

## A STUDY OF X-RAY EMISSION OF GALAXIES HOSTING MOLECULAR OUTFLOWS (MOX SAMPLE).

SIBASISH LAHA<sup>1</sup>, MATTEO GUAINAZZI<sup>2</sup>, ENRICO PICONCELLI<sup>3</sup>, POSHAK GANDHI<sup>4</sup>, CLAUDIO RICCI<sup>5,6,7</sup>, RITESH GHOSH<sup>8</sup>,  
ALEX G. MARKOWITZ<sup>9,1</sup>, AND JOYDEEP BAGCHI<sup>10</sup>.

*Draft version September 24, 2018*

### ABSTRACT

We have carried out an extensive X-ray spectral analysis of a sample of galaxies exhibiting molecular outflows (MOX sample), to characterize the X-ray properties and investigate the effect of AGN on the dynamical properties of the molecular outflows. We find that the X-ray bolometric correction ( $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}/L_{\text{AGN}}$ ) of these sources ranges from  $\sim 10^{-4.5}$  to  $10^{-0.5}$ , with  $\sim 70\%$  of the sources below  $10^{-2}$ , implying a weak X-ray emission relative to the AGN bolometric luminosity ( $L_{\text{AGN}}$ ). However, the upper limit on the 2 – 10 keV luminosity ( $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}, 12\mu\text{m}}$ ) obtained from 12 $\mu\text{m}$  flux, following the correlation derived by Asmus et al., are  $\sim 0.5 - 3$  orders of magnitude larger than the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values estimated using X-ray spectroscopy, implying a possibility that the MOX sources host normal AGN (not X-ray weak), and their X-ray spectra are extremely obscured. We find that both  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ , and  $L_{\text{AGN}}$  correlates strongly with the molecular outflow velocity as well as the mass outflow rates ( $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$ ), implying that the central AGN plays an important role in driving these massive outflows. However, we also find statistically significant positive correlations between the starburst emission and MO mass outflow rate,  $L_{\text{Starburst}}$  vs  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$ , and  $L_{0.6-2 \text{ keV}}$  vs  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$ , which implies that starbursts can generate and drive the molecular outflows. The correlations of MO velocity and  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$  with AGN luminosities are found to be stronger compared to those with the starburst luminosities. We conclude that both starbursts and AGN play crucial role in driving the large scale MO.

*Subject headings:* galaxies: Seyfert, X-rays: galaxies, AGN, Molecular outflows, X-ray, Galaxies, Feedback.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The tight correlation between the mass of the central super massive black hole (SMBH) and the stellar bulge velocity distribution points to a coevolution of black hole and its host galaxy over cosmological times (Ferrarese & Merritt 2000; Gebhardt et al. 2000). However, the exact nature of the interaction is still not clearly understood. Energetic outflows detected in absorption and emission in different wavelength bands have been postulated to be important mechanisms responsible for galaxy SMBH co-evolution (see for e.g., Fabian 2012, and references therein).

With the advent of high spatial resolution IR and radio telescopes in the last couple of decades, we have made rapid progress in understanding the nature of the molecular outflows (MO), which are outflows detected using the broad CO(I-J) emission lines, OH absorption lines, HCN

and SiO emission lines, and several other molecular tracers (Sturm et al. 2011; Aalto et al. 2012; Veilleux et al. 2013; Brusa et al. 2015; Feruglio et al. 2015; Stone et al. 2016; Brusa et al. 2018). In several cases where the host galaxies can be spatially resolved, the outflows have been found to extend to a few kpc, and these are believed to be one of the most powerful mechanisms by which the SMBH deposits matter onto its host galaxy. The relation between the SMBH and MO, as well as the mechanism through which MO would interact with and deposit energy into the interstellar medium (ISM) are still poorly understood.

The effect of the central AGN on the kpc scale MO is still debated. Several investigations (see for e.g., Sturm et al. 2011; Veilleux et al. 2013; Cicone et al. 2014) have revealed that the presence of an AGN in the host galaxy boosts the power of the MO. However, we still do not have a consensus on how the AGN interacts with the host galaxy molecular clouds and drives the outflows at kpc scale. Tombesi et al. (2015) and Feruglio et al. (2015) have suggested that the ultra fast outflows (UFOs) detected in X-rays may interact with the ISM of the host galaxy and generate MO in an energy conserving way (Faucher-Giguère & Quataert 2012; Zubovas & King 2012). A more recent study by Fiore et al. (2017) have found tight correlations between the bolometric luminosity of the AGN with the mass outflow rates of molecular outflows.

X-ray emission from active galactic nuclei (AGN) probes the innermost energetic regions where matter is accreted onto a central SMBH. The emission from the accretion process for an SMBH of mass  $\sim 10^7 - 10^8 M_{\odot}$  peaks in the UV, and these photons get inverse Comptonised by a corona in AGN to yield a powerlaw spectrum which extends into the hard X-rays. X-ray photons being less obscured by dust, is a good probe of the SMBH activity. In this work we carry out a systematic study of the 0.5 – 10 keV X-ray spectral properties

<sup>1</sup> University of California, San Diego, Center for Astrophysics and Space Sciences, 9500 Gilman Dr, La Jolla, CA 92093-0424, USA.; email: slaha@ucsd.edu, sib.laha@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> European Space Research and Technology Centre, Keplerlaan 1, 2201 AZ Noordwijk, Netherlands.

<sup>3</sup> Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma (INAF), via Frascati 33, 00040, Monte Porzio Catone, Roma, Italy.

<sup>4</sup> Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Highfield, Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK.

<sup>5</sup> Núcleo de Astronomía de la Facultad de Ingeniería, Universidad Diego Portales, Av. Ejército Libertador 441, Santiago, Chile

<sup>6</sup> Kavli Institute for Astronomy and Astrophysics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

<sup>7</sup> Chinese Academy of Sciences South America Center for Astronomy, Camino El Observatorio 1515, Las Condes, Santiago, Chile

<sup>8</sup> Visva-Bharati University, Santiniketan, Bolpur 731235, West Bengal, India.

<sup>9</sup> Nicolaus Copernicus Astronomical Center, Polish Academy of Sciences, Bartycka 18, PL-00-716 Warszawa, Poland.

<sup>10</sup> Inter University Centre for Astronomy and Astrophysics, Post Bag 4, Ganeshkhind, Pune, India.

of the sources exhibiting molecular outflows (MOX sample hereafter). The main aim in this work is to characterise the X-ray properties of the MOX sample and investigate the effect of AGN on the dynamical properties of the MO. Several sources in the MOX sample are luminous in infra-red (See Section 2 for details). Previous studies on ultra luminous infra-red galaxies (ULIRGs) revealed that these galaxies are under-luminous in X-rays (Imanishi & Terashima 2004). A recent hard X-ray survey of six nearby ULIRGS using *NuSTAR* data (Teng et al. 2015) revealed similar findings. The unabsorbed 2 – 10 keV luminosity for these sources when compared with the bolometric luminosity  $L_{\text{bol}}$  of the AGN or the mid-IR [O IV] line luminosity, are found lower than that for Seyfert 1 galaxies. However, there are a few studies which have pointed out that the ULIRGs are not actually X-ray faint, but are extremely obscured. For example, a recent work on an ULIRG UGC 5101 (Oda et al. 2017) with *NuSTAR* and Swift BAT telescopes have revealed that the intrinsic 2 – 10 keV luminosity of the source is  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 1.4 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ , which is  $\sim 2.5$  times larger than those obtained by previous estimates using X-ray spectra only up to 10 keV. The new value of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  luminosity of UGC 5101 when compared with the luminosity of the  $26\mu\text{m}$  forbidden emission lines of [O IV], were found to be similar to Seyfert galaxies indicating that the source is not X-ray weak. Ricci et al. (2017) in a sample study of LIRGs and ULIRGs found that these sources are heavily obscured by dust and almost 65% of the sources in their sample were Compton thick. We should clearly note that estimating the intrinsic X-ray luminosity in these massive dusty galaxies is not straight forward due to the largely unknown obscuration column density, and the unknown geometry and composition of the obscurer.

This paper aims at addressing the following important questions:

1. Are the AGN in the galaxies hosting molecular outflows intrinsically X-ray weak?
2. Is AGN the main driver of the large scale molecular outflows?

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the sample selection. It also includes the bolometric luminosity, the  $12\mu\text{m}$  luminosity, and molecular outflow properties of the MOX sample. Section 3 describes the X-ray observations for the MOX sample. Section 4 describes the methods employed for data analysis. Section 5 describes the correlation analysis. Section 6 discusses the results from the extensive X-ray analysis, followed by conclusions in Section 7.

## 2. SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

We have selected a sample of 47 galaxies from published literature, which have exhibited molecular outflows, as on 20th October 2016. Table 1 lists the sources, their redshift and spectral classification based on previous optical and X-ray studies. Table 2 lists the MO velocity and the mass outflow rates ( $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$ ). These 47 sources define the MOX sample.

The molecular outflows detected in the MOX sample are either in the form of OH absorption lines at 119, 79,  $65\mu\text{m}$  or CO rotational-vibrational emission line at 115 GHz, CO(1-0), using several state-of-the-art IR and radio telescopes such as VLT-SINFONI, Herschel-PACS, ALMA, Noema, and IRAM-PDBI. For the sources IRAS 17208–0014 and NGC 1433, the MO properties were derived using the transitions CO(2-1) and CO(3-2) respectively (See Table 2 and Section 2.1 for details).

From Table 2 we find that four sources have CO as well as OH detections of MO. In all cases the velocity measured by the two different outflows are consistent within errors, except for the source IRAS 17208-0014, where the CO measured a velocity of  $600 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  while OH measured a velocity of  $100 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . We consider only the highest velocity outflow in this case, which measures the maximum impact of the central engine on the host galaxy ISM. We should note that the OH absorption and the CO emission lines may be probing entirely different clumps of molecular gas at different locations in the host galaxy. However, we find that the distributions of MO velocity and mass outflow rates ( $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$ ) estimated using OH absorption features or the CO emission lines are similar for the sources in the MOX sample. Hence, we treat the velocity and  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$  obtained using OH and CO methods on equal footings.

The MOX sample is not complete and can be biased towards infra-red bright objects as most of these are ULIRGS or LIRGs. Figure 1 left panel shows the distribution of the redshift of the galaxies in the sample, and we find that they are all in the local Universe ( $z < 0.2$ ).

### 2.1. Molecular outflow properties of the sample.

As noted earlier, Table 2 lists the molecular outflow properties of the sources along with the references from which they have been derived. We briefly describe in this section the methods used by different authors to estimate the MO properties and the threshold they have set for detecting a MO.

Sturm et al. (2011) detected the MO using the OH absorption lines at  $79\mu\text{m}$  and  $119\mu\text{m}$  observed using *Herschel*-PACS telescope. The average error on the velocity estimated by the authors is  $150 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . Veilleux et al. (2013) detected the MO using the OH absorption line  $119\mu\text{m}$  observed using *Herschel*-PACS telescope. The average error on the velocity estimated by the authors is  $50 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . The authors define a wind as an OH absorption profile whose median velocity ( $v_{50}$ ) is more negative than  $-50 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  with respect to the systemic velocity. In our work, we use the quantity  $v_{84}$  as the outflow velocity.  $v_{84}$  is the velocity above which 84% of the absorption of the OH profile takes place. Cicone et al. (2014) studied the MO in a sample of galaxies using CO(1-0) emission lines at 115.271 GHz, observed by the IRAM-PDBI telescope. The authors have relied on the simultaneous detection of OH absorption as well as CO emission lines for a given galaxy to detect MO. In a few cases the authors could only put upper limits on velocity and hence could not effectively constrain the mass outflow rates. Stone et al. (2016) carried out a blind search for MO in a sample of 52 local Seyfert galaxies using the OH  $119\mu\text{m}$  absorption line with *Herschel*-PACS data, and detected MO in three sources.

The MO velocities range from  $\sim 50 - 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  and the mass outflow rates  $\sim 10^{0.20} - 10^{3.26} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ . Figure 2 left panel shows the distribution of MO velocity and right panel shows the distribution of mass outflow rates. From Table 2 we note that the mass outflow rates of the MO are reported only for the first 27 sources, and for other sources they could not be calculated by the authors due to the lack of distance estimates, because of insufficient spatial resolution.

### 2.2. The bolometric luminosity of the sample.

The total bolometric luminosity  $L_{\text{bol}}$  of the host galaxies along with the references are listed in Table 7. The values of  $L_{\text{bol}}$  include the AGN as well as the stellar contribution from

the host galaxies calculated using the integrated infra-red luminosity ( $8 - 1000\mu\text{m}$ ) and following the scaling relation  $L_{\text{bol}} = 1.12L_{\text{IR}}$  (Cicone et al. 2014; Veilleux et al. 2013). We also list the AGN fraction,  $\alpha_{\text{AGN}}$ , for each source calculated using the IR flux ratios,  $f_{15\mu\text{m}}/f_{30\mu\text{m}}$  (Veilleux et al. 2013). The bolometric luminosity of the central AGN is calculated as  $L_{\text{AGN}} = \alpha_{\text{AGN}} \times L_{\text{bol}}$ . The starburst luminosity from the galaxies are calculated using  $L_{\text{Starburst}} = (1 - \alpha_{\text{AGN}}) \times L_{\text{bol}}$ .

### 2.3. The $12\mu\text{m}$ luminosity of the sample

Gandhi et al. (2009) have found a strong correlation between the  $12\mu\text{m}$  luminosity from the inner core of active galaxies and the  $2 - 10\text{ keV}$  AGN X-ray luminosity ( $L_{2-10\text{ keV}}$ ), indicating the effects of dust being heated by the central AGN which then re-emits in the IR. Thus the  $12\mu\text{m}$  luminosity can be used as a probe for the  $L_{2-10\text{ keV}}$  AGN emission for the MOX sources. However, obtaining the  $12\mu\text{m}$  flux of the spatially resolved inner core of the MOX galaxies is beyond the scope of the paper. Hence we use the  $12\mu\text{m}$  values quoted in NASA Extragalactic database (NED) obtained using the Infrared Astronomical Satellite (IRAS) observatory. Since this is the emission from the whole galaxy, we must remember that the  $12\mu\text{m}$  luminosity can have contributions from both the AGN and stellar emission. In order to obtain an estimate of the AGN contribution to the  $12\mu\text{m}$  emission we multiply the values obtained from NED by  $\alpha_{\text{AGN}}$  as described in the last section, and then use this quantity in the correlation in Asmus et al. (2015), given by,  $\log(\frac{L_{2-10\text{ keV}}}{10^{43}\text{ erg s}^{-1}}) = -0.32 + 0.95 \times \log(\frac{L_{12\mu\text{m}} \times \alpha_{\text{AGN}}}{10^{43}\text{ erg s}^{-1}})$ . However, we note that the  $L_{2-10\text{ keV}}$  obtained using this method is possibly an upper limit to the intrinsic AGN emission as there can be other mechanisms in the host galaxy contributing to the  $12\mu\text{m}$  flux (See Section 6.1 for a discussion). Table 6 lists the values of the  $L_{2-10\text{ keV}}$  obtained using this method. See Figure 3 left and right panels for a comparison of the  $L_{2-10\text{ keV}}$  estimated using the  $12\mu\text{m}$  luminosity and that directly measured via X-ray spectroscopy.

### 3. X-RAY OBSERVATIONS AND DATA REDUCTION

We have used broadband X-ray spectra from *XMM-Newton* EPIC-pn and *Chandra* ACIS CCD telescopes which give an energy coverage of  $0.3 - 10\text{ keV}$  and  $0.6 - 10\text{ keV}$  respectively. For sources where there are multiple observations, we have considered only the longest observation to maximize the signal to noise ratio irrespective of the flux or spectral state of the source. Table 3 shows the list of X-ray observations used for the MOX sample. All the data used in this work are publicly available in the *XMM-Newton* and *Chandra* archives.

The *XMM-Newton* EPIC-pn data were downloaded and reduced using the standard Scientific-Analysis-System (SAS) software, version 15. Calibrated and concatenated event lists for the EPIC-pn camera were generated using the SAS task *epchain*. Good time intervals for the accumulation of scientific products were defined as those with particle background count rate  $R \leq 1\text{ ct s}^{-1}$  above  $10\text{ keV}$ . The source region was selected using a circle of radius  $40\text{ arcsec}$  with the centre of the circle fixed to the RA and Dec of the source obtained from NED (NASA extragalactic database). The background regions were selected from regions away from the source but from the same CCD. There was no photon pile up for any of the sources, which we checked using the command *epatplot*.

