

JWST Exoplanetary Worlds and Elemental Survey (JEWELS) I: High-Precision Chemical Abundances of 20 FGK Planet-Hosting Stars from JWST Cycle 2

QINGHUI SUN ¹

¹ *Tsung-Dao Lee Institute, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, 200240, China*

ABSTRACT

We present high-precision chemical abundances for 20 FGK stars hosting planets observed in JWST Cycle 2 GO programs. Using high-resolution, high-signal-to-noise ratio spectra from the ESO and Keck archives, we perform a strict line-by-line differential analysis relative to the Sun to derive stellar parameters and abundances of 19 elements from C to Zn. The stars span effective temperatures of 4500–6500 K and metallicities from -0.57 to $+0.50$ dex. The sample includes hosts of both gas giants and terrestrial planets, allowing direct comparison between stellar composition and planetary properties. Several of the giant planets orbit metal-rich stars. The detailed abundance patterns show clear chemical diversity, including carbon-enhanced but mildly metal-poor stars (TOI-824, TOI-1130, GJ 9827) and α -enhanced metal-poor stars (TOI-561, GJ 9827, TOI-824). These variations trace differences in protoplanetary disk composition and may influence planetary interiors and atmospheric chemistry. The planet-hosts show a range of [C/O] ratios, and the diverse [Mg/Si] ratios may suggest varied interior compositions for their rocky planets. This homogeneous stellar abundance, together with future uniform JWST planetary atmosphere measurements, provides a foundation for exploring the planet mass-metallicity relation and the connection between stellar chemistry and planetary formation pathways. These results constitute the first step in a larger survey spanning multiple JWST cycles to systematically examine how host star composition shapes exoplanetary systems.

1. INTRODUCTION

The discovery and characterization of exoplanets have advanced significantly with the *James Webb Space Telescope* (JWST). Since its launch in late 2021 (Gardner et al. 2023), JWST has expanded the scope of exoplanet science, from refining orbital and bulk properties to probing atmospheric compositions with unprecedented precision. Its infrared capabilities allow studies across diverse planetary types, including ultra-hot Jupiters, temperate sub-Neptunes, and Earth-sized rocky planets, using techniques including transit spectroscopy, phase-curve observations, and direct imaging.

One of the major contributions of JWST is the detection and characterization of atmospheric compositions over a broad spectral range (0.6–28 μm). Water (H₂O), sodium (Na), and potassium (K) have been the most commonly observed species, as demonstrated in pre-JWST studies (e.g., Charbonneau et al. 2002; Redfield et al. 2008; Madhusudhan et al. 2014; Wyttenbach et al. 2015; Barstow et al. 2017; Nikolov et al. 2018; Pinhas et al. 2019; Welbanks et al. 2019). Beyond these, JWST has detected CO₂ and SO₂ in WASP-39b (JWST Transiting Exoplanet Community Early Release Science Team et al. 2023; Powell et al. 2024), CH₄ in WASP-80b (Bell et al. 2023), silicate clouds in VHS1256b (Miles et al. 2023), SO₂ and silicate clouds in WASP-107b (Dyrek et al. 2024), and H₂O in multiple systems (e.g., Dyrek et al. 2024; Coulombe et al. 2023; Davenport et al. 2025). Additional detections include CO and H₂S in HD189733b (Fu et al. 2024), Na and K in several planetary atmospheres (Rustamkulov et al. 2023; Taylor et al. 2023), and isotopic ratios such as ¹²C/¹³C in VHS1256b (Gandhi et al. 2023). These measurements provide constraints on C/O ratios, atmospheric metallicities, and temperature–pressure profiles across a wide range of exoplanets (Wordsworth & Kreidberg 2022). JWST has also demonstrated its capability to probe terrestrial planet atmospheres,

such as LHS475b (Lustig-Yaeger et al. 2023). Collectively, these results are reshaping our understanding of planetary atmospheres and their chemical diversity, from gas giants to potentially habitable worlds.

The chemical composition of a planet’s atmosphere offers key insights into its formation and evolution (Helled et al. 2022). Two widely discussed formation pathways are the core accretion and disk instability models. In the core accretion scenario (e.g., Pollack et al. 1996), planetesimals gradually build a solid core, which then accretes gas from the surrounding disk over several million years. Because solids can condense and migrate within the disk, the composition of the accreted gas may differ from that of the host star (Lodders 2010; Öberg et al. 2011). If a giant planet forms in the outer disk and migrates inward (e.g., Dawson & Johnson 2018; Welbanks et al. 2019; Hands & Helled 2022), core accretion predicts a relationship between planetary mass and atmospheric metallicity. Some observations have shown an inverse relation between planetary mass and heavy-element content, as well as correlations with stellar metallicity (e.g., Miller & Fortney 2011; Fortney et al. 2013; Mordasini et al. 2016; Thorngren et al. 2016).

The disk instability scenario (e.g., Boss 1997) proposes that parts of the protoplanetary disk can collapse under gravity, forming massive gaseous protoplanets within a few hundred years. Unlike core accretion, this process does not predict a clear mass–metallicity trend (e.g., Batygin et al. 2016; Knierim et al. 2022). High metallicity increases the disk’s optical depth and temperature, which can inhibit clump formation, so disk instability may be more favorable around lower-metallicity stars (Boss 2002). Current observations are insufficient to favor one formation pathway conclusively.

Multiple chemical species detected in exoplanet atmospheres, including H_2O , CO , CO_2 , SO_2 , Na, and K, have been used to explore connections between atmospheric composition and planetary mass (e.g., Sing et al. 2016; Heng 2016). The chemical abundance of the host star strongly affects the composition of its planets. For example, variations in stellar oxygen abundance can influence the composition of solid material available in the protoplanetary disk, since higher O abundances generally increase the fraction of oxygen-bearing condensates such as silicates and water ice. Models of disk chemistry and planet formation show that these changes in the disk’s oxygen budget affect the water-ice content and overall makeup of planetary building blocks (e.g., Bitsch & Johansen 2016; Madhusudhan et al. 2017; Adibekyan et al. 2021). Comparing planetary and stellar abundances is therefore crucial for constraining the mass–metallicity relation. This requires homogeneous measurements of planetary atmosphere compositions (Edwards et al. 2023) and consistent stellar abundance determinations.

JWST data are processed through the same pipeline, allowing planetary measurements to be treated consistently. Equally important is a uniform characterization of their host stars to ensure direct comparisons. For instance, Kolecki & Wang (2022) analyzed chemical abundances for 17 FGK stars in JWST Cycle 1 programs. However, a complete and homogeneous set of stellar abundances for all JWST planet hosts from all cycles is still lacking. Variations in instruments and reduction methods can introduce systematic errors, complicating direct comparisons between studies. By combining homogeneous stellar abundances with uniform JWST planetary measurements across multiple cycles, it is now possible to assemble a dataset large enough to robustly examine trends such as the planet mass–metallicity relation (Sun et al. 2024) and to investigate the connection between planet formation and stellar chemical composition.

We introduce the JWST Exoplanetary Worlds and Elemental Survey (JEWELS), a homogeneous program to measure high-precision stellar abundances for JWST planet-hosting stars and to connect stellar and planetary compositions. In this paper, we derive high-precision stellar abundances for host stars of exoplanets observed in JWST Cycle 2 General Observer (GO) program, focusing on FGK stars with high-resolution, high signal-to-noise ratio (S/N) public spectra. This study represents the first step in a larger survey that will eventually extend to stars in JWST Cycles 1, 3, and 4, providing a uniform dataset to examine how stellar composition shapes planetary properties and formation pathways.

2. TARGET SELECTION AND OBSERVATIONS

Our initial sample includes all planetary systems scheduled for observation in the JWST Cycle 2 GO program. Additional selection criteria were applied to ensure that the host stars are suitable for precise stellar characterization, as described below. Table A1 lists all planetary systems approved in the JWST Cycle 2 GO program, along with their host star effective temperatures (T_{eff}) and the JWST instruments assigned for the observations.

