamical safe zones in gray. Notice that the saddle point between the stars for isopleths and equipotentials does not coincide, as the former is set by the relative luminosities, whereas the latter by their mass ratio.

We define our binary habitable zones (BHZ) as the annular




Figure 1. Illustrative diagram for the concept of binary habitable zone. The stars are on the x -axis (black dots whose size is proportional to their luminosity —upper half—, or mass —lower half—). The upper part of the diagram shows the flux isophotes (equation 2) with the boundaries of the radiative safe zone shown with thick black lines and the zone itself shaded in gray. The lower part shows the equipotentials, with the circumbinary and circumstellar zones of dynamical stability shown in gray. Our definition of binary habitable zones (BHZ) is shown as the annular green region, where both conditions are met. In this case there is a circumbinary and a circumsecondary habitable zone.

regions (shown in green) where both conditions are met. For the circumbinary habitable zone, it is an annular region centered at the barycenter of the system. For the circumstellar habitable zones, they are annular regions centered in the corresponding star. Notice that in this particular example there is a circumbinary and a circumsecondary habitable zones, but not a circumprimary. In this section we will tackle the radiative condition alone, leaving the condition of dynamical stability for the next section and the combined effect for section 4.

The edges of the radiative safe zone are set by two stellar flux isopleths and the resulting shape is more complicated than that of the CHZ. Figure (2) illustrates a particular example: the gray region is the radiative safe zone. Dashed lines indicate possible planetary orbits that are not fit for life, while solid lines indicate safe orbits (we have approximated the planetary orbits as circles centered in either star, or the barycenter). Notice that for an orbit to be safe, it must remain within the radiative safe zone at all times. In this particular case, there are safe circumprimary and circumsecondary planetary orbits, but no circumbinary ones.

In addition to the above complication, the separation between the stars will vary for the general case of binaries with elliptical orbits. First we will tackle the simpler case of circular orbit binaries.

2.1 Binaries in circular orbits

The star distances to the barycenter are given by:

$$r_p = -(m_s/M)r_{12}, \quad r_s = +(m_p/M)r_{12},$$




Figure 2. Safe (continuous) and unsafe (dashed) planetary orbits. The radiative safe zone is the gray region. The planetary orbits are simply circles centered on either star, or the center of mass of the system. In this case no circumbinary safe orbits are possible.

where the p and s subindexes refer to the primary and secondary stars, m are the individual stellar masses and M is the total mass. Finally, r_{12} is the constant distance between the stars.

If we take the interstellar distance and total mass as units of length and mass, we can write the previous relation as:

$$\eta_p = -q, \quad \eta_s = +(1 - q), \quad (3)$$

where η is dimensionless distance and $q = m_s/M$ is the mass fraction due to the secondary.

A similar scaling in luminosity can be accomplished adopting L_T as its unit. The dimensionless combined stellar flux is then:

$$\mathcal{I}(\eta_x, \eta_y) = \frac{(1 - \lambda_s)}{(\eta_x + q)^2 + \eta_y^2} + \frac{\lambda_s}{(\eta_x + q - 1)^2 + \eta_y^2}, \quad (4)$$

where (η_x, η_y) are the corresponding dimensionless Cartesian coordinates. Notice that \mathcal{I} is completely set by the luminosity and mass ratios, its unit is L_T/r_{12}^2 .

2.1.1 The critical flux isopleth

The shape of the \mathcal{I} -isopleths changes from a single (circumbinary) to a double (circumstellar) contour at the *critical isopleth* (see figure 3). Its value is given by:

$$\mathcal{I}_c(\lambda) = \frac{(1 - \lambda_s)^{1/3} + \lambda_s^{1/3}}{\left[(1 - \lambda_s)^{2/3} + \lambda_s^{2/3} - \lambda_s^{1/3}(1 - \lambda_s)^{1/3} \right]^2} \quad (5)$$

Figure (4) shows the value of the critical flux isopleth as a function of the secondary luminosity fraction. Notice that \mathcal{I}_c does not depend on the mass ratio q . This is because the latter only shifts the isopleths on the orbital plane (see equations 3). The curve is also symmetric with respect to $\lambda_s = 1/2$. This is because λ can

Figure 3. Various flux isopleths are shown for a binary with $q = 0.5$, $\lambda = 0.1$. The thick line is the critical isopleth. The plot origin is at the barycenter frame and only the positive y axis is shown.




Figure 4. Critical isopleth flux value as a function of the secondary star luminosity fraction. Notice that \mathcal{I}_c is symmetric with respect to $\lambda_s = 0.5$.

refer to either star (the more massive star is not necessarily the most luminous one). So we drop the s subindex from now on.

2.1.2 The three different radiative zone configurations

Depending on the value of the dimensionless stellar fluxes that define the CHZ (equation 1) with respect to the critical isopleth flux, the radiative safe zone may have three different configurations:

Configuration I: ($\mathcal{I}_c < \mathcal{I}_o$). This corresponds to 2 separate circumstellar radiative safe zones.

Configuration II: ($\mathcal{I}_o < \mathcal{I}_c < \mathcal{I}_i$). This corresponds to a combined case, where we find a circumbinary radiative safe zone with two inner holes around the stars.

Configuration III: ($\mathcal{I}_i < \mathcal{I}_c$). This corresponds to a single radiative safe zone with a single inner hole.

These configurations are illustrated in figure 5.

In any of these configurations, safer planetary orbits are the ones better contained within the safe radiative zone. In the most strict sense, this means that we must consider their shape, which introduces an added complexity we will not get into. Since stable




Figure 5. The three different radiative zone configurations. The illustration is for a binary with $\lambda = 0.4$.




Figure 6. Circumstellar boundaries of the rBHZ (configuration I). The boundary isopleth is the dashed line. If this isopleth corresponds to the outer boundary, the largest safe orbit touches the isopleth on its η_x intersection opposite the other star (left solid circle). If the isopleth is the inner boundary, the smallest safe orbit touches the isopleth at the opposite η_x intersection (right solid circle). The case shown is $q = 0.3$, $\lambda = 0.2$ and the isopleth depicted is $1.0045\mathcal{I}_c$. The primary star, which in this example is also the most luminous, is the one on the left.

orbital planetary configurations in binaries have in general low eccentricities (smaller to ~ 0.3 , Pichardo *et al.* (2005)), we will define a radiative Binary Habitable Zone (rBHZ) as the largest circular annular region that can fit entirely within the radiative safe zone. We consider two cases: circumstellar and circumbinary zones. Orbits that are safe for life will lay most likely within these zones. We should remember that these zones are defined by the radiative condition only. In next section we will consider the dynamical condition and in section 4 we will combined both conditions to define the combined binary habitable zone.

Now, a problem arises because the flux isopleths are not circles (see figure 3), particularly close to the critical isopleth. Our definition of BHZ implies that the largest safe orbit must be entirely inscribed within the flux isopleth that defines the outer boundary of the safe zone. Similarly, the smallest safe orbit must be entirely circumscribed outside the inner boundary flux isopleth. Note that this condition is not over the planetary orbit itself but just in order to fix the boundaries for habitability, in such way that it is possible to ensure that a planet will remains all the time inside this zone.

The study can be separated depending on the configuration of the radiative safe zones, we now examine these conditions for each case.

2.1.3 Configuration I ($\mathcal{I}_c < \mathcal{I}_o$)

In this case we have two separate circumstellar habitable zones. The orbital radius of the largest safe planetary orbit is given by the smallest distance between the outer boundary isopleth and the corresponding star. This ensures that the orbit will remain within the outer boundary isopleth.

Similarly, for the radius of the smallest, circumstellar safe orbit, we must now consider the maximum distance from either star to the corresponding inner boundary flux isopleth, so the orbit remains outside it at all times.

The circumstellar isopleths are elongated along the η_x axis in the direction of the other star, while they are squashed in the opposite direction. This means that both, the outer and inner circumstellar orbital radii (r_{os} and r_{is} , respectively) correspond to the respective boundary isopleth intersections with the η_x axis (see figure 6).