The *Chandra* data were reprocessed using the software *ciao*, version 4.7.1. The source regions were extracted from

circles of radius  $2.5\text{ arc-secs}$  with the centre of the circle fixed to the RA and Dec of the source. The background regions were selected from regions away from the source but from the same CCD. The command *specextract* was used to extract the source+background spectra, the background spectra, the effective area (ARF) and the redistribution matrix (RMF). In the MOX sample there are 16 sources for which we have used *Chandra* observations. Appendix A lists the X-ray spectra, the best fit models, and the residuals of the MOX sources. In Appendix B we describe the previous studies of the sources in the MOX sample, as well as we list the details of the X-ray spectral modelling carried out in this work.

### 4. X-RAY SPECTRAL ANALYSIS

For the 39 out of 47 sources where the total photon count is  $> 200$  (see Table 3) we have used a combination of mostly phenomenological models, step by step, to fit the spectra. The signal to noise ratio (SNR) of several sources in the MOX sample is not sufficiently high to obtain statistically meaningful results with complex models. The simple baseline model consists of a power law absorbed by Galactic extinction (Kalberla et al. 2005). A further intrinsic absorber (*ztbabs*) was added if the source exhibited obscuration. The model *APEC* (Smith et al. 2001) was used to describe emission in the soft X-rays. In a few cases two *APEC* models were necessary to describe the soft X-ray emission. A simple black body model was used in two sources (IZW 1 and NGC 7172) where the *APEC* did not give a good fit. For sources with higher SNR, Gaussian profiles were used to describe the emission lines in soft as well as hard X-ray, specially the Fe K features in the  $6 - 8\text{ keV}$  band. These narrow soft emission lines arise mostly due to photo-ionisation of the plasma by the central source, or reprocessing of the nuclear high-energy primary continuum by optically thick matter. The *diskline* profile was used to model the broad Fe  $K\alpha$  profile, wherever present.

The *XMM-Newton* EPIC-pn data were grouped using *specgroup* command in Scientific Analysis System (SAS), by which we ensured that each data bin has at least 20 counts and there are at most 5 data bins per resolution element. The *Chandra* observation were grouped by a minimum signal to noise ratio of 2. We used  $\chi^2$  statistics to fit the data. All errors quoted on the fitted parameters reflect the 90% confidence interval for one interesting parameter corresponding to  $\Delta\chi^2 = 2.7$  (Lampton et al. 1976). The Interactive Spectral Interpretation System (ISIS) software (Houck & Denicola 2000) was used in fitting the spectra.

Table 4 lists the best fit parameters along with the  $0.6 - 2\text{ keV}$  and  $2 - 10\text{ keV}$  absorption-corrected flux and luminosity. The  $0.6 - 2\text{ keV}$  luminosity quoted in the table is from the model *APEC* only and not the integrated continuum flux. We assume hereafter that the model *APEC* describes the thermal emission in the soft X-rays mostly arising from supernova remnants and star-bursts (see for e.g., Mitsuishi et al. 2013; Ducci et al. 2013). The best fit temperatures of *APEC* lie in the range  $\sim kT = 0.08 - 1\text{ keV}$ . In most cases the AGN continuum is absorbed below  $2\text{ keV}$ , and from Table 4 we find that almost all the sources with sufficient SNR have a neutral intrinsic column density of  $\sim 10^{21} - 10^{22}\text{ cm}^{-2}$ . However, as a caveat we should note that in some cases the soft X-rays may also contain contributions from the reprocessed emission from the central AGN, such as ionized disk reflection, and can mimic thermal emission. Figures A10-A13 show the data and the best fit model in the upper panels, and the residuals in the lower panels. Note that for the two sources M 82 and

NGC 1068, the soft X-ray spectra were extremely complex and could not be fit using the simple baseline model.

For the sources where the SNR does not permit us to constrain simultaneously the powerlaw slope and the neutral absorption column, we fix the slope to a value  $\Gamma = 1.8$ , typical of Seyfert galaxies, and calculate the corresponding fluxes and absorption column. See Table 4 for details. For the six Compton thick sources (NGC 6240, NGC 1068, NGC 1377, IRAS F08572+3915, IRAS F20551-4250, IRASF14348-1447, IRAS 13120-5453) in our sample identified from previous studies, we have multiplied the observed  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  with a factor of 100 to obtain the intrinsic  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  while carrying out the correlation analysis (see for e.g., Lamastra et al. 2009; Puccetti et al. 2016). See Table 5 for the final  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values of these sources and Section 4.1 for details.

For eight sources in the MOX sample, having total counts  $< 200$ , we have used the 2 – 10 keV luminosity from previous studies who have employed hardness ratio method (e.g., Teng & Veilleux 2010). The hardness ratio is defined as  $HR=(H-S)/(H+S)$ , where H and S are the number of counts in the hard (2 – 8 keV) and soft (0.5 – 2.0 keV) bands respectively. The hardness ratios calculated from the data were then compared with hardness ratios generated with an absorbed power law model to estimate the model parameters (Teng et al. 2005).

#### 4.1. Assembling the best values of $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ estimated using X-ray spectroscopy

As inferred from Sec. 4, most of the sources in the MOX sample are probably obscured by the intervening host galaxy dust and gas and therefore the 2 – 10 keV luminosity estimated from the X-ray spectral analysis of *XMM-Newton* and *Chandra* may not give us the real picture. A better glimpse of the unobscured  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  luminosities can be obtained by analysing spectra at energies  $> 10 \text{ keV}$  where the hard X-ray photons have lesser probability to get absorbed. *NuSTAR* operates in the energy range  $\sim 3 - 40 \text{ keV}$  and gives us the unique opportunity of such an intrinsic view of the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  luminosity. In this section we discuss how we selected the best estimate of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  available to us by different X-ray spectral analysis methods.

We assigned the highest preference to the unabsorbed  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values estimated using *NuSTAR*, whenever available. Only 23 sources in the MOX sample have been observed by *NuSTAR* either as targets or serendipitously. We carried out a literature search on the analysis of *NuSTAR* data of these sources and found that out of these 23, only 10 sources have enough SNR to carry out a spectral study in the broad band 3 – 40 keV. For e.g., the *NuSTAR* observations of the sources IRASF08572+3915 and IRASF10565+2448 found no detectable X-ray signatures in the 3 – 40 keV energy band (Teng et al. 2015). The intrinsic  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values for the 10 sources obtained with *NuSTAR* have been quoted in Table 5, along with the references from where they have been derived. For a list of the MOX sources not observed by *NuSTAR* see Appendix C. For the rest of the MOX sources we use the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  estimated from the *XMM-Newton* and *Chandra* spectroscopy and the HR method enumerated in Section 4. For sources which have been previously identified as C-thick and have not been studied by *NuSTAR*, we have multiplied the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values obtained using the *XMM-Newton* and *Chandra* spectroscopy by a factor of 100 (see for e.g., Lamastra et al. 2009; Puccetti et al. 2016), to obtain an esti-

mate of the intrinsic unabsorbed 2 – 10 keV luminosity.

Table 5 column 3 lists the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values obtained using *XMM-Newton* and *Chandra* spectroscopy, while column 4 lists the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values obtained using *NuSTAR*. The last column of Table 5 lists the best values of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  we use in the rest of this work for analysis, which we refer to as  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}, \text{X-ray spectra}}$ . In Table 6 we compare the finally selected  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values with those estimated using the  $12\mu\text{m}$  flux ( $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}, 12\mu\text{m}}$ ). Fig 3 left panel shows the distribution of the best  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  estimated above and the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  estimated using  $12\mu\text{m}$  flux. The right panel of Figure 3 shows the ratio  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}, \text{X-ray spectra}}/L_{2-10 \text{ keV}, 12\mu\text{m}}$  plotted against the bolometric luminosity of the AGN ( $L_{\text{AGN}}$ ).

The bolometric corrections ( $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}/L_{\text{bol}}$ ) corresponding to the two sets of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values are listed in Table 7. Figure 4 left and right panels show the bolometric corrections of the MOX sources with  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}, \text{X-ray spectra}}$  and  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}, 12\mu\text{m}}$  values respectively, plotted against the bolometric luminosity of the AGN. In the left panel of Fig. 4 we have plotted in yellow triangles the bolometric corrections of the sources for which the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  were obtained using *NuSTAR* broad band spectroscopy. *NuSTAR* provides an accurate estimate of the intrinsic  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  luminosity and hence the bolometric corrections obtained using those estimates are more reliable.

## 5. CORRELATIONS

To test the dependence of molecular outflow kinematics on AGN activity, we have correlated the X-ray luminosity in the two energy bands,  $L_{0.6-2 \text{ keV}}$  (*APEC*) and  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ , as well as the AGN bolometric luminosity  $L_{\text{AGN}}$  with the MO velocity and mass outflow rates ( $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$ ). We have also correlated the starburst luminosity,  $L_{\text{Starburst}}$ , with MO velocity and mass outflow rates. Table 8 lists the non-parametric Spearman rank coefficient, the null hypothesis probability, as well as the linear regression slope and intercept for these correlations. The number of data points involved in each correlation are also quoted in Table 8. The difference in the number of data points arises due to the fact that some of the sources in the MOX sample do not have mass outflow rate estimates, and also for a few sources we do not have an estimate of the  $L_{0.6-2 \text{ keV}}$  (*APEC*) and  $L_{\text{AGN}}$ . Figures 5-9 show the correlation between the  $L_{0.6-2 \text{ keV}}$  (*APEC*),  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ , the  $L_{\text{AGN}}$  and the  $L_{\text{Starburst}}$  luminosities with the MO dynamical parameters ( $v$  and  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$ ). The starburst galaxies are plotted in green circles, and they occupy the phase space of lowest X-ray and AGN luminosity and lowest MO velocity as well as the mass outflow rates. The black triangles, red circles, and the blue circles denote the Seyfert 1 galaxies, Compton-thin Seyfert 2 galaxies, and the Compton-thick galaxies respectively. The magenta stars denote the unclassified sources.

From Figures 5 and 6 we find that the 2 – 10 keV luminosities of the MOX sources,  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}, \text{X-ray spectra}}$  and  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}, 12\mu\text{m}}$  respectively, show strong correlation with MO velocity and  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$ , with a confidence  $> 99.99\%$ . In both the figures we find that the mass outflow rate  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$  correlates better than that of the MO velocity. Similarly, Figure 7 shows that both the MO velocity and  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$  strongly correlate with the AGN bolometric luminosity, with a confidence  $> 99.99\%$ . From Figures 8 and 9 we find that the  $L_{0.6-2 \text{ keV}}$  and  $L_{\text{Starburst}}$  correlates with the MO velocity and  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$  with a confidence  $> 99\%$ , but the correlations are not as strong as

those with the AGN X-ray and bolometric luminosity. We discuss the implications of these results in Section 6

We have used the freely available Python code by Nemmen et al. (2012) using the BCES technique (Akritas & Bershady 1996) to carry out the linear regression analysis between the quantities mentioned above. In this method the errors in both variables defining a data point are taken into account, as is any intrinsic scatter that may be present in the data, in addition to the scatter produced by the random variables. The strength of the correlation analysis was tested using the non-parametric Spearman rank correlation method.

## 6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We have carried out a uniform X-ray spectral analysis of a sample of 47 sources exhibiting molecular outflows and obtained the best estimates of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values using X-ray spectroscopy. We have also estimated the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  luminosity using  $12\mu\text{m}$  flux. As a caveat we note that estimating the intrinsic X-ray luminosity in these massive dusty galaxies is not straight forward due to large uncertainties in the obscuration along the line of sight, and most estimates are based on several assumptions. In this section we discuss the main results.

### 6.1. Are the AGN in the MOX sources X-ray weak?

The MOX sources are bright in IR and hence it is possible that large columns of neutral gas and dust obscures our line of sight and we do not observe the intrinsic  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  for most of the galaxies. In this section we therefore investigate whether the MOX sources are extremely Compton thick or the AGN at the centre of the galaxies are indeed X-ray weak.

The NED classification of the MOX sources as listed in Table 1 shows that 33 out of 47 sources are ULIRGs or LIRGs, implying that they have large columns of gas and dust emitting in the infra-red. A systematic study of the ULIRGs in the X-rays using the broad band *Chandra* and *XMM-Newton* data were carried out by Teng & Veilleux (2010), and the authors noted that possibly in the ULIRGs we are capturing the nascent stages of AGN activity (Sanders et al. 1988), in which case the central AGN emission could be weak and starburst emission dominates the total power. In a more recent study by Teng et al. (2015) using *NuSTAR* observations of six ULIRGs, the authors conclude that these sources are indeed X-ray weak and not obscured. The typical example is that of MRK 231, which is a merger remnant containing both intense starburst as well as a luminous AGN at its centre. MRK 231 which was earlier thought to be a Compton thick AGN, was found by the authors to be intrinsically X-ray weak using the 4 – 80 keV *NuSTAR* spectra (Teng et al. 2014). The X-ray bolometric correction ( $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}/L_{\text{AGN}}$ ) estimated by the authors for the six sources in their sample were found in the range from  $8 \times 10^{-4}$  to  $10^{-2}$  indicating that the AGN at the centre of these sources are X-ray weak. Particularly for the two sources MRK 231 and IRAS 08572+3915 they are remarkably low, at  $\sim 5 \times 10^{-4}$  and  $< 10^{-4}$  respectively. Normally for Seyfert galaxies these values lie in the range 0.02 – 0.15 (see for e.g., Elvis et al. 1994; Vasudevan et al. 2009, 2010, and references therein). The authors rule out obscuration as the cause for the X-ray weakness. They conclude that possibly the AGN is accreting at super Eddington rates, in which case the UV bump dominates, or else the presence of large scale outflows may have quenched the X-ray emission in the AGN.

From Figure 4 left panel and Table 7, we find that the

distribution of the bolometric correction ( $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}/L_{\text{AGN}}$ ) of the MOX sample ranges from  $10^{-4.5}$  to  $10^{-0.5}$ , with 70% of the sources having X-ray bolometric correction below  $10^{-2}$ . To compare the bolometric correction of the MOX sources with Seyfert and quasars we selected four AGN samples at different redshift ranges and well studied in X-rays: 1. The warm absorbers in X-rays (WAX) sample, Laha et al. (2014). This sample consists of 26 nearby ( $z < 0.06$ ) Seyfert 1 galaxies, with an X-ray luminosity of  $10^{42} < L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} < 10^{45} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . 2) ‘Palomar Green (PG) quasars’, Laor et al. (1994), consists of quasars in a redshift range  $z = 0.06 - 1.72$ , with an X-ray luminosity of  $10^{43} < L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} < 10^{46} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . 3) The WISSH quasar sample (Martocchia et al. 2017), consisting of WISE-SDSS selected high redshift quasars ( $z = 3 - 4$ ) with an X-ray luminosity of  $10^{44} < L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} < 10^{46} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . 4) The  $12\mu\text{m}$  selected AGN sample by Brightman & Nandra (2011), for which we have used a subsample of 10 sources which are type-1 AGN having well estimated values of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  and  $L_{\text{bol}}$  (Vasudevan & Fabian 2009). The type-1 constraint on these IR bright sources ensures that we obtain an unobscured view of the central engine. In Figure 4 left panel we have over-plotted the bolometric correction ( $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}/L_{\text{bol}}$ ) vs  $L_{\text{bol}}$  of these comparison samples along with the MOX sample. We find that the X-ray bolometric corrections of most of the MOX sources are orders of magnitude lower than that of the Seyfert galaxies and the quasars. We also find that the *NuSTAR* estimates of the bolometric correction for the MOX sources (plotted as yellow triangles) are nearly similar to the Seyfert galaxies and quasars except for the source Mrk 231, which has a correction of  $\log(L_{2-10 \text{ keV, X-ray spectra}}/L_{\text{AGN}}) = -3.62$ . Therefore, it may be possible that most of the MOX sources are not X-ray weak, instead they are heavily obscured.