To support planet formation and atmospheric studies with reliable stellar parameters and abundances, we retrieved high-resolution spectra of the host stars from the ESO (Romaniello 2022) and Keck (Tran et al. 2014) public archives. Only spectra of sufficient quality for abundance analysis were retained. When multiple spectra of a given target from the same instrument had insufficient S/N individually, only exposures with the same resolution, instrumental setup, and closely spaced observation times were selected, so that exposure time was the only difference. The radial velocity

differences among these spectra were negligible and did not affect the co-added results. The spectra were then co-added using the *scombine* task in IRAF¹, which sums the flux at each wavelength. This procedure improves the S/N while preserving intrinsic line profiles.

We required a minimum S/N of 100 per Å in the final co-added spectrum to achieve the precision necessary for accurate stellar parameter and abundance determinations. Targets were excluded if the combined archival spectra did not meet this S/N threshold, lacked adequate wavelength coverage, or were not obtained at sufficiently high spectral resolution. These requirements ensure that the retained spectra yield high-precision abundances and robust constraints for interpreting planet formation and atmospheric compositions. Table A1 also reports the spectral wavelength coverage, ground-based instruments used, original program PIs, relevant comments, and the final co-added S/N values.

To maintain homogeneity and precision, we further restricted the stellar hosts to those with T_{eff} between 4000 and 7600 K, based on values reported in the NASA Exoplanet Archive (Christiansen et al. 2025; NASA Exoplanet Archive 2019a,b). This range corresponds to late-K through late-A dwarfs, encompassing the majority of JWST Cycle 2 planet hosts while excluding cooler stars, where molecular line blending complicates abundance analysis, and hotter stars, where shallow spectral lines limit accuracy.

Several systems (e.g., MWC 758 c, 51 Eri b, KELT-7 b, TrES-4 b, and HAT-P-65 b) were excluded because their available spectra either covered too narrow a wavelength range for reliable abundance measurements, exhibited unresolved double-lined features, showed excessive rotational broadening that caused line blending, lacked publicly available data, or had already been analyzed in Sun et al. (2024). These cases are noted in Table A1 and discussed in detail in the Appendix.

Our final sample consists of 20 FGK-type planet-hosting stars from the JWST Cycle 2 GO program, for which we derived high-precision stellar parameters and chemical abundances. Table 1 lists the derived stellar atmospheric parameters (discussed in detail below), together with the planetary orbital periods, radii, and masses compiled from the literature.

3. STELLAR ATMOSPHERE PARAMETERS

We derived stellar atmospheric parameters for the 20 planet-hosting FGK stars using a strictly differential, line-by-line analysis relative to the Sun, following the procedures described in Sun et al. (2025b,a). Equivalent widths (EWs) for elements with atomic number $Z \leq 30$ were measured using the *splot* task in IRAF, adopting the line list of Meléndez et al. (2014). For each instrument, a solar reference spectrum obtained from reflected sunlight (e.g., asteroid Vesta or the Moon) was analyzed in parallel, and EWs were measured for each line in the solar spectra corresponding to the different instruments.

Only lines with EWs between 10 and 150 mÅ were retained. Lines weaker than 10 mÅ are too uncertain due to noise, while those stronger than 150 mÅ lie outside the linear regime of the curve of growth and are more affected by damping and saturation. In a few cases, all available lines of a given element were weaker than 10 mÅ; for example, the three oxygen lines in TOI-1130. In such cases, the weak lines were retained to enable an [X/H] determination, but the resulting abundances are flagged as uncertain.

Stellar atmospheric parameters were determined using the *q²* code (Ramírez et al. 2014) with MARCS model atmospheres (Gustafsson et al. 2008), based on the measured EWs of Fe lines for the star and for the Sun. The effective temperature (T_{eff}) was obtained by requiring excitation equilibrium of Fe I lines, the surface gravity ($\log g$) by enforcing ionization equilibrium between Fe I and Fe II, and the microturbulence (V_t) by minimizing trends between Fe I abundances and reduced equivalent width ($\log \text{EW}/\lambda$). The parameters were iterated until all equilibrium conditions were satisfied.

Uncertainties were estimated by propagating line-to-line abundance scatter and accounting for parameter covariances. The complete line list and EW measurements for all elements are provided in Table A2, and the resulting T_{eff} , $\log g$, v_t , [Fe/H], and their associated uncertainties are summarized in Table 1.

¹ IRAF is distributed by the National Optical Astronomy Observatories, operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy Inc., under a cooperative agreement with the National Science Foundation.

Table 1. Stellar and planetary parameters for 20 planet-hosting F, G, K stars in JWST cycle 2 GO program

Star ^a	T_{eff}^a K	σT_{eff}^a K	$\log g^a$ dex	$\sigma \log g^a$ dex	[Fe/H] ^a dex	$\sigma[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]^a$ dex	V_t^a km s ⁻¹	σV_t^a km s ⁻¹	Planet ^b	P ^b (days)	R_p^b	M_p^b
WASP-121	6523	101	4.22	0.19	0.25	0.07	1.83	0.16	WASP-121 b	1.27	1.865 R_J	1.183 M_J
WASP-94 A	6285	60	4.38	0.15	0.40	0.05	1.47	0.10	WASP-94 A b	3.950	1.72 R_J	0.452 M_J
WASP-69	4874	100	4.33	0.20	0.22	0.07	1.80	0.20	WASP-69 b	3.868	$\sim 0.98 R_J$	$\sim 0.26 M_J$
WASP-52	5036	56	4.31	0.11	0.24	0.05	0.81	0.20	WASP-52 b	1.7498	1.27 R_J	0.46 M_J
WASP-47	5472	18	4.21	0.04	0.40	0.02	0.80	0.06	WASP-47 e	4.159	1.14 R_J	1.14 M_J
WASP-18	6314	79	4.25	0.16	0.07	0.06	1.64	0.14	WASP-18 b	0.941	1.17 R_J	$\sim 10 M_J$
WASP-15	6424	64	4.29	0.14	0.09	0.04	1.26	0.10	WASP-15 b	3.7521	1.43 R_J	0.54 M_J
TOI-824	4977	90	4.52	0.13	-0.20	0.09	0.97	0.22	TOI-824 b	1.393	2.93 $R_{\oplus}$	18.5 $M_{\oplus}$
TOI-561	5378	22	4.51	0.04	-0.38	0.02	0.83	0.06	TOI-561 b	0.446	1.37 $R_{\oplus}$	$\sim 3.2 M_{\oplus}$
TOI-1130	4504	100	4.10	0.14	-0.14	0.10	0.80	0.24	TOI-1130 b	4.070	3.56 $R_{\oplus}$	19.3 $M_{\oplus}$
									TOI-1130 c	8.4	13.32 $R_{\oplus}$	325.59 $M_{\oplus}$
TOI-125	5204	25	4.29	0.06	-0.11	0.02	0.80	0.14	TOI-125 b	4.650	2.73 $R_{\oplus}$	9.5 $M_{\oplus}$
									TOI-125 c	9.15	2.76 $R_{\oplus}$	6.63 $M_{\oplus}$
									TOI-125 d	19.98	2.93 $R_{\oplus}$	13.6 $M_{\oplus}$
PH-2 ^c	5734 ⁺⁸⁴ ₋₈₂	...	4.47 ^{+0.03} _{-0.04}	...	0.017 ^{+0.051} _{-0.044}	...	1.08	...	PH-2 b	282.5	0.833 R_J	0.274 M_J
NGTS-2	6481	121	4.00	0.26	-0.13	0.08	2.13	0.27	NGTS-2 b	4.512	1.60 R_J	0.74 M_J
LTT 9779	5385	42	4.38	0.11	0.24	0.04	0.88	0.13	LTT 9779 b	0.792	$\sim 4.7 R_{\oplus}$	$\sim 29 M_{\oplus}$
Kepler-12	6128	41	4.35	0.10	0.17	0.03	1.30	0.07	Kepler-12 b	4.438	1.70 R_J	0.43 M_J
HD 106315	6577	98	4.76	0.17	-0.14	0.06	2.09	0.25	HD 106315 c	9.5539	2.50 $R_{\oplus}$	$\sim 12 M_{\oplus}$
HAT-P-30	6338	16	4.45	0.04	0.06	0.01	1.52	0.03	HAT-P-30 b	2.812	1.34 R_J	0.71 M_J
GJ 9827	4977	98	4.36	0.33	-0.61	0.09	1.93	0.21	GJ 9827 d	1.21	1.64 $R_{\oplus}$	4.87 $M_{\oplus}$
GJ 504	6161	28	4.48	0.08	0.28	0.02	1.25	0.06	GJ 504 b	94863.5	1.08 R_J	$\sim 4 M_J$
14 Hercules	5474	77	4.51	0.12	0.48	0.08	1.09	0.22	14 Hercules c	1777.0	$\sim 1.12 R_J$	$\sim 8.053 M_J$

