

MUSEQuBES: Calibrating the redshifts of Ly α emitters using stacked circumgalactic medium absorption profiles

Sowgat Muzahid^{1,2*}, Joop Schaye², Raffaella Anna Marino³, Sebastiano Cantalupo³, Jarle Brinchmann^{2,4}, Thierry Contini⁵, Martin Wendt^{1,6}, Lutz Wisotzki¹, Johannes Zabl⁷, Nicolas Bouché⁷, Mohammad Akhlaghi^{8,9}, Hsiao-Wen Chen¹⁰, Adélaïde Claeysens⁷, Sean Johnson^{11,12†}, Floriane Leclercq^{7,13}, Michael Maseda², Jorryt Matthee³, Johan Richard⁷, Tanya Urrutia¹, and Anne Verhamme¹³

¹ Leibniz-Institut für Astrophysik Potsdam (AIP), An der Sternwarte 16, D-14482 Potsdam, Germany

² Leiden Observatory, Leiden University, PO Box 9513, NL-2300 RA Leiden, the Netherlands

³ Department of Physics, ETH Zürich, Wolfgang-Pauli-Strasse 27, 8093 Zürich, Switzerland

⁴ Instituto de Astrofísica e Ciências do Espaço, Universidade do Porto, CAUP, Rua das Estrelas, PT4150-762 Porto, Portugal

⁵ Institut de Recherche en Astrophysique et Planétologie (IRAP), Université de Toulouse, CNRS, UPS, F-31400 Toulouse, France

⁶ Institut für Physik und Astronomie, Universität Potsdam, Karl-Liebknecht-Str 24/25, D-14476 Golm, Germany

⁷ Univ Lyon, Univ Lyon1, Ens de Lyon, CNRS, Centre de Recherche Astrophysique de Lyon UMR5574, F-69230, Saint-Genis-Laval, France

⁸ Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, C/ Vía Láctea, 38200 La Laguna, Tenerife, Spain

⁹ Facultad de Física, Universidad de La Laguna, Avda. Astrofísico Fco. Sánchez s/n, 38200 La Laguna, Tenerife, Spain

¹⁰ Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics, The University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637, USA

¹¹ Department of Astrophysical Science, 4 Ivy Lane, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

¹² The Observatories of the Carnegie Institution for Science, 813 Santa Barbara Street, Pasadena, CA 91101, USA

¹³ Observatoire de Genève, Université de Genève, 51 Ch. des Maillettes, CH-1290 Versoix, Switzerland

Accepted. Received; in original form

ABSTRACT

Lyman- α (Ly α) emission lines are typically found to be redshifted with respect to the systemic redshifts of galaxies, likely due to resonant scattering of Ly α photons. Here we measure the average velocity offset for a sample of 96 $z \approx 3.3$ Ly α emitters (LAEs) with a median Ly α flux (luminosity) of $\approx 10^{-17}$ erg cm $^{-2}$ s $^{-1}$ ($\approx 10^{42}$ erg s $^{-1}$) and a median star formation rate (SFR) of $\approx 1.3 M_{\odot}$ yr $^{-1}$ (not corrected for possible dust extinction), detected by the Multi-Unit Spectroscopic Explorer as part of our MUSEQuBES circumgalactic medium (CGM) survey. By postulating that the stacked CGM absorption profiles of these LAEs, probed by 8 background quasars, must be centered on the systemic redshift, we measure an average velocity offset, $V_{\text{offset}} = 171 \pm 8$ km s $^{-1}$, between the Ly α emission peak and the systemic redshift. The observed V_{offset} is lower by factors of ≈ 1.4 and ≈ 2.6 compared to the velocity offsets measured for narrow-band selected LAEs and Lyman break galaxies, respectively, which probe galaxies with higher masses and SFRs. Consistent with earlier studies based on direct measurements for individual objects, we find that the V_{offset} is correlated with the full width at half-maximum of the red peak of the Ly α line, and anti-correlated with the rest-frame equivalent width. Moreover, we find that V_{offset} is correlated with SFR with a sub-linear scaling relation, $V_{\text{offset}} \propto \text{SFR}^{0.16 \pm 0.03}$. Adopting the mass scaling for main sequence galaxies, such a relation suggests that V_{offset} scales with the circular velocity of the dark matter halos hosting the LAEs.