From equation (4), setting $\eta_y = 0$ and putting the star in question at the coordinate origin, we arrive at the following polynomial:




Figure 7. Fractional error made using the CHZ criterion for a single star, instead of r_{is} , as a function of the inner boundary flux value (in units of the critical flux value). The solid line is for the most luminous star ($\lambda = 0.9$), while the dashed line is for the less luminous star ($\lambda = 0.1$).

$$\mathcal{I}_b r_s^4 - 2\mathcal{I}_b r_s^3 + (\mathcal{I}_b - 1)r_s^2 + 2\lambda r_s - \lambda = 0, \quad (6)$$

where \mathcal{I}_b is the dimensionless flux value that defines the rBHZ boundary and r_s is either, the outer circumstellar orbital radius r_{os} , or the inner one r_{is} , depending on the solution we choose. Unfortunately, although 4-degree polynomials can always be solved by radicals, the solution in this case is quite cumbersome. We have decided instead, to list in table 1 some solutions. The first value at each entry corresponds to r_{os} (smallest value), the second to r_{is} . We list results from the critical isopleth up to thrice its value only, because for larger values, the circumstellar boundaries are very close to the star and the single star CHZ criterion (equation (1)) is sufficient. This is shown in figure 7, where the fractional error made in using the CHZ criterion individually for each star, instead of the true value obtained by solving equation (6), is shown as a function of the flux value for the inner boundary. We can see that for values larger than those listed in table 1, the error drops well below 1%.

2.1.4 Configuration III ($\mathcal{I}_i < \mathcal{I}_c$)

The considerations that define the largest and smallest boundaries are the same as for the previous case, except that this time we are dealing with boundary isopleths that surround both stars and the relevant extremal distances are with respect to the binary barycenter.

In this case there are two additional difficulties: the position of the isopleths with respect to the barycenter depends on the mass ratio too and their form, close to the critical one, is nowhere near circular.


For the outer boundary, the relevant distance is that from the barycenter to the closest point along the boundary isopleth. In general, this point is not along either axis (see figure 8).

From equation (4), we obtain the barycenter-isopleth distance. Minimizing this function, we get the orbital radius of the largest safe orbit:

$$r_{ob}(q, \lambda, \mathcal{I}_o) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_o} \sqrt{\frac{A_1 + A_2}{2qf_1(q)}}, \quad (7)$$

Table 1. Some values of the radius of the largest/smallest safe circumstellar orbits r_s (real solutions to equation (6) for $\mathcal{I}_b > \mathcal{I}_c$)

$\mathcal{I}_b/\mathcal{I}_c$	$\lambda = 0.1$	$\lambda = 0.2$	$\lambda = 0.3$	$\lambda = 0.4$	$\lambda = 0.5$	$\lambda = 0.6$	$\lambda = 0.7$	$\lambda = 0.8$	$\lambda = 0.9$
1	0.208/0.343	0.260/0.387	0.299/0.430	0.333/0.466	0.366/0.500	0.400/0.534	0.439/0.570	0.487/0.614	0.559/0.675
1.001	0.208/0.316	0.260/0.378	0.299/0.421	0.333/0.457	0.366/0.491	0.400/0.525	0.439/0.561	0.487/0.605	0.559/0.667
1.002	0.208/0.313	0.260/0.374	0.298/0.417	0.333/0.453	0.366/0.487	0.400/0.521	0.439/0.557	0.486/0.601	0.558/0.663
1.005	0.208/0.306	0.259/0.367	0.298/0.410	0.332/0.446	0.365/0.480	0.399/0.513	0.438/0.550	0.486/0.593	0.558/0.656
1.01	0.207/0.298	0.258/0.359	0.297/0.402	0.331/0.438	0.364/0.471	0.398/0.505	0.437/0.541	0.484/0.585	0.556/0.648
1.02	0.206/0.288	0.257/0.348	0.296/0.390	0.329/0.426	0.362/0.459	0.396/0.493	0.435/0.529	0.482/0.573	0.553/0.636
1.05	0.202/0.269	0.253/0.327	0.291/0.368	0.324/0.403	0.357/0.436	0.390/0.469	0.428/0.506	0.475/0.549	0.545/0.612
1.1	0.197/0.248	0.246/0.305	0.284/0.345	0.316/0.379	0.348/0.411	0.381/0.444	0.418/0.479	0.464/0.522	0.533/0.584
1.2	0.187/0.223	0.234/0.277	0.271/0.314	0.302/0.347	0.333/0.377	0.364/0.409	0.400/0.443	0.444/0.485	0.510/0.546
1.5	0.164/0.181	0.207/0.228	0.240/0.262	0.269/0.291	0.296/0.319	0.325/0.347	0.357/0.378	0.396/0.417	0.456/0.473
2	0.139/0.147	0.177/0.187	0.206/0.216	0.231/0.242	0.255/0.266	0.280/0.291	0.308/0.318	0.343/0.352	0.394/0.402
3	0.112/0.115	0.143/0.147	0.167/0.171	0.187/0.191	0.207/0.211	0.228/0.232	0.251/0.255	0.279/0.283	0.321/0.324

**Figure 8.** Circumbinary boundaries of the rBHZ (configuration III). The boundary isopleth is the dashed line and the barycenter is at the coordinate origin. If this isopleth corresponds to the outer boundary, that largest safe orbit touches the isopleth at the point where the barycenter to isopleth distance is minimum (inner circle). If the isopleth is the inner boundary, the smallest safe orbit touches the isopleth at the η_x intersection farthest away from the barycenter (outer circle). The binary parameters are the same as those in figure (5), except that the isopleth depicted is $0.779\mathcal{I}_c$

where r_{ob} denotes the outer circumbinary orbital radius and \mathcal{I}_o is the flux value that defines the outer boundary isopleth (in this case $\mathcal{I}_o < \mathcal{I}_c$). The auxiliary quantities are given by:

$$A_1 = 2[\mathcal{I}_o q f_1(q)]^2 + \mathcal{I}_o f_2^2(q) \sqrt{\lambda q f_1(\lambda) f_1(q)}, \quad (8)$$

$$A_2 = \mathcal{I}_o q f_1(q) \left[\sqrt{\frac{\lambda f_1(\lambda)}{q f_1(q)}} - 2[q f_2(\lambda) + f_1(\lambda)] \right], \quad (9)$$


and

$$f_1(x) = x - 1, \quad f_2(x) = 1 - 2x \quad (10)$$

Equation (7) is symmetric around $\lambda = 1/2$. This is expected, since a reflexion around the η_y axis of figure (8) leaves the shortest barycenter to isopleth distance unchanged.

Notice that the radius of the largest safe circumstellar orbit does not depend on q , whereas that of the circumbinary orbit does. As we mentioned, this is because the position of the isopleths is fixed with respect to the stars, but not with respect to the barycenter (equation 3).

For the inner boundary, the proper orbital radius is the distance from the barycenter to the farthest away η_x axis intersection of the boundary isopleth (figure 8). The easiest way to find this distance is to solve equation (4) for $\eta_y = 0$, which leads to the same polynomial as in case I (equation 6). But now ($\mathcal{I}_b < \mathcal{I}_c$), the polynomial has only two real roots, which are the distances from either star to the boundary isopleth (r_*). To find the final inner circumbinary or-

**Figure 9.** Fractional error made using the CHZ criterion for a single star at the barycenter with the total binary luminosity, instead of r_{ib} , as a function of the inner boundary flux value (in units of the critical flux value). The $\lambda = 0.9$ case is shown.

bit radius, we now add the respective star to barycenter distance (equation 3) to each root and compare the resulting barycenter to isopleth distances. The largest one is r_{ib} .

As before, the solution is rather complicated and some values of r_* are shown in table 2. For distant boundaries (small values of $\mathcal{I}_i/\mathcal{I}_c$), the isopleths become circular and converge to the CHZ criterion applied using the total binary luminosity. This can be seen in figure (9), where the fractional error made using the CHZ instead of the rBHZ criterion is plotted for the $\lambda = 0.9$ case. Again, for values beyond those listed in table 2 the error is very small.

In this case it may be that $r_{ib} > r_{ob}$, which means that no safe circular orbits centered in the barycenter exist. However, a non-circular and sufficiently elongated orbit may remain within the rBHZ, but this is beyond this study.

2.1.5 Configuration II ($\mathcal{I}_o < \mathcal{I}_c < \mathcal{I}_i$)

This is the most complicated configuration to compute, since we now have the possibility of both, circumstellar and circumbinary safe zones. This is a mixture of the previous two cases and they have to be dealt separately.