Table 1 continued on next page

Table 1 (*continued*)

Star ^a	T_{eff}^a	σT_{eff}^a	$\log g^a$	$\sigma \log g^a$	$[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]^a$	$\sigma [\text{Fe}/\text{H}]^a$	V_t^a	σV_t^a	Planet ^b	P ^b (days)	R_p^b	M_p^b
	K	K	dex	dex	dex	dex	km s ⁻¹	km s ⁻¹		days		

^aThe stellar effective temperature (T_{eff}), surface gravity ($\log g$), microturbulence (V_t), metallicity ($[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$), and their associated uncertainties derived from high-resolution, high S/N spectra.

^bReferences for the planetary orbital period, radius, and mass are listed below. WASP-121 b (Delrez et al. 2016); WASP-94 A b (Neveu-VanMalle et al. 2014); WASP-69 b (Anderson et al. 2014); WASP-52 b (Hébrard et al. 2013); WASP-47 e (Becker et al. 2015); WASP-18 b (Hellier et al. 2009); WASP-15 b (West et al. 2009); TOI-824 b (Burt et al. 2020); TOI-561 b (Weiss et al. 2021); TOI-1130 b, c (Korth et al. 2023a); TOI-125 b, c (Nielsen et al. 2020); PH-2 b (Bryson et al. 2013; NASA Exoplanet Archive 2019a,b); NGTS-2 b (Raynard et al. 2018); LTT 9779 (Jenkins et al. 2020); Kepler-12 b (Fortney et al. 2011); HD 106315 c (Crossfield et al. 2017); HAT-P-30 b (Johnson et al. 2011); GJ 9827 d (Niraula et al. 2017; Teske et al. 2018); GJ 504 b (Kuzuhara et al. 2013; NASA Exoplanet Archive); 14 Herculis c (Wittenmyer et al. 2007; NASA Exoplanet Archive).

^cUnable to derive stellar atmospheric parameters for PH-2 via ionization balance owing to the lack of usable Fe lines; adopted literature values from Dalba et al. (2024).

4. CHEMICAL ABUNDANCE ANALYSIS

Elemental abundances were derived following the procedures described in Sun et al. (2025b,a). We adopted a strictly line-by-line differential abundance analysis relative to the solar spectrum to compute $[X/H]^2$. The measured EWs were analyzed with the **abfind** driver in MOOG to derive individual line abundances, $A(X)$, for each element. The selected lines include those important for tracing planetary atmospheric compositions. For oxygen, we applied the NLTE corrections from Ramírez et al. (2007); for all other elements, NLTE effects are expected to be negligible and largely cancel in the differential analysis.

Final elemental abundances were obtained by averaging the $[X/H]$ values from all lines of the same element in linear space after excluding 2σ outliers. We computed both the standard deviation (σ) and the standard deviation of the mean ($\sigma_\mu = \sigma/\sqrt{N}$). For elements measured from a single line (e.g., K), σ_μ was estimated from the 1σ uncertainty in EW following Sun et al. (2025b), based on the plate scale and S/N of the spectrum.

Table 2 reports σ_μ , the propagated uncertainties from the stellar atmosphere parameters, and the total uncertainties obtained by adding these components in quadrature. Most elements show high-precision measurements, with typical total uncertainties ranging from 0.02 to 0.10 dex. For $[Fe/H]$, we recommend using the uncertainties in Table 2 rather than those in Table 1, as the former reports σ_μ combined with atmospheric parameter uncertainties, providing a more comprehensive estimate of the total error in the stellar $[Fe/H]$ abundances.

5. DISCUSSION

The JWST planet-host sample investigated in this study is inherently shaped by the mission’s proposal-driven target selection and therefore does not represent a statistically unbiased set of FGK dwarf stars. These systems were chosen primarily because their planets exhibit unusual or scientifically compelling characteristics, rather than because they form a representative subset of the broader exoplanet population. As a result, any apparent abundance patterns in this section should be interpreted strictly within the context of this curated sample and not extrapolated to the general population of planet-hosting stars. The figures presented here are intended to provide a global view of the diversity of stellar abundance behavior within the JWST targets, rather than to identify universal or population-level astrophysical trends.

The planet-hosting FGK stars in the JWST Cycle 2 GO sample exhibit a wide range of chemical compositions, with $[Fe/H]$ values spanning from -0.57 to $+0.50$ dex. Fischer & Valenti (2005) found that stars with extrasolar planets are more likely to form in higher-metallicity environments. Within this sample, we likewise find that many giant-planet hosts have above-solar metallicities. Figure 1 plots several relationships between stellar and planetary properties as they appear in this curated sample. Panel (a) shows planetary radius as a function of stellar metallicity, colored by T_{eff} . While some gas giants with large radii appear around metal-rich stars such as WASP-94 A, WASP-47, and 14 Herculis, removing the two most metal-poor stars substantially weakens any apparent trend. Panel (b) presents planetary density versus metallicity, where a few low-density (inflated) planets orbit more metal-rich and hotter stars. Panel (c) shows orbital period versus stellar T_{eff} , colored by $[Fe/H]$; here, several long-period giants (e.g., GJ 504 b) are metal-rich and orbit relatively hotter stars.

Beyond overall metallicity, detailed abundance patterns reveal additional diversity. The sample includes stars with near-solar compositions and others showing distinct chemical peculiarities, such as carbon-enhanced but slightly metal-poor stars (TOI-824, TOI-1130, GJ 9827), volatile-rich stars (WASP-69, WASP-52), and old, α -enhanced, metal-poor stars (TOI-561, GJ 9827). These abundance differences trace the composition of the natal protoplanetary disks and can influence planet formation outcomes. For example, the stellar $[C/O]$ affects the atmospheric chemistry of gas giants, while refractory element ratios such as $[Mg/Si]$ shape the interior composition of terrestrial planets. Together, these stellar chemical signatures provide essential context for interpreting the structure, bulk properties, and atmospheres of the associated planetary systems.

Several stars in the sample show carbon enrichment (Figure 2d). GJ 9827, TOI-824, and TOI-1130 have $[C/H]$ values of 1.011, 1.214, and 1.639 dex, respectively, despite having slightly subsolar metallicities ($[Fe/H] = -0.612$, -0.196 , and -0.141 dex). This results in $[C/Fe] > +1.4$ dex. One possible explanation is mass transfer from an

² $[X/H] = A(X)_* - A(X)_\odot$, where X denotes the element. $A(X) = 12 + \log(N_X/N_H)$, and N_X and N_H are the number densities of element X and hydrogen, respectively.