The broad absorption line quasars (BAL) have also been found to be extremely X-ray weak. A study of two BAL quasars, PG 1004+130 (radio loud) and PG 1700+518 (radio quiet), by Luo et al. (2013), using *NuSTAR* data has revealed that although they are among the optically brightest BAL quasars, their 2 – 10 keV luminosity is 16-120 times weaker as compared to typical quasars. Another study by Luo et al. (2014) of six optically bright BAL quasars using *NuSTAR* and *Chandra* revealed that the 2 keV luminosity of the sources are almost  $> 330$  times fainter than normal Seyfert galaxies, while the overall hard X-ray 8 – 24 keV luminosity is consistently weak for all the six sources. Extreme Compton thick absorption ( $N_{\text{H}} > 10^{25} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ ) is ruled out from the analysis of the stacked *Chandra* spectra, confirming the sources to be bonafide X-ray weak. One possibility for the X-ray weakness of the BAL quasars is the failed winds, which are ionised clouds which do not get enough radiative push to get out of the gravitational field of the SMBH and falls back on the central engine. These failed winds obscure substantial fraction of the AGN luminosity in the X-rays making them X-ray weak. Another possibility is that the BAL outflows remove the feeding gas near the SMBH thereby quenching the central AGN. The latter possibility can hold true for molecular outflows. Observations by Cicone et al. (2014) have shown that MO kinetic energy can be as large as  $\sim 5\%$  of the AGN bolometric luminosity, which according to feedback models (Hopkins & Elvis 2010) is enough to blow away the gases in the host galaxies. Martocchia et al. (2017) studied the X-ray properties of a sample of hyper luminous quasars ( $L_{\text{bol}} \geq 2 \times 10^{47} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ ) at redshift of  $z \sim 2 - 4$ . They found that the X-ray bolometric correction for these sources

lies in the range  $\sim 10^{-3} - 10^{-2}$ , which are orders of magnitude lower than low luminosity AGN. They conjecture that possibly the X-ray weakness could be due to the powerful high ionization emission line driven winds which perturb the X-ray corona and weaken their emission. On a similar vein we find that although the MOX sources have a wide range of X-ray bolometric corrections, on an average they are mostly lower compared to the other quasar samples, and possibly the molecular outflows are responsible for their lower X-ray bolometric corrections.

It is not very straight forward to understand why the AGN at the centre of the MOX galaxies can be X-ray weak, given the fact that the AGN bolometric luminosities of these galaxies are comparable to local Seyfert galaxies and quasars ( $L_{\text{AGN}} \sim 10^{41} - 10^{46} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ ). The X-ray coronal emission is very unlikely to be affected by molecular outflows because the AGN corona is confined to a location  $\ll \text{pc}$  while the MO are detected at distances of kpc scales. Therefore, a direct link between the molecular outflows and quenching of X-ray emission does not seem feasible. In the light of this argument we probe in detail the possibility of extreme Compton thick obscuration of the MOX galaxies. In the scenario where the X-ray photons find it hard to escape out of the dust, the  $12 \mu\text{m}$  flux gives us an approximate upper limit on the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  luminosity (See Section 2.3). Figure 4 right panel shows the bolometric correction ( $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}/L_{\text{AGN}}$ ) vs the bolometric luminosity  $L_{\text{AGN}}$ , where the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values have been calculated using the  $12 \mu\text{m}$  luminosity. We find that the range of the bolometric corrections calculated using  $12 \mu\text{m}$  flux are similar with those of local Seyfert galaxies, and also the MOX galaxies follow the trend of having a lower bolometric correction for sources with higher bolometric luminosity, as also detected in Seyfert galaxies and quasars (See for e.g., Martocchia et al. 2017, and references therein). The  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values estimated using  $12 \mu\text{m}$  flux may therefore be good indicators of the intrinsic  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  luminosity as it shows that the AGN central engine at the centre of the MOX sources functions similarly as that of the Seyfert galaxies and quasars. From Figure 3 right panel we find that the ratio between the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  of the MOX sources obtained using the  $12 \mu\text{m}$  flux and using X-ray spectroscopy ranges from  $10^{-1} - 10^3$ , indicating that these estimates differ by orders of magnitude. The possible reasons behind this discrepancy could be any or all of the following: 1. The X-ray spectra does not give us the correct estimate of intrinsic X-ray luminosity due to uncertainties in the obscuring column, 2. The  $12 \mu\text{m}$  flux can contain emission from polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) from the host galaxy (see for e.g., Hernán-Caballero et al. 2015, , and the references therein), which mostly affects the mid-IR energy band, 3. The AGN emission factor  $\alpha_{\text{AGN}}$  may have an intrinsic uncertainty leading to uncertainties in the estimates of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ . In a future work we intend to address these uncertainties with a more comprehensive multi-wavelength approach.

In summary, we find that on an average the AGN at the centres of the MOX sources may not actually be X-ray weak. The apparent X-ray weakness could be due to the large obscuration column of the intervening dust and gas. The *NuSTAR* estimates as well as the  $12 \mu\text{m}$  estimates of the bolometric corrections of the MOX sources mostly lie in the range spanned by Seyfert galaxies and quasars. Therefore, the AGN at the heart of these galaxies may be functioning similar to that of the local Seyfert galaxies and quasars, and the X-ray emission is weak due to obscuration. As a caveat we must remember

that the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  estimated using  $12 \mu\text{m}$  flux is an indirect measurement and there can be other contributors to the  $12 \mu\text{m}$  flux apart from the AGN and the starburst processes, such as the PAH emission from galaxies.

## 6.2. Is the AGN the main driver of molecular outflows?

Figure 5 left panel shows the correlation between the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  and MO velocity in the MOX sample while the right panel shows the correlation between  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  and MO mass outflow rate. The correlations are statistically significant (See Table 8) and the positive slope indicates that a stronger AGN emission drives faster and more powerful MO. We find that the correlations between  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  and MO dynamical quantities become stronger when we use the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  estimated using  $12 \mu\text{m}$  flux (See Figure 6). Figure 7 shows that the MO outflow velocity and the mass outflow rates correlate very strongly with the AGN bolometric luminosity. In the left panel of Figure 7 we find that two SB dominated sources Arp 220 and IRASF12112+0305 have larger AGN luminosity,  $L_{\text{AGN}}$ , compared to other SB galaxies, although their AGN fraction is small, 5.8% and 17.8% respectively (See Table 7). However, the MO velocity in those sources are  $\leq 400 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ , comparable with the other SB galaxies. From the right panel of Figure 7 we find a tight correlation between the  $L_{\text{AGN}}$  and the MO mass outflow rate with a probability  $> 99.99\%$ . A recent study by Fiore et al. (2017) found similar strong correlations not only between the molecular outflows and  $L_{\text{AGN}}$ , but also with ionised outflows and  $L_{\text{AGN}}$ . The linear regression slope derived by them for  $\log(L_{\text{AGN}})$  vs  $\log(\dot{M}_{\text{out}})$  is  $0.76 \pm 0.06$  for molecular winds. We find a more flat slope of  $0.45 \pm 0.04$  probably due to the fact that the SB dominated galaxies skews the correlation. We note from Figures 5-7 that the starburst dominated sources (in green circles) have the lowest MO velocity and  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$ . These results indicate that the central AGN plays a dominant role in driving these large scale molecular outflows.

Sturm et al. (2011) in a sample of six galaxies detected molecular outflows and found that the MO velocity scales positively with the strength of the AGN. They concluded that the central AGN plays a definitive role in driving these large scale outflows. Moreover, the authors predicted that we can distinguish between an AGN driven MO with a SB driven by noting the velocity of the outflow. Typically AGN driven flows are faster  $\sim 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  while the SB driven outflows are slower  $200 - 400 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . More recent studies by Cicone et al. (2014) on a sample of 19 sources with molecular outflows show that the molecular mass outflow rates increases with the strength of the central AGN. The starburst dominated sources on the other hand harbour outflows with lower mass outflow rates. These point to the fact that the central AGN plays a dominant role in driving these outflows.

Although we find that the presence of an AGN boosts the MO velocity and  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$ , yet, the physical nature of the interaction between the central AGN and the MO is still not clear. One possibility investigated by previous studies is the effect of highly ionised high velocity outflows (UFOs) striking the inter-stellar medium (ISM). Feruglio et al. (2015) detected the presence of ultra-fast outflows (UFO) as well as molecular outflow in the galaxy MRK 231. The MO extends to 1 kpc, which the authors conjectured could be driven by the UFOs by transferring the kinetic energy to the inter-stellar medium. Tombesi et al. (2015) found similar trends of energy conserving interactions of the faster UFOs and the slower MO for the

source IRAS F11119+3257, suggesting that the UFOs could be the mechanism generating large molecular outflows at kpc scale. This theory is however, still debated (Veilleux et al. 2017). Moreover, except for two MOX sources, MRK 231 and IRAS F11119+3257, no other sources exhibit simultaneous detections of MO and UFO, which can also be due to low SNR in the spectral range of 7 – 9 keV where the UFOs are found. Another mechanism that may produce large scale molecular outflows is the radiative thrust from the central AGN, much similar to UV line driven disk winds (Proga & Kallman 2004). The presence of dust enhances the possibility of coupling the AGN radiation with the inter-stellar matter and thereby transferring the radiative thrust onto the gas leading to the MO. However, it is not clear how the AGN emission from < pc radial distance influences molecular gas clouds at kpc scales and what physical mechanism transfers momentum and energy efficiently in the region pc – kpc of the host galaxy.

The question therefore remains, whether the presence of an AGN is necessary to generate and drive a MO? Geach et al. (2014) have detected molecular outflows in a compact massive starburst galaxy at a redshift of  $\sim 0.7$  which are mainly driven by stellar radiation pressure. The authors demonstrated that nuclear bursts of star formation can eject large amounts of cold gas from the centre of the galaxies which truncates the star formation and affects their evolution. Similarly, Sell et al. (2014) in a sample of 12 massive galaxies, at  $z \sim 0.6$ , exhibiting signs of rapid quenching of star formation rate, have shown that the quenching is happening likely due to feedback from the fast outflows generated by star formation rather than AGN. For 9/12 galaxies the authors rule out the presence of any AGN at the centre of the galaxies. Diamond-Stanic et al. (2012) in a sample of starburst galaxies at  $z \sim 0.6$  also find that radiation pressure from massive stars and ram pressure from supernova and stellar winds is sufficient to produce high velocity outflows and the presence of an AGN is not needed in such cases. Theoretical studies by Sharma & Nath (2013) have also suggested that starbursts can play an active role in driving massive galactic winds.

From Table 7 we find that more than 50% (27 out of 47) of the sources in the MOX sample have an AGN fraction of < 50%, implying that the total galactic emission is dominated by star bursts in more than half of the sources. Very interestingly we also find statistically significant positive correlations between the soft X-ray APEC luminosity  $L_{0.6-2 \text{ keV}}$  (APEC) and MO velocity and  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$ . In this work we assume APEC luminosity in the energy range 0.6 – 2 keV probes the strength of starburst (SB) activity. As a caveat we note that this may not be true for a few sources where the primary or the reflected emission from AGN may also contribute to the 0.6 – 2 keV luminosity. We also find statistically strong positive correlations between  $L_{\text{Starburst}}$  vs MO velocity and  $L_{\text{Starburst}}$  vs  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$  (See Figure 9). These correlations indicate that SB also can play a significant role in generating and driving the molecular outflows. The SB emission arises from extended regions of the galaxies (compared to the size of the central AGN) and are sometimes cospatial with the MO ( $\sim$  kpc), and hence has a good probability to generate the MO. However, we should note that the correlations of the molecular outflow velocity and  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$  with the  $L_{\text{Starburst}}$  and  $L_{0.6-2 \text{ keV}}$  are weaker compared to those of the AGN X-ray and bolometric luminosities. It is possible that both star bursts and AGN generate and drive these massive MO.

In summary we confirm that the AGN power is well correlated with the power of the MO. However, the fact that the powerful MO are also found in sources whose contribution to the AGN bolometric luminosity is small, and the strong correlations between  $L_{0.6-2 \text{ keV}}$  vs  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$ , and  $L_{\text{Starburst}}$  vs  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$  indicate that powerful star bursts are equally probable to generate and drive the large scale MO.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

We have carried out an extensive X-ray spectral analysis of a sample of 47 galaxies exhibiting molecular outflows (the MOX sample), using observations from *Chandra* and *XMM-Newton*. Below we list the main conclusions:

- From the X-ray spectra of the MOX sources we find that they are generally X-ray weak, with an X-ray bolometric correction ranging from  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}/L_{\text{AGN}} \sim 10^{-4.5}$  to  $10^{-0.5}$ , with 70% of the sources below  $10^{-2}$ . Possibly the MOX sources have AGN with weaker X-ray emission compared to local Seyfert galaxies and quasars. However it is not physically clear why and how should the X-ray emission be selectively quenched relative to the overall AGN bolometric luminosity.
- We obtain an upper limit on the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  emission from the AGN ( $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}, 12\mu\text{m}}$ ) in the MOX sources using the  $12\mu\text{m}$  flux emitted from the galaxies, following the correlation by Asmus et al.,  $\log\left(\frac{L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}}{10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}}\right) = -0.32 + 0.95 \times \log\left(\frac{L_{12 \mu\text{m}} \times \alpha_{\text{AGN}}}{10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}}\right)$ . The factor  $\alpha_{\text{AGN}}$  ensures that we consider the  $12\mu\text{m}$  flux from the central AGN only. The  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}, 12\mu\text{m}}$  values obtained using this method are 0.5 – 3 orders of magnitude larger than the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values obtained using X-ray spectroscopy. Moreover, the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}, 12\mu\text{m}}$  values are consistent with local Seyfert galaxies and quasars. Speculatively we can say that the AGN at the heart of the MOX sources may have similar  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  as local Seyfert galaxies and quasars, but their weak X-ray emission is due to the high column of obscuration along the line of sight. As a caveat we must note that the galactic PAH emission also contributes to the  $12\mu\text{m}$  flux which are unaccounted for, and hence we refer to the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}, 12\mu\text{m}}$  obtained using the  $12\mu\text{m}$  flux as an upper limit on the 2 – 10 keV emission from the AGN.
- The relation ( $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}, 12\mu\text{m}}/L_{\text{AGN}}$ ) vs  $L_{\text{AGN}}$  of the MOX sources also shows a similar trend as that of the local Seyfert galaxies and quasars, that is, with increasing bolometric luminosity of AGN ( $L_{\text{AGN}}$ ) the X-ray bolometric correction decreases. This may imply that at the heart of these galaxies the AGN functions similarly as that of the quasars, and their apparent X-ray weakness is due to extreme obscuration.
- We find statistically significant positive correlations between  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  and  $L_{\text{AGN}}$  with the molecular outflow velocity and  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$  in the MOX sample, indicating that the presence of an AGN boosts the molecular outflow velocity and power.
- We find that the starburst emission in the host galaxies of the MOX sample,  $L_{\text{Starburst}}$  correlates strongly with the molecular outflow velocity and  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$ . The starburst emission, measured in the soft X-rays (0.6 – 2 keV)

with the model *APEC*, also shows significant correlation with the MO velocity and  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$ . These correlations points to the fact that starburst has the potential to generate and drive the molecular outflows. The starburst emission arises from regions that are more extended (compared to the size of AGN central engine) and hence may sometimes be co-spatial with the molecular outflows, and therefore can play more important role in driving the outflows. Supporting our claim above, we also find that 27 of the 47 sources in the MOX sample have an AGN fraction  $< 50\%$ , implying that the starburst are dominant in these galaxies, and they drive can these large scale molecular outflows. However, we should note that the correlations of the molecular outflow velocity and  $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$  with the  $L_{\text{Starburst}}$  and  $L_{0.6-2 \text{ keV}}$  are weaker compared to those of the AGN X-ray and bolometric luminosities. It is possible that although starburst can drive massive molecular outflows, the presence of an AGN always boosts the power of the outflows.






FIG. 1.— The redshift distribution of the MOX sources.




FIG. 2.— *Left*: The distribution of MO velocity. *Right*: The distribution of the MO mass outflow rate.




FIG. 3.— *Left*: The 2 – 10 keV luminosity,  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ , distribution of the MOX sources calculated by the two methods, X-ray spectroscopy (in pink color) and  $12 \mu\text{m}$  luminosity (in blue color), as described in Sections 2.3 and 4.1. *Right*: The ratio between the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  calculated using the two methods plotted against the bolometric luminosity of the AGN  $L_{\text{AGN}}$  of the MOX sources. The classification of source types are obtained from NED and from previous optical and X-ray studies. See Section 2 and Table 1 for details. The blue circles, red circles, black triangles, green circles and magenta stars denote Compton thick, Compton thin, Seyfert 1, starburst, and unclassified sources respectively. We use this classification consistently throughout the paper.