For the circumstellar zone, we use the procedure used for case I, with $\mathcal{I}_b = \mathcal{I}_i$, to interpolate values of r_{is} for each star from table 1. For the outer edge, we use the procedure of case III with $\mathcal{I}_b = \mathcal{I}_o$, to obtain from equation (7) a value that we will interpret

Table 2. Some values of the star to outer boundary isopleth r_* (negative real solution to equation (6) for $\mathcal{I}_b < \mathcal{I}_c$)

$\mathcal{I}_o/\mathcal{I}_c$	$\lambda = 0.1$	$\lambda = 0.2$	$\lambda = 0.3$	$\lambda = 0.4$	$\lambda = 0.5$	$\lambda = 0.6$	$\lambda = 0.7$	$\lambda = 0.8$	$\lambda = 0.9$
0.99	0.210	0.261	0.300	0.335	0.368	0.403	0.441	0.489	0.562
0.90	0.222	0.276	0.316	0.352	0.387	0.423	0.463	0.514	0.589
0.80	0.239	0.295	0.338	0.375	0.412	0.450	0.492	0.546	0.626
0.60	0.287	0.349	0.397	0.439	0.480	0.523	0.571	0.632	0.723
0.40	0.379	0.446	0.500	0.549	0.597	0.648	0.705	0.778	0.888
0.20	0.635	0.695	0.754	0.812	0.872	0.938	1.014	1.111	1.262
0.10	1.084	1.101	1.151	1.213	1.282	1.363	1.461	1.590	1.795
0.05	1.796	1.736	1.759	1.814	1.889	1.984	2.106	2.275	2.552
0.01	4.978	4.624	4.512	4.508	4.574	4.701	4.900	5.211	5.769
0.005	7.392	6.833	6.623	6.571	6.624	6.767	7.017	7.427	8.188
0.001	17.61	16.20	15.59	15.34	15.34	15.54	15.99	16.80	18.40
0.0005	25.27	23.24	22.33	21.93	21.88	22.13	22.72	23.84	26.07
0.0001	57.60	52.93	50.76	49.75	49.51	49.95	51.16	53.53	58.40




Figure 10. Circumbinary safe orbits in configuration II. The dashed line is the critical isopleth and the shaded area is the radiative safe zone. The extremal safe circumbinary orbits, which define the boundaries of the circumbinary rBHZ are shown (continuous line circles). The example shown is for $q = 0.44$, $\lambda = 0.375$ and $\mathcal{I}_o/\mathcal{I}_c = 0.179$, $\mathcal{I}_i/\mathcal{I}_c = 1.592$.

as r_{os} . Notice that for the outer circumstellar edge we are using an isopleth that is not circumstellar. This is because a safe circumstellar orbit may reach beyond the critical isopleth¹ (see figure 12). It is obvious that if the resulting r_{os} reaches all the way to the inner edge of the circumstellar safe zone of the other star, then the smaller of the two distances should be taken, since a safe circumstellar orbit should not get into the unsafe region of the other star.

For the circumbinary region, we apply the procedure of case III with $\mathcal{I}_b = \mathcal{I}_o$ for the outer edge. For the inner edge we have to deal again with the possibility of safe orbits that cross the critical isopleth (see figure (10)). The inner circumbinary orbital radius is given by the largest of the two barycenter to inner boundary isopleth η_x intersections farther away in the direction to each star. These distances are given by the individual r_{is} for each star (which we computed already), plus their respective star distance to the barycenter.

¹ We should remember that the Roche lobes, which are the regions of dynamical influence of each star, are not the same as the circumstellar regions defined by the critical flux isopleth.

2.1.6 Procedure to obtain the habitability region

Tables 1 and 2, together with equation (7) and auxiliary relations, define the orbital radii of the largest and smallest circumstellar or circumbinary safe edges.

The detailed procedure to find the limits of the rBHZ is then as follows:

- (i) From the binary components individual masses and luminosities, obtain the dimensionless mass fraction q and luminosity fraction λ , the latter for both stars.
- (ii) Get specific boundary radiative stellar flux values I_o , I_i (e.g. Kopparapu *et al.* (2013)) and convert them to the dimensionless system we use here: \mathcal{I}_i , \mathcal{I}_o (normalized to total binary luminosity per square semimajor axis).
- (iii) Given λ (either star), use equation (5) to find the value of the critical flux for this case: \mathcal{I}_c .
- (iv) If $\mathcal{I}_o > \mathcal{I}_c$, proceed to configuration I; if $\mathcal{I}_i < \mathcal{I}_c$, proceed to configuration III; else, go to configuration II.
- (v) **Configuration I:** Two separate radiative circumstellar habitable zones. Use table 1 to interpolate the r_{os} and r_{is} edges radii for each star using the appropriate value of \mathcal{I}_b .
- (vi) **Configuration II:** One radiative circumbinary habitable zone with two circumstellar inner edges. We have to solve the circumstellar and circumbinary zones separately.

(a) *Circumstellar zones:* Use table 1 to interpolate the r_{is} radii for each star using $\mathcal{I}_b = \mathcal{I}_i$.

(b) *Circumbinary zone:* Use equation (7) to get the outermost radius r_{ob} . For the smallest radii, add to the r_{is} previously computed for each star their respective star to barycenter distances, the largest of the two is the radius of the innermost safe circumbinary edge.

(vii) **Configuration III:** One radiative circumbinary habitable zone whose inner edge surrounds both stars. For the outer boundary, use equation (7) to compute r_{ob} . For the inner boundary, use table 2 to compute the distances of each star to its closest η_x intersection of the inner boundary isopleth r_* . To each add the barycenter to respective star distance using equation (3). The largest of the two is r_{ib} .

Figure (11) shows the result for a specific example. We have a primary G2V star with $1M_\odot$ and $1L_\odot$, while the secondary is a G8V star with $0.8M_\odot$ and $0.6L_\odot$. The stars are assumed to be $4AU$ apart. We have used the stellar flux limits of Kopparapu *et al.* (2013) for a G2 star: $I_o = 0.53$ and $I_i = 1.10 L_\odot/AU^2$, which correspond to the CO_2 condensation and water loss limits,




Figure 11. The critical flux isopleth (thick, dashed line) and radiative binary habitability zones (shaded areas) for the first worked example. The limiting safe orbits are shown (thick, continuous lines). The frame is centered in the barycenter and the unit of length is the binary separation, which in this case is 4 AU.




Figure 12. Same as figure (11), but in this case the binary separation has shrunk to 3 AU (taken as unit length in the plot). Notice that the largest circumstellar orbits reach outside the critical isopleth.

respectively. In this case it is clear that safe orbits can exist within two circumstellar zones.

Figure (12) shows the result for the same binary, but now with a separation of 3 AU. By putting the stars closer together, the circumstellar safe zones have merged into a single, case II habitable zone. In this case, the only safe orbits lie between the r_{is} and the outer boundary isopleth. No circumbinary safe orbits are possible.

2.2 Binaries in eccentric orbits

Once the case of the binary in a circular orbit has been solved, the eccentric orbit case is rather simple. We use the circular orbit procedure twice: at periastron and apoastron, and compare the resulting limits. For the smallest safe orbit, we take the largest of the computed values for both orbital extrema. For the largest safe orbit, we take the smallest of the respective values. This guarantees that a fixed, circular, planetary orbit will remain within the safe zone for all orbital phases. Again, if the resulting outer limit is smaller than the inner limit, no safe orbit is possible.

We must stress again that, although this procedure does not take into account explicitly non-circular orbits for planets, nor does it take into account the possible variation in their shape as a function of binary orbital phase (if any), we claim that planetary orbits

in binary eccentric systems will not develop readily, highly eccentric stable orbits (*i.e.* $e \lesssim 0.3$). Furthermore, these deforming effects on orbits in binary systems, may arise close to the critical isopleth, however, it does not necessarily coincides with the loop gap between circumstellar and circumbinary stable orbits.

3 STABILITY CONDITION FOR HABITABLE ZONES IN BINARY STARS

In this paper we have employed the criteria of Pichardo *et al.* (2005) and Pichardo *et al.* (2009) for circumstellar and circumbinary stable orbits respectively. The same approach was used in Jaime *et al.* (2009), where stability zones were studied for binaries of the solar neighborhood. We show in this paper why this stability method results better in searching habitable regions for planets.

Unlike the fundamental work of Holman & Wiegert (1999), that represents an excellent empirical approximation to the stability problem, invariant loops provide an exact solution for stable orbits in ideal (isolated) binary systems at any binary eccentricity. In this manner, rather than orbits that keep stable for some small fraction of the binary star life, to ensure life development, much more time than a small fraction of the binary life is needed. With invariant loops, numerical integrations are used to identify them in phase space, their existence and moreover, their stability, are supported by integrals of motion in the extended phase space. As long as the orbital parameters of the binary are not changed, the stability of the loops is guaranteed without having further numerical integrations (see Pichardo *et al.* 2005, Section 2). Consequently, due to the methodology, Holman & Wiegert's approximation overestimates the available stable regions since their stability criteria depends on a given time of integration that the particles keep in orbit (about 10^4 periods), which results in a very relaxed criteria when looking for strict stability, needed for life emergency and its development. Furthermore, invariant loops show in the circumbinary discs cases, that there is a shift of the stable region that can be considerable for high eccentricities, compromising the intersection between stable regions for planets and habitable regions (as is the case, for example of Kepler 16). The shift can not be detected with the Holman & Wiegert method, this was detected theoretically and presented in Pichardo *et al.* 2008 paper. We consider and computed this shift in the present work.

