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ABSTRACT

We conducted a survey for infrared excess emission from 16 nearby main-sequence shell stars using the Multiband Imaging Photometer for Spitzer (MIPS) on the Spitzer Space Telescope. Shell stars are early-type stars with narrow absorption lines in their spectra that appear to arise from circumstellar (CS) gas. Four of the 16 stars in our survey showed excess emission at 24 and 70 μm characteristic of cool CS dust and are likely to be edge-on debris disks. Including previously known disks, it appears that the fraction of protoplanetary and debris disks among the main-sequence shell stars is at least 48% ± 14%. While dust in debris disks has been extensively studied, relatively little is known about their gas content. In the case of β Pictoris, extensive observations of gaseous species have provided insights into the dynamics of the CS material and surprises about the composition of the CS gas coming from young planetesimals. To understand the coevolution of gas and dust through the terrestrial planet formation phase, we need to study the gas in additional debris disks. The new debris disk candidates from this Spitzer survey double the number of systems in which the gas can be observed right now with sensitive line-of-sight absorption spectroscopy.

Subject headings: circumstellar matter — infrared: stars — planetary systems: formation — stars: early-type

1. INTRODUCTION

Protoplanetary disks may be classified by their relative abundance of primordial gas and dust left over from star formation. As the amount of this material decreases, disks evolve from primordial disks to transitional disks to debris disks. Debris disks, which are found around main-sequence stars, contain little or no primordial material. Instead, they are composed of recently produced secondary material generated by collisions between small planetesimals, analogs of solar system asteroids and comets. Terrestrial planet formation may be occurring in the younger debris disks, while the older ones seem to correspond to the "clearing out" stage early in the history of the solar system, during which most leftover planetesimals are removed from the system. Impacts by water-rich planetesimals probably delivered most of the Earth’s surface volatiles during the clearing phase (e.g., Morbidelli et al. 2000).

Gas in debris disks is generally hard to detect. Only one bona fide debris disk, 49 Ceti, shows any trace of submillimeter CO emission (Zuckerman et al. 1995; Dent et al. 2005), indicating that debris disk gas abundances are low relative to those in primordial and transitional disks. It appears that primordial molecular gas left over from star formation has largely dissipated by the debris disk phase. However, sensitive UV/optical absorption spectroscopy has revealed small amounts of secondary gas in a few debris disks: β Pictoris (e.g., Lagrange et al. 1998), 51 Ophiuchi (e.g., Roberge et al. 2002), σ Herculis (Chen & Jura 2003), and HD 32297 (Redfield 2007). The gas seen is primarily atomic.

The primary production mechanisms for secondary gas in debris disks are currently unknown, but may include photon-stimulated desorption from circumstellar (CS) dust grains (Chen et al. 2007) and/or grain-grain collisions (Czechowski & Mann 2007).

β Pic is the only debris disk whose gas is well characterized. In this disk, most measured gaseous elements have roughly solar abundances relative to each other (Roberge et al. 2006). The exception is carbon, which is extremely overabundant relative to every other measured element (e.g., C/O = 18× solar). This discovery was surprising, since the central star has solar metallicity (Holweger et al. 1997). The carbon overabundance suggests that a previously unsuspected—and currently unknown—process is operating in the disk, during which the planetesimals preferentially lose volatile carbonate material. However, the lack of similar abundance information for other debris disks renders interpretation of the β Pic results difficult.

