TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

Star	$T_{\rm eff}$ [K]	$\log g$ [dex]	[Fe/H] [dex]	ξ [km s^{-1}]	e$T_{\rm eff}$ [K]	e$\log g$ [dex]	e[Fe/H] [dex]	eξ [km s^{-1}]	Ref[1]
HD 46375_1	5210	4.37	0.24	0.65	35.26	0.10	0.06	0.04	R4
HD 46375_2	5252	4.50	0.26	0.68	21.15	0.09	0.10	0.06	R5
HD 50554	5978	4.51	−0.01	1.10	11.93	0.10	0.06	0.03	R5
HD 52265_1	6102	4.28	0.24	1.20	17.71	0.06	0.05	0.03	R4
HD 52265_2	6163	4.37	0.27	1.21	19.51	0.10	0.03	0.03	R4
HD 52265_3	5993	4.21	0.17	1.24	25.17	0.18	0.06	0.04	R6
HD 6434	5715	4.32	−0.54	0.70	23.11	0.16	0.11	0.10	R5
HD 68988	5936	4.49	0.32	1.19	19.40	0.02	0.09	0.05	R5
HD 75289_1	6138	4.52	0.27	1.50	20.96	0.10	0.07	0.05	R7
HD 75289_2	6070	4.44	0.23	1.42	30.93	0.16	0.06	0.05	R6
HD 75332	6277	4.47	0.22	1.03	24.73	0.11	0.05	0.04	R4
HD 82943_1	5950	4.45	0.28	1.10	25.37	0.07	0.05	0.03	R6
HD 82943_2	5987	4.46	0.24	1.11	17.85	0.04	0.05	0.03	R5
HD 83443_1	5389	4.31	0.33	1.00	27.40	0.18	0.08	0.04	R6
HD 83443_2	5427	4.40	0.34	0.99	22.07	0.13	0.07	0.05	R5
HD 8574	6029	4.34	0.00	1.19	13.29	0.16	0.05	0.03	R5
HD 89744	6315	4.16	0.27	1.67	28.06	0.07	0.04	0.05	R4
HD 92788	5755	4.43	0.29	1.02	26.37	0.04	0.05	0.04	R4
HD 95128	5832	4.31	0.02	1.08	13.83	0.10	0.05	0.02	R5
HR 810	6072	4.48	0.15	1.23	27.89	0.09	0.07	0.08	R4
ν And_1	6165	4.21	0.13	1.40	50.44	0.03	0.06	0.07	R8
ν And_2	6150	4.14	0.09	1.48	50.48	0.03	0.07	0.07	R7
ρ Cnc_1	5201	4.27	0.32	0.78	99.87	0.20	0.11	0.10	R2
ρ Cnc_2	5206	4.40	0.41	0.69	27.42	0.18	0.07	0.04	R7
ρ Crb	5751	4.15	−0.24	1.33	28.85	0.05	0.04	0.05	R2
τ Boo_1	6517	4.37	0.30	1.57	60.99	0.04	0.06	0.08	R8
τ Boo_2	6415	4.23	0.30	1.34	49.61	0.06	0.08	0.07	R7

[1]References for the equivalent widths (last column): R1: Gonzalez et al. (1999), R2: Gonzalez (1998), R3: Laws & Gonzalez (2001), R4: Gonzalez et al. (2001), R5: Laws et al. (2003), R6: Santos et al. (2000), R7: Gonzalez & Laws (2000), R8: Gonzalez (1997).

FUNDPAR include the uncertainty estimation of the parameters and they are shown in the ouput files. The size of the uncertainty depends on many factors, such as the number of lines involved (which is usually small for FeII), the measured equivalent widths and the laboratory data of the spectral lines. The $\log gf$ values (oscillator strength) and excitation potential of the lines are important because many derived values (Fe abundances, the slopes of abundance vs. equivalent widths and vs. excitation potential, etc.) depend on these quantities. We note that the inclusion of a line which (for one reason or another) implies an abundance very different from the average could modify the results and/or increase the uncertainty of the parameters. These lines should be eliminated from the list of measured equivalent widths. The abundances of individual lines are shown in the file `out2.txt` (`work.dir` directory).

6. COMPARISON WITH LITERATURE VALUES

There are small differences in the parameters derived using this method by different authors. Santos et al. (2000) derived surface gravities systematically larger than the ones obtained by other authors (e.g., Gonzalez et al. 2001) by 0.15 dex. To solve this problem, Santos, Israelian, & Mayor (2004) adopted new $\log gf$ values for the iron lines. Then the authors found a small average difference of +25 K in the temperature compared to the studies of Gonzalez et al. (2001) and Laws et al. (2003) (57 stars in common). Also their $\log g$ are +0.05 dex (on average) larger and the average differences in metallicity are between −0.10 and +0.10 dex. Ammler-von Eiff et al. (2009) derived the fundamental parameters of host stars with transiting planets using the 2002 version of the code MOOG and ATLAS model atmospheres. However, for the TrES and HAT objects the abundances determined by Sozzetti et al.