Table 2. Stellar Abundances for 20 Planet-Host F, G, K Stars in JWST cycle 2 GO program

Atom	WASP-121				WASP-94 A				WASP-69				...
	[X/H] ^a	σ_μ^a	err _{atm} ^a	err _{comb} ^a	[X/H]	σ_μ	err _{atm}	err _{comb}	[X/H]	σ_μ	err _{atm}	err _{comb}	
Fe (26)	0.251	0.010	0.031	0.033	0.397	0.008	0.050	0.051	0.215	0.017	0.028	0.033	...
C (6)	0.131	0.056	0.024	0.061	0.253	0.031	0.048	0.057	1.458	0.197	0.062	0.206	...
O (8) ^b	0.281	0.010	0.037	0.038	0.189	0.025	0.057	0.062	0.653	0.047	0.042	0.064	...
Na (11)	0.435	0.096	0.016	0.097	0.487	0.127	0.028	0.130	0.462	0.070	0.034	0.078	...
Mg (12)	0.206	0.085	0.027	0.089	0.301	0.021	0.032	0.038	0.171	0.010	0.023	0.025	...
Al (13)	0.34	0.03	0.029	0.042	0.388	0.029	0.032	0.043	0.491	0.048	0.087	0.099	...
Si (14)	0.295	0.02	0.016	0.026	0.372	0.013	0.021	0.025	0.494	0.042	0.052	0.067	...
S (16)	0.288	0.072	0.014	0.073	0.144	0.004	0.042	0.042	1.207	0.012	0.097	0.098	...
K (19) ^c	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	...
Ca (20)	0.269	0.028	0.031	0.042	0.393	0.015	0.048	0.050	0.197	0.062	0.141	0.154	...
Sc (21)	0.587	0.136	0.034	0.140	0.48	0.032	0.062	0.070	0.411	0.097	0.083	0.128	...
Ti (22)	0.418	0.063	0.041	0.075	0.457	0.018	0.064	0.066	0.195	0.047	0.067	0.082	...
V (23)	0.368	0.116	0.059	0.130	0.418	0.012	0.054	0.055	0.373	0.07	0.15	0.166	...
Cr (24)	0.27	0.037	0.035	0.051	0.397	0.016	0.051	0.053	0.373	0.089	0.092	0.128	...
Mn (25)	0.447	0.177	0.033	0.180	0.362	0.031	0.052	0.061	0.458	0.158	0.079	0.177	...
Co (27)	0.661	0.159	0.05	0.167	0.389	0.029	0.047	0.055	0.419	0.025	0.026	0.036	...
Ni (28)	0.200	0.021	0.029	0.036	0.417	0.01	0.041	0.042	0.340	0.025	0.012	0.028	...
Cu (29)	0.87	0.129	0.041	0.135	0.39	0.057	0.036	0.067	0.827	0.241	0.018	0.242	...
Zn (30)	0.035	0.074	0.032	0.081	0.286	0.001	0.035	0.035	0.332	0.115	0.045	0.123	...

NOTE—a

Averaged abundance [X/H], standard deviation of the mean (σ_μ), uncertainties propagated from the atmosphere, and co-added total uncertainty.

NOTE—b

For Oxygen, we applied the NLTE corrections from [Ramírez et al. \(2007\)](#), and show the NLTE-corrected [O/H] here.

NOTE—c

For potassium (K), only a single strong line is available. Since lines with equivalent widths greater than 150 mÅ are excluded from the analysis, and in some cases the spectra do not cover the K line, the abundance A(K) is not always available. The full table including all stars is available in machine-readable form online.

evolved asymptotic giant branch (AGB) companion (e.g., [Lucatello et al. 2005](#); [Masseron et al. 2010](#)). Enrichment from early supernovae is unlikely because these stars do not reach the very low metallicities of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] < -1.0$ dex. Apart from carbon-enriched metal-poor stars, WASP-69 also exhibits elevated C, O, and S abundances, indicative of a volatile-rich formation environment.

To examine whether mass transfer is feasible for GJ 9827, TOI-824, and TOI-1130, we first check for evidence of companions. As JWST targets, these stars have extensive RV follow-up, which should reveal any nearby massive companion. The literature shows no sign of a secondary object around TOI-824 or GJ-9827. For TOI-1130, [Korth et al. \(2023b\)](#) report a linear RV trend that may indicate an outer massive companion, though this has not yet been confirmed. We next examine the abundances of s-process elements (Sr, Y, Ba), which can indicate past AGB mass transfer. We perform spectrum synthesis using the *synth* driver in MOOG for Sr, Y, and Ba, and apply the same procedure to a solar spectrum taken with the same instrument. All three stars show strong Sr absorption lines, with EWs more than twice those of the Sun, indicating significant Sr enrichment. The Y and Ba lines are also detected though in general weaker than the solar lines. Table 3 lists the synthesized abundances for each line and the mean abundances calculated in linear space. The uncertainties are estimated in the same way as in previous sections, coadding the propagated atmospheric-parameter errors and σ_μ in quadrature. In all three stars, Sr is above solar and




Figure 1. Relations between stellar and planetary properties within the JWST Cycle 2 GO sample. (a) Planetary radius versus stellar metallicity. (b) Planetary density versus metallicity. (c) Orbital period versus stellar T_{eff} . Colors indicate T_{eff} (a,b) and [Fe/H] (c). For TOI-1130 and TOI-125, which host multiple planets, all planets are shown and connected with black dashed lines.

Table 3. Sr, Y, and Ba abundance for three carbon-enhanced, metal poor stars

Wavelength ^a	Ion ^a	EP ^a	$\log(gf)$ ^a	C_6^a	HARPS ^b	ESPRESSO ^b	GJ 9827 ^c	TOI-824 ^c	TOI-1130 ^c
					A(X)	A(X)	A(X) [X/H]	A(X) [X/H]	A(X) [X/H]
Å		eV			dex	dex	dex	dex	dex
4607.338	38.0	0	0.283	6.55E−32	2.67	2.67	3.55 0.88	3.54 0.87	3.44 0.77
4883.685	39.1	1.0841	0.07	2.80E+00	1.91	1.96	1.64 −0.27	1.98 0.07	1.86 −0.10
5087.420	39.1	1.0841	−0.17	2.80E+00	2.08	2.11	1.24 −0.84	1.58 −0.50	1.61 −0.50
5853.670	56.1	0.604	−0.91	5.30E−32	1.51	1.50	0.71 −0.80	1.30 −0.21	1.30 −0.20
6141.710	56.1	0.704	−0.08	5.30E−32	1.80	1.80	1.11 −0.69	1.85 0.05	1.83 0.03
6496.900	56.1	0.604	−0.38	5.30E−32	1.63	1.76	0.81 −0.82	1.58 −0.05	1.53 −0.23
					[Sr/H] ^d =		0.88 ± 0.14	0.87 ± 0.09	0.77 ± 0.11
					[Y/H] ^d =		−0.47 ± 0.22	−0.13 ± 0.22	−0.26 ± 0.15
					[Ba/H] ^d =		−0.77 ± 0.04	−0.06 ± 0.07	−0.12 ± 0.08

NOTE—a. Wavelength in Å. Ion identifier: integer represents atomic number, fractional part indicates ionization state (e.g., 26.0 = Fe I, 26.1 = Fe II). Excitation potential, $\log(gf)$ value, and damping constant of the line.

b. Solar A(X) values synthesized from the HARPS or ESPRESSO solar spectra.

c. Synthesized A(X) values for GJ 9827, TOI-824, and TOI-1130. The [X/H] ratios are computed as $A(X)_\star - A(X)_\odot$. GJ 9827 and TOI-824 use HARPS solar abundances, and TOI-1130 uses ESPRESSO solar abundances.

d. Final mean [Sr/H], [Y/H], and [Ba/H] values and their uncertainties. The uncertainties combine the propagated atmospheric-parameter errors and σ_μ , added in quadrature.

strongly enhanced relative to iron, with [Sr/Fe] values of 1.49, 1.07, and 0.91 dex. In contrast, Y and Ba are below solar in all cases, but their absolute abundances are consistent with the stars' slightly subsolar metallicities. Although Sr is enhanced, the lack of corresponding Y and Ba enhancement may not suggest mass transfer from an AGB companion.