FIG. 4.— *Left*: The X-ray bolometric correction  $\log(L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}/L_{\text{AGN}})$  vs  $L_{\text{AGN}}$  of the MOX sources along with the WAX (Laha et al. 2014), PG quasars (Laor et al. 1994), WISSH quasars (Martocchia et al. 2017) and the  $12 \mu\text{m}$  selected AGN (Brightman & Nandra 2011), as described in section 6.1. Here the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values of the MOX sources have been estimated using the method described in Section 4.1 and listed in Table 5. As *NuSTAR* gives us the best estimate of the unabsorbed  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ , we have plotted those sources in yellow triangles to separate them from those estimated using *XMM-Newton* and *Chandra* spectroscopy. *Right*: Same as left, but here the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  of the MOX sources are estimated using  $12 \mu\text{m}$  luminosity.





FIG. 5.— *Left*: The correlation between the molecular outflow velocity and the 2 – 10 keV unabsorbed luminosity of the MOX sources obtained using X-ray spectroscopy as described in Section 4.1. *Right*: The correlation between the molecular mass outflow rate and the 2 – 10 keV unabsorbed luminosity of the sources. We have assumed an error of 0.2 dex on the molecular mass outflow rates uniformly.





FIG. 6.— *Left*: Same as Figure 5 except that the 2 – 10 keV luminosity has been obtained using the 12 $\mu$ m flux, as described in Section 2.3. *Right*: Same as Figure 5 except that the 2 – 10 keV luminosity has been obtained using the 12 $\mu$ m flux.





FIG. 7.— *Left*: The correlation between MO velocity and the AGN bolometric luminosity,  $L_{\text{AGN}}$ . *Right*: The correlation between the mass outflow rate and the AGN bolometric luminosity. Symbol description as in Figure 3




FIG. 8.— *Left*: The dependence of Mol outflow velocity on the 0.6 – 2 keV APEC luminosity. *Right*: The dependence of Mol mass outflow rate on the 0.6 – 2 keV APEC luminosity. Symbol description as in Figure 3




FIG. 9.— *Left*: The dependence of Mol outflow velocity on the starburst luminosity,  $L_{\text{Starburst}}$ , as calculated in Section 2.2. *Right*: The dependence of Mol mass outflow rate on the starburst luminosity. Symbol description as in Figure 3

TABLE 1  
THE LIST OF SOURCES, THEIR GENERAL PROPERTIES, PREVIOUS X-RAY STUDIES AND THE 12  $\mu\text{m}$  FLUX.

Index	Source	Other names	z	R.A.	Dec.	Classification <sup>A</sup>	Galaxy <sup>B</sup> activity	Ref <sup>C</sup>	$F_{12\mu\text{m}}^D$ mJy
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	IRAS F08572+3915	-	0.0583	09h00m25.3s	+39d03m54.4s	ULIRG	CT	1,2	325 $\pm$ 30
2	IRAS F10565+2448	-	0.0431	10h59m18.1s	+24d32m34s	ULIRG	OA	2	200 $\pm$ 30
3	IRAS 23365+3604	-	0.0645	23h39m01s	+36d21m08s	ULIRG	OA/LINER	1	< 0.09
4	Mrk 273	-	0.0377	13h44m42.1s	+55d53m13s	ULIRG	Sy2/OA	2	240 $\pm$ 17
5	Mrk 876	-	0.129	16h13m57.2s	+65d43m10s	-	Sy1		87 $\pm$ 12
6	I Zw 1	UGC 00545	0.0589	00h53m34.9s	+12d41m36s	Sy1	NLSy1		549 $\pm$ 11
7	Mrk 231	-	0.0421	12h56m14.2s	+56d52m25s	ULIRG/RL	Sy1/SB	2	1830 $\pm$ 17
8	NGC 1266	-	0.0072	03h16m00.7s	-02d25m38s	Sy	AGN	3	250 $\pm$ 30
9	M 82	-	0.0006	09h55m52.7s	+69d40m46s	-	SB	4	63000 $\pm$ 3150
10	NGC 1377	-	0.0059	03h36m39.1s	-20d54m08s	-	NC	5,6	560 $\pm$ 20
11	NGC 6240	-	0.0244	16h52m58.9s	+02d24m03s	LIRG	CT/GM/SB	1	590 $\pm$ 25
12	NGC 3256	-	0.0093	10h27m51.3s	-43d54m13s	LIRG	SB	7	3570 $\pm$ 31
13	NGC 3628	-	0.0028	11h20m17.0s	+13d35m23s	RL	SB	8	3130 $\pm$ 48
14	NGC 253	-	0.0008	00h47m33.1s	-25d17m18s	-	Variable SB	9	41000 $\pm$ 35
15	NGC 6764	-	0.0081	19h08m16.4s	+50d56m00s	-	AGN+SB	10	310 $\pm$ 47
16	NGC 1068	-	0.0038	02h42m40.7s	-00d00m48s	LIRG	CT/Sy2	11	39800 $\pm$ 76
17	IC 5063	-	0.0113	20h52m02.3s	-57d04m08s	Sy1/RL	NLSy2	12	1110 $\pm$ 23
18	NGC 2146	-	0.0029	06h18m37.7s	+78d21m25s	LIRG	SB	13	7360 $\pm$ 800
19	IRAS 17208-0014	-	0.0428	17h23m21.9s	-00d17m01s	ULIRG/LINER	ULIRG	2	200 $\pm$ 25
20	NGC 1614	-	0.0159	04h33m59.8s	-08d34m44s	LIRG/SB	SB	14	1210 $\pm$ 111
21	IRAS 05083+7936	VII Zw 031	0.0536	05h16m46.1s	+79d40m13s	LIRG	OA	-	200 $\pm$ 26
22	Iras 13451+1232	4C +12.50	0.1217	13h47m33.3s	+12d17m24s	ULIRG/RL	Sy2	2	< 143
23	3C 293	UGC 08782	0.0450	13h52m17.8s	+31d26m46s	Sy/RL	NC	15	19 $\pm$ 2
24	NGC 1433	-	0.0035	03h42m01.5s	-47d13m19s	SB	NC	-	237 $\pm$ 17
25	IRAS 13120-5453	WKK 2031	0.0308	13h15m06.3s	-55d09m23s	ULIRG	NC	16	440 $\pm$ 27
26	IRASF 14378-3651	-	0.0676	14h40m59s	-37d04m32s	ULIRG	Sy2	1	< 100
27	IRAS F11119+3257	B2 1111+32	0.1890	11h14m38.9s	+32d41m33s	ULIRG	NC	17	167 $\pm$ 27
28	IRAS F01572+0009	MRK 1014	0.1631	01h59m50.2s	+00d23m41s	ULIRG/Sy 1.5	NC	18	134 $\pm$ 40
29	IRAS F05024-1941	-	0.1920	05h04m36.5s	-19d37m03s	ULIRG	NC	2	< 276
30	IRAS F05189-2524	-	0.0425	05h21m45s	-25d21m45s	ULIRG	Sy2	2	740 $\pm$ 16
31	IRAS 07251-0248	-	0.0875	07h27m37.5s	-02d54m55s	ULIRG	Faint src	1	< 7
32	IRAS F07599+6508	-	0.1483	08h04m33.1s	+64d59m49s	ULIRG	NC	2	264 $\pm$ 23
33	IRAS 09022-3615	-	0.0596	09h04m12.7s	-36d27m01s	ULIRG	AGN	1	200 $\pm$ 32
34	IRAS F09320+6134	UGC 05101	0.0393	09h35m51.6s	+61d21m11s	ULIRG	OA	1	179 $\pm$ 16
35	IRAS F12072-0444	-	0.1284	12h09m45.1s	-05d01m14s	ULIRG/Sy2	NC	2	< 119
36	IRAS F12112+0305	-	0.0733	12h13m46.0s	+02d48m38s	ULIRG	SB	1	< 110
37	IRAS F14348-1447	-	0.0830	14h37m38.4s	-15d00m20s	ULIRG	CT/SB	1	108 $\pm$ 32
38	IRAS F14394+5332	-	0.1045	14h41m04.4s	+53d20m09s	ULIRG	NC	-	< 72
39	IRAS F15327+2340	ARP 220	0.0181	15h34m57.2s	+23d30m11s	ULIRG/Sy	OA	2	496 $\pm$ 45
40	IRAS F15462-0450	-	0.0997	15h48m56.8s	-04d59m34s	ULIRG/NLSy1	NC	2	100 $\pm$ 30
41	IRAS F19297-0406	-	0.0857	19h32m21.2s	-03d59m56s	ULIRG	NC	1	< 100
42	IRAS 19542+1110	-	0.0649	19h56m35.4s	+11d19m03s	ULIRG	OA	1	80
43	IRAS F20551-4250	ESO 286IG019	0.0429	20h58m26.8s	-42d39m00s	ULIRG	CT	1	280 $\pm$ 21
44	IRAS F23233+2817	-	0.1140	23h25m49.4s	+28d34m21s	ULIRG/Sy2	NC	-	< 129
45	NGC 5506	-	0.0062	14h13m14.9s	-03d12m27s	Sy	NC	19	1480 $\pm$ 90
46	NGC 7479	-	0.0079	23h04m56.6s	+12d19m22s	SB/Sy1.9	NC	20	1390 $\pm$ 30
47	NGC 7172	-	0.0087	22h02m01.9s	-31d52m11s	Sy2	NC	21	720 $\pm$ 60

<sup>A</sup> The classification as obtained from NED.

<sup>B</sup> The galaxy activity as identified by previous X-ray and optical studies: CT=Compton thick, CL=Changing Look, OA=Obscured AGN, LINER=Low ionisation nuclear emission line region, Sy2= Seyfert 2, NLSy1= Narrow line Seyfert 1, SB= starburst, GM=Galaxy mergers, NC=Not classified.

<sup>C</sup> The references to the previous X-ray studies: 1=Iwasawa et al. (2011), 2=Teng & Veilleux (2010), 3=Alatalo et al. (2015), 4=Liu et al. (2014), 5=Costagliola et al. (2016), 6=Aalto et al. (2016), 7=Lehmer et al. (2015), 8=Tsai et al. (2012), 9=Krips et al. (2016), 10=Croston et al. (2008), 11=Marinucci et al. (2016), 12=Cicone et al. (2014), 13=Inui et al. (2005), 14=Herrero-Illana et al. (2014), 15=Lanz et al. (2015), 16=Teng et al. (2015), 17=Tombesi et al. (2015), 18=Ricci et al. (2014), 19=Guainazzi et al. (2010), 2=Akylas & Georgantopoulos (2009), 21=Guainazzi et al. (1998)

<sup>D</sup> The 12 $\mu\text{m}$  monochromatic flux of the galaxies obtained from NASA Extragalactic Database.

TABLE 2  
THE LIST OF SOURCES AND THEIR MOLECULAR OUTFLOW PROPERTIES.

Index	Source	Method used	Reference <sup>B</sup>	Outflow velocity <sup>C</sup> km s <sup>-1</sup>	$M_{\text{out}}$ log( $M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$ )	SFR [ $M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$ ]
1	IRAS F08572+3915 <sup>A</sup>	CO(1-0)	1	800 ± 160	3.082	20
	"	OH	2	700 ± 140	2.98	-
2	IRAS F10565+2448	CO(1-0)	1	450 ± 90	2.477	95
3	IRAS 23365+3604	CO(1-0)	1	450 ± 90	2.230	137
4	Mrk 273	CO(1-0)	1	620 ± 124	2.778	139
5	Mrk 876	CO(1-0)	1	700 ± 140	≤ 3.262	6.5
6	I Zw 1	CO(1-0)	1	500 ± 100	≤ 2.146	36
7	MrK 231 <sup>1</sup>	CO(1-0)	1	700 ± 140	3.02	234
	"	OH	2	600 ± 120	3.07	-
8	NGC 1266	CO(1-0)	1,3	177 ± 100	1.518 – 2.255	1.6
9	M 82	CO(1-0)	1,4	100 ± 100	1.079 – 1.255	10
10	NGC 1377	CO(1-0)	1,5	110 ± 100	1.146 – 1.881	0.9
11	NGC 6240	CO(1-0)	1,6	400 ± 100	2.903	16
12	NGC 3256	CO(1-0)	1,7	250 ± 100	1.041 – 1.204	36
13	NGC 3628	CO(1-0)	1,8	50 ± 100	0.653 – 0.826	1.8
14	NGC 253 <sup>1</sup>	CO(1-0)	1,9	50 ± 100	0.623 – 0.799	3
	"	OH	2	75 ± 100	0.20	-
15	NGC 6764	CO(1-0)	1,10	170 ± 100	0.491 – 0.672	2.6
16	NGC 1068	CO(1-0)	1,11	150 ± 100	1.924	18
17	IC 5063	CO(1-0)	1,12	300 ± 100	1.361 – 2.103	0.6
18	NGC 2146	CO(1-0)	1,13	150 ± 100	1.146 – 1.342	12
19	IRAS 17208-0014 <sup>1</sup>	CO(2-1)	14	600 ± 100	2.518	-
	"	OH	2	100 ± 100	1.954	-
20	NGC 1614	CO(1-0)	14	360 ± 100	1.602	-
21	IRAS 05083+7936	CO(1-0)	15	750 ± 100	-	-
22	IRAS 13451+1232	CO(1-0)	16	750 ± 50	2.361 – 2.903	-
23	3C 293	CO(1-0)	17	350 ± 100	1.397 – 1.477	-
24	NGC 1433	CO(3-2)	18	200 ± 100	0.845	-
25	IRAS 13120-5453	OH	2	520 ± 150	2.113	-
26	IRAS 14378-3651	OH	2	800 ± 150	2.869	-
27	IRAS F11119+3257	OH	19	1000 ± 200	2.903 <sup>+0.400</sup> -0.501	-
28	IRAS F01572+0009	OH	20	892 ± 50	-	-
29	IRAS F05024-1941	OH	20	508 ± 50	-	-
30	IRAS F05189-2524	OH	20	574 ± 50	-	-
31	IRAS 07251-0248	OH	20	255 ± 50	-	-
32	IRAS F07599+6508	OH	20	1000 ± 50	-	-
33	IRAS 09022-3615	OH	20	297 ± 50	-	-
34	IRAS F09320+6134	OH	20	225 ± 50	-	-
35	IRAS F12072-0444	OH	20	321 ± 50	-	-
36	IRAS F12112+0305	OH	20	237 ± 50	-	-
37	IRAS F14348-1447	OH	20	508 ± 50	-	-
38	IRAS F14394+5332	OH	20	495 ± 50	-	-
39	IRAS F15327+2340	OH	20	153 ± 50	-	-
40	IRAS F15462-0450	OH	20	459 ± 50	-	-
41	IRAS F19297-0406	OH	20	532 ± 50	-	-
42	IRAS 19542+1110	OH	20	489 ± 50	-	-
43	IRAS F20551-4250	OH	20	748 ± 50	-	-
44	IRAS F23233+2817	OH	20	423 ± 50	-	-
45	NGC 5506	OH	21	357 ± 50	-	-
46	NGC 7479	OH	21	658 ± 50	-	-
47	NGC 7172	OH	21	207 ± 50	-	-

<sup>A</sup> Sources which have been observed both by CO and OH molecules.

<sup>B</sup> References: 1=Cicone et al. (2014), 2=Sturm et al. (2011), 3=Alatalo et al. (2011), 4=Walter et al. (2002), 5=Aalto et al. (2012), 6=Feruglio et al. (2013), 7=Sakamoto et al. (2006), 8=Tsai et al. (2012), 9=Mauersberger et al. (1996), 10=Sanders & Mirabel (1985), 11=Maiolino et al. (1997), 12=Wiklind et al. (1995), 13=Tsai et al. (2006), 14=García-Burillo et al. (2015), 15=Leroy et al. (2015), 16=Dasyra et al. (2014), 17=Labiano et al. (2014), 18=Combes et al. (2013), 19=Tombesi et al. (2015), 20=Veilleux et al. (2013), 21=Stone et al. (2016)

<sup>C</sup> Different authors have used +ve and -ve notations to denote outflow velocities (blue shifted) with respect to the systemic velocity. To avoid confusion and maintain uniformity, we have considered the modulus of the velocities

TABLE 3  
DETAILS OF X-RAY OBSERVATIONS.