Detections of gas in debris disks to date have almost exclusively used optical or UV absorption spectroscopy of edge-on disks. Such observations are sensitive to very small amounts of cold gas. Unfortunately, the geometric constraint that the line of sight to the central star must pass through the disk severely limits the number of disks that may be probed for gas in this way. There is a strong need for additional debris disks in which gas can be observed, in order to study the evolution of gas abundance and composition throughout the entire planet formation phase. A class of peculiar stars called shell stars may be the avenue toward finding edge-on debris disks containing gas. These are stars whose spectra show narrow absorption lines arising from line-of-sight gas at the velocity of the star. Most shell stars are B or A type. In some cases, the narrow lines may arise from interstellar (IS) material, although the fact that the gas is at the velocity of the star makes this interpretation less likely. In addition, the absorption lines are generally stronger than can be readily explained by IS gas (e.g., Abt & Moya 1973). The shell stars have high projected rotational velocities compared to nonshell early-type stars, showing that gas is more likely to be detected when the line of sight intersects the rotational plane of the system (e.g., Holweger et al. 1999). This indicates that the gas is usually...
TABLE 1
TARGET STARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>OTHER NAME</th>
<th>SPECTRAL TYPE</th>
<th>DISTANCE (pc)</th>
<th>INSIDE THE LIB?</th>
<th>EXPOSURE TIMES (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 21620</td>
<td>A0 Vn</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 24863</td>
<td>A4 V</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 39283</td>
<td>ξ Aur</td>
<td>A2 V</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 77190</td>
<td>67 Cnc</td>
<td>A8 Vn</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 98353</td>
<td>55 UMa</td>
<td>A2 V</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 118232</td>
<td>24 Cvn</td>
<td>A5 V</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 142926</td>
<td>4 Her</td>
<td>B9p V</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 158352</td>
<td>A8 V</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 196724</td>
<td>A0 V</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 199603</td>
<td>A9 V</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 223884</td>
<td>A5 V</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 224463</td>
<td>F2 V</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shell Stars with Time-Variable Infalling Gas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>OTHER NAME</th>
<th>SPECTRAL TYPE</th>
<th>DISTANCE (pc)</th>
<th>INSIDE THE LIB?</th>
<th>EXPOSURE TIMES (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 42111</td>
<td>A3 Vn</td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 50241</td>
<td>α Pic</td>
<td>A7 IV</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 148283</td>
<td>25 Her</td>
<td>A5 V</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 217782</td>
<td>2 And</td>
<td>A3 Vn</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Binary system.

2. TARGET SELECTION AND OBSERVATIONS

We began our target selection by considering which subset of the 57 shell stars in Hauck & Jaschek (2000) is the most likely to contain debris disks. To eliminate evolved stars, we selected only the stars with luminosity class V (23 stars). Then we eliminated six stars already known to have protoplanetary or debris disks. We also wanted to eliminate ordinary stars that might have been misclassified as shell stars simply because they have anomalously large amounts of IS material along their lines of sight. Therefore, we discarded stars that are outside the Local Interstellar Bubble (LIB), using the LIB size and shape from Lallement et al. (2003). This left us with 12 stars (listed in Table 1).

To this set, we added four shell stars whose spectra show narrow, time-variable absorption features. These are HD 42111 (Lecavelier des Etangs et al. 1997), HD 50241 (Hempel & Schmitt 2003), HD 148283 (Grady et al. 1996), and HD 217782 (Cheng & Neff 2003). The time-variability confirms that the gas along the lines of sight to these stars is CS, despite the fact that one of them is outside the LIB. Such behavior is seen in spectra of β Pic and is caused by evaporation of star-grazing planetesimals passing through the line of sight (e.g., Beust et al. 1990). One of the four stars (HD 50241) has luminosity class IV. However, since it has time-variable infalling CS gas, it is unlikely to be an evolved mass-losing star.

We obtained MIPS 24 µm images and 70 µm default-scale images for 15 of our 16 target stars. For one of our stars (HD 77190), we obtained only a 70 µm observation. This star was observed at 24 µm in GTO program 40; we used that image in our study. All the data were calibrated with version S13.2.0 of the Spitzer Science Center (SSC) calibration pipeline software. The total exposure times for each star are listed in the last two columns of Table 1.

3. ANALYSIS

3.1. 24 µm Photometry

To determine the 24 µm fluxes from the target stars, we used the pipeline-processed post–Basic Calibrated Data (BCD) mosaic images, which are suitable for detailed analysis. The pixels in these images are 2.45 × 2.45. Every target star was detected at S/N ≥ 50, except for the faintest (HD 224463), which was detected at S/N = 7. The locations of the star centers were determined by fitting a two-dimensional Gaussian to each star.

For most of the target stars, we performed aperture photometry using an object aperture and sky annulus combination close to the 24 µm large-aperture combination used in Su et al. (2006; \( r_{\text{obj}} = 14.7'' \), \( r_{\text{inner}} = 29.4'' \), and \( r_{\text{outer}} = 41.7'' \)). The aperture correction for this combination is 1.143. For three of the targets, there are nearby faint stars or background objects that fall within the default object aperture or sky annulus. In these cases,
we used aperture and annulus combinations that avoid the nearby sources. Aperture corrections for these combinations were calculated using the 24 μm image of our brightest target star at this wavelength (HD 50241). To verify the accuracy of our calculated corrections, we used that image to calculate a correction for the Su et al. (2006) aperture combination given above. Our calculated correction differed from the published Su et al. (2006) correction by only 0.5%. All the apertures, annuli, and corrections used appear in Table 2.