The α -element ratios further reveal the Galactic origins of these stars. Elements such as Mg, Si, Ti, and Ca, primarily produced in core-collapse supernovae, trace early star formation timescales. Metal-poor stars including GJ 9827, TOI-561, and TOI-824 show high $[\alpha/\text{Fe}]$ (Figure 2a), consistent with rapid formation before substantial iron enrichment from Type Ia supernovae. These stars likely belong to the thick-disk population. In contrast, metal-rich




Figure 2. Relation between stellar chemistry and planetary systems within the JWST Cycle 2 GO sample. (a) α -element abundance ratio versus metallicity, tracing Galactic chemical evolution. (b) Planetary radius versus stellar $[\text{C}/\text{O}]$, where high $[\text{C}/\text{O}]$ may indicate carbon-rich atmospheres. Both planets in the TOI-1130 system are shown and connected by a black dashed line. TOI-125 lacks an $[\text{O}/\text{H}]$ measurement and is not shown. (c) Bulk density of rocky planets versus $[\text{Mg}/\text{Si}]$. The planets TOI-1130 b and TOI-125 b are included in this panel. (d) Stellar carbon enhancement ($[\text{C}/\text{Fe}]$) versus $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, highlighting carbon-rich metal-poor stars.

hosts such as WASP-47, WASP-94 A, and 14 Herculis exhibit near-solar or slightly subsolar $[\alpha/\text{Fe}]$, typical of thin-disk stars formed over longer timescales.

In Figure 2b, planet radius is plotted against $[\text{C}/\text{O}]$. The $[\text{C}/\text{O}]$ values vary widely across systems; in particular, the multi-planet system TOI-1130 exhibits very high $[\text{C}/\text{O}]$. The $[\text{Mg}/\text{Si}]$ ratio also provides insight into the composition of rocky planets. As shown in Figure 2c, stars in the sample span a range of $[\text{Mg}/\text{Si}]$. This ratio controls the dominant mineralogy of terrestrial mantles (Bond et al. 2010; Delgado Mena et al. 2010): low $[\text{Mg}/\text{Si}]$ values favor feldspar-rich silicates, while high $[\text{Mg}/\text{Si}]$ values produce olivine- and pyroxene-dominated interiors. Variations in this ratio suggest that rocky planets around different hosts may have diverse interior structures, mantle convection patterns, and volcanic activity, resulting in a wider range of geological and thermal behaviors than found in the Solar System.

In summary, this study presents a homogeneous set of high-precision stellar abundances for planet-hosting stars observed in the JWST Cycle 2 General Observer (GO) program, spanning a range of stellar types (FGK) and Galactic populations (thin and thick disk). This dataset complements JWST measurements of exoplanet atmospheric compositions and enables a more robust interpretation of planetary chemical properties. As part of an ongoing survey, future work will extend these abundance measurements to stars observed in JWST Cycles 1, 3, and 4, establishing a

complete and uniform dataset to investigate the planetary mass–metallicity relation and to test the relative roles of core accretion and disk instability in planet formation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is supported by the Science and Technology Commission of Shanghai Municipality under Grant No. 25ZR1402244, the National Key R&D Program of China under Grant No. 2024YFA1611801, and the Shanghai Jiao Tong University Funds Program No. AF4260012.

Some of the data presented herein were obtained at Keck Observatory, which is a private 501(c)3 non-profit organization operated as a scientific partnership among the California Institute of Technology, the University of California, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Observatory was made possible by the generous financial support of the W. M. Keck Foundation. This research has made use of the Keck Observatory Archive (KOA), which is operated by the W. M. Keck Observatory and the NASA Exoplanet Science Institute (NExScI), under contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This research is also based on data obtained from the ESO Science Archive Facility under request 080.A-9021(A), 192.C-0224(C), 093.A-9008(A), 099.C-0491(A), 0102.D-0789(D), 198.C-0169(A), 084.C-1039(A), 112.25T7.001, 099.C-0303(A), 1102.C-0923(A), 111.24HZ.001, 0103.C-0874(A), 112.25T4.001, 105.20KD.002, 082.C-0040(E), 106.21BV.009, 0103.C-0422(A), 0102.C-0493(B), 097.C-0863(A), 094.A-9010(A), 095.D-0383(A), 106.21QM.002, 0102.D-0185(A), 089.D-0202(A).

REFERENCES

- Adibekyan, V., Dorn, C., Sousa, S. G., et al. 2021, *Science*, 374, 330, doi: [10.1126/science.abg8794](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abg8794)
- Anderson, D. R., Collier Cameron, A., Delrez, L., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 445, 1114, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stu1737](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu1737)
- Barstow, J. K., Aigrain, S., Irwin, P. G. J., & Sing, D. K. 2017, *ApJ*, 834, 50, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/834/1/50](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/834/1/50)
- Batygin, K., Bodenheimer, P. H., & Laughlin, G. P. 2016, *ApJ*, 829, 114, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/829/2/114](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/829/2/114)
- Becker, J. C., Vanderburg, A., Adams, F. C., Rappaport, S. A., & Schwengeler, H. M. 2015, *ApJL*, 812, L18, doi: [10.1088/2041-8205/812/2/L18](https://doi.org/10.1088/2041-8205/812/2/L18)
- Bell, T. J., Welbanks, L., Schlawin, E., et al. 2023, *Nature*, 623, 709, doi: [10.1038/s41586-023-06687-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06687-0)
- Bitsch, B., & Johansen, A. 2016, *A&A*, 590, A101, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201527676](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201527676)
- Bond, J. C., O’Brien, D. P., & Lauer, D. S. 2010, *ApJ*, 715, 1050, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/715/2/1050](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/715/2/1050)
- Boss, A. P. 1997, *Science*, 276, 1836, doi: [10.1126/science.276.5320.1836](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.276.5320.1836)
- . 2002, *ApJL*, 567, L149, doi: [10.1086/340108](https://doi.org/10.1086/340108)
- Bryson, S. T., Jenkins, J. M., Gilliland, R. L., et al. 2013, *PASP*, 125, 889, doi: [10.1086/671767](https://doi.org/10.1086/671767)
- Burt, J. A., Nielsen, L. D., Quinn, S. N., et al. 2020, *AJ*, 160, 153, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/abac0c](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/abac0c)
- Charbonneau, D., Brown, T. M., Noyes, R. W., & Gilliland, R. L. 2002, *ApJ*, 568, 377, doi: [10.1086/338770](https://doi.org/10.1086/338770)
- Christiansen, J. L., McElroy, D. L., Harbut, M., et al. 2025, *PSJ*, 6, 186, doi: [10.3847/PSJ/ade3c2](https://doi.org/10.3847/PSJ/ade3c2)
- Coulombe, L.-P., Benneke, B., Challener, R., et al. 2023, *Nature*, 620, 292, doi: [10.1038/s41586-023-06230-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06230-1)
- Crossfield, I. J. M., Ciardi, D. R., Isaacson, H., et al. 2017, *AJ*, 153, 255, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aa6e01](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aa6e01)
- Dalba, P. A., Kane, S. R., Isaacson, H., et al. 2024, *ApJS*, 271, 16, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/ad18c3](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/ad18c3)
- Dall, T. H., Santos, N. C., Arentoft, T., Bedding, T. R., & Kjeldsen, H. 2006, *A&A*, 454, 341, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361:20065021](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361:20065021)
- Davenport, B., Kempton, E. M. R., Nixon, M. C., et al. 2025, *ApJL*, 984, L44, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/adcd76](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/adcd76)
- Dawson, R. I., & Johnson, J. A. 2018, *ARA&A*, 56, 175, doi: [10.1146/annurev-astro-081817-051853](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-astro-081817-051853)
- Delgado Mena, E., Israelian, G., González Hernández, J. I., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 725, 2349, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/725/2/2349](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/725/2/2349)
- Delrez, L., Santerne, A., Almenara, J. M., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 458, 4025, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stw522](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stw522)
- Dyrek, A., Min, M., Decin, L., et al. 2024, *Nature*, 625, 51, doi: [10.1038/s41586-023-06849-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06849-0)
- Edwards, B., Changeat, Q., Tsiaras, A., et al. 2023, *ApJS*, 269, 31, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/ac9f1a](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/ac9f1a)
- Fischer, D. A., & Valenti, J. 2005, *ApJ*, 622, 1102, doi: [10.1086/428383](https://doi.org/10.1086/428383)
- Fortney, J. J., Mordasini, C., Nettelmann, N., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 775, 80, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/775/1/80](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/775/1/80)
- Fortney, J. J., Demory, B.-O., Désert, J.-M., et al. 2011, *ApJS*, 197, 9, doi: [10.1088/0067-0049/197/1/9](https://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/197/1/9)
- Fu, G., Welbanks, L., Deming, D., et al. 2024, *Nature*, 632, 752, doi: [10.1038/s41586-024-07760-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07760-y)
- Gandhi, S., de Regt, S., Snellen, I., et al. 2023, *ApJL*, 957, L36, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ad07e2](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ad07e2)