Index	Source	Telescope	observation ID	Observation Date	Exposure (ks)	Net Exposure (ks)	Total counts
1	IRAS F08572+3915	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0200630101	13-04-2004	29	14	2.28e+02
2	IRAS F10565+2448	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0150320201	17-06-2003	32	25	1.307e+03
3	IRAS 23365+3604	<i>Chandra</i>	4115	03-02-2003	10	10	74
4	Mrk 273	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0722610201	04-11-2013	23	6	9.81e+02
5	Mrk 876	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0102040601	14-11-2002	13	0.1	3.06e+02
6	I Zw 1	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0743050301	19-01-2015	141	20	1.81e+05
7	Mrk 231	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0770580501	28-05-2015	26	21	3.63e+03
8	NGC 1266	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0693520101	23-07-2012	139	96	9.80e+03
9	M 82	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0206080101	21-04-2004	104	62	3.08e+05
10	NGC 1377	<i>Chandra</i>	16086	10-12-2013	48	44	2.06e+02
11	NGC 6240	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0147420201	14-03-2003	42	4	2.61e+03
12	NGC 3256	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0300430101	06-12-2005	134	97	5.54e+04
13	NGC 3628	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0110980101	27-11-2000	65	38	6.29e+03
14	NGC 253	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0152020101	19-06-2003	141	-	-
15	NGC 6764	<i>Chandra</i>	9269	20-01-2008	20	20	5.89e+02
16	NGC 1068	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0740060201	10-07-2014	64	44	5.26e+05
17	IC 5063	<i>Chandra</i>	7878	15-06-2007	35	34	5.37e+03
18	NGC 2146	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0110930101	26-08-2001	27	12	6.34e+03
19	IRAS 17208-0014	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0081340601	19-02-2002	19	12	6.89e+02
20	NGC 1614	<i>Chandra</i>	15050	21-11-2012	16	16	8.33e+02
21	IRAS 05083+7936	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	009400101	11-09-2001	33	26	9.59e+02
22	IRAS 13451+1232	<i>Chandra</i>	836	24-02-2000	28	25	1.42e+03
23	3C 293	<i>Chandra</i>	12712	16-11-2010	69	68	2.12e+03
24	NGC 1433	<i>Chandra</i>	16345	04-03-2015	49	49	3.30e+02
25	IRAS 13120-5453	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0693520201	20-02-2013	129	85	6.15e+03
26	IRAS 14378-3651	<i>Chandra</i>	7889	25-06-2007	14	14	1.05e+02
27	IRAS F11119+3257	<i>Chandra</i>	3137	30-06-2002	19	18	2.89e+03
28	IRAS F01572+0009	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0101640201	29-07-2000	15	5	6.42e+03
29	IRAS F05024-1941	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0405950401	07-02-2007	42	26	6.89e+02
30	IRAS F05189-2524	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0722610101	02-10-2013	38	30	1.48e+04
31	IRAS 07251-0248	<i>Chandra</i>	7804	01-12-2006	16	15	7.80e+01
32	IRAS F07599+6508	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0094400301	24-10-2001	23	16	7.12e+02
33	IRAS 09022-3615	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0670300401	23-04-2012	33	16	1.16e+03
34	IRAS F09320+6134	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0085640201	12-11-2001	35	26	1.49e+03
35	IRAS F12072-0444	<i>Chandra</i>	4109	01-02-2003	10	10	7.3e+01
36	IRAS F12112+0305	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0081340801	30-12-2001	23	18	4.92e+02
37	IRAS F14348-1447	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0081341401	29-07-2002	22	15	7.97e+02
38	IRAS F14394+5332	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0651100301	06-07-2015	13	8	3.31e+02
39	IRAS F15327+2340	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0205510201	14-01-2005	35	6.3	5.09e+02
40	IRAS F15462-0450	<i>Chandra</i>	10348	23-04-2009	15	15	6.08e+02
41	IRAS F19297-0406	<i>Chandra</i>	7890	18-06-2007	17	-	-
42	IRAS 19542+1110	<i>Chandra</i>	7817	10-09-2007	15	15	4.27e+02
43	IRAS F20551-4250	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0081340401	21-04-2001	22	11	1.07e+03
44	IRAS F23233+2817	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0553870101	15-12-2008	80	52	2.07e+03
45	NGC 5506	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0554170101	02-01-2009	90	61	7.94e+05
46	NGC 7479	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0301651201	24-06-2005	16	0.57	9.8e+01
47	NGC 7172	<i>XMM-Newton</i>	0414580101	24-04-2007	58	28	9.81e+04

TABLE 4  
THE X-RAY PROPERTIES OF THE SOURCES WITH MO.

Index	Source	$F_{0.6-2 \text{ keV}}$ erg cm $^{-2}$ s $^{-1}$	$F_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ erg cm $^{-2}$ s $^{-1}$	$L_{0.6-2 \text{ keV}}$ erg s $^{-1}$	$L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ erg s $^{-1}$	KT $_1$ APEC	KT $_2$ APEC	$\Gamma$	$N_{\text{H}}$ cm $^{-2}$	$\chi^2/dof$
1	IRAS F08572+3915	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	IRAS F10565+2448	0	$-13.345^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	0	$41.25 \pm 0.05$	-	-	$2.17^{+0.23}_{-0.23}$	0	72/54 $\sim$ 1.54
3	IRAS 23365+3604	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	Mrk 273	$-13.44 \pm 0.05$	$-12.35^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	$41.43 \pm 0.04$	$42.25 \pm 0.05$	-	-	$1.98 \pm 0.32$	$< 10^{20}$	70/37 $\sim$ 1.90
5	Mrk 876	0	$-11.47^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	0	$44.11 \pm 0.04$	-	-	$2.04^{+0.17}_{-0.18}$	0	14/11 $\sim$ 1.27
6	I Zw 1	$-10.99 \pm 0.01$	$-11.21^{+0.005}_{-0.005}$	$43.84 \pm 0.01$	$43.63 \pm 0.02$	-	-	$2.37^{+0.08}_{-0.04}$	$4.5 \times 10^{20}$	307/219 $\sim$ 1.41
7	Mrk 231	$-10.64 \pm 0.02$	$-12.14^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	$43.93 \pm 0.02$	$42.42 \pm 0.04$	$0.25 \pm 0.10$	$0.80 \pm 0.10$	1.8*	$0.91^{+0.17}_{-0.17} \times 10^{22}$	181/117 $\sim$ 1.55
8	NGC 1266	$-10.95 \pm 0.01$	$-13.15^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$	$41.98 \pm 0.01$	$39.78 \pm 0.05$	$0.08 \pm 0.02$	$0.16 \pm 0.05$	$1.79^{+0.3}_{-0.3}$	$0.78^{+0.02}_{-0.02} \times 10^{22}$	231/124 $\sim$ 1.87
9	M 82	-	$-10.90^{+0.002}_{-0.002}$	-	$40.32 \pm 0.06$	$0.82 \pm 0.12$	-	$1.83^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.29^{+0.1}_{-0.1} \times 10^{22}$	818/239 $\sim$ 3.42
10	NGC 1377 $^1$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	NGC 6240	$-12.78 \pm 0.05$	$-11.80^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$41.87 \pm 0.02$	$42.28 \pm 0.05$	$0.03 \pm 0.01$	-	$1.90^{+0.27}_{-0.27}$	0	149/77 $\sim$ 1.94
12	NGC 3256	$-13.51 \pm 0.02$	$-12.35^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$41.06 \pm 0.02$	$40.97 \pm 0.03$	$0.62 \pm 0.22$	$1.10 \pm 0.02$	$2.40^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	$0.24^{+0.02}_{-0.02} \times 10^{22}$	443/193 $\sim$ 2.32
13	NGC 3628	$-20.30 \pm 0.02$	$-12.26^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	0	$40.22 \pm 0.04$	$0.10 \pm 0.02$	-	$1.50^{+0.08}_{-0.08}$	$0.30^{+0.04}_{-0.04} \times 10^{22}$	172/154 $\sim$ 1.12
14	NGC 253	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	NGC 6764	$-13.23 \pm 0.04$	$-13.19^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	$40.16 \pm 0.04$	$39.85 \pm 0.05$	$0.98 \pm 0.05$	-	$> 2.28$	$0.25^{+0.21}_{-0.09} \times 10^{22}$	67/72 $\sim$ 0.93
16	NGC 1068	-	$-11.29^{+0.005}_{-0.005}$	-	$40.95 \pm 0.11$	-	-	$1.92^{+0.2}_{-0.2}$	0	505/175 $\sim$ 2.88
17	IC 5063	$-13.35 \pm 0.03$	$-10.79^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$40.25 \pm 0.03$	$42.57 \pm 0.03$	$0.81 \pm 0.14$	$< 2.4$	1.8*	$21.47^{+0.92}_{-0.92} \times 10^{22}$	612/490 $\sim$ 1.25
18	NGC 2146	$-12.71 \pm 0.03$	$-12.00^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$39.50 \pm 0.03$	$40.20 \pm 0.03$	$0.77 \pm 0.15$	-	$1.59^{+0.12}_{-0.10}$	$0.20^{+0.11}_{-0.11} \times 10^{22}$	329/119 $\sim$ 2.77
19	IRAS 17208-0014	$-13.88 \pm 0.15$	$-12.98^{+0.2}_{-0.2}$	$40.68 \pm 0.17$	$41.59 \pm 0.15$	$0.76 \pm 0.23$	-	1.8*	$6.23^{+18}_{-5} \times 10^{22}$	14/27
20	NGC 1614	$-13.35 \pm 0.20$	$-12.86^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$40.33 \pm 0.20$	$40.82 \pm 0.18$	$0.79 \pm 0.13$	-	1.8*	$0.24^{+0.24}_{-0.22} \times 10^{22}$	108/110 $\sim$ 0.98
21	IRAS 05083+7936	$-13.98 \pm 0.13$	$-13.28^{+0.12}_{-0.02}$	$40.79 \pm 0.13$	$41.49 \pm 0.11$	$0.75 \pm 0.11$	-	1.8*	$4.89^{+4.92}_{-3.52} \times 10^{22}$	79/38 $\sim$ 2.08
22	IRAS 13451+1232	$-14.16 \pm 0.08$	$-11.89^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$41.63 \pm 0.08$	$43.64 \pm 0.09$	$0.61 \pm 0.17$	-	$1.69^{+0.30}_{-0.20}$	$3.23^{+0.52}_{-0.52} \times 10^{22}$	182/230 $\sim$ 0.79
23	3C 293	$-14.06 \pm 0.03$	$-11.78^{+0.01}_{-0.09}$	$41.07 \pm 0.03$	$42.85 \pm 0.04$	$1.06 \pm 0.29$	$< 2.11$	$< 1.4$	$7.42^{+0.82}_{-0.82} \times 10^{22}$	262/320 $\sim$ 0.820
24	NGC 1433	$-13.43 \pm 0.07$	$-13.32^{+0.09}_{-0.07}$	$38.91 \pm 0.07$	$39.02 \pm 0.08$	$0.52 \pm 0.10$	-	1.8	0	44/51 $\sim$ 0.86
25	IRAS 13120-5453	$-13.98 \pm 0.02$	$-12.76^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$40.32 \pm 0.02$	$41.54 \pm 0.05$	$1.24 \pm 0.1$	-	$1.50^{+0.08}_{-0.15}$	$0.22^{+0.03}_{-0.03} \times 10^{22}$	223/146 $\sim$ 1.53
26	IRAS 14378-3651 $^1$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	IRAS F11119+3257	$-14.19 \pm 0.05$	$-11.79^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$41.76 \pm 0.05$	$44.16 \pm 0.11$	$0.40 \pm 0.15$	-	$1.83^{+0.13}_{-0.13}$	$0.83^{+0.09}_{-0.09} \times 10^{22}$	282/280 $\sim$ 1.00
28	IRAS F01572+0009	$-14.73 \pm 0.20$	$-12.07^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$41.07 \pm 0.21$	$43.73 \pm 0.12$	$0.07 \pm 0.02$	-	$2.26^{+0.10}_{-0.10}$	$< 0.009 \times 10^{22}$	103/85 $\sim$ 1.21
29	IRAS F05024-1941	$-14.72 \pm 0.20$	$-13.46^{+0.3}_{-0.2}$	$41.24 \pm 0.21$	$42.50 \pm 0.18$	$< 2.16$	-	1.8	0	25/25 $\sim$ 1.00
30	IRAS F05189-2524	$-13.14 \pm 0.02$	$-11.25^{+0.005}_{-0.005}$	$41.42 \pm 0.02$	$43.31 \pm 0.11$	$0.09 \pm 0.02$	-	$1.86^{+0.11}_{-0.10}$	$6.61^{+0.70}_{-0.70} \times 10^{22}$	286/209 $\sim$ 1.37
31	IRAS 07251-0248	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	IRAS F07599+6508	$-13.90 \pm 0.08$	$< -11.34$	$41.81 \pm 0.08$	$43.37 \pm 0.12$	$0.11 \pm 0.02$	$0.75 \pm 0.02$	1.8*	0	17/27 $\sim$ 0.64
33	IRAS 09022-3615	$-14.15 \pm 0.45$	$-12.70^{+0.09}_{-0.09}$	$40.73 \pm 0.45$	$42.19 \pm 0.42$	$0.64 \pm 0.32$	-	1.8*	0	63/48 $\sim$ 1.32
34	IRAS F09320+6134	$-13.53 \pm 0.03$	$-11.83^{+0.07}_{-0.07}$	$40.97 \pm 0.04$	$42.67 \pm 0.05$	$0.85 \pm 0.21$	-	1.8*	0	82/62 $\sim$ 1.34
35	IRAS F12072-0444	$-14.25 \pm 0.03$	$-13.05^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$	$41.33 \pm 0.20$	$42.53 \pm 0.18$	$< 0.99$	-	1.8*	0	1.4/2 $\sim$ 0.71
36	IRAS F12112+0305	$-14.69 \pm 0.05$	$-13.47^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$	$40.39 \pm 0.20$	41.60	$< 0.68$	-	1.8*	0	20/17 $\sim$ 1.19
37	IRAS F14348-1447	0	$-13.22^{+0.13}_{-0.11}$	0	$41.96 \pm 0.12$	-	-	1.8*	0	32/32 $\sim$ 1.0
38	IRAS F14394+5332	0	$-13.41^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	0	$41.97 \pm 0.11$	-	-	1.8*	0	12/10 $\sim$ 1.2
39	IRAS F15327+2340	$-13.40 \pm 0.20$	$-12.66^{+0.11}_{-0.20}$	$40.67 \pm 0.21$	$41.17 \pm 0.15$	$0.73 \pm 0.15$	-	1.8*	0	38/18 $\sim$ 2.15
40	IRAS F15462-0450	$-14.23 \pm 0.22$	$-12.38^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	$41.11 \pm 0.26$	$42.97 \pm 0.23$	$0.25 \pm 0.14$	-	1.8*	0	72/95 $\sim$ 0.77
41	IRAS 19297-0406	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
42	IRAS 19542+1110	$-14.03 \pm 0.09$	$-12.32^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	$40.90 \pm 0.18$	$42.61 \pm 0.14$	$> 1.92$	-	1.8*	0	68/61 $\sim$ 1.12
43	IRAS F20551-4250	$-13.62 \pm 0.18$	$-12.99^{+0.15}_{-0.15}$	$40.94 \pm 0.18$	$41.57 \pm 0.15$	$0.60 \pm 0.25$	-	1.8*	0	52/39 $\sim$ 1.34
44	IRAS F23233+2817	$-18.61 \pm 0.05$	$-13.95^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	0	$41.50 \pm 0.15$	$< 0.04$	-	1.8*	0	71/70 $\sim$ 1.0
45	NGC 5506	$-12.12 \pm 0.01$	$-9.866^{+0.001}_{-0.001}$	$40.86 \pm 0.01$	$43.11 \pm 0.05$	-	-	$1.78^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$3.09^{+0.03}_{-0.03} \times 10^{22}$	453/261 $\sim$ 1.74
46	NGC 7479	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
47	NGC 7172	$-13.24 \pm 0.03$	$-10.16^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	-	$42.91 \pm 0.06$	$0.75 \pm 0.14$	$< 2.5$	$1.56^{+0.08}_{-0.04}$	$7.79^{+0.30}_{-0.20} \times 10^{22}$	267/269 $\sim$ 1.07

\* Sources for which the powerlaw slope  $\Gamma$  could not be constrained and hence fixed to  $\Gamma = 1.8$ .



TABLE 5  
THE  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  LUMINOSITY OF THE MOX SOURCES OBTAINED USING DIFFERENT METHODS AND THE FINAL LIST OF VALUES USED IN THE CORRELATIONS.