In our approach however, we do not consider multiple stars, nor stars that have evolved away from the main sequence, or planets in highly eccentric orbits. In the case of multiple stars, this is first because it is not straightforward to extend the loop formalism to that case, and furthermore, multiple systems result generally in unstable systems, unless they are hierarchical (v.g. triple systems where a very close binary star with a far companion as the Alpha Centauri system and Proxima Centauri seem to be, or a system with a double binary where both binary systems act like a whole binary system since they tend to be extremely separated), and in that case, these systems can be reduced to regular separated binary systems at a good approximation. On the same direction, in the general case of multiple stars, stable regions for planetary orbits would be severely compromised, and even if stable regions would exist, finding them would be a challenging task. Thus, if we are not able to calculate stable regions, it is not of importance to find the correct irradiance zones because we still would not be able to establish habitable zones (*i.e.* the combination of stability and stellar irradiance).

Regarding the type of star, although our method allows us to calculate radiative safe zones for any type of star, in our specific

study for solar neighborhood binaries, we only calculated habitable zones for main sequence stars since those out of this “life stage”, would likely be inhospitable for life.

Finally, we do not include studies of planets on very eccentric orbits (i.e. $e_p \gtrsim 0.3$), in our experience and work with stability zones in binaries constructed out of invariant loops, we have found that their probability of survival is highest, for example, either on planets in a circumbinary disc for the case of very close binary systems (where the circumbinary material feels the system almost as a single star), or in circumstellar discs, for very open binaries (where both stars act almost as single stars). However, this is not the general case, in any other binary system in between, stable regions for planetary orbits with high eccentricities ($e_p \gtrsim 0.3$), the reduction of the available phase space for planets to settle down, and consequently, of their possibilities to be stable for long timescales can be considerable (this is an ongoing study that will be presented in a future paper).

Under this approach stable zones are defined by invariant loops (see Pichardo *et al.* (2005) and Pichardo *et al.* (2009) for details). The radius for the most exterior dynamically stable orbit around each star is given by:

$$R_i = R_i^{Egg} (0.733(1 - e)^{1.2} q^{0.07}), \quad (11)$$

In a similar manner, the inner viable radius for circumbinary stable orbits is:

$$R_{CB} \approx 1.93a (1 + 1.01e^{0.32}) (q(1 - q))^{0.043}, \quad (12)$$

where subindex i represents each star primary ($i = 1$) and secondary ($i = 2$), a is the semimajor axis of the binary, e the eccentricity and $q = q_2/(q_1 + q_2)$ is the mass ratio (see eq. (3)).

Finally, in equation (11), R_i^{Egg} is the approximation of Eggleton Eggleton (1983) to the maximum radius of a circle within the Roche lobe, given by,

$$R_i^{Egg} = \frac{0.49aq_i^{2/3}}{0.6q_i^{2/3} + \ln(1 + q_i^{1/3})}, \quad (13)$$

in this equation q_i is defined by $q_1 = M_{*1}/M_{*2}$ and $q_2 = M_{*2}/M_{*1}$.

For the general eccentric case, one must consider a shift of the center of the minimum radius for stable circumbinary orbits, R_{CB} (eq. (12)). This shift is given by,

$$R_{sh} = -3.7 a e^{0.8} (0.5 - q) [q(1 - q)]^{1/4}. \quad (14)$$

It is important to stress that the orbits defined by equations (11) and (12), represent stable orbits formed by non self-intersecting loops, where gas and planets could settle down in long term basis.

4 THE COMBINED HABITABILITY CONDITION: SOME PARTICULAR CASES.

As we have mentioned, the combination of the radiative and stability conditions is one of the goals of the present paper. In order to show how this approach allows us to find candidates in the search for habitable planets, in this section we apply our method to 64 binary systems of the solar neighborhood, with known orbital parameters, and main sequence stars. Most of the cases are eccentric binaries, thus we apply our procedure (both, radiative and stability

conditions) at periastron and apoastron. Once we have these two calculations, we compare both and take, conservatively, the most restricted circular edge. It is worth to mention that it is important to compute it in both locations because we do not know *a priori* in which case the binary will be located (i.e., if the habitable zone will be circumstellar or circumbinary). Given this, the restriction at periastron or apoastron acts in different ways for configurations I, II or III, and the case can even change from one to another, and this should be taken into account.

Most of binaries considered in this paper are taken from Jaime *et al.* (2009), which correspond to binaries with stars in the main sequence. We have applied the classical stellar luminosity-mass function Cox (2000) in order to obtain the luminosity for each star. Orbital parameters are the same as the ones considered in Jaime *et al.* (2009).

Another important issue that must be considered, is the circumbinary disc center shift, produced by eccentric binary systems (eq.(14)). In high eccentric cases this shift might become relevant when calculating the circumbinary orbits inside the habitable zone.

Table 3 shows the results for the 64 objects at periastron, column 1 is the Hipparcos name, column 2 is an alternative name, column 3 shows the particular habitable case resulting for the binary, columns 4 and 5 contain the inner and outer habitable radii for the primary star and columns 6 and 7 are the same but around the secondary star. Finally columns 8 and 9 provide the inner and outer habitable radii in the circumbinary case. Table 4 shows the same as Table 3 but at apoastron.

Table 5 shows orbital parameters for each binary, columns 1 and 2 are the HIP name and alternative name, column 3, 4, 5 and 6 are semimajor axis, eccentricity, primary and secondary masses respectively. Column 7 shows the outer stability radius around the primary star while column 8 shows the same but for the secondary star of the binary. Column 9 shows the inner circumbinary stability radius for the object and column 10 gives the shift for the circumbinary stability radius. Finally column 11 provides the reference for orbital parameters used in this paper.

Table 6 shows the cases where all criteria are satisfied together, i.e. objects where the intersection of habitability at periastron and apoastron is not empty. For the objects in this table we can observe some habitability zone well defined at periastron and apoastron at the same time and also inside of the stability zone given by equations of section 3. In circumbinary cases the shift was taken into account.

In this section three particular cases are considered in order to show how the approach is implemented.

HIP 1995

HIP 1995 has a semimajor axis of $a = 0.54AU$ with an eccentricity $e = 0.33$, stellar masses are $M_{*1} = 1.13M_{\odot}$ and $M_{*2} = 0.45M_{\odot}$. We have included habitable zones at periastron and apoastron (tables 3 and 4), this two separate calculations will restrict the effective habitable zone, which is located just in a circumbinary position. At Periastron we have $R_P^{*1}(inner) = 1.49AU$, $R_P^{*1}(outer) = 2.22$, and at apoastron $R_A^{*1}(inner) = 1.59AU$, $R_A^{*1}(outer) = 2.2$. The dynamical stability is given by the minimum radius of the circumbinary stable zone, following equation (12) this starts at $R_{CB} = 1.66AU$. As an additional restriction, the shift should be considered, its value in this case is important because it change the viable zone defined under our approach, $R_{shift} = -0.11AU$. Figure 13 shows all of these estimations, black (semi) dots are the stars located at periastron while (semi) dots in gray show them at apoastron. Gray disks are the habitable zones, calculated for both cases. Dark gray provides the in-




Figure 13. Effective habitable zone (radiative and stability conditions) for HIP 1955. Black dots are the stars at periastron, gray dots at apoastron. The shaded region is the radiative habitable zone, with darker gray indicating the intersection between these two zones at periastron and apoastron. The blue dashed circle represents the minimum dynamical stable orbit around the binary and the red one is the same but considering the effect because the shift.




Figure 14. Effective habitable zone for HIP 80346. Black dots are the stars located at periastron, gray disks shows the habitable zone, darker gray illustrate the intersection of habitable at periastron and apoastron. Red circles shows the maximum dynamical stable orbit around each star. We can observe only secondary star have a complete effective habitable zone.

tersection of the BHZ, the effective habitable zone for the binary. Dashed blue circle is the minimum dynamically stable circumbinary orbit, and the red one is the same but with the shift considered, this is the inner border of the viable stable orbit. Taken in to account all of these criteria is how we decide where is located the completely viable BHZ.