The results of our aperture photometry, which have not been color corrected, appear in Table 3. The uncertainties in the flux measurements were determined in the following way. The aperture photometry equation giving the fluxes in mJy is

\[ F = cAp \left( \sum_{i,j} f_{i,j} - N \bar{\sigma} \right), \]

where \( c \) is a units conversion factor (0.023504 mJy sr arcsec\(^{-2}\)), \( A \) is the aperture correction, \( p \) is the angular size of the pixels (2.45\(^2\) arcsec\(^{-2}\)), \( f_{i,j} \) is the surface brightness value of pixel \( i,j \) in units of MJy sr \(^{-1}\), \( N \) is the number of pixels in the object aperture, and \( \bar{\sigma} \) is the mean sky brightness calculated from the pixels in the sky annulus. The sum is taken over all the pixels in the object aperture. This equation may be reduced to

\[ F = C \left( \sum_{i,j} f_{i,j} - B \right), \]

where \( C \) is a constant and \( B \) is the estimate of the background flux in the object aperture. Propagating uncertainties gives the following equation for the uncertainty in the total flux:

\[ \sigma_F = C \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} \sigma_{f_{i,j}}^2 + \sigma_B^2}, \]

where the \( \sigma_{f_{i,j}} \) are the uncertainties in the surface brightness values and \( \sigma_B \) is the uncertainty in the estimate of the background flux in the object aperture.

The \( \sigma_{f_{i,j}} \) values were taken from the uncertainty array provided by the SSC calibration pipeline. To estimate \( \sigma_B \) we placed eight apertures and sky annuli in empty regions around each star. For each empty aperture, the difference between the actual value of \( B \) and the value estimated from the pixels in the sky annulus was calculated. The standard deviation of the differences was taken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave (μm)</th>
<th>( r_{\text{object}} ) (arcsec)</th>
<th>( r_{\text{sky inner}} ) (arcsec)</th>
<th>( r_{\text{sky outer}} ) (arcsec)</th>
<th>Aperture Correction</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>Default(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>Used for HD 24111(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>Used for HD 158352(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td>Used for HD 199603(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>Default(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>1.884</td>
<td>Used for HD 39283, HD 77190, HD 42111, and HD 158352(^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>4.186</td>
<td>Used for HD 199603(^c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) From Su et al. (2006).
\(^b\) Calculated from our data. See § 3.1.
\(^c\) From the SSC Web site (http://ssc.spitzer.caltech.edu/mips/apercorr).

### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>( F_x ) (mJy)</th>
<th>( F_{\text{MIPS}} ) (mJy)</th>
<th>( \sigma_{\text{MIPS}} ) (mJy)</th>
<th>( \frac{(F_{\text{MIPS}} - F_x)}{F_x} ) (100%)</th>
<th>Excess?</th>
<th>24 μm</th>
<th>70 μm</th>
<th>( F_x ) (mJy)</th>
<th>( F_{\text{MIPS}} ) (mJy)</th>
<th>( \sigma_{\text{MIPS}} ) (mJy)</th>
<th>( \frac{(F_{\text{MIPS}} - F_x)}{F_x} ) (100%)</th>
<th>Excess?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD 21620</td>
<td>27.31</td>
<td>34.11</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>24.88 ± 2.34</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>650.1 ± 199.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 24863</td>
<td>25.06</td>
<td>28.01</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>11.77 ± 2.20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>&lt;19.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>&lt;545.4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 39283</td>
<td>84.22</td>
<td>84.88</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.79 ± 0.83</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>&lt;23.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>&lt;133.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 77190</td>
<td>45.08</td>
<td>48.81</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>8.29 ± 1.12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>&lt;16.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>&lt;200.1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 98353</td>
<td>108.95</td>
<td>114.52</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>5.11 ± 0.49</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>&lt;54.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>&lt;315.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 118232</td>
<td>111.10</td>
<td>155.67</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>40.12 ± 0.44</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>513.7 ± 57.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 142926</td>
<td>28.55</td>
<td>107.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>276.66 ± 1.79</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>651.6 ± 186.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 158352</td>
<td>74.02</td>
<td>103.44</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>39.75 ± 0.47</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>235.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2515.2 ± 82.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 196724</td>
<td>73.44</td>
<td>75.21</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2.41 ± 0.63</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>970.0 ± 56.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 199603</td>
<td>44.71</td>
<td>50.54</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>13.04 ± 0.85</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>239.7 ± 71.0</td>
<td>Yes(^a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 223884</td>
<td>34.45</td>
<td>37.23</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>8.06 ± 1.13</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>&lt;21.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>&lt;412.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 224463</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>7.50 ± 15.51</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>&lt;11.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>&lt;2469.1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 42111</td>
<td>47.02</td>
<td>51.13</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>8.73 ± 1.56</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>&lt;9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>&lt;59.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 50241</td>
<td>608.29</td>
<td>647.56</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>6.46 ± 0.07</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.0 ± 13.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 148283</td>
<td>66.95</td>
<td>71.03</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>6.10 ± 0.64</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>&lt;21.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>&lt;164.4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 217782</td>
<td>88.28</td>
<td>92.10</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>4.33 ± 0.63</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>&lt;41.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>&lt;296.8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) This “excess” is probably caused by a nearby source.
as the estimate of $\sigma_B$. This method of calculating the flux uncertainties includes object noise, noise due to variations of the background within the sky annulus, and noise due to spatial variations of the background between the object aperture and the sky annulus.