Index	Source	$\log L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ (XMM/Chandra) <sup>1</sup> erg s <sup>-1</sup>	$\log L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ ( <i>NuSTAR</i> ) <sup>2</sup> erg s <sup>-1</sup>	$\log L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ Final selection <sup>5</sup> erg s <sup>-1</sup>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1	IRAS F08572+3915(CT)	†41.38 <sup>a</sup>	—	43.38 <sup>#</sup>
2	IRAS F10565+2448	41.25	—	41.25
3	IRAS 23365+3604	†41.51 <sup>b</sup>	—	41.51
4	Mrk 273	42.25	42.93 <sup>A</sup>	42.93
5	Mrk 876	44.11	—	44.11
6	I Zw 1	43.62	—	43.62
7	MrK 231	42.42	42.47 <sup>B</sup>	42.47
8	NGC 1266	39.78	—	39.78
9	M 82	40.32	—	40.32
10	NGC 1377(CT)	†39.00 <sup>c</sup>	—	41.00 <sup>#</sup>
11	NGC 6240(CT)	42.28	43.84 <sup>C</sup>	43.84
12	NGC 3256	40.96	40.04 <sup>D</sup>	40.96
13	NGC 3628	40.22	—	40.22
14	NGC 253	†39.00 <sup>d</sup>	39.47 <sup>E</sup>	39.47
15	NGC 6764	39.85	—	39.85
16	NGC 1068(CT)	40.95	43.84 <sup>F</sup>	43.84
17	IC 5063	42.57	—	42.57
18	NGC 2146	40.20	—	40.20
19	IRAS 17208-0014	41.58	—	41.58
20	NGC 1614	40.82	—	40.82
21	IRAS 05083+7936	41.49	—	41.49
22	IRAS 13451+1232	43.64	—	43.64
23	3C 293	42.85	—	42.85
24	NGC 1433	39.01	—	39.01
25	IRAS 13120-5453(CT)	41.54	43.09 <sup>G</sup>	43.09
26	IRAS 14378-3651	†41.53 <sup>e</sup>	—	41.96
27	IRAS F11119+3257	44.16	—	44.16
28	IRAS F01572+0009	43.73	—	43.73
29	IRAS F05024-1941	42.50	—	42.50
30	IRAS F05189-2524	43.31	43.56 <sup>H</sup>	43.56
31	IRAS 07251-0248	†43.20 <sup>f</sup>	—	43.20
32	IRAS F07599+6508	43.37	42.70 <sup>I</sup>	43.37
33	IRAS 09022-3615	42.18	43.14 <sup>J</sup>	43.14
34	IRAS F09320+6134	42.67	—	42.67
35	IRAS F12072-0444	42.53	—	42.53
36	IRAS F12112+0305	41.60	—	41.60
37	IRAS F14348-1447(CT)	41.96	—	43.96 <sup>#</sup>
38	IRAS F14394+5332	41.97	—	41.97
39	IRAS F15327+2340	41.16	—	41.16
40	IRAS F15462-0450	45.96	—	42.96
41	IRAS F19297-0406	†41.25 <sup>g</sup>	—	41.25
42	IRAS 19542+1110	42.62	—	42.61
43	IRAS F20551-4250(CT)	41.57	—	43.57 <sup>#</sup>
44	IRAS F23233+2817	41.50	—	41.50
45	NGC 5506	43.11	—	43.11
46	NGC 7479	†42.00 <sup>*</sup>	—	42.00
47	NGC 7172	42.90	—	42.90

<sup>#</sup>The C-thick sources for which we multiplied the  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  obtained in Column 3 by a factor of 100.

<sup>†</sup> The  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  of the MOX sources estimated using the hardness ratio method.

Columns 1 & 2: The source indices and names.

Column 3: The  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values of the MOX sources obtained using X-ray spectral fits and HR method using *XMM-Newton* and *Chandra* observations.

References for HR method: a=Teng & Veilleux (2010), b=Iwasawa et al. (2011), c=Aalto et al. (2016), d=Krips et al. (2016), e=Iwasawa et al.

(2011), f=Nardini & Risaliti (2011), g=Iwasawa et al. (2011)

Column 4: The intrinsic  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values obtained using *NuSTAR* observations.

References for *NuSTAR* observations: A=Teng et al. (2015), B=Teng et al. (2014); Reynolds et al. (2017), C=Puccetti et al. (2016), D=Lehmer et al. (2015),

E=Lehmer et al. (2013), F=Marinucci et al. (2016), G=Teng et al. (2015), H=Teng et al. (2015), I=Luo et al. (2014), J=Oda et al. (2017)

Column 5: The final set of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  values of the MOX sources used in the correlations and analysis throughout this work.

<sup>\*</sup> This was obtained using broad band X-ray spectroscopy using *XMM-Newton* observations by Brightman & Nandra (2011).

TABLE 6  
THE  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$  OF THE MOX SOURCES CALCULATED USING TWO METHODS.

Index	Source	$L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}^a$ ( $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ , X-ray spectra) $\text{erg s}^{-1}$	$L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}^c$ $12 \mu\text{m}$ flux ( $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ , $12\mu\text{m}$ ) $\text{erg s}^{-1}$
1	IRAS F08572+3915	43.38	44.27
2	IRAS F10565+2448	41.25	42.71
3	IRAS 23365+3604	41.51	43.61
4	Mrk 273	42.93	43.48
5	Mrk 876	44.11	44.52
6	I Zw 1	43.62	44.76
7	Mrk 231	42.47	44.76
8	NGC 1266	39.78	41.90
9	M 82	40.32	40.24
10	NGC 1377	41.00	41.99
11	NGC 6240	43.84	43.81
12	NGC 3256	40.96	40.94
13	NGC 3628	40.22	40.19
14	NGC 253	39.47	–
15	NGC 6764	39.85	40.99
16	NGC 1068	43.84	42.95
17	IC 5063	42.57	43.46
18	NGC 2146	40.20	39.83
19	IRAS 17208-0014	41.58	42.70
20	NGC 1614	40.82	–
21	IRAS 05083+7936	41.49	–
22	IRAS 13451+1232	43.64	44.63
23	3C 293	42.85	–
24	NGC 1433	39.01	–
25	IRAS 13120-5453	43.09	43.55
26	IRAS 14378-3651	41.96	43.41
27	IRAS F11119+3257	44.16	45.08
28	IRAS F01572+0009	43.73	44.76
29	IRAS F05024-1941	42.50	44.31
30	IRAS F05189-2524	43.56	44.34
31	IRAS 07251-0248	43.20	43.63
32	IRAS F07599+6508	43.37	45.09
33	IRAS 09022-3615	43.14	43.99
34	IRAS F09320+6134	42.67	43.59
35	IRAS F12072-0444	42.53	44.57
36	IRAS F12112+0305	41.60	43.46
37	IRAS F14348-1447	43.96	43.54
38	IRAS F14394+5332	41.97	44.10
39	IRAS F15327+2340	41.16	42.43
40	IRAS F15462-0450	42.96	44.18
41	IRAS F19297-0406	41.25	43.64
42	IRAS 19542+1110	42.61	43.34
43	IRAS F20551-4250	43.57	43.84
44	IRAS F23233+2817	41.50	44.27
45	NGC 5506	43.11	43.22
46	NGC 7479	42.	43.11
47	NGC 7172	42.90	43.00

<sup>a</sup> The 2 – 10 keV luminosity obtained in Table 5 column 7.

<sup>c</sup> The 2 – 10 keV luminosity obtained from the  $12 \mu\text{m}$  flux as described in section 2.3.

TABLE 7  
TOTAL BOLOMETRIC LUMINOSITY, AGN LUMINOSITY AND THE X-RAY BOLOMETRIC CORRECTION FRACTION OF THE SOURCES.

Index	Source	$\log L_{\text{bol}}$ erg s $^{-1}$	$\alpha_{\text{AGN}}$ (in %)	$\log L_{\text{AGN}}$	References for $\alpha_{\text{AGN}}$	$\log(L_{2-10 \text{ keV, X-ray spectra}}/L_{\text{AGN}})^a$	$\log(L_{2-10 \text{ keV, } 12\mu\text{m}}/L_{\text{AGN}})^a$
1	IRAS F08572+3915	45.78	70.4	45.62	1	-2.24	-1.36
2	IRAS F10565+2448	45.68	47.1	45.35	1	-4.10	-2.64
3	IRAS 23365+3604	45.80	44.6	45.45	1	-3.93	-1.83
4	Mrk 273	45.79	34.2	45.32	1	-2.39	-1.84
5	Mrk 876	45.87	92.6	45.83	1	-1.72	-1.32
6	I Zw 1	45.59	90.1	45.54	1	-1.92	-0.97
7	Mrk 231	46.18	80.5	46.08	1	-3.62	-1.32
8	NGC 1266	43.91	25	43.30	2	-3.52	-1.40
9	M 82	44.58	0.09	41.53	2	-1.21	-1.29
10	NGC 1377	43.63	20	42.93	2	-1.93	-0.94
11	NGC 6240	45.48	78	45.37	1	-1.53	-1.56
12	NGC 3256	45.12	0.07	41.96	2	-1.00	-1.02
13	NGC 3628	43.83	0.09	40.78	2	-0.56	-0.59
14	NGC 253	44.06	0.04	40.66	2	-	-
15	NGC 6764	43.99	1.7	42.22	2	-2.37	-1.23
16	NGC 1068	44.95	9.7	43.94	2	-0.09	-0.98
17	IC 5063	44.34	90	44.29	2	-1.72	-0.83
18	NGC 2146	44.61	0.03	41.08	2	-0.88	-1.25
19	IRAS 17208-0014	46.08	5	44.77	1	-3.19	-2.07
20	NGC 1614	45.34	0	0	4	-	-
21	IRAS 05083+7936	45.63	0	0	1	-	-
22	IRAS 13451+1232	45.96	80.6	45.87	1	-2.23	-1.26
23	3C 293	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	NGC 1433	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	IRAS 13120-5453	45.88	33.4	45.40	1	-2.31	-1.85
26	IRAS 14378-3651	45.75	21.1	45.07	1	-3.11	-1.66
27	IRAS F11119+3257	46.29	80	46.19	1	-2.03	-1.11
28	IRAS F01572+0009	46.26	64.6	46.07	1	-2.34	-1.31
29	IRAS F05024-1941	46.01	7.3	44.87	1	-2.37	-0.56
30	IRAS F05189-2524	45.80	71.7	45.65	1	-2.09	-1.31
31	IRAS 07251-0248	46.03	30.0	45.51	1	-2.30	-1.87
32	IRAS F07599+6508	46.17	87.6	46.11	1	-2.74	-1.02
33	IRAS 09022-3615	45.93	54.9	45.66	1	-2.53	-1.67
34	IRAS F09320+6134	45.63	56.4	45.38	1	-2.71	-1.79
35	IRAS F12072-0444	46.04	74.8	45.91	1	-3.38	-1.34
36	IRAS F12112+0305	45.96	17.8	45.21	1	-3.61	-1.75
37	IRAS F14348-1447	45.98	17.4	45.22	1	-1.26	-2.68
38	IRAS F14394+5332	45.75	62.5	45.54	1	-3.57	-1.44
39	IRAS F15327+2340	45.80	5.8	44.56	1	-3.40	-2.13
40	IRAS F15462-0450	45.85	60.6	45.63	1	-2.67	-1.45
41	IRAS F19297-0406	46.02	23.4	45.38	1	-4.13	-1.74
42	IRAS 19542+1110	45.70	25.5	45.11	1	-2.49	-1.76
43	IRAS F20551-4250	45.69	56.9	45.44	1	-1.87	-1.60
44	IRAS F23233+2817	45.69	44.6	45.33	1	-3.84	-1.06
45	NGC 5506	44.21	93.3	44.18	3	-1.06	-0.95
46	NGC 7479	43.49	83.7	43.41	3	-1.41	-0.30
47	NGC 7172	44.37	92.4	44.33	3	-1.44	-1.33

References: 1=Veilleux et al. (2013) 2=Cicone et al. (2014), 3= Stone et al. (2016), 4=Armus et al. (2009)

<sup>a</sup> See Section 4.1 for the definition of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV, X-ray spectra}}$  and  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV, } 12\mu\text{m}}$ .

TABLE 8  
CORRELATION RESULTS BETWEEN PARAMETERS  $x$  AND  $y$  ( $y = ax + b$ ).

Correlation	$a$	Dev( $a$ )	$b$	Dev( $b$ )	$R_S$	$P_{\text{null}}$	Data points
$L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ vs MO vel	150	18	-5901	766	0.56	$4 \times 10^{-5}$	47
$L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ vs MO $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$	0.55	0.07	-21	2.89	0.76	$1.1 \times 10^{-5}$	25
$L_{2-10 \text{ keV, } 12\mu\text{m}}$ vs MO vel	180	24	-7382	1063	0.70	$2.6 \times 10^{-7}$	43
$L_{2-10 \text{ keV, } 12\mu\text{m}}$ vs MO $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$	0.51	0.06	-19	2.40	0.81	$3.8 \times 10^{-6}$	22
$L_{0.6-2 \text{ keV}}$ vs MO vel	173	37	-6686	1520	0.59	$4 \times 10^{-4}$	31
$L_{0.6-2 \text{ keV}}$ vs MO $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$	0.52	0.08	-19.58	3.31	0.83	$2.5 \times 10^{-5}$	17
$L_{\text{AGN}}$ vs MO vel	155	18	-6511	813	0.70	$1.48 \times 10^{-7}$	43
$L_{\text{AGN}}$ vs MO $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$	0.45	0.04	-17.93	1.93	0.86	$3.8 \times 10^{-7}$	25
$L_{\text{Starburst}}$ vs MO vel	197	61	-8437	2775	0.40	0.008	43
$L_{\text{Starburst}}$ vs MO $\dot{M}_{\text{out}}$	1.02	0.16	-43.99	7.22	0.57	0.005	22

## APPENDIX

## A. THE BEST FIT SPECTRA AND MODELS

In this section we show the best fit data for the sources in the MOX sample, along with the best fit model and the residuals after the data have been fitted with the model. For sources with counts  $\leq 200$  we have shown the spectra for viewing purpose only as we have used HR method to calculate the luminosity.




FIG. A10.— The X-ray data, the best fit model and the residuals of the sources. For the sources where the low counts do not allow us to carry out standard fitting, we have plotted just the X-ray data. See Section 4 for details.




FIG. A11. — Continued from Fig. A10.




FIG. A12. — Same as Fig. A10 except that for these sources we only have outflow velocity estimates and not the molecular gas mass outflow rate.




FIG. A13 — Same as Fig. A12



## B. DESCRIPTION OF THE INDIVIDUAL SOURCES IN THE MOX SAMPLE.

1. IRAS F08572+3915: This is a double nucleus ULIRG. The source has been identified as Compton thick (Teng & Veilleux 2010), and the previous studies have estimated an absorption column density of  $\sim 10^{25} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ . The powerlaw photon index  $\Gamma = -0.43$  is not constrained due to low counts. The authors classified this as a weak ULIRG. This source has also been studied by Iwasawa et al. (2011) using *Chandra* observations. The source luminosity estimated by the authors are  $L_{\text{SX}} = 8.0 \times 10^{40} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  and  $L_{\text{HX}} = 2.0 \times 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  in the soft and the hard band respectively. Nustar hard X-ray studies were carried out by Teng et al. (2015) and the authors conclude that the source is X-ray weak and could not be detected in any of the *NuSTAR* energy bands. The molecular outflows in this source has been detected using IRAM PDBI telescope with the CO(1-0) emission line (Cicone et al. 2014).

In our analysis, we found that this source has very low counts and hence HR method was used to calculate the 2 – 10 keV luminosity.

2. IRAS F10565+2448: This is a pair of interacting spiral galaxies, and is a heavily obscured source. Teng & Veilleux (2010) studied this source using *Chandra* observation and have estimated an absorption column density of  $0.05_{-0.04}^{+0.07} \times 10^{22} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ , implying a Compton thin obscurer. The estimated powerlaw  $\Gamma = 1.62_{-0.13}^{+0.14}$ . Iwasawa et al. (2011) studied the *Chandra* observation of this source and have estimated a luminosity of  $L_{\text{SX}} = 1.21 \times 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  and  $L_{\text{HX}} = 1.6 \times 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . The authors mention that the hard X-ray emission is point like but the soft X-ray emission is much more extended up to 7". Nustar hard X-ray studies carried out by Teng et al. (2015) could not detect the source in any energy band of *NuSTAR*.

We could not constrain the intrinsic neutral absorption for this source. The best fit photon index is  $\Gamma = 2.17_{-0.23}^{+0.23}$ . In addition we required an absorption edge at 0.34 keV.