HIP 80346

This is a particular case, in this object we can find an effective habitability within the dynamical stability zone just around the secondary star. Semimajor axes of this binary is $a = 2.07AU$, eccentricity $e = 0.67$, nevertheless stellar masses are very small, $M_{*1} = 0.5M_{\odot}$ and $M_{*2} = 0.13$. The main restriction to habitability is because the eccentricity of the binary. The dynamical stability region is given by equation 11, by using this relation we obtain the maximum stable orbit radius around each star, $R_{ce}^{*1} = 0.18AU$ and $R_{ce}^{*2} = 0.1AU$. Figure 14 shows both stars at periastron, the gray disks are the habitable zones, where the darker gray allows to see the habitable zone with the value at apoastron considered. Red circle around each star provides the maximum radius for dynamical stable orbits. We can observe that for the primary star habitable zone is out of dynamical stability, but in the secondary we can observe habitability within stable zone. Figure 15 shows a zoom for the secondary star of this object.




Figure 15. Zoom of secondary star of HIP 80346. This star can provide a complete effective habitable zone. Darker gray disk is where we can expect an habitable planet.




Figure 16. A pathological case, HIP 76852: Dashed lines show the boundaries of the radiative safe zone. This is a type III configuration. However, as shown by the red circles, no circumbinary BHZ is possible despite having a non-zero radiative safe zone.

HIP 76852

HIP 76852 is a peculiar configuration III case, because we can not find a well defined BHZ (the inner boundary has a radius larger than the outer one), and yet, it has a non-zero radiative safe zone. Figure 16 shows this case (in units of the separation at periastron), black dots are primary (left) and secondary (right) stars located at periastron, interior dashed line is the flux isopleth that define the inner habitable zone, the exterior dashed line is the same but for the outer boundary. The inner red circle is what we have defined as the minimum circumscribe circle to the outer habitable boundary and the exterior red circle is the circle that circumscribe the inner flux isopleth boundary for habitability. This way we can observe it is not possible to have both conditions satisfied at the same time, nevertheless an habitable zone is well defined around the binary. This is a very important restriction because, in case we have this kind of objects we can not tell for sure if a planet can be hosted within this zone, the eccentricity that the planet must have in order to be all the time inside the habitable zone could be very high or even the shape of the orbit could be non physical. So this case show us it is not always possible to find a well behaved habitable zone, where some planet can settle.

5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this work we have constructed a straightforward and clear formulation to calculate regions for habitable planets in binary stellar systems. To this purpose, we search for two general restrictions assuming in principle Earth-like planets: a) the planet must be located in a region of orbital stability (and approximately circular

orbit), and b) the planet is located at a position, such as it reaches the correct host star energy, to permit the existence of liquid water on its surface Kopparapu *et al.* (2013). Some other particular restrictions, as the ones proper of the intrinsic characteristics of the planet for example, can readily be addressed to this formulation as multiplicative factors.

Regarding the fundamental test for orbital stability to develop life, in this paper we employ the criteria of Pichardo *et al.* (2005) and Pichardo *et al.* (2009) for stable orbits in binary systems. This stability method results better in searching habitable regions for planets. Indeed, although the empirical approximation of Holman & Wiegert was an excellent and fundamental first approximation to the stability problem, their method is rather based on a detailed trial and error approximation, that overestimates by construction, the available stable regions since their stability criteria depends on a given time of integration that particles keep in orbit (about 10^4 periods), which results on a relaxed criteria when looking for strict stability, needed for life emergency and developing. Instead, we have employed the invariant loops method that searches for the exact solution for stable orbits in binary systems at all binary eccentricities.

On the other hand, invariant loops show in the circumbinary discs cases, that there is a shift of the geometric center of the stable region (disk) that can be considerable for high eccentricities, compromising the intersection between stable regions for planets and habitable regions in the simple sense of the irradiance (as is the case, for example of Kepler 16). The shift can not be detected with other method than the exact solution provided by the invariant loops tool, this was detected theoretically and presented in Pichardo *et al.* 2008 paper, we are considering this for planets in circumbinary disks in our calculations for binaries of the solar neighborhood.

It is worth mentioning that in our approach to calculate habitable zones in binary stars, for different life likelihood considerations, such as orbital stability and irradiation, we are not considering multiple stars, or stars out of their main sequence or planets on highly eccentric orbits. In the case of multiple stars, although an extension of this work to any multiple star systems would be straightforward for the irradiance calculations, in the majority of cases these systems result in unstable ones, unless they are hierarchical (v.g. triple systems where a very close binary star with a far companion as Alpha Centauri and Proxima, or a double binary where both binary systems act like single stars in one larger binary system). On the other hand, there is no straightforward method to find stable orbital zones in multiple stellar systems, needed to calculate formally habitable zones.

Although our method is applicable to all kind of stars, we only calculated habitable zones for the solar neighborhood main sequence stars, since stars out of this life stage would likely be inhospitable for life. In the case of planets on very eccentric orbits ($e \gtrsim 0.3$), the probability of survival is diminished due to the presence of the companion that reduces severely the available phase space for planets to settle down (this is a detailed study that will be presented in a future work). On the other hand, what induces eccentricity on a planet in a binary star?, external factors are stellar encounters, but to affect a very small disc (truncated by the binary), a very close stellar encounter (with a third star) must be taking place (~ 3 times the disk radius at least, Jiménez-Torres *et al.* (2011)), likely affecting the binary stability itself, this results in a non stable situation for habitability. Or an internal factor, for example a resonance that is able to induce secularly eccentricity in the planetary orbits, however that is also an unstable situation for planets, since resonances tend to increase rapidly eccentricities on orbiting bod-

ies, wiping out entire disk regions. Other possibility, a giant planet on eccentric orbit that induces eccentricity in terrestrial planets, a clearly difficult situation in terms of stability.

Regarding irradiance zones. We have defined three zones where the binary star provides the necessary energy for habitability: (I) the zone around each star, (III) the zone around the hole binary or (II) in a mixture of this two zones. In this work, we consider a "habitable environment", the intersection of one of these zones and the allowed dynamical zone for stable orbits.

Taking into account both restrictions, from a binary sample of main sequence stars, with known orbital parameters of the solar neighborhood (64), we have selected 36 candidates (56 % of our original sample), as plausible candidates to host habitable planets. We present this table together with three particular and interesting examples in detail: HIP 1995, HIP 80346 and HIP 76852.

We find, from our sample of candidates, that none allows planets inside the BHZ defined by the configuration II (circumbinary discs). This is because in all cases, the system allows habitability too close to the binary, where the stability restriction becomes very important, making impossible for all cases in our sample, to host a planet there. Although a greater sample is necessary to produce a final conclusion on the solar neighborhood, this small first sample is useful to statistically elucidate the possibilities of finding habitability on binaries of the solar neighborhood, and the possibilities for circumbinary discs seem reduced.

Programming our formulation for habitable zones (from the irradiance point o view) is rather simple, however software to compute numerically the size of habitable zones for binary systems is available from the authors.

We thank the anonymous referee for a very thorough review of our manuscript and suggestions that resulted in a clearer and deeper exposition. We acknowledge financial support from UNAM/DGAPA through grant IN114114.

REFERENCES

- Abt, H.A. 1983, *Annual Review of Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 21, 343
- Arnold, V.I. 1984, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*. Springer, Berlin, P.271
- Bains, W. 2004, *Astrobiology*, 4, 137
- Bonavita, M. & Desidera, S., *A&A*, 2007, 468, 721-729
- Cakirli, O.; Ibanoglu, C.; Bilir, S.; Sipahi, E. 2009, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Vol. 395, pp. 1649
- Chauvin, G., Beust, H., Lagrange, A.-M., & Eggenberger, A. 2011, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 528, A8
- Correia, A. C. M., Udry, S., Mayor, M., *et al.* 2005, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 440, 751
- Cox Arthur N. 2000, *Allen's Astrophysical Quantities*, Fourth Edition, Springer
- Cuntz, 2013, arXiv 1303.6645
- Desidera, S. & Barbieri M. 2007, *A&A*, 462, 345
- Doyle, L.R., Billingham, J., Devincenzi, D.L. 1998, *Acta Astronautica*, 42, 599
- Doyle, L.R., Carter, J. A., Fabrycky, D. C., *et al.* 2011, *Science*, 333, 1602
- Drake, F.D. 1961, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 14, 40
- Dumusque, X., Pepe, F., Lovis, C., *et al.* 2012, *Nature*, 491, 207
- Duquenooy, A., & Mayor, M. 1991, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 248, 485