We calculated the median background surface brightness in each image using pixels between 61" and 135" from the target star. The background values range from 17.3 MJy sr$^{-1}$ (low) to 49.7 MJy sr$^{-1}$ (medium). The definitions of low, medium, and high background levels may be found on the SSC Web site. For our target stars, variation of the background between the object aperture and the sky annulus appears to be responsible for 18% to 67% of the total flux uncertainty.

### 3.2. 70 \( \mu \)m Photometry

Since the 70 \( \mu \)m post-BCD mosaic images are not suitable for detailed analysis, we used the SSC software MOPEX to combine the filtered BCD images. MOPEX was set to propagate the uncertainty images from the SSC pipeline and to use multiframe temporal outlier rejection, since all the mosaics have good coverage values (>10 exposures in the regions around the target stars). The pixels in the final mosaics are 4.0 x 4.0. One of the final 70 \( \mu \)m mosaics is shown in Figure 1. Seven of the 16 target stars were detected at 70 \( \mu \)m with S/N $\geq$ 3. Since many of the stars were not detected, we used the telescope pointing information in the image headers to determine the locations of the star centers.

For most of the stars, we used an object aperture and sky annulus combination close to the 70 \( \mu \)m large-aperture combination used in Su et al. (2006; $r_{\text{obj}} = 28.0''$, $r_{\text{sky inner}} = 40.0''$, and $r_{\text{sky outer}} = 68.0''$). The default object aperture and sky annulus are overlaid on the 70 \( \mu \)m mosaic shown in Figure 1. For stars with nearby faint sources in the 24 \( \mu \)m images, we used aperture and annulus combinations that avoided the sources, even if they were not visible in the 70 \( \mu \)m images. The aperture corrections for these combinations were taken from tables available on the SSC Web site. All the apertures, annuli, and corrections used appear in Table 2. The 70 \( \mu \)m photometry results, which have not been color corrected, appear in Table 3.

We calculated the uncertainties in the 70 \( \mu \)m fluxes following the same procedure used for the 24 \( \mu \)m photometry (described in §3.1). For each star not detected at the $\sigma$ level, a conservative upper limit on the 70 \( \mu \)m flux was set by adding 3 times the total statistical uncertainty to any positive flux measured in the object aperture. The median background surface brightnesses near the target stars were estimated from the unfiltered post-BCD mosaic images, using pixels between 48" and 80" from the stars. The background values range from 5.8 MJy sr$^{-1}$ (low) to 16.3 MJy sr$^{-1}$ (medium). At 70 \( \mu \)m, background variation between the object aperture and the sky annulus appears to be responsible for 43% to 84% of the total flux uncertainty for our target stars.