Key words: galaxies: haloes – galaxies: high-redshift – quasar: absorption lines

1 INTRODUCTION

Lyman- α (Ly α) emitters (LAEs) are galaxies that are identified through the Ly α line of neutral hydrogen ($\lambda 1215.67$ Å). Owing

* E-mail: sowgat@strw.leidenuniv.nl

† Carnegie–Princeton fellow

to the high cosmic abundance of hydrogen and the large oscillator strength of the $2p \rightarrow 1s$ transition, Ly α emission has been recognized as an excellent tool to identify galaxies using a variety of techniques, including narrow-band (NB) and medium-band surveys (e.g., Malhotra & Rhoads 2002; Gronwall et al. 2007; Sobral et al. 2018; Shibuya et al. 2018), integral-field-spectroscopy (IFS) surveys (e.g., Wisotzki et al. 2016; Inami et al. 2017; Leclercq et al. 2017; Urrutia et al. 2019), multi-object spectroscopy (e.g., Cassata et al. 2011), and long-slit spectroscopy (e.g., Rauch et al. 2008, 2016). LAEs detected via different techniques can probe a diverse galaxy population, however, there is a growing consensus that the majority of LAEs are typically low-mass, star-forming galaxies (e.g., Gawiser et al. 2007; Hagen et al. 2016; Hao et al. 2018).

Though Ly α is an excellent tool to detect galaxies, particularly at high redshift ($z > 2$), interpreting Ly α emission spectra is challenging because of resonant scattering and susceptibility to dust extinction (e.g., Hayes 2015). The Ly α spectrum emerging from a uniform spherical, static gas cloud with a central Ly α emitting source appears as symmetric double peaked emission with a peak separation that increases with increasing line-center optical depth (e.g., Neufeld 1990; Zheng & Miralda-Escudé 2002; Cantalupo et al. 2005; Verhamme et al. 2006; Dijkstra et al. 2006). Any bulk motion of the gas with respect to the central source, however, makes the peaks asymmetric. For example, outflowing (infalling) gas would enhance the red¹ (blue) peak and suppress the blue (red) peak (e.g., Laursen et al. 2009). In fact, the signature of outflowing gas (i.e., a dominant asymmetric red peak and an occasional weaker blue “bump”) is ubiquitous in the spectra of high- z LAEs (e.g., Gronke 2017). Composite spectra of high- z LAEs indeed show signatures of metal enriched outflows with outflow velocity increasing with continuum luminosity (Trainor et al. 2015). Owing to resonant scattering, the Ly α emission line does not trace the systemic redshift. In fact, observations have shown that Ly α redshifts are, on average, shifted by $\approx +230$ km s⁻¹ (for LAEs; e.g., Shibuya et al. 2014) to $\approx +440$ km s⁻¹ (for Lyman break galaxies (LBGs); e.g., Steidel et al. 2010). The Ly α redshifts should, thus, be taken with caution in the absence of non-resonant rest-frame ultraviolet (UV)/optical stellar absorption and/or nebular emission lines which provide the most accurate galaxy redshifts.

Recently, Verhamme et al. (2018) suggested two empirical relations to recover the systemic redshift of galaxies from their Ly α line profile using the observed correlations between (i) the velocity offset (measured from non-resonant UV/optical lines) and the full width at half-maximum (FWHM) of the red peak of the Ly α line; (ii) the velocity offset and the velocity separation between the red peak and the blue bump. Erb et al. (2014) reported $> 3\sigma$ correlations between velocity offset and R -band magnitude, M_{UV} , and the velocity dispersion of nebular emission lines for a sample of 36 LAEs at $z \approx 2 - 3$. In addition, a strong anti-correlation ($> 7\sigma$) was found between velocity offset and the Ly α equivalent width (EW_0). Such empirical relationships are valuable for understanding the physics of the Ly α emitting galaxies, and provide indirect means to obtain the systemic redshifts. Finding and confirming such empirical relations and observational trends using complementary techniques is thus important.