HIP	Alter. name	Case _P	R _P ^{*1} inner [AU]	R _P ^{*1} outer [AU]	R _P ^{*2} inner [AU]	R _P ^{*2} outer [AU]	R _P ^{**} inner [AU]	R _P ^{**} outer [AU]
-	δ Equ	3	-	-	-	-	4.51	6.49
-	V821 Cas	3	-	-	-	-	5.04	8.55
1349	HD 1273	3	-	-	-	-	1.26	1.78
1955	HD 2070	3	-	-	-	-	1.49	2.22
2941	ADS520	1	0.55	0.95	0.55	0.95	-	-
5842	HD 7693	1	0.87	1.50	0.78	1.34	-	-
7078	HD 9021	3	-	-	-	-	1.78	2.70
7751	HD 10360	1	0.66	1.14	0.63	1.08	-	-
7918	HD 10307	1	0.71	1.22	0.03	0.05	-	-
8903	HD 11636	3	-	-	-	-	4.68	7.68
11231	HD 15064	3	-	-	-	-	1.35	2.02
12062	HD 15862	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
12153	HD 16234	3	-	-	-	-	128.82	219.85
12623	HD 16739	3	-	-	-	-	2.53	4.16
14954	HD 19994	1	1.92	3.30	0.15	0.25	-	-
18512	HD 24916	1	0.15	0.25	0.04	0.06	-	-
20087	HD 27176	2	3.50	4.44	1.41	2.28	-	-
20935	HD 28394	3	-	-	-	-	2.02	3.25
24419	HD 34101	2	0.89	1.53	0.07	0.18	1.37	1.27*
30920		1	0.06	0.10	0.01	0.02	-	-
33451	HD 51825	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
34164	HD 53424	3	-	-	-	-	1.77	2.17
39893		3	-	-	-	-	1.50	1.53
44248		1	2.19	3.75	0.90	1.60	-	-
45343		1	0.31	0.54	0.30	0.52	-	-
56809	HD 101177	1	3.86	6.63	1.95	3.34	-	-
63406	HD 112914	2	0.76	0.96	0.11	0.30	0.98	1.10
64241		2	1.90	3.17	1.47	2.48	-	-
64797		1	0.60	1.03	0.31	0.54	-	-
67275	HD 120136	1	1.92	3.30	0.19	0.33	0	-
67422		1	0.58	1.00	0.48	0.82	-	-
72848	HD 131511	3	-	-	-	-	1.05	1.56
73440	HD 133621	3	-	-	-	-	1.27	1.83
75379	HD 137502	3	-	-	-	-	1.84	2.86
76852	HD 140159	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
79101	HD 145389	3	-	-	-	-	11.98	18.51
80346		1	0.29	0.50	0.03	0.05	-	-
80686	HD 147584	3	-	-	-	-	1.23	1.90
82817	HD 152771	1	0.36	0.62	0.14	0.25	-	-
82860	HD 153597	3	-	-	-	-	1.59	2.42
84425		2	1.73	2.82	0.97	1.61	-	-
84720	HD 156274	1	0.69	1.19	0.26	0.44	-	-
84949	HD 157482	3	-	-	-	-	7.35	11.01
86400	HD 1360346	3	-	-	-	-	0.70	0.98
86722	HD 161198	3	-	-	-	-	1.03	1.54
87895	HD 163840	3	-	-	-	-	1.61	1.88
91768	HD 173739	1	0.18	0.31	0.14	0.24	-	-
93017	ADS 11871	1	2.86	4.93	2.64	4.56	-	-
93825		1	1.72	2.95	1.66	2.87	-	-
95028	HD 181602	3	-	-	-	-	2.21	3.28
95575	HD 183255	3	-	-	-	-	0.86	1.10
98001	HD 188753	2	1.88	3.16	1.43	2.43	-	-
99965	HD 193216	3	-	-	-	-	1.31	1.42
109176	HD 210027	3	-	-	-	-	1.83	2.99
111170	HD 213429	3	-	-	-	-	1.72	2.21
113718	HD 217580	3	-	-	-	-	0.75	1.00
116310	HD 221673	1	4.06	6.99	4.06	6.99	-	-
116727	HD 222404	1	2.62	4.50	0.20	0.35	-	-
	Kepler 16	3	-	-	-	-	0.58	0.85
	Kepler 34	3	-	-	-	-	1.65	2.81
	Kepler 35	3	-	-	-	-	1.76	2.75
	Kepler 38	3	-	-	-	-	0.64	0.99
	Kepler 47	3	-	-	-	-	0.12	0.21
	Kepler 64	3	-	-	-	-	2.60	4.44

Table 3. Radiative habitable zones at Periastron. Columns are: (1) HIP name, (2) Alternative name (some cases), (3) rHZ case described in section 2.1.2, (4) Inner rHZ for primary star, (5) Outer rHZ for primary star, (6) Inner rHZ for secondary star, (7) Outer rHZ for secondary star, (8) Inner rHZ for binary zone and (9) Outer rHZ for binary zone. Note: rHZ - Radiative Habitable Zone.

HIP	Alter. name	Case _A	R _A ^{*1} inner [AU]	R _A ^{*1} outer [AU]	R _A ^{*2} inner [AU]	R _A ^{*2} outer [AU]	R _A ^{**} inner [AU]	R _A ^{**} outer [AU]
-	δ Equ	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	V821 Cas	3	-	-	-	-	5.04	8.55
1349	HD 1273	3	1.16	1.82	0.50	0.79	-	-
1955	HD 2070	3	-	-	-	-	1.59	2.20
2941	ADS520	1	0.55	0.95	0.55	0.95	-	-
5842	HD 7693	1	0.87	1.50	0.78	1.34	-	-
7078	HD 9021	3	-	-	-	-	1.91	2.67
7751	HD 10360	1	0.66	1.13	0.63	1.08	-	-
7918	HD 10307	1	0.71	1.22	0.02	0.04	-	-
8903	HD 11636	3	-	-	-	-	5.01	7.66
11231	HD 15064	3	-	-	-	-	1.48	2.00
12062	HD 15862	3	1.00	1.70	0.25	0.47	-	-
12153	HD 16234	3	-	-	-	-	129.76	219.82
12623	HD 16739	3	-	-	-	-	3.09	4.03
14954	HD 19994	1	1.92	3.30	0.15	0.26	-	-
18512	HD 24916	1	0.15	0.25	0.04	0.06	-	-
20087	HD 27176	2	3.24	5.50	1.10	2.00	-	-
20935	HD 28394	3	-	-	-	-	2.17	3.21
24419	HD 34101	2	0.89	1.53	0.06	0.15	-	-
30920		1	0.06	0.10	0.01	0.02	-	-
33451	HD 51825	3	2.72	4.67	1.73	3.02	-	-
34164	HD 53424	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
39893		3	1.02	1.71	0.37	0.67	-	-
44248		1	2.18	3.74	0.89	1.55	-	-
45343		1	0.31	0.54	0.30	0.52	-	-
56809	HD 101177	1	3.86	6.63	1.95	3.35	-	-
63406	HD 112914	2	0.75	1.28	0.07	0.14	-	-
64241		1	1.79	3.09	1.35	2.34	-	-
64797		1	0.60	1.03	0.31	0.54	-	-
67275	HD 120136	1	1.92	3.30	0.19	0.33	-	-
67422		1	0.58	1.00	0.48	0.82	-	-
72848	HD 131511	3	-	-	-	-	1.21	1.52
73440	HD 133621	3	1.15	1.97	0.06	0.46	1.38	1.79
75379	HD 137502	3	-	-	-	-	2.24	2.77
76852	HD 140159	3	4.43	7.34	4.35	7.21	-	-
79101	HD 145389	3	-	-	-	-	12.53	18.46
80346		1	0.29	0.50	0.02	0.04	-	-
80686	HD 147584	3	-	-	-	-	1.23	1.90
82817	HD 152771	1	0.36	0.62	0.14	0.24	-	-
82860	HD 153597	3	-	-	-	-	1.63	2.42
84425		1	1.61	2.78	0.82	1.43	-	-
84720	HD 156274	1	0.69	1.19	0.26	0.44	-	-
84949	HD 157482	3	-	-	-	-	9.28	10.38
86400	HD 1360346	3	-	-	-	-	0.76	0.96
86722	HD 161198	3	0.97	1.66	0.14	0.25	-	-
87895	HD 163840	3	1.11	1.86	0.58	1.01	-	-
91768	HD 173739	1	0.18	0.31	0.14	0.24	-	-
93017	ADS 11871	1	2.82	4.87	2.60	4.49	-	-
93825		1	1.71	2.94	1.66	2.85	-	-
95028	HD 181602	3	-	-	-	-	2.37	3.25
95575	HD 183255	3	-	-	-	-	0.92	1.07
98001	HD 188753	2	1.79	3.09	1.33	2.30	-	-
99965	HD 193216	3	-	-	-	-	1.38	1.38
109176	HD 210027	3	-	-	-	-	1.83	2.99
111170	HD 213429	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
113718	HD 217580	3	0.64	1.11	0.04	0.09	-	-
116310	HD 221673	1	4.05	6.97	4.05	6.97	-	-
116727	HD 222404	1	2.62	4.50	0.19	0.32	-	-
	Kepler 16	3	-	-	-	-	0.59	0.85
	Kepler 34	3	-	-	-	-	1.67	8.90
	Kepler 35	3	-	-	-	-	2.44	3.80
	Kepler 38	3	-	-	-	-	0.71	1.09
	Kepler 47	3	-	-	-	-	0.11	0.19
	Kepler 64	3	-	-	-	-	1.18	6.26