### 4. SPECTRAL ENERGY DISTRIBUTIONS

#### 4.1. Fitting Photospheric Models

To see whether any of the target stars show excess IR emission, we first needed to determine their expected photospheric fluxes at 24 and 70 \( \mu \)m for comparison to the observed fluxes. This was done by fitting stellar models to the optical and near-IR fluxes from the stars. $B$ and $V$ magnitudes from the Tycho-2 Catalogue (Høg et al. 2000) were converted to Johnson magnitudes using formulae given in Volume 1 of the Hipparcos and Tycho catalogs, then to flux densities. The near-IR magnitudes in the $J$, $H$, and $K_S$ bands from the 2MASS Catalog were converted to flux densities using the zero points given in the 2MASS Explanatory Supplement. Since all but one of the target stars are within the LIB, we did not apply an IS extinction correction to the optical and near-IR photometry. Kurucz model photospheric spectra, with log $g = 4.0$ for the stars with spectral types earlier than A5 and log $g = 4.5$ for the cooler stars, were fit to the optical and near-IR fluxes using $\chi^2$ minimization. The best-fitting model spectrum for each star was used to calculate the predicted photospheric fluxes at 24 and 70 \( \mu \)m, which appear in Table 3.

We then considered whether any of the stars showed significant excess flux at either wavelength. The excesses were characterized by calculating the percent deviation of the measured flux from the predicted photospheric flux, while propagating the statistical uncertainties in the measured fluxes (see Table 3). First, we compared the excesses to the uncertainties in the absolute photometric calibration of MIPS data processed with version S13 of the SSC calibration pipeline. The uncertainties are 4% for 24 \( \mu \)m data and 7% for 70 \( \mu \)m data (MIPS Data Handbook, ver. 3.2). We conservatively designated excesses greater than 5 times these uncertainties as significant, which corresponds to >20% at 24 \( \mu \)m and >35% at 70 \( \mu \)m. The second criterion for a significant excess is that it must be at least 3 times greater than its propagated statistical uncertainty. This criterion eliminated apparent excesses only at 70 \( \mu \)m.

Four of the 16 stars showed significant 24 \( \mu \)m excesses (HD 21620, HD 118232, HD 142926, and HD 158352). These stars also showed significant 70 \( \mu \)m excesses. The spectral energy distributions (SEDs) of all the target stars are shown in Figure 2. One additional star, HD 199603, showed a significant 70 \( \mu \)m excess. However, the source visible in the 70 \( \mu \)m image of HD 199603 is slightly offset from the expected position of the A star; it is located at the position of a nearby faint source visible in the 24 \( \mu \)m image of HD 199603. Therefore, we believe that the apparent 70 \( \mu \)m excess from HD 199603 is due to contamination from this nearby red source, despite our care in aperture selection. The nature of this nearby red source is not yet known.

---

3 See http://ssc.spitzer.caltech.edu/mips/apercorr.
4 See http://www.rssd.esa.int/Hipparcos/CATALOGUE_VOL1/sect1_03.pdf.
5 See http://www.ipac.caltech.edu/2mass/releases/allsky/doc/sec6-4a.html.
For the rest of the target stars, the mean 24 μm excess is 6.3% ± 3.1%. There is a small positive offset, although it is not significant at the 3σ level. Ordinarily, this would indicate a problem with the photospheric modeling or with the aperture photometry itself. However, we do not believe this to be the case. The photometry should be accurate, since the MIPS color corrections for early-type stars are extremely small. The photospheric modeling appears accurate. The average deviation between the fitted effective temperatures and the expected effective temperatures (based on the spectral types) is only 378 K. The accuracy of the fitted effective temperatures also indicates that IS reddening does not significantly affect the photospheric model fitting.

The small positive offset measured at 24 μm may be real. None of the target stars are unambiguously nonexcess stars, since they are all main-sequence shell stars with CS gas. If they are not debris disks or protoplanetary disks, then they may be classical Be stars, which show small, hot mid-IR excesses from free-free emission (see Fig. 6 in Su et al. 2006). We plan additional studies to

Fig. 2.—SEDs of the target stars. The fluxes in the B and V bands from the Tycho-2 Catalogue and the J, H, and K, bands from the 2MASS Catalog are plotted with green diamonds. Color-corrected fluxes from IRAS are plotted with blue circles. The new 24 and 70 μm MIPS fluxes, which have not been color corrected, are plotted with red squares. Upper limits are indicated with arrows. Uncertainties in the flux measurements are overlapped with straight vertical lines. The best-fitting Kurucz model photospheric spectra are overlapped with solid black lines. In each panel, the total SED model (the sum of the stellar model and a single-temperature blackbody model) is shown with dashed or dotted black lines. The blackbody temperatures and \( L_{IR}/L_* \) values for these models are given in Table 4. For the four stars with significant IR excess emission at the MIPS wavelengths (HD 21620, HD 118232, HD 142926, and HD 158352), the best-fitting total SED model is shown with a dashed line. For the stars without significant IR excesses, the total SED model showing the upper limit on the IR excess emission is overlapped with a dotted line.
clarify the nature of the target shell stars without significant MIPS excesses.

