TABLE 5

FRACTION OF STARS IN THREE AGE INTERVALS

	Δt (Gyr)	0–3	3–6	> 6
Method 1	t_1	0.57	0.13	0.30
	t_2	0.62	0.18	0.20
	t_3	0.57	0.19	0.24
	t_4	0.67	0.18	0.16
	t_5	0.51	0.13	0.36
	t_6	0.71	0.17	0.12
	t_7	0.61	0.15	0.24
	t_8	0.71	0.11	0.18
Method 2	t_9	0.76	0.12	0.12
	t_{10}	0.79	0.10	0.11
	t_{11}	0.92	0.04	0.04
	t_{12}	0.77	0.18	0.05
	t_{13}	0.78	0.10	0.12
	t_{14}	0.78	0.11	0.11
	t_{15}	0.93	0.03	0.04
	t_{16}	0.76	0.18	0.06

of the present method are comparable and probably smaller than in the case of the methods based on age-metallicity relations considered by Maciel et al. (2010).

The results for Sample 2 are not essentially different from those of Sample 1, so that a direct comparison can be made with the results by Maciel et al. (2010). The results of both investigations are similar, even though the present methods are completely independent of the metallicity-based methods used by Maciel et al. (2010). The main difference is that the kinematic methods used in the present investigation suggest somewhat lower ages for the CSPN in our samples. In this respect, these results fit nicely with the probability distribution for the progenitors of the CSPN according to Maciel et al. (2010, cf. Figure 7, dashed line). In this case the well known relation between the main sequence mass and the stellar ages by Bahcall & Piran (1983) was adopted, taking $t = 10$ Gyr for 1 $M_\odot$ stars on the main sequence. Taking into account the uncertainties of the methods, which are typically in the range 1–2 Gyr, this case was considered as the most realistic, so that it is reassuring that the kinematic methods produce similar results.

We thank Dr. R. Branham, Jr., for some interesting comments on an earlier version of this paper. This work was partly supported by FAPESP and CNPq.

REFERENCES

Bahcall, J. N., & Piran, T. 1983, ApJ, 267, L77
Boesgaard, A. M., & Tripicco, M. J. 1986, ApJ, 303, 724
Branham, R. L., Jr. 2010, MNRAS, 409, 1269
Cahn, J. H., Kaler, J. B., & Stanghellini, L. 1992, A&AS, 94, 399
Clemens, D. C. 1985, ApJ, 295, 422
Daub, C. T. 1982, ApJ, 260, 612
Durand, S., Acker, A., & Zijlstra, A. 1998, A&S, 132, 13
Holmberg, J., Nordström, B., & Andersen, J. 2007, A&A, 475, 519
_____. 2009, A&A, 501, 941
Maciel, W. J. 1984, A&AS, 55, 253
Maciel, W. J., Costa, R. D. D., & Idiart, T. E. P. 2010, A&A, 512, A19
Maciel, W. J., Costa, R. D. D., & Uchida, M. M. M. 2003, A&A, 397, 667
Maciel, W. J., & Dutra, C. M. 1992, A&A, 262, 271
Maciel, W. J., & Lago, L. G. 2005, RevMexAA, 41, 383
Maciel, W. J., Lago, L. G., & Costa, R. D. D. 2005, A&A, 433, 127
_____. 2006, A&A, 453, 587
Nordström, B., et al. 2004, A&A, 418, 989
Perryman, M. 2009, Astronomical Applications of Astrometry: Ten Years of Exploitation of the Hipparcos Satellite Data (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press)
Reid, M. 2010, http://www.cfa.harvard.edu/events/2010/dyn
Stanghellini, L., Shaw, R. A., & Villaver, E. 2008, ApJ, 689, 194

W. J. Maciel, T. S. Rodrigues and R. D. D. Costa: Instituto de Astronomia, Geofísica e Ciências Atmosféricas, Universidade de São Paulo, Rua do Matão 1226, CEP 05508-090, São Paulo SP, Brazil (maciel, tsrodrigues, roberto@astro.iag.usp.br).