Table 4. Radiative habitable zones at Apoastron. Columns are: (1) HIP name, (2) Alternative name (some cases), (3) rHZ case described in section 2.1.2, (4) Inner rHZ for primary star, (5) Outer rHZ for primary star, (6) Inner rHZ for secondary star, (7) Outer rHZ for secondary star, (8) Inner rHZ for binary zone and (9) Outer rHZ for binary zone. Note: rHZ - Radiative Habitable Zone.

HIP	Alter. name	a [AU]	e	m* ¹ M _⊙	m* ² M _⊙	r _{ce} ^{*1} [AU]	r _{ce} ^{*2} [AU]	r** [AU]	r _{shift} [AU]	ref
–	δ Equ	4.73	0.42	1.66	1.59	0.66	0.64	15.18	-0.07	A
–	V821 Cas	0.044	0.13	2.046	1.626	0.01	0.01	0.12	0.00	B
1349	HD 1273	1.25	0.57	0.98	0.55	0.13	0.1	4.18	-0.29	C
1955	HD 2070	0.54	0.33	1.13	0.48	0.1	0.07	1.66	-0.11	C
2941	ADS520	9.57	0.22	0.7	0.7	1.87	1.87	28.23	0.00	A
5842	HD 7693	23.4	0.04	0.89	0.84	5.96	5.81	57.89	-0.07	D
7078	HD 9021	0.64	0.31	1.21	0.7	0.12	0.09	1.97	-0.09	C
7751	HD 10360	52.2	0.53	0.77	0.75	5.61	5.54	173.15	-0.54	D
7918	HD 10307	7.1	0.42	0.8	0.14	1.26	0.57	22.13	-2.75	E
8903	HD 11636	0.66	0.9	2.07	1.28	0.01	0.01	2.37	-0.18	E
11231	HD 15064	0.64	0.29	1.01	0.68	0.12	0.1	1.95	-0.06	C
12062	HD 15862	2.04	0.26	0.95	0.44	0.43	0.3	6.11	-0.32	C
12153	HD 16234	4.22	0.88	11	9.41	0.09	0.08	15.11	-0.39	E
12623	HD 16739	1.27	0.66	1.39	1.13	0.1	0.09	4.35	-0.12	E
14954	HD 19994	120	0.26	1.35	0.35	27.34	14.83	354.86	-28.27	F
18512	HD 24916	174.55	0	0.35	0.17	52.36	37.68	315.65	0.00	G
20087	HD 27176	7.05	0.17	1.76	0.95	1.66	1.26	20.08	-0.65	E
20935	HD 28394	0.99	0.24	1.13	1.11	0.19	0.19	2.95	0.00	C
24419	HD 34101	1.75	0.08	0.9	0.21	0.52	0.27	4.52	-0.17	C
30920		4.3	0.37	0.22	0.08	0.773	0.488	13.421	-1.1144	K
33451	HD 51825	9.3	0.43	1.61	1.26	1.31	1.17	29.93	-0.75	E
34164	HD 53424	1.7	0.27	1.09	0.66	0.34	0.27	5.13	-0.19	C
39893		1.81	0.21	0.95	0.52	0.4	0.31	5.29	-0.19	C
44248		10.4	0.15	1.44	0.89	2.470	1.983	29.246	-0.6940	K
45343		97.2	0.28	0.52	0.51	17.405	17.251	295.520	-0.4459	K
56809	HD 101177	240.39	0.05	1.95	1.36	63.9	54.21	605.53	-5.06	G
63406	HD 112914	1.59	0.33	0.82	0.23	0.32	0.18	4.86	-0.44	C
64241		11.8	0.5	1.3	1.12	1.398	1.306	38.807	-0.6585	K
64797		89.2	0.12	0.73	0.52	21.553	18.458	245.009	-3.5692	K
67275	HD 120136	245	0.91	1.35	0.4	4.38	2.52	868.91	-147.85	F
67422		32.7	0.45	0.72	0.65	4.306	4.109	105.959	-1.1531	K
72848	HD 131511	0.52	0.51	0.93	0.45	0.07	0.05	1.71	-0.13	D
73440	HD 133621	1.25	0.22	1.03	0.15	0.32	0.14	3.56	-0.30	C
75379	HD 137502	0.91	0.68	1.26	0.68	0.07	0.05	3.12	-0.26	C
76852	HD 140159	12.4	0.15	2	1.98	2.7	2.69	34.96	-0.02	E
79101	HD 145389	2.24	0.47	3.47	1.31	0.33	0.21	7.23	-0.68	C
80346		2.07	0.67	0.5	0.13	0.18	0.1	6.98	-1.04	C
80686	HD 147584	0.12	0.06	1.05	0.37	0.04	0.02	0.3	-0.01	C
82817	HD 152771	1.38	0.05	0.56	0.33	0.38	0.3	3.47	-0.04	E
82860	HD 153597	0.33	0.21	1.18	0.52	0.08	0.05	0.96	-0.05	C
84425		7.7	0.49	1.23	0.86	0.970	0.824	25.221	-0.9998	K
84720	HD 156274	91.65	0.78	0.79	0.47	4.33	3.41	321.18	-24.55	D
84949	HD 157482	4.87	0.67	2.62	1.15	0.29	0.42	16.6	-1.73	E
86400	HD 1360346	0.39	0.23	0.72	0.39	0.08	0.06	1.15	-0.05	C
86722	HD 161198	3.97	0.94	0.94	0.34	0.04	0.03	14.21	-2.18	E
87895	HD 163840	2.14	0.41	0.99	0.68	0.32	0.27	6.84	-0.25	C
91768	HD 173739	49.51	0.53	0.39	0.34	5.43	5.1	164.2	-2.67	G
93017	ADS 11871	22.96	0.25	1.65	1.58	4.34	4.26	68.77	-0.21	A
93825		32.7	0.32	1.27	1.25	5.463	5.424	101.163	-0.1364	K
95028	HD 181602	0.85	0.37	1.4	0.5	0.15	0.1	2.65	-0.22	C
95575	HD 183255	0.62	0.15	0.78	0.38	0.15	0.11	1.74	-0.06	C
98001	HD 188753	11.65	0.47	1.3	1.11	1.48	1.38	37.98	-0.66	E
99965	HD 193216	1.24	0.08	0.88	0.56	0.32	0.26	3.26	-0.05	C
109176	HD 210027	0.12	0	1.25	0.8	0.03	0.03	0.22	0.00	C
111170	HD 213429	1.74	0.38	1.08	0.7	0.28	0.23	5.5	-0.22	C
113718	HD 217580	1.16	0.54	0.76	0.18	0.15	0.08	3.78	-0.51	C
116310	HD 221673	95	0.322	2	2	15.7	15.7	294.14	0.00	H
116727	HD 222404	18.5	0.36	1.59	0.4	3.55	1.9	57.04	-5.72	F
	Kepler 16	0.22	0.16	0.69	0.2	0.06	0.03	0.63	-0.03	I
	Kepler 34	0.23	0.52	1.05	1.02	0.03	0.03	0.76	-0.003	J
	Kepler 35	0.18	0.14	0.81	0.81	0.040	0.040	0.504	0.0000	L
	Kepler 38	0.15	0.1	0.95	0.25	0.043	0.024	0.397	-0.0163	L
	Kepler 47	0.08	0.02	1.043	0.362	0.025	0.015	0.185	-0.0021	L
	Kepler 64	0.17	0.21	1.528	0.408	0.042	0.023	0.490	-0.0333	L