4.2. Fitting Models to Excess Emission

The next steps were to begin characterization of the CS material responsible for the detected excesses and to set upper limits on the amount of material around the stars without significant excesses. We modeled the total SED of each star as the sum of the best-fitting photospheric model spectrum and a single-temperature blackbody dust emission model. The free parameters of the total SED model were the blackbody dust temperature ($T_{BB}$) and the fractional IR luminosity ($L_{IR}/L_\odot$). The model was fit to the MIPS 24 and 70 $\mu$m fluxes using $\chi^2$ minimization. If the star’s 12 $\mu$m flux from the Infrared Astronomical Satellite (IRAS) was a detection, it was included in the fitting. IRAS upper limits and detections at other wavelengths were not included; the IRAS photometry has large upper limits and measurement uncertainties compared to the MIPS photometry and did not usefully constrain the fit.

For the four stars with significant IR excess, the dust parameters of the best-fitting SED models appear in Table 4. We estimated the uncertainties in these parameters in the following way. We compared total SED models, each of which was the sum of a Kurucz photospheric spectrum model and a single-temperature blackbody emission model, to the optical, near-IR, and mid-IR photometry simultaneously. All the stellar and blackbody model parameters were varied, and $\chi^2$ values were calculated over large regular grids of parameter space (which could be described as the “brute force” method). This is in contrast to the fitting procedure described in the previous paragraph, which used the downhill simplex method to rapidly find the $\chi^2$ minimum.

![Figure 2 — Continued](image_url)
The contours of $\chi^2$ from the brute force minimization were used to determine the $\pm 1 \sigma$ uncertainties on the model parameters shown in Table 4. This method should give accurate estimates of the uncertainties even if any model parameter is correlated with any other. The contours showed that the stellar parameters (Teff and a normalization factor) are correlated with each other, as are the blackbody parameters (TBB and LIR/L*). As expected, the stellar parameters are nearly independent of the blackbody parameters. This is why the parameters of the best-fitting model from each brute force $\chi^2$ minimization agree with those found using the method described in the first paragraph of this subsection, in which minimization was done first for the stellar model and afterward for the blackbody model.

We next determined upper limits on LIR/L* for the 12 stars without significant 24 or 70 $\mu$m excesses. The procedure was similar to that described in the first paragraph of this subsection. For each star, we fit the sum of the best-fitting Kurucz model spectrum and blackbody emission models with fixed values of TBB to the IRAS 12 $\mu$m flux if it was not an upper limit and the MIPS 24 and 70 $\mu$m fluxes even if they were upper limits. The $\chi^2$ minimization code used forced the models to (1) stay below upper limits, (2) stay below FMIps + 1 $\sigma$ for detections, and (3) stay above the photospheric flux. The best-fitting models with fixed values of TBB between 20 and 300 K were determined. For each of these models, the LIR/L* value is the upper limit, assuming that particular blackbody temperature.

Figure 3 illustrates the general behavior of the LIR/L* upper limits as a function of TBB. Plots of the LIR/L* upper limits versus TBB for HD 217782 and HD 77190 appear in the panels on the left. The panels on the right show portions of the two stars’ SEDs, with the best-fitting upper limit SED models for four values of TBB overplotted. The LIR/L* upper limits decrease sharply with increasing temperature between 20 and about 50 K. This is because we do not have photometry at longer wavelengths, which would constrain the fitting of SEDs with cold blackbody temperatures. As TBB increases, the LIR/L* upper limits increase and then decrease, forming an absolute maximum (e.g., HD 217782) or local maximum (e.g., HD 77190) somewhere between ~50 and ~150 K. The LIR/L* upper limits then gradually increase again.

The maximum between ~50 and ~150 K occurs at the temperature of the best-fitting SED model found if one treats a 70 $\mu$m upper limit as a detection (Fig. 3, right). However, for five of the stars without significant excesses (including HD 77190), the largest LIR/L* upper limit occurs at 300 K (Fig. 3, left). In these cases, SED models with fairly high blackbody temperatures are consistent with the limits imposed by the 12 and 24 $\mu$m fluxes, indicating that the SED fitting is also poorly constrained at shorter mid-IR wavelengths. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4. For the stars without significant IR excess, the LIR/L*, upper limit given is valid for all blackbody temperatures between 50 and 300 K.