Obtaining accurate systemic redshifts is particularly important for studying the circumgalactic medium (CGM) of galaxies using background quasars, since the association of galaxies with their CGM absorption lines, seen in the quasar spectrum, is based on

Table 1. The data sample

Quasar Field (1)	RA _{QSO} (2)	Dec _{QSO} (3)	z _{QSO} (4)	t _{exp} (5)	N _{LAE} (6)
Q1422+23	14:24:38.1	+22:56:01	3.620	4	8
Q0055–269	00:57:58.1	–26:43:14	3.655	10	12
Q1317–0507	13:20:30.0	–05:23:35	3.700	10	22
Q1621–0042	16:21:16.9	–00:42:50	3.709	9	12
QB2000–330	20:03:24.0	–32:51:44	3.773	10	14
PKS1937–101	19:39:57.3	–10:02:41	3.787	3	2
J0124+0044	01:24:03.0	+00:44:32	3.834	2	4
BRI1108–07	11:11:13.6	–08:04:02	3.922	2	22

Notes– (1) Name of the quasar field; (2) Right Ascension (J2000), (3) Declination (J2000), and (4) Redshift of the quasar; (5) MUSE exposure time of the field in hour; (6) Number of detected LAEs in the redshift range of interest.

velocity coincidence. CGM studies in the literature typically adopt a velocity window of ± 500 km s⁻¹ around the galaxy redshift to search for associated CGM absorption. It is thus essential to know the galaxy redshifts with an accuracy of $\Delta z/(1+z) \approx 10^{-3}$ or better. Using guaranteed time observations with the Multi-Unit Spectroscopic Explorer (MUSE; Bacon et al. 2010), we conducted the MUSEQuBES (MUSE Quasar-field Blind Emitters Survey) survey—a blind search for LAEs in $1' \times 1'$ fields centered on 8 bright $z \approx 3.6 - 3.8$ quasars (see Table 1). This is the first systematic survey of the CGM of LAEs in absorption (Muzahid et al., in preparation). Since, we generally do not have access to stellar absorption and/or non-resonant nebular emission lines for the LAEs in our sample, we must make use of the Ly α redshifts (z_{peak} ; determined from the peak of the Ly α line). Here we adopt the approach proposed by Rakić et al. (2011) to calibrate the Ly α redshifts in a statistical manner using mean/median stacked CGM² absorption (H I Ly α) profiles, by requiring that the average CGM absorption profiles must be centered on the systemic velocity since the LAEs are randomly oriented with respect to the background quasar. Rakić et al. (2011) applied this technique to a large sample of $z \approx 2.3$ LBGs, finding velocity offsets that agreed with the direct measurements from non-resonant nebular lines available for a subset of their sample.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we briefly describe the observations and data reduction procedures. In Section 3 we summarize the properties of our LAE sample. Section 4 presents the main results, followed by a discussion in Section 5. Section 6 concludes the paper. Throughout this study, we adopt a flat Λ CDM cosmology with $H_0 = 70$ km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹, $\Omega_M = 0.3$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$. All distances given are in physical units.

2 OBSERVATIONS & DATA REDUCTION

Our MUSEQuBES survey utilizes ≈ 50 h of MUSE GTO observations in the wide field mode centered on 8 high- z quasars that have high quality ($S/N > 50$ per pixel) optical spectra obtained with the Very Large Telescope Ultraviolet and Visual Echelle Spectrograph (VLT/UVES) and/or Keck High Resolution Echelle Spectrometer (Keck/HIRES). The details of the quasar fields are given in Table 1. The MUSE and UVES/HIRES observations and data reduction procedures will be presented in Muzahid et al., (in preparation). The MUSE data for four of the eight quasar fields (Q0055–269, Q1317–0507, Q1621–0042, and Q2000–330) were reduced using

¹ The lower energy (higher wavelength) peak.

² Note that, in most cases, the impact parameters of the LAEs in our sample are larger than the inferred virial radii (the latter are a few tens of kpc).

the standard MUSE pipeline v1.6 (Weilbacher et al. 2020) and post-processed with the tools in the CubExtractor package (CubEx v1.6; Cantalupo in preparation; see Cantalupo et al. 2019, for a description) to improve flat-fielding and sky subtraction as presented in Marino et al. (2018). The remaining fields were reduced using the MUSE pipeline software (v2.4) and post-processed with CubEx v1.6 following the same procedures.