3. IRAS 23365+3604: Iwasawa et al. (2011) studied the *Chandra* data of this source and found that it is a heavily obscured source. A faint X-ray source is present in the nucleus, which however could not be studied properly because of the short exposure of the observation ( $\sim 10$  ks). The hard X-ray color HR=-0.22 points to the fact that this object is an AGN, which is Compton thick. This source was also studied by Teng et al. (2005), who found  $\Gamma = 1.10_{-0.25}^{+0.35}$  and an absorption column density of  $50_{-27}^{+39} \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ .

Due to lack of counts, HR method was used to calculate the 2 – 10 keV luminosity .

4. MRK 273: Classified as Seyfert 2 (NED). Hernández-García et al. (2015) classified the candidate as a changing look candidate with both Compton thick and thin signatures available from different observations. Nustar hard X-ray studies were carried out by Teng et al. (2015) and an intrinsic luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 8.55 \times 10^{42} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  was derived.

In our study, we detected a broad Fe K line which was modeled by diskline profile. Soft X-ray emission lines were modeled using a Gaussian profile. We could not detect any neutral absorption intrinsic to the source. The powerlaw slope  $\Gamma < 1.58$  is very flat.

5. MRK 876: This is a Seyfert 1 galaxy and has a strong AGN at its centre. Early studies by Erkens et al. (1995) confirm the source to be variable in X-rays and UV. The Swift/XRT data studied by Bottacini et al. (2015) found a broad Fe K $\alpha$  emission line. The Fe K line was also studied by de La Calle Pérez et al. (2010) using *XMM-Newton* data. Piconcelli et al. (2005) had studied this source as a part of a sample of PG quasars, and reported  $L_{2-10} = 1.78 \times 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ .

In our work, the data quality being poor, we could not constrain any intrinsic neutral absorption. The spectra just required an absorbed powerlaw, and the slope could be constrained. We derived similar X-ray luminosity as those of Piconcelli et al. (2005). The *NuSTAR* observation of this source is not yet made public.

6. I Zw 1: This is a narrow line Sy 1 galaxy, and is highly variable. An extensive X-ray study of this source has been done by Gallo et al. (2007) and Piconcelli et al. (2005) studied the source as a part of a sample of PG quasars.

For this source we detected two components of warm absorbers. There was also the presence of a broad Fe K emission line and a neutral intrinsic absorption column.

7. MRK 231: Obscured source with a strong AGN, studied by Teng & Veilleux (2010). A connection between MO and UFO is found in this source by Feruglio et al. (2015). The authors confirm an energy conserving mechanism responsible for creating the molecular outflows from the UFOs. *Chandra* imaging and spectroscopy has been carried out by Veilleux et al. (2014). A Nustar hard X-ray view of this source has been carried out by Teng et al. (2015). A separate study using Nustar data focussing only on this source has been carried out by Teng et al. (2014), and the authors measured an X-ray luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 3.94 \times 10^{42} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . The authors concluded that this source is a Compton thin AGN.

We found that this source has a complex spectrum which required one component of warm absorber, one component of thermal emission (*APEC*), a neutral intrinsic absorption as well as a broad Fe K emission line. The powerlaw slope is flat and its lower value is pegged at  $\Gamma = 1.5$ .

8. NGC 1266: A nearby lenticular galaxy, harbouring an AGN which powers a massive MO detected in this source which harbours an AGN (Alatalo et al. 2015). Apart from extensive analysis of *Chandra* and *XMM* data, a multiwaveband study was carried out by the authors, where they detected a soft emission from starburst, a powerlaw and Fe K line from the AGN. The intrinsic absorption column density estimated for this source from IR studies of (Alatalo et al. 2015) is  $N_{\text{H}} = 3 \times 10^{24} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ , almost 3 orders of magnitude higher than that found using X-ray studies. Suppression of Star formation in this S.B galaxy is

studied by Alatalo et al. (2015). There is *NuSTAR* observation of this source but there is no published study.

In our study we found that this source has a complex spectrum which required a soft thermal component (*APEC*) along with a warm absorber, a neutral intrinsic absorber, and soft X-ray emission lines at 1.48 keV and 1.85 keV in the observer's frame. The Fe K line was not detected due to poor SNR.

9. M 82: This is a starburst dominated galaxy. Liu et al. (2014) studied the nuclear region of the source with 500 ks Chandra data. Fe K  $\alpha$  line is detected, and most of the hard X-ray emission 2 – 8 keV has a thermal origin. A weakly broadened Fe K line was detected by Caballero-García (2011).

The spectrum is complex with several discrete emission features in the soft X-ray band. We could not obtain a good statistical fit to the data with the baseline models used in this work. We detected narrow Fe K emission. A neutral intrinsic absorber has also been detected.

10. NGC 1377: Chandra and Swift data not published, hence no previous studies available for this source.

The source photon counts being weak, the HR method was used in our work.

11. NGC 6240: Mostly Compton thick galaxy merger. Puccetti et al. (2016) studied the source with Nustar data, and concluded that this source could be an early merger stage galaxy with two nuclei separated, and an intrinsic source luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 7 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . Both active and obscured Compton thick material present. Wang et al. (2014) detected fast shock heated gas within 5 kpc of the central region. Nardini et al. (2013) and Feruglio et al. (2013) have studied the Chandra data and detected a soft X-ray halo, and also CO emission lines. Teng & Veilleux (2010) and Iwasawa et al. (2011) have studied the source in a sample. Netzer et al. (2005) have studied *XMM-Newton* observation of this source and found that starburst emission dominates the soft X-ray 0.5 – 3 keV energy range.

In our study the X-ray spectra required a broad Fe K emission line, along with a soft X-ray emission line at 0.89 keV. We could not constrain the intrinsic neutral absorption.

12. NGC 3256: Powerful starburst galaxy studied by Lehmer et al. (2015) with Chandra and Nustar data. Nature of X-ray emission is unclear as no obvious AGN signature was found. This galaxy was studied by Jenkins et al. (2004) and was referred to as starburst merger galaxy, and a hard X-ray bolometric correction was estimated to be  $\sim 10^{-5}$ . The  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} \sim 10^{40} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  has been estimated mostly from the ULXs and crowded X-ray sources, and not an AGN.

In our study we found that the X-ray spectrum is complex. It required two thermal components in the soft X-rays (*APEC*), one neutral intrinsic absorber, and three Gaussian emission lines for three Fe K emission lines at different ionisation states.

13. NGC 3628: Tsai et al. (2012) studied this starburst galaxy and found connection between MO and emission line plasma in X-rays. A study of the source was carried out by Strickland et al. (2001) using Chandra data, where they find a luminous X-ray source 20" away from the nucleus.

The spectrum required one thermal component (*APEC*), neutral intrinsic absorption and a high energy absorption in the Fe K band which was modeled using an inverted Gaussian. The powerlaw slope is pegged at  $\Gamma = 1.5$ .

14. NGC 253: A highly variable starburst galaxy studied by Nustar Lehmer et al. (2013). Nustar and Chandra data reveal that the nuclear region contains three bright X-ray point sources which are ULXs and not an AGN, and highly obscured with a column density of  $\log N_{\text{H}} = 23 \text{ cm}^{-2}$ . The Fe K line complex was studied by Mitsuishi et al. (2011) and found several highly ionised Fe K emission lines.

Due to low photon counts, HR method was employed in our work.

15. NGC 6764: This is an AGN + Starburst galaxy and the chandra data is studied by Croston et al. (2008).

The hard X-ray band  $> 2 \text{ keV}$  has very few counts, hence the powerlaw slope upperlimit could not be constrained,  $\Gamma > 2.28$ . The soft X-ray emission was modeled using *Apec*.

16. NGC 1068: Compton thick Sy 2 galaxy was studied by Nustar data by Bauer et al. (2015). Multi component X-ray reflectors were needed to fit the data. Kallman et al. (2014) studied the source with Chandra data, and found the amount of mass of gas necessary for the emission in X-rays is  $\sim 3.7 \times 10^5 M_{\odot}$ . Shu et al. (2011) studied the Fe K line emission of the source. Marinucci et al. (2016) studied the source using Nustar data unveiling the obscured source.

This source could not be modeled with the baseline model. The spectra shows a very unique broad Fe K emission line, typical of Compton thick objects.

17. IC 5063: Classified as narrow line Sy 2 radio galaxies and the Suzaku data are studied by Tazaki et al. (2011). There is a Nustar data but not published. Marinucci et al. (2012) also studied the source in a sample of Sy 2 sources which have exhibited broad Fe K line in reflected spectra. The source is classified as Compton thin by Marinucci et al. (2012).

Absorbed source with a concave spectra in the hard X-rays and diffuse soft X-ray emission. An absorbed powerlaw and a blackbody for the diffuse soft X-ray emission could fit the data. There could be X-ray contribution from radio jets.

18. NGC 2146: The Chandra observation of this starburst galaxy was carried out by Inui et al. (2005). There were 6 ultra-luminous point sources detected in the field of view.

In our work we found that the spectra can be modeled by an absorbed powerlaw only.

19. IRAS 17208-0014: Teng & Veilleux (2010) and Iwasawa et al. (2011) have studied this source. This is a luminous ULIRG. In our work the powerlaw slope could not be constrained due to low photon counts.
20. NGC 1614: ULIRG, and a star forming galaxy studied in the multiwaveband by Herrero-Illana et al. (2014). This is also detected as a merger remnant by Saito et al. (2017) using ALMA data. The nature of the dominant emitting mechanism at the centre is still under debate, however AGN presence may not be needed to describe the spectral properties. Possibly a compact starburst ( $r \leq 90$  pc) is present. The total IR luminosity is  $L = 4 \times 10^{11} L_{\odot}$  Armus et al. (2009); Herrero-Illana et al. (2014). An upper limit to AGN luminosity is given by the authors,  $L_{\text{AGN}} \leq 4.5 \times 10^{11} L_{\odot}$ . In our study, the powerlaw slope could not be constrained due to low photon counts.
21. IRAS 05083+7936: This is an absorbed quasar. Ballo et al. (2014) had studied this absorbed quasar. Nustar hard X-ray studies carried out by Teng et al. (2015). In our work, the powerlaw slope could not be constrained due to low photon counts.
22. IRAS 13451+1232: A Seyfert 2 galaxy. Jia et al. (2013), Teng & Veilleux (2010) and LaMassa et al. (2014) studied the source in X-rays. We found that the hard X-ray photon count is poor, however, the powerlaw slope and the absorption column could be constrained.
23. 3C 293: Lanz et al. (2015) studied the Jet-ISM interaction of this radio loud source and states how the molecular gas is heated by the jets. Only Chandra data available for this source.
24. NGC 1433: Only Chandra data available which is not published. In our study we found the source has very poor data counts. The powerlaw slope as well as the intrinsic neutral absorption column density were frozen to a value of 1.5 and  $0.07 \times 10^{22} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ , as they could not be constrained.
25. IRAS 13120-5453: 129 ks *XMM-Newton* data is not published yet. Nustar hard X-ray studies carried out by Teng et al. (2015) who confirms it as Compton thick AGN. We found that this source has a narrow Fe K emission line.
26. IRAS 14378-3651: Nustar hard X-ray studies carried out by Teng et al. (2015) and the authors do not detect any source X-ray flux beyond 10 keV. The *Chandra* spectra have been studied by Iwasawa et al. (2011).
27. IRAS F11119+3257: Studied by Tombesi et al. (2015) who found strong molecular outflows in IR using Herschel PACS as well as ultrafast outflows in the X-rays using Suzaku telescope. Tombesi et al. (2017) observed this source with *NuSTAR* and detected a similar observed flux as ours. We found that this is a bright source and could be modeled with a simple absorbed powerlaw and a very weak bbody for the soft emission.
28. IRAS F01572+0009: This source is also known as MRK 1014 alias PG0157+001. It has been studied by Ricci et al. (2014) and a 2 – 10 keV luminosity of  $10^{43.80} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  has been estimated using the same dataset used by us. The authors have detected reflection from distant matter and used the model *Mytorus*. We found that this is a low count source which could be modeled with a simple absorbed powerlaw and a bbody for the soft emission. The data did not require a neutral intrinsic absorber.
29. IRAS F05024-1941: This is a ULIRG and was studied by Teng & Veilleux (2010) and the authors have used HR method to calculate the flux. The source has very low photon counts. The powerlaw slope and the neutral absorber  $N_{\text{H}}$  could not be constrained.
30. IRAS F05189-2524: A ULIRG studied by Teng & Veilleux (2010) and the authors found  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 2.3 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . The soft emission was modeled using two bbody components. The spectra required two Gaussian emission lines for two Fe K complex. The spectra is concave indicating neutral absorption.
31. IRAS 07251-0248: This source is a ULIRG and has been studied by Iwasawa et al. (2011) as well as by Teng & Veilleux (2010) both of whom found the source to be Compton thin AGN. However, the source could not be detected in the X-rays (Chandra) by the authors (as well as by us) due to its weakness and obscuration. The X-ray flux of the source estimated from the infra-red analysis is  $F_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 7.4 \times 10^{-12} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$  (Nardini & Risaliti 2011).
32. IRAS F07599+6508: This is a Compton thin absorbed ULIRG. Teng & Veilleux (2010) studied this source and calculated a luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 1.12 \times 10^{42} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  using HR method. Imanishi & Terashima (2004) studied a sample of four ULIRGs with detectable broad near-infrared-emission lines produced by AGN, one of the sources being IRAS F07599+6508. Using spectral analysis they could constrain the luminosity of the AGN  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 8 \times 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . Very low photon counts did not allow us to constrain the powerlaw slope or the  $N_{\text{H}}$  of the intrinsic absorber.

33. IRAS 09022-3615: This is a LIRG and Iwasawa et al. (2011) calculated an X-ray luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 2.0 \times 10^{42} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . The authors found that the hard X-ray source is marginally resolved.  
Very low photon counts did not allow us to constrain the powerlaw slope or the  $N_{\text{H}}$  of the intrinsic absorber.
34. IRAS F09320+6134: The alternative name of this source is UGC 05101 and was studied in a large sample of ULIRGs by U et al. (2012). The authors have also estimated the infrared luminosity for all the sources. The X-ray flux estimated is  $F_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 8.64 \times 10^{-9} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$  which is higher than our estimate of  $10^{-11.83} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ .  
Very low photon counts did not allow us to constrain the powerlaw slope or the  $N_{\text{H}}$  of the intrinsic absorber.
35. IRAS F12072-0444: This is a ULIRG and was studied by Teng & Veilleux (2010) who have calculated a luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 1.5 \times 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . Very low photon counts did not allow us to constrain the powerlaw slope or the  $N_{\text{H}}$  of the intrinsic absorber.
36. IRAS F12112+0305: This is a ULIRG and was studied by Teng & Veilleux (2010) and Iwasawa et al. (2011) who have calculated a luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 1.5 \times 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  and  $4 \times 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  respectively.  
Very low photon counts did not allow us to constrain the powerlaw slope or the  $N_{\text{H}}$  of the intrinsic absorber.
37. IRAS F14348-1447: This is a ULIRG studied by Teng & Veilleux (2010) who estimated a luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 7.4 \times 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ .  
Very low photon counts did not allow us to constrain the powerlaw slope or the  $N_{\text{H}}$  of the intrinsic absorber.
38. IRAS F14394+5332: This source has not been studied before.  
Very low photon counts did not allow us to constrain the powerlaw slope or the  $N_{\text{H}}$  of the intrinsic absorber.
39. IRAS F15327+2340: This source is also known as ARP 220 and is a starburst galaxy. LaMassa et al. (2012) have worked on a sample of sources including this source where the authors have attempted to disentangle the AGN and starburst contribution of the sources in the 0.5 – 2 keV soft X-ray band. Also studied by Teng & Veilleux (2010) and they calculated a luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 1.2 \times 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ .  
Very low photon counts did not allow us to constrain the powerlaw slope or the  $N_{\text{H}}$  of the intrinsic absorber.
40. IRAS F15462-0450: ULIRG studied by Teng & Veilleux (2010) and they calculated a luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 1.3 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  using HR method. Very low photon counts did not allow us to constrain the powerlaw slope or the  $N_{\text{H}}$  of the intrinsic absorber.
41. IRAS 19297-0406: This source is a very faint source in X-rays and studied as a part of C-goals by Iwasawa et al. (2011) who calculated an X-ray luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 1.8 \times 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  using the HR method.  
No significant counts. Hence we used previous studies to estimate the X-ray luminosity.
42. IRAS 19542+1110 : This source is a very faint source in X-rays and studied as a part of C-goals by Iwasawa et al. (2011) who calculated an X-ray luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 1.0 \times 10^{42} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  using the HR method.  
Very low photon counts did not allow us to constrain the powerlaw slope or the  $N_{\text{H}}$  of the intrinsic absorber.
43. IRAS F20551-4250: Also known as ESO 286-IG19 and studied by Iwasawa et al. (2011) who calculated an X-ray luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 2.1 \times 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ .  
Very low photon counts did not allow us to constrain the powerlaw slope or the  $N_{\text{H}}$  of the intrinsic absorber.
44. IRAS F22491-1808: Both the papers Iwasawa et al. (2011) and Teng & Veilleux (2010) discuss this source and the luminosity calculated by them are  $0.6 \times 10^{41}$  and  $2.1 \times 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  respectively.  
Very low photon counts did not allow us to constrain the powerlaw slope or the  $N_{\text{H}}$  of the intrinsic absorber.
45. NGC 5506: Guainazzi et al. (2010) studied the source which is an X-ray obscured Seyfert galaxy with a broad Fe  $K\alpha$  emission line. The maximum value of the luminosity quoted for this source is  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 1.1 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . The source is an obscured Seyfert 1 galaxy.
46. NGC 7479: Akylas & Georgantopoulos (2009) studied the source in a sample of Sy1, Sy2 and Compton thick galaxies, where they infer an X-ray luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 2.8 \times 10^{40} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . The source is a Seyfert 2 galaxy with significant obscuration.  
No significant counts. Hence we used previous studies to estimate the X-ray luminosity.
47. NGC 7172: Guainazzi et al. (1998) studied this Seyfert 2 source and calculated a luminosity of  $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 1.5 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . The source is an obscured Seyfert 1 galaxy.