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>TBB (K)</th>
<th>LIR/L*</th>
<th>BB*</th>
<th>Silicatesb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD 21620</td>
<td>93.4 ± 8.2</td>
<td>(2.51 ± 0.49) × 10⁻⁵</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 24863</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>&lt;1.9 × 10⁻⁵</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 39283</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>&lt;3.1 × 10⁻⁶</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 77190</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>&lt;1.3 × 10⁻⁵</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 98353</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>&lt;9.5 × 10⁻⁶</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 118332</td>
<td>114.0 ± 4.4</td>
<td>(2.56 ± 0.12) × 10⁻⁵</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 142926</td>
<td>221.6 ± 19.6</td>
<td>(8.67 ± 0.84) × 10⁻⁵</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 158352</td>
<td>76.1 ± 0.79</td>
<td>(9.29 ± 0.26) × 10⁻⁵</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 196724</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>&lt;2.4 × 10⁻⁵</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 199603</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>&lt;1.8 × 10⁻⁵</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 223884</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>&lt;1.6 × 10⁻⁵</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 224463</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>&lt;1.1 × 10⁻⁴</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 42111</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>&lt;1.0 × 10⁻⁵</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 50241</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>&lt;9.8 × 10⁻⁶</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 148283</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>&lt;8.4 × 10⁻⁶</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 217782</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>&lt;9.6 × 10⁻⁶</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**—The upper limits on LIR/L* are valid for values of TBB between 50 and 300 K.

a Calculated assuming blackbody grains.
b Calculated assuming 1 $\mu$m size astronomical silicate grains.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. Stars with Excesses

This first survey for debris disks around main-sequence shell stars was successful; 4 out of the 16 stars we observed with MIPS show IR excess emission at 24 and 70 $\mu$m. The dust temperatures from simple modeling of their SEDs are cool, similar to those of other debris disks. These candidate debris disks have best-fitting LIR/L* values that are about 30 to 100 times lower than that of $\beta$ Pic. The mid-IR excesses of these four stars do not resemble those of classical Be stars, whose mid-IR fluxes observed with Spitzer show a steep power-law decline with increasing wavelength (see Fig. 6 in Su et al. 2006).

For the stars with excesses, we calculated the distances from the central stars of grains with these temperatures, assuming blackbody grains and 1 $\mu$m size astronomical silicate grains. The distance calculated assuming blackbody grains represents a minimum distance, while the one calculated assuming silicate grains is probably more accurate. The values appear in Table 4. For HD 21620, HD 118232, and HD 158352, the calculated distances suggest that their CS dust lies in the Kuiper Belt region for an A star (Su et al. 2006). The dust around HD 142926 is somewhat warmer and may lie closer to the central star.

We have searched the literature for information on the ages of our debris disk candidates. HD 21620 is a member of the $\alpha$ Per open cluster, which indicates that it is about 80 Myr old. This age
is fairly young compared to most debris disks, whose ages range from \( \approx 10 \) Myr (e.g., \( \beta \) Pic) to more than 1 Gyr. We were not able to find any published age estimate for HD 118232. In a future paper, we will estimate the age of this star using multiple age-dating techniques.

An estimate of the age of HD 142926 appears in Zorec et al. (2005). In this paper, the ages of Be stars were determined by comparing their positions on the H-R diagram to theoretical tracks of the evolution of rapidly rotating stars from the zero-age main-sequence (ZAMS) to the terminal-age main-sequence (TAMS) and beyond into the post-main-sequence phases. Zorec et al. (2005) estimate the age of HD 142926 to be about 78 Myr old, which is \( \approx 37\% \) of the star's total main-sequence lifetime.

Based on the \( \text{IRAS} \) fluxes from HD 158352, Oudmaijer et al. (1992) tentatively suggested that it has an IR excess. A new analysis of the \( \text{IRAS} \) data by Moor et al. (2006) reaffirmed this suggestion, which is now confirmed by our MIPS photometry. HD 158352 is not known to be a member of any young moving group. Its age is estimated to be \( \approx 750 \pm 150 \) Myr, based on the star’s location on the H-R diagram relative to theoretical isochrones (Moor et al. 2006). The IR excess from this star is anomalously large, given its presumed advanced age. In a recent \( \text{Spitzer} \) MIPS survey for excesses from nearby main-sequence early-type stars, there are no stars older than about 300 Myr that show as large a 24 \( \mu \)m excess as HD 158352 (Su et al. 2006).