- Gardner, J. P., Mather, J. C., Abbott, R., et al. 2023, *PASP*, 135, 068001, doi: [10.1088/1538-3873/acd1b5](https://doi.org/10.1088/1538-3873/acd1b5)
- Gustafsson, B., Edvardsson, B., Eriksson, K., et al. 2008, *A&A*, 486, 951, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/200809724](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/200809724)
- Hands, T. O., & Helled, R. 2022, *MNRAS*, 509, 894, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stab2967](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab2967)
- Hébrard, G., Collier Cameron, A., Brown, D. J. A., et al. 2013, *A&A*, 549, A134, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201220363](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201220363)
- Helled, R., Werner, S., Dorn, C., et al. 2022, *Experimental Astronomy*, 53, 323, doi: [10.1007/s10686-021-09739-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10686-021-09739-3)
- Hellier, C., Anderson, D. R., Collier Cameron, A., et al. 2009, *Nature*, 460, 1098, doi: [10.1038/nature08245](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08245)
- Heng, K. 2016, *ApJL*, 826, L16, doi: [10.3847/2041-8205/826/1/L16](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8205/826/1/L16)
- Jenkins, J. S., Díaz, M. R., Kurtovic, N. T., et al. 2020, *Nature Astronomy*, 4, 1148, doi: [10.1038/s41550-020-1142-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41550-020-1142-z)
- Johnson, J. A., Winn, J. N., Bakos, G. Á., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 735, 24, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/735/1/24](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/735/1/24)
- JWST Transiting Exoplanet Community Early Release Science Team, Ahrer, E.-M., Alderson, L., et al. 2023, *Nature*, 614, 649, doi: [10.1038/s41586-022-05269-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-05269-w)
- Knierim, H., Shibata, S., & Helled, R. 2022, *A&A*, 665, L5, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202244516](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202244516)
- Kolecki, J. R., & Wang, J. 2022, *AJ*, 164, 87, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ac7de3](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ac7de3)
- Korth, J., Gandolfi, D., Šubjak, J., et al. 2023a, *A&A*, 675, A115, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202244617](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202244617)
- . 2023b, *A&A*, 675, A115, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202244617](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202244617)
- Kuzuhara, M., Tamura, M., Kudo, T., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 774, 11, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/774/1/11](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/774/1/11)
- Lodders, K. 2010, in *Formation and Evolution of Exoplanets*, ed. R. Barnes, 157, doi: [10.1002/9783527629763.ch8](https://doi.org/10.1002/9783527629763.ch8)
- Lucatello, S., Tsangarides, S., Beers, T. C., et al. 2005, *ApJ*, 625, 825, doi: [10.1086/428104](https://doi.org/10.1086/428104)
- Lustig-Yaeger, J., Fu, G., May, E. M., et al. 2023, *Nature Astronomy*, 7, 1317, doi: [10.1038/s41550-023-02064-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41550-023-02064-z)
- Madhusudhan, N., Bitsch, B., Johansen, A., & Eriksson, L. 2017, *MNRAS*, 469, 4102, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stx1139](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx1139)
- Madhusudhan, N., Crouzet, N., McCullough, P. R., Deming, D., & Hedges, C. 2014, *ApJL*, 791, L9, doi: [10.1088/2041-8205/791/1/L9](https://doi.org/10.1088/2041-8205/791/1/L9)
- Masseron, T., Johnson, J. A., Plez, B., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 509, A93, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/200911744](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/200911744)
- Meléndez, J., Ramírez, I., Karakas, A. I., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 791, 14, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/791/1/14](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/791/1/14)
- Miles, B. E., Biller, B. A., Patapis, P., et al. 2023, *ApJL*, 946, L6, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/acb04a](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/acb04a)
- Miller, N., & Fortney, J. J. 2011, *ApJL*, 736, L29, doi: [10.1088/2041-8205/736/2/L29](https://doi.org/10.1088/2041-8205/736/2/L29)
- Mordasini, C., van Boekel, R., Mollière, P., Henning, T., & Benneke, B. 2016, *ApJ*, 832, 41, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/832/1/41](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/832/1/41)
- NASA Exoplanet Archive. 2019a, Confirmed Planets Table, Last Accessed on: 2025-11-18 18:00. <https://exoplanetarchive.ipac.caltech.edu/cgi-bin/TblView/nph-tblView?app=ExoTbIs&config=planets>
- . 2019b, Composite Planet Data Table, Last Accessed on: 2025-11-18 18:00. <https://exoplanetarchive.ipac.caltech.edu/cgi-bin/TblView/nph-tblView?app=ExoTbIs&config=compositepars>
- Neveu-VanMalle, M., Queloz, D., Anderson, D. R., et al. 2014, *A&A*, 572, A49, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201424744](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201424744)
- Nielsen, L. D., Gandolfi, D., Armstrong, D. J., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 492, 5399, doi: [10.1093/mnras/staa197](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa197)
- Nikolov, N., Sing, D. K., Fortney, J. J., et al. 2018, *Nature*, 557, 526, doi: [10.1038/s41586-018-0101-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0101-7)
- Niraula, P., Redfield, S., Dai, F., et al. 2017, *AJ*, 154, 266, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aa957c](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aa957c)
- Öberg, K. I., Murray-Clay, R., & Bergin, E. A. 2011, *ApJL*, 743, L16, doi: [10.1088/2041-8205/743/1/L16](https://doi.org/10.1088/2041-8205/743/1/L16)
- Pinhas, A., Madhusudhan, N., Gandhi, S., & MacDonald, R. 2019, *MNRAS*, 482, 1485, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty2544](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty2544)
- Pollack, J. B., Hubickyj, O., Bodenheimer, P., et al. 1996, *Icarus*, 124, 62, doi: [10.1006/icar.1996.0190](https://doi.org/10.1006/icar.1996.0190)
- Powell, D., Feinstein, A. D., Lee, E. K. H., et al. 2024, *Nature*, 626, 979, doi: [10.1038/s41586-024-07040-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07040-9)
- Ramírez, I., Allende Prieto, C., & Lambert, D. L. 2007, *A&A*, 465, 271, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/20066619](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/20066619)
- Ramírez, I., Meléndez, J., Bean, J., et al. 2014, *A&A*, 572, A48, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201424244](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201424244)
- Raynard, L., Goad, M. R., Gillen, E., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 481, 4960, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty2581](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty2581)
- Redfield, S., Endl, M., Cochran, W. D., & Koesterke, L. 2008, *ApJL*, 673, L87, doi: [10.1086/527475](https://doi.org/10.1086/527475)
- Romaniello, M. 2022, in *Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series*, Vol. 12186, *Observatory Operations: Strategies, Processes, and Systems IX*, ed. D. S. Adler, R. L. Seaman, & C. R. Benn, 121860D, doi: [10.1117/12.2628253](https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2628253)
- Rustamkulov, Z., Sing, D. K., Mukherjee, S., et al. 2023, *Nature*, 614, 659, doi: [10.1038/s41586-022-05677-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-05677-y)
- Sing, D. K., Fortney, J. J., Nikolov, N., et al. 2016, *Nature*, 529, 59, doi: [10.1038/nature16068](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16068)
- Sun, Q., Ji, C., Wang, S. X., et al. 2025a, *A&A*, 701, A107, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202556272](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202556272)