C. SOURCES IN MOX SAMPLE WITHOUT *NuSTAR* OBSERVATIONS, AS ON DECEMBER 2017.

In this section we list the 23 sources in the MOX sample which have not been observed by *NuSTAR*. The sources are: IRAS 23365+3604, IZw1, NGC 1377, NGC 3628, NGC 2146, NGC 6764, IRAS 17208-0014, NGC 1614, IRAS05083+7936, IRAS13451+1232, 3C293, NGC1433, IRASF01572+0009, IRASF05024-1941, IRAS07251-0248, IRAS 09022-3615, IRASF12112+0305, IRASF14348-1447, IRASF14394+5332, IRASF15462-0450, IRASF19297-0406, IRAS19542+1110, and IRASF23233+2817.

*Acknowledgements* : Author SL is grateful to Silvia Martocchia for supplying the X-ray bolometric corrections and AGN bolometric luminosities for the PG quasars and the high redshift bright quasar sample (WISSH). Author SL is also grateful to Daniel Stern, Sylvain Veilleux, Richard Mushotzky and Richard Rothschild for sharing interesting ideas involved in this work. This research has made use of the NASA/IPAC Extragalactic Database (NED) which is operated by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

## REFERENCES

- Aalto, S., Muller, S., Sakamoto, K., Gallagher, J. S., Martín, S., & Costagliola, F. 2012, *A&A*, 546, A68
- Aalto, S., et al. 2016, *A&A*, 590, A73
- Akritas, M. G., & Bershady, M. A. 1996, *ApJ*, 470, 706
- Akylas, A., & Georgantopoulos, I. 2009, *A&A*, 500, 999
- Alatalo, K., Blitz, L., Young, L. M., & Davis, T. A. 2011, *ApJ*, 735, 88
- Alatalo, K., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 798, 31
- Armus, L., Mazzarella, J. M., Evans, A. S., Surace, J. A., & Sanders, D. B. 2009, *PASP*, 121, 559
- Asmus, D., Gandhi, P., Hönig, S. F., Smette, A., & Duschl, W. J. 2015, *MNRAS*, 454, 766
- Ballo, L., Severgnini, P., Della Ceca, R., Caccianiga, A., Vignali, C., Carrera, F. J., Corral, A., & Mateos, S. 2014, *MNRAS*, 444, 2580
- Bauer, F. E., Arevalo, P., Walton, D. J., & Koss, M. J. 2015, *ApJ*, 812, 116
- Bottacini, E., Orlando, E., Greiner, J., Ajello, M., Moskalenko, I., & Persic, M. 2015, *ApJ*, 798, L14
- Brightman, M., & Nandra, K. 2011, *MNRAS*, 413, 1206
- Brusa, M., Feruglio, C., Cresci, G., Mainieri, V., Sargent, M. T., Perna, M., & Santini, e. a. 2015, *A&A*, 578, A11
- Brusa, M., et al. 2018, *A&A*, 612, A29
- Caballero-García, M. D. 2011, *MNRAS*, 418, 1973
- Cicone, C., et al. 2014, *A&A*, 562, A21
- Combes, F., et al. 2013, *A&A*, 558, A124
- Costagliola, F., Herrero-Illana, R., Lohfink, A., Pérez-Torres, M., Aalto, S., Muller, S., & Alberdi, A. 2016, *A&A*, 594, A114
- Croston, J. H., Hardcastle, M. J., Kharb, P., Kraft, R. P., & Hota, A. 2008, *ApJ*, 688, 190
- Dasyra, K. M., Combes, F., Novak, G. S., Bremer, M., Spinoglio, L., Pereira Santaella, M., Salomé, P., & Falgarone, E. 2014, *A&A*, 565, A46
- de La Calle Pérez, I., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 524, A50
- Diamond-Stanic, A. M., Moustakas, J., Tremonti, C. A., Coil, A. L., Hickox, R. C., Robaina, A. R., Rudnick, G. H., & Sell, P. H. 2012, *ApJ*, 755, L26
- Ducci, L., Sasaki, M., Haberl, F., & Pietsch, W. 2013, *A&A*, 553, A7
- Elvis, M., et al. 1994, *ApJS*, 95, 1
- Erkens, U., Wagner, S. J., Alloin, D., & Axon. 1995, *A&A*, 296, 90
- Fabian, A. C. 2012, *ARAA*, 50, 455
- Faucher-Giguère, C.-A., & Quataert, E. 2012, *MNRAS*, 425, 605
- Ferrarese, L., & Merritt, D. 2000, *ApJ*, 539, L9
- Feruglio, C., et al. 2013, *A&A*, 549, A51
- . 2015, *A&A*, 583, A99
- Fiore, F., et al. 2017, *A&A*, 601, A143
- Gallo, L. C., Brandt, W. N., Costantini, E., Fabian, A. C., Iwasawa, K., & Papadakis, I. E. 2007, *MNRAS*, 377, 391
- Gandhi, P., Horst, H., Smette, A., Hönig, S., Comastri, A., Gilli, R., Vignali, C., & Duschl, W. 2009, *A&A*, 502, 457
- García-Burillo, S., et al. 2015, *A&A*, 580, A35
- Geach, J. E., et al. 2014, *Nat*, 516, 68
- Gebhardt, K., et al. 2000, *ApJ*, 539, L13
- Guainazzi, M., Bianchi, S., Matt, G., Dadina, M., Kaastra, J., Malzac, J., & Risaliti, G. 2010, *MNRAS*, 406, 2013
- Guainazzi, M., Matt, G., Antonelli, L. A., Fiore, F., Piro, L., & Ueno, S. 1998, *MNRAS*, 298, 824
- Hernán-Caballero, A., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 803, 109
- Hernández-García, L., Masegosa, J., González-Martín, O., & Márquez, I. 2015, *A&A*, 579, A90
- Herrero-Illana, R., Perez-Torres, M. Á., & Alonso-Herrero. 2014, *ApJ*, 786, 156
- Hopkins, P. F., & Elvis, M. 2010, *MNRAS*, 401, 7
- Houck, J. C., & Denicola, L. A. 2000, in *Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series*, Vol. 216, *Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems IX*, ed. N. Manset, C. Veillet, & D. Crabtree, 591
- Imanishi, M., & Terashima, Y. 2004, *aj*, 127, 758
- Inui, T., Matsumoto, H., Tsuru, T. G., Koyama, K., Matsushita, S., Peck, A. B., & Tarchi, A. 2005, *PASJ*, 57, 135
- Iwasawa, K., et al. 2011, *A&A*, 529, A106
- Jenkins, L. P., Roberts, T. P., Ward, M. J., & Zezas, A. 2004, *MNRAS*, 352, 1335
- Jia, J., Ptak, A., Heckman, T., & Zakamska, N. L. 2013, *ApJ*, 777, 27
- Kalberla, P. M. W., Burton, W. B., Hartmann, D., Arnal, E. M., Bajaja, E., Morras, R., & Pöppel, W. G. L. 2005, *A&A*, 440, 775
- Kallman, T., Evans, D. A., Marshall, H., Canizares, C., Longinotti, A., Nowak, M., & Schulz, N. 2014, *ApJ*, 780, 121
- Krips, M., Martín, S., Sakamoto, K., & Aalto. 2016, *A&A*, 592, L3
- Labiano, A., et al. 2014, *A&A*, 564, A128
- Laha, S., Guainazzi, M., Dewangan, G. C., Chakravorty, S., & Kembhavi, A. K. 2014, *MNRAS*, 441, 2613
- LaMassa, S. M., Heckman, T. M., & Ptak, A. 2012, *ApJ*, 758, 82
- LaMassa, S. M., Yaqoob, T., Ptak, A. F., Jia, J., Heckman, T. M., Gandhi, P., & Meg Urry, C. 2014, *ApJ*, 787, 61
- Lamastra, A., Bianchi, S., Matt, G., Perola, G. C., Barcons, X., & Carrera, F. J. 2009, *A&A*, 504, 73
- Lampton, M., Margon, B., & Bowyer. S. 1976, *ApJ*, 208, 177
- Lanz, L., Ogle, P. M., Evans, D., Appleton, P. N., Guillard, P., & Emonts, B. 2015, *ApJ*, 801, 17
- Laor, A., Fiore, F., Elvis, M., Wilkes, B. J., & McDowell, J. C. 1994, *ApJ*, 435, 611
- Lehmer, B. D., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 771, 134
- . 2015, *ApJ*, 806, 126
- Leroy, A. K., Walter, F., Decarli, R., Bolatto, A., Zschaechner, L., & Weiss, A. 2015, *ApJ*, 811, 15
- Liu, J., Gou, L., Yuan, W., & Mao, S. 2014, *MNRAS*, 437, L76
- Luo, B., Brandt, W. N., Alexander, D. M., Harrison, F. A., & Stern, D. 2013, *ApJ*, 772, 153
- Luo, B., Brandt, W. N., Alexander, D. M., & Stern, D. 2014, *ApJ*, 794, 70
- Maiolino, R., Ruiz, M., Rieke, G. H., & Papadopoulos, P. 1997, *ApJ*, 485, 552
- Marinucci, A., Bianchi, S., Nicastro, F., Matt, G., & Goulding, A. D. 2012, *ApJ*, 748, 130
- Marinucci, A., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 456, L94
- Martocchia, S., et al. 2017, *A&A*, 608, A51
- Mauersberger, R., Henkel, C., Wielebinski, R., Wiklind, T., & Reuter, H.-P. 1996, *A&A*, 305, 421
- Mitsuishi, I., Yamasaki, N. Y., & Takei, Y. 2011, *ApJ*, 742, L31
- . 2013, *PASJ*, 65, 44
- Nardini, E., & Risaliti, G. 2011, *MNRAS*, 415, 619
- Nardini, E., Wang, J., Fabbiano, G., Elvis, M., Pellegrini, S., Risaliti, G., Karovska, M., & Zezas, A. 2013, *ApJ*, 765, 141
- Nemmen, R. S., Georganopoulos, M., Guiriec, S., Meyer, E. T., Gehrels, N., & Sambruna, R. M. 2012, *Science*, 338, 1445

- Netzer, H., Lemze, D., Kaspi, S., George, I. M., Turner, T. J., Lutz, D., Boller, T., & Chelouche, D. 2005, *ApJ*, 629, 739
- Oda, S., Tanimoto, A., Ueda, Y., Imanishi, M., Terashima, Y., & Ricci, C. 2017, *ApJ*, 835, 179
- Piconcelli, E., Jimenez-Bailón, E., Guainazzi, M., Schartel, N., Rodríguez-Pascual, P. M., & Santos-Lleó, M. 2005, *A&A*, 432, 15
- Proga, D., & Kallman, T. R. 2004, *ApJ*, 616, 688
- Puccetti, S., Comastri, A., Bauer, F. E., & Brandt, 2016, *A&A*, 585, A157
- Reynolds, C., Punsly, B., Miniutti, G., O’Dea, C. P., & Hurley-Walker, N. 2017, *ApJ*, 836, 155
- Ricci, C., Ueda, Y., Ichikawa, K., Paltani, S., Boissay, R., Gandhi, P., Stalevski, M., & Awaki, H. 2014, *A&A*, 567, A142
- Ricci, C., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 468, 1273
- Saito, T., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 835, 174
- Sakamoto, K., Ho, P. T. P., & Peck, A. B. 2006, *ApJ*, 644, 862
- Sanders, D. B., & Mirabel, I. F. 1985, *ApJ*, 298, L31
- Sanders, D. B., Soifer, B. T., Elias, J. H., Madore, B. F., Matthews, K., Neugebauer, G., & Scoville, N. Z. 1988, *ApJ*, 325, 74
- Sell, P. H., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 441, 3417
- Sharma, M., & Nath, B. B. 2013, *ApJ*, 763, 17
- Shu, X. W., Yaqoob, T., & Wang, J. X. 2011, *ApJ*, 738, 147
- Smith, R. K., Brickhouse, N. S., Liedahl, D. A., & Raymond, J. C. 2001, *ApJ*, 556, L91
- Stone, M., Veilleux, S., Meléndez, M., Sturm, E., Graciá-Carpio, J., & González-Alfonso, E. 2016, *ApJ*, 826, 111
- Strickland, D. K., Colbert, E. J. M., Heckman, T. M., Weaver, K. A., Dahlem, M., & Stevens, I. R. 2001, *ApJ*, 560, 707
- Sturm, E., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 733, L16
- Tazaki, F., Ueda, Y., Terashima, Y., & Mushotzky, R. F. 2011, *ApJ*, 738, 70
- Teng, S. H., Brandt, W. N., & Harrison, F. A. 2014, *ApJ*, 785, 19
- Teng, S. H., Rigby, J. R., Stern, D., & Ptak. 2015, *ApJ*, 814, 56
- Teng, S. H., & Veilleux, S. 2010, *ApJ*, 725, 1848
- Teng, S. H., Wilson, A. S., Veilleux, S., Young, A. J., Sanders, D. B., & Nagar, N. M. 2005, *ApJ*, 633, 664
- Tombesi, F., Meléndez, M., Veilleux, S., Reeves, J. N., González-Alfonso, E., & Reynolds, C. S. 2015, *Nat*, 519, 436
- Tombesi, F., Veilleux, S., Meléndez, M., Lohfink, A., Reeves, J. N., Piconcelli, E., Fiore, F., & Feruglio, C. 2017, *ApJ*, 850, 151
- Tsai, A.-L., Matsushita, S., Kong, A. K. H., Matsumoto, H., & Kohno, K. 2012, *ApJ*, 752, 38
- Tsai, C.-W., Turner, J. L., Beck, S. C., Crosthwaite, L. P., Ho, P. T. P., & Meier, D. S. 2006, *aj*, 132, 2383
- U, V., Sanders, D. B., Mazzarella, J. M., & Evans. 2012, *ApJS*, 203, 9
- Vasudevan, R. V., & Fabian, A. C. 2009, *MNRAS*, 392, 1124
- Vasudevan, R. V., Fabian, A. C., Gandhi, P., Winter, L. M., & Mushotzky, R. F. 2010, *MNRAS*, 402, 1081
- Vasudevan, R. V., Mushotzky, R. F., Winter, L. M., & Fabian, A. C. 2009, *MNRAS*, 399, 1553
- Veilleux, S., Bolatto, A., Tombesi, F., Meléndez, M., Sturm, E., González-Alfonso, E., Fischer, J., & Rupke, D. S. N. 2017, *ApJ*, 843, 18
- Veilleux, S., Melendez, M., Sturm, E., & Gracia-Carpio, J. 2013, *ApJ*, 776, 27
- Veilleux, S., Teng, S. H., Rupke, D. S. N., Maiolino, R., & Sturm, E. 2014, *ApJ*, 790, 116
- Walter, F., Weiss, A., & Scoville, N. 2002, *ApJ*, 580, L21
- Wang, J., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 781, 55
- Wiklind, T., Combes, F., & Henkel, C. 1995, *A&A*, 297, 643
- Zubovas, K., & King, A. 2012, *ApJ*, 745, L34