5.2. Stars without Excesses

We here discuss two particular stars from our survey that do not have significant IR excesses. HD 50241 (\( \alpha \) Pic) does not show significant excess emission at either MIPS wavelength, although a claim for IR excess from this star has been made based on its fluxes from \( \text{IRAS} \) (Song et al. 2001). This star is often used as a point-spread function reference for coronagraphic imaging of the \( \beta \) Pic debris disk (e.g., Golimowski et al. 2006), so it is fortunate that it does not have a large amount of CS dust.

There has been a claim for star-grazing planetesimals around HD 217782 (Cheng & Neff 2003), which would make it a true \( \beta \) Pic analog. However, the lack of a significant amount of CS dust near the star argues against this scenario. The process that is thought to give rise to the large numbers of star-grazing planetesimals in the \( \beta \) Pic system, gravitational perturbation by an unseen giant planet (Beust et al. 1990), would also be expected to
cause dust-producing collisions between planetesimals. The time-variable, narrow absorption lines seen in spectra of HD 217782 seem to require a different explanation. None of the four stars in our sample with claims for variable CS gas showed significant IR excess emission. Redfield et al. (2007) found the same result using Spitzer observations of three other stars with variable CS gas. The origin of time-variable, narrow absorption lines in spectra of main-sequence early-type stars is a topic we plan to investigate further.

5.3. The Disk Fraction among MS Shell Stars

We surveyed 12 out of the 23 main-sequence (MS) shell stars compiled in Hauck & Jaschek (2000). Six of the 23 were already known to harbor debris disks or younger protoplanetary disks (MWC 480, β Pic, HD 97048, HD 139614, HD 163296, and HD 179218); these stars were observed in other Spitzer programs. The remaining five stars were not observed in our program because they lie outside the LIB. However, one of them (HD 144667) is an accreting Herbig Ae star, which very likely has a protoplanetary disk (e.g., Garcia Lopez et al. 2006). Therefore, we consider that there were seven known protoplanetary or debris disks in the Hauck & Jaschek (2000) sample of main-sequence shell stars prior to our Spitzer survey.

We found four additional disk candidates among the 12 main-sequence shell stars from Hauck & Jaschek (2000) that we observed. Therefore, the disk fraction among the Hauck & Jaschek (2000) main-sequence shell stars appears to be at least 11 out of 23 (48% ± 14%). We have no information about the presence of disks around four of the 23 stars; therefore, the disk fraction in this set of stars could be as high as 65%.

At this time, we are not able to properly compare the disk fraction among the main-sequence shell stars to the disk fraction in other sets of early-type stars. The disk fraction is higher for young early-type stars than it is for early-type stars with ages >30 Myr (Su et al. 2006). Therefore, when comparing the disk fraction in different sets of stars, the sets should have similar distributions of stellar ages. We do not currently know the age distribution in the Hauck & Jaschek (2000) main-sequence shell star set, although we plan to estimate the stellar ages using multiple techniques in a future paper.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have found four debris disk candidates in our Spitzer survey of 16 main-sequence shell stars. These stars show IR excess emission characteristic of moderate amounts of cool CS dust. We have begun follow-up observations of all of our shell stars, to more fully characterize their CS material.

Based on their SEDs, it seems likely that our candidates will be confirmed as debris disks. If so, they are likely to be edge-on, which is the most advantageous orientation for coronagraphic imaging of a disk. These disk candidates will likely double the number of debris disks with currently detectable CS gas. With this sample, we may begin a program to determine why some debris disks have both gas and dust and how these different components are related.

As mentioned in § 1, the nature of the main-sequence shell stars has been something of a puzzle. Our Spitzer study suggests that at least half of the stars in this class have protoplanetary or debris disks. Surveys for shell stars using ground-based optical spectroscopy, followed by IR photometry to look for CS dust, may be an effective way of finding protoplanetary and debris disks.

This work is based on observations made with the Spitzer Space Telescope, which is operated by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology under a contract with NASA. Support for this work was provided by NASA through an award issued by JPL/Caltech. This publication makes use of data products from the Two Micron All Sky Survey (2MASS), which is a joint project of the University of Massachusetts and the Infrared Processing and Analysis Center, California Institute of Technology, funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation.
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