Table 5. Orbital parameters and stability radii. Columns are: (1) HIP name, (2) Alternative name (some cases), (3) Semi-major axis, (4) eccentricity, (5) Mass of the primary star, (6) Mass of the secondary star, (7) Outer stable circumstellar radius for primary star, (8) Outer stable radius for secondary star, (9) Inner stable radius for circumbinary zone and (10) References about the orbital parameters. References are: A=Holman & Wiegert (1999), B=Cakirli *et al.*

HIP	Alter. Name	case	R_{inner}^{*1} AU	R_{outer}^{*1} AU	R_{inner}^{*2} AU	R_{outer}^{*2} AU	R_{inner}^{**} AU	R_{outer}^{**} AU
-	V821 Cas	3	-	-	-	-	5.04	8.55
1955	HD 2070	3	-	-	-	-	1.77	2.20
2941	ADS520	1	0.55	0.95	0.55	0.95	-	-
5842	HD 7693	1	0.87	1.5	0.78	1.34	-	-
7078	HD 9021	3	-	-	-	-	2.06	2.67
7751	HD 10360	1	0.66	1.13	0.63	1.08	-	-
7918	HD 10307	1	0.71	1.22	0.03	0.04	-	-
8903	HD 11636	3	-	-	-	-	5.01	7.66
12153	HD 16234	3	-	-	-	-	128.82	219.85
14954	HD 19994	1	1.92	3.3	0.15	0.25	-	-
18512	HD 24916	1	0.15	0.25	0.04	0.06	-	-
30920		1	0.06	0.1	0.01	0.02	-	-
44248		1	2.19	2.47	0.9	1.55	-	-
45343		1	0.31	0.54	0.3	0.52	-	-
56809	HD 101177	1	3.86	6.63	1.95	3.34	-	-
64797		1	0.6	1.03	0.31	0.54	-	-
67422		1	0.58	1	0.48	0.82	-	-
67275	HD 120136	1	1.92	3.3	0.19	0.33	-	-
80346		1	-	-	0.03	0.04	-	-
80686	HD 147584	3	-	-	-	-	1.23	1.90
82817	HD 152771	1	0.36	0.38	0.14	0.24	-	-
82860	HD 153597	3	-	-	-	-	1.63	2.42
84720	HD 156274	1	0.69	1.19	0.26	0.44	-	-
91768	HD 173739	1	0.18	0.31	0.14	0.24	-	-
93017	ADS 11871	1	2.86	4.34	2.64	4.26	-	-
93825		1	1.72	2.94	1.66	2.85	-	-
95028	HD 181602	3	-	-	-	-	2.87	3.25
109176	HD 210027	3	-	-	-	-	1.83	2.99
116310	HD 221673	1	4.06	6.97	4.06	6.97	-	-
116727	HD 222404	1	2.62	4.5	0.2	0.32	-	-
	Kepler 16	3	-	-	-	-	0.66	0.85
	Kepler 34	3	-	-	-	-	1.67	2.81
	Kepler 35	3	-	-	-	-	2.44	2.75
	Kepler 38	3	-	-	-	-	0.71	0.97
	Kepler 47	3	-	-	-	-	0.185	0.19
	Kepler 64	3	-	-	-	-	2.6	4.41

Table 6. Binary systems with effective habitable zone. In these cases we can find radiative safe zones (at apo and periastron) within the stable zone. Columns are: (1) HIP name, (2) Alternative name (some cases), (3) Case of HZ introduced in section 2.1.2, (4) Maximum of inner radii at Apoastron and Periastron for the primary star intersected with the corresponding stability zone, (5) Minimum of outer radii at Apoastron and Periastron for the primary star intersected with the corresponding stability zone, (6) Maximum of inner radii at Apoastron and Periastron for the secondary star intersected with the corresponding stability zone, (7) Minimum of outer radii at Apoastron and Periastron for the secondary star intersected with the corresponding stability zone, (8) Maximum of inner radii at Apoastron and Periastron for the circumbinary zone intersected with the corresponding stability zone, (9) Minimum of outer radii at Apoastron and Periastron for the circumbinary zone intersected with the corresponding stability zone. Corrections because of the shift were taken in to account.

Eggl, Siegfried; Pilat-Lohinger, Elke; Georgakarakos, Nikolaos; Gyergyovits, Markus; Funk, Barbara 2012, *Astrophysical Journal*, 752, 74

Eggl, S.; Pilat-Lohinger, E.; Funk, B.; Georgakarakos, N.; Haghighipour, N. 2013, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 428, 3104

Eggleton, P. P. 1983, *Astrophysical Journal*, 268, 368

Fischer, D. A., & Marcy, G. W. 1992, *Astrophysical Journal*, 396, 178

Hart, M.H. 1979, *Icarus*, 37, 351

Hale, A. 1996, in Doyle, L.R., ed, *Circumstellar Habitable Zones*, Travis House Pub., p. 143

Haghighipour, N. 2010, *Astrophysics and Space Science Library*, 366

Haghighipour, N., Dvorak, R., & Pilat-Lohinger, E. 2010, in: *Planets in Binary Star Systems*, Ed. Haghighipour, N. (Springer, New York)

Haghighipour, N., & Kaltenegger, L. 2013, *Astrophysical Journal*,

777, 166

Hatzes, A. P., Cochran, W. D., Endl, M., et al. 2003, *Astrophysical Journal*, 599, 1383

Holman M.J. and Wiegert P.A. 1999, *AJ*, Vol. 117, pp 621

Jaime, L.G., Pichardo B. and Aguilar L. 2009, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Vol. 427, pp 2723

Jancart S., Jorissen A., Babusiaux C. and Pourbaix D. 2005, *A&A* vol. 442, pp. 365

Kaltenegger, L., & Haghighipour, N. 2013, *Astrophysical Journal*, 777, 165

Kasting, J.F., Whitmire, D.P., Reynolds, R.T. 1993, *Icarus*, 101, 108

Kopparapu, R. K., Ramirez, R., Kasting, J. F., et al. 2013, *Astrophysical Journal*, 765, 131

Stephen R. Kane, Natalie R. Hinkel 2013, arXiv:1211.2812

Lichtenberg A.J. & Leiberman M.A. 1992, *Regular and Chaotic Dynamics*. 2nd edn. Springer, New York, P.11

S. Lines, Z. M. Leinhardt, S. Paardekooper, C. Baruteau, and P.

- Thebault 2011, *Astrophysical Journal*, 782, L11
- Maciejewski, W., & Sparke, L.S. 1997, *Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 484, L117
- Maciejewski, W., & Sparke, L.S. 2000, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 313, 745
- Martin, C.; Mignard, F.; Hartkopf, W. I. and McAlister, H. A., *A&A*, 1998, 133, 149-162.
- Mathieu, R. D. 1994, *Annual Review of Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 32, 465
- Müller, T. W. A., & Haghighipour, N. 2014, *Astrophysical Journal*, 782, 26
- Jiménez-Torres, J. J., Pichardo, B., Lake, G., & Throop, H. 2011, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 418, 1272
- Muterspaugh, M.W., Fekel, F.C., Lane, B.F., et al. 2010, *Astronomical Journal*, 140, 1646
- Orosz, J. A., Welsh, W.F., Carter, J.A., et al. 2012, *Astrophysical Journal*, 758, 87
- Orosz, J. A., Welsh, W. F., Carter, J. A., et al. 2012, *Science*, 337, 1511
- Pierrehumbert, R., Gaidos, E., *Astrophys. J.* 2011, 734, L13
- Pichardo, Barbara; Sparke, Linda S.; Aguilar, Luis A. 2005, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 359, 521
- Pichardo, Barbara; Sparke, Linda S.; Aguilar, Luis A. 2008, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 391, 815
- Queloz, D., Mayor, M., Weber, L., et al. 2000, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 354, 99
- Raghavan, D., McAlister, H. A., Henry, T. J., et al. 2010, *Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 190, 1
- Schwamb, M. E., Orosz, J. A., Carter, J. A., et al. 2013, *Astrophysical Journal*, 768, 127
- Seager, S. 2013, Exoplanet Habitability, *Science* 340, 577
- D. J. Stevenson, 1999, *Nature* 400, 32
- Strigachev, A. & Lampens, P. *A&A*, 2004, 422, 1023-1029.
- Welsh, W. F., Orosz, J. A., Carter, J. A., et al. 2012, *Nature*, 481, 475
- A. Zsom, S. Seager, J. de Wit, 2013, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1304.3714>
- Zucker, S., Mazeh, T., Santos, N. C., Udry, S., & Mayor, M. 2004, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 426, 695