- Sun, Q., Wang, S. X., Welbanks, L., Teske, J., & Buchner, J. 2024, *AJ*, 167, 167, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ad298d](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ad298d)
- Sun, Q., Wang, S. X., Gan, T., et al. 2025b, *ApJ*, 980, 179, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ad9924](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ad9924)
- Taylor, J., Radica, M., Welbanks, L., et al. 2023, *MNRAS*, 524, 817, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stad1547](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stad1547)
- Teske, J. K., Wang, S., Wolfgang, A., et al. 2018, *AJ*, 155, 148, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aaab56](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aaab56)
- Thorngren, D. P., Fortney, J. J., Murray-Clay, R. A., & Lopez, E. D. 2016, *ApJ*, 831, 64, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/831/1/64](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/831/1/64)
- Tran, H. D., Holt, J., Goodrich, R. W., et al. 2014, in *Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series*, Vol. 9152, *Software and Cyberinfrastructure for Astronomy III*, ed. G. Chiozzi & N. M. Radziwill, 91522I, doi: [10.1117/12.2054830](https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2054830)
- Weiss, L. M., Dai, F., Huber, D., et al. 2021, *AJ*, 161, 56, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/abd409](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/abd409)
- Welbanks, L., Madhusudhan, N., Allard, N. F., et al. 2019, *ApJL*, 887, L20, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ab5a89](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab5a89)
- West, R. G., Anderson, D. R., Gillon, M., et al. 2009, *AJ*, 137, 4834, doi: [10.1088/0004-6256/137/6/4834](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-6256/137/6/4834)
- Wittenmyer, R. A., Endl, M., & Cochran, W. D. 2007, *ApJ*, 654, 625, doi: [10.1086/509110](https://doi.org/10.1086/509110)
- Wordsworth, R., & Kreidberg, L. 2022, *ARA&A*, 60, 159, doi: [10.1146/annurev-astro-052920-125632](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-astro-052920-125632)
- Wytttenbach, A., Ehrenreich, D., Lovis, C., Udry, S., & Pepe, F. 2015, *A&A*, 577, A62, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201525729](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201525729)

APPENDIX

Table A1 lists the planets included in the JWST Cycle 2 General Observer (GO) program. For each target, we provide the host star effective temperature (T_{eff}) from NASA Exoplanet Archive, the archival source and wavelength coverage of available spectra, the principal investigator (PI), and comments on data quality or special considerations (e.g., co-added spectra, insufficient S/N, or absence of public data). Exposure times or S/N are reported where available, together with the planned JWST instrument modes. Systems are grouped by spectral type, with FGK stars listed first, followed by A stars and late-K/M dwarfs. In this paper, we focus on FGK hosts with spectra of S/N > 100 and full optical coverage. Abundance measurements for M dwarfs will be presented in future work.

Several individual cases are worth noting. The spectrum of MWC 758 covers too narrow a wavelength range to allow reliable abundance measurements. The 51 Eri spectrum exhibits blended double lines that cannot be separated for individual component analyses. KELT-7 is a very rapid rotator, and its spectrum is heavily blended and thus unsuitable for standard FGK abundance techniques, so it is excluded from this study. No public spectra are available for TrES-4 b or HAT-P-65 b. Other planet hosts were previously analyzed in Sun et al. (2024), as noted in the table, and are not re-measured here. In total, we derive high-precision stellar parameters and chemical abundances for 20 FGK stars in the JWST Cycle 2 GO sample.

For the strict differential abundance analysis, each star is compared to a solar spectrum obtained with the same instrument. Depending on public availability, we use either a daytime sky solar spectrum or an asteroid (e.g., Vesta) reflecting sunlight. The ESPRESSO Vesta spectrum was obtained from the ESO Archive (Program 0102.D-0185(A)). The Keck/HIRES Vesta spectrum, taken by M. Asplund on 2015 November 1, was retrieved from the Keck Archive. The high S/N HARPS day-sky solar spectrum provided by T. H. Dall (used in Dall et al. 2006) was downloaded from the ESO website.³ The FEROS Vesta spectrum (taken on date 2012 December 22) was obtained from the ESO Archive, and the UVES Vesta spectrum was retrieved from the ESO Archive under Program 089.D-0202(A). All of the solar reference spectra have S/N greater than 200.

Table A2 provides the equivalent width (EW) measurements used in the stellar parameter and abundance analysis. For each line, we list the wavelength, ion, excitation potential, $\log(gf)$, and adopted damping constant. EW measurements from solar spectra obtained with VLT/ESPRESSO, KECK/HIRES, ESO-3.6m/HARPS, ESO-2.2m/FEROS, and VLT/UVES are included for cross-comparison, followed by those for the stellar targets. A subset of the table is shown here; the complete set of line measurements is available in machine-readable format.

³ <https://www.eso.org/sci/facilities/lasilla/instruments/harps/inst/monitoring/sun.html>

Table A1. JWST Cycle 2 GO program targets and host-star metadata.

Planet ^a	T_{eff}^b (K)	Archive ^c	Wavelength ^c (Å)	PI ^c	Note ^c	Exp./S/N ^c	JWST instrument(s) ^c
MWC 758 c	7580	UVES	3732–5000	Martin-Zaidi, C.	spectral range too narrow	490	NIRCam Coronagraph
51 Eri b	7422	FEROS	3527–9216	Weise, Patrick	–	409	NIRSpec G395H
KELT-7 b	6789	HIRES	2950–7590; 9630	Alam	–	300	NIRSpec G395H
WASP-121 b	6776	ESPRESSO	3772–7900	Hoeijmakers, Jens	already in Cycle 1	465	MIRI LRS
NGTS-2 b	6478	HARPS	3782–6913	Bouchy, Francois	co-add 7 exposures	–	NIRSpec G395H
WASP-18 b	6400	ESPRESSO	3772–7900	Pino, Lorenzo	–	1366	NIRISS SOSS
HAT-P-30 b	6338	ESPRESSO	3772–7900	Cegla, H. M.	–	>300	NIRSpec G395H
WASP-15 b	6300	HARPS	3782–6913	Cameron, A.	co-add 5 exposures	>100	NIRSpec G395H
TrES-4 b	6295	–	–	–	public spectra found	–	NIRSpec G395H
HD 106315 c	6260	HARPS	3782–6913	Santerne, Alexandre	–	160	MIRI LRS
WASP-94 A b	6194	UVES	3064–3917; 10436	Ramirez, Ivan; Mortier, A.	–	>100	NIRSpec G395H
GJ 504 b	6000	FEROS	3527–9216	Kopytova, Taisiya	–	127	MIRI MRS
HAT-P-1 b	5975	–	–	–	published in Sun24	–	MIRI LRS
Kepler-12 b	5947	HIRES	3360–8100	Hillenbrand	check the spectra	1000s	NIRSpec PRISM
HAT-P-65 b	5872	–	–	–	public spectra found	–	NIRSpec PRISM
PH-2 b	5734	HIRES	3360–8100	Muirhead	–	839s	NIRSpec PRISM
WASP-47 e	5552	ESPRESSO	3772–7900	Bayliss, Daniel	co-add multiple spectra	230	NIRSpec G395H
WASP-96 b	5500	–	–	–	published in Sun24, but S/N <100	–	NIRSpec G395H
WASP-39 b	5485	–	–	–	published in Sun24, but S/N <100	1366	NIRISS SOSS; NIR- Cam F322W2 grism; NIRSpec G395H; NIRSpec PRISM
LTT 9779 b	5445	ESPRESSO	3772–7900	Vaughan, Sophia	–	300	NIRSpec G395H
TOI-561 b	5326	ESPRESSO	3772–7900	Soares, Bárbara	–	174	NIRSpec G395H

Table A1 continued on next page

Table A1 (continued)

Planet ^a	T_{eff}^b (K)	Archive ^c	Wavelength ^c (Å)	PIt ^c	Note ^c	Exp./S/Nt ^c	JWST instrument(s)t ^a
TOI-125 b, c	5320	HARPS	3782–6913	Gandolfi, Davide	co-add 6 exposures	150	NIRSpec G395H
14 Herculis c	5129	HIRES	3360–8100	Konacki	–	228s	NIRCam Coronagraph
WASP-52 b	5000	ESPRESSO	3772–7900	Chen, Guo	–	160	NIRSpec G395H
HAT-P-11 b	4780	–	–	–	published in Sun24, but S/N < 100	–	MIRI LRS; NIRSpec G395H
WASP-69 b	4715	UVES/FEROS	3732–5000; 5655– 9464; 3528–9218	Salz, Michael	–	300; 500	NIRSpec G395H; MIRI LRS
TOI-824 b	4600	HARPS	3782–6913	Nielsen, Louise	–	83	NIRSpec G395H
WASP-43 b	4400	–	–	–	published in Sun24, but S/N < 100	–	MIRI LRS
TOI-1130 b, c	4360	ESPRESSO	3772–7900	Knudstrup, Emil	–	246	NIRISS SOSS; NIR- Spec G395H
GJ 9827 d	4255	HARPS	3782–6913	Gandolfi, Davide	co-add 24 exposures	270	NIRISS SOSS; NIR- Spec G395H

A dwarf; late-K/M dwarfs							
HIP 65426 b	8840	–	–	–	–	–	NIRCam Corona- graph; MIRI Corona- graph; NIRISS AMI
TOI-3757 b	3913	–	–	–	–	–	NIRSpec PRISM
TOI-1899 b	3841	–	–	–	–	–	NIRSpec PRISM
K2-22 b	3830	–	–	–	–	–	MIRI LRS
HD 260655 b	3803	–	–	–	–	–	MIRI F1500W
HATS-75 b	3790	–	–	–	–	–	NIRSpec PRISM
HATS-6 b	3770	–	–	–	–	–	NIRSpec PRISM
TOI-3714 b	3652	–	–	–	–	–	NIRSpec PRISM
TOI-5293 A b	3586	–	–	–	–	–	NIRSpec PRISM
TOI-1231 b	3562	–	–	–	–	–	NIRISS SOSS; NIR- Spec G395H; MIRI LRS
GJ 3090 b	3556	–	–	–	–	–	NIRISS SOSS; NIR- Spec G395H
TOI-1685 b	3519	–	–	–	–	–	NIRSpec G395H

Table A1 continued on next page

Table A1 (continued)

Planet ^a	T_{eff}^b (K)	Archive ^c	Wavelength ^c (Å)	Pt ^c	Note ^c	Exp./S/Nt ^c	JWST instrument(s)t ^a
TOI-270 d	3506	—	—	—	—	—	NIRISS SOSS; MIRI LRS; NIRSpec G395H
L-231-32 b	3506	—	—	—	—	—	MIRI F1500W
GJ 357 b	3505	—	—	—	—	—	MIRI F1500W
TOI-1468 c	3496	—	—	—	—	—	NIRISS SOSS; NIRSpec G395H; MIRI LRS
TOI-1468 b	3496	—	—	—	—	—	MIRI F1500W
TOI-3984 A b	3476	—	—	—	—	—	NIRSpec PRISM
TOI-5205 b	3430	—	—	—	—	—	NIRSpec PRISM
L 98-59 b,c,d	3415	—	—	—	—	—	NIRSpec G395H; NIRISS SOSS; MIRI LRS; MIRI F1500W
COCONUTS-2 b	3406	—	—	—	—	—	NIRSpec PRISM; NIRSpec G395H; MIRI LRS
TOI-3235 b	3389	—	—	—	—	—	NIRSpec PRISM
LHS 1478 b	3381	—	—	—	—	—	MIRI F1500W
GJ 3473 b	3347	—	—	—	—	—	MIRI F1500W
TOI-2445 b	3333	—	—	—	—	—	NIRSpec PRISM
LTT 3780 b,c	3331	—	—	—	—	—	NIRSpec G395H; NIRISS SOSS; MIRI LRS; MIRI F1500W
LHS 1140 b	3216	—	—	—	—	—	MIRI F1500W
LHS 3844 b	3036	—	—	—	—	—	NIRSpec G395H
TRAPPIST-1 b,c	2566	—	—	—	—	—	MIRI F1500W
2M1207 b	1600	—	—	—	—	—	NIRSpec IFU
VHS 1256 b	1190	—	—	—	—	—	NIRSpec IFU; MIRI MRS; NIRCam Imaging

Table A1 continued on next page

Table A1 (*continued*)

Planet ^a	T_{eff}^b (K)	Archive ^c	Wavelength ^c (Å)	PI ^c	Note ^c	Exp./S/N ^c	JWST instrument(s) ^a
---------------------	------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------	-------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------

NOTE— a. Planet proposed for observation in the JWST Cycle 2 GO program, along with the JWST instrument assigned for the observation.

b. Stellar effective temperature (T_{eff}) taken from the [NASA Exoplanet Archive \(2019a,b\)](#).

c. Ground-based stellar spectra information: adopted instrument, wavelength coverage, original PI of the public spectra, relevant notes, and total exposure time (for HIRES) or signal-to-noise ratio (Exp./S/N).

Table A2. Equivalent Width Measurements for Solar and Stellar Spectra

λ^a (Å)	Ion ^a	EP^a (eV)	$\log(gf)^a$	C_6^a	ESPRESSO ^b (mÅ)	HIRES ^b (mÅ)	HARPS ^b (mÅ)	FEROS ^b (mÅ)	UVES ^b (mÅ)	WASP-121 ^c (mÅ)	WASP-94A ^c (mÅ)	... ^c
5044.211	26.0	2.8512	-2.058	2.71E-31	73.3	73.3	72.6	74.2	73.0	64.8	81.1	...
5054.642	26.0	3.6400	-1.921	4.68E-32	39.3	40.5	40.3	42.0	39.5	28.7	45.7	...
5127.359	26.0	0.9150	-3.307	1.84E-32	96.5	96.0	95.9	97.0	96.1	89.8	101.0	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

^aWavelength in Å. Ion identifier: integer represents atomic number, fractional part indicates ionization state (e.g., 26.0 = Fe I, 26.1 = Fe II). Excitation potential, $\log(gf)$ value, and damping constant of the line.

^bEquivalent widths (mÅ) of the solar spectrum obtained with different instruments.

^cEquivalent widths (mÅ) of the object spectrum.

NOTE—This table is available in its entirety in machine-readable form.