The optical spectra of the quasars were obtained primarily using VLT/UVES with resolution, $R \approx 45000$. The final coadded and continuum normalized spectra were downloaded from the SQUAD database (Murphy et al. 2019) for all but Q1422+23. The spectrum of the quasar Q1422+23 was reduced using the Common Pipeline Language (CPL v6.3) of the UVES pipeline. After the standard reduction, the custom software UVES Popler³ was used to combine the extracted echelle orders into single 1D spectra. The coadded spectrum was continuum normalized by low-order spline interpolation to the absorption line free regions determined by iterative sigma-clipping. Keck/HIRES data are available for four quasars: BRI1108–07, PKS1937–101, QB2000–330, and Q1422+23. We used the HIRES spectra of PKS1937–101 and Q1422+23 from the KODIAQ data release (O’Meara et al. 2015) to fill in the gaps in the UVES spectra. We combined the continuum normalized UVES and HIRES spectra using inverse-variance weighting. Air-to-vacuum conversion was done for both the MUSE and UVES spectra before performing any measurements.

For the CGM spectral stacking analysis we have first used the pixel optical depth method (Cowie & Songaila 1998; Aguirre et al. 2002; Schaye et al. 2003; Turner et al. 2014) using the python module PODPy developed by Turner et al. (2014). PODPy iteratively examines whether the optical depth of a given pixel in a quasar spectrum is consistent with being the transition of interest (e.g., Ly α , C IV). PODPy corrects for contamination by flagging the pixels whose optical depths are not consistent with the expectation. For multiplets, it uses all available transitions (up to Ly η for H I) leading to a larger dynamic range in the “recovered” optical depth. We refer the reader to Appendix A of Turner et al. (2014) for more details. The optical depth recovered by PODPy was then converted to flux before stacking the quasar spectra.

3 THE LAE SAMPLE

We used CubEx v1.6 (Cantalupo et al. 2019) for automatic extraction of emission line sources in the MUSE datacubes. CubEx uses a 3D extension of the connected-component labeling algorithm. The source extraction and classification procedure will be presented in detail in Muzahid et al., (in preparation). Briefly, after spatially smoothing (by 2 pixels radius) the datacubes and the corresponding variances at each wavelength layer, we require three conditions to be satisfied for a detection: (i) S/N per voxel > 4.0 , (ii) number of connected voxels $N_{\text{vox}} > 40$, and (iii) a spectral S/N > 4.5 measured on the 1D Ly α emission line spectrum. All the extracted objects are then visually inspected (both 1D spectra, extracted using the segmentation maps produced by CubEx, and pseudo-NB images around the emission features) and classified by two members of the team (SM and RAM) independently.

A total of 96 LAEs have been detected in the 8 MUSE cubes. The impact parameters (ρ) of the LAEs from the quasar sight lines are plotted against the Ly α peak redshifts (z_{peak}) in Fig. 1. The




Figure 1. Scatter plot of impact parameter versus redshift of the 96 LAEs. The data points are color coded by the Ly α luminosity. The median impact parameter and median redshift are indicated by the arrows. The maximum impact parameter allowed by the MUSE FoV is shown by the dashed line on the top.

redshifts of the LAEs are determined directly from the peak of the emission lines in the 1D spectra without any modelling. We ensured that z_{peak} is not affected by noise-spikes by visually inspecting the spectra. In case of double peaked emission we used the red peak for the z_{peak} measurement. The minimum z_{peak} (≈ 2.9) is determined by the lowest wavelength covered by MUSE. Note that we did not use the first 8–10 wavelength layers ($\approx 10 \text{ \AA}$) in our search, in order to avoid a large number of spurious detections at the very edge of the spectrum. The maximum z_{peak} is determined by the quasar redshift (z_{QSO}). In order to exclude the quasars’ proximity regions (see e.g., Muzahid et al. 2013), we did not use the 3000 km s^{-1} bluewards of the z_{QSO} . The LAEs in our sample span a redshift range of 2.92–3.82 with a median z_{peak} of 3.33. The maximum and minimum ρ values are determined by the MUSE field-of-view and the quasars’ point spread functions (PSFs), respectively. The ρ values span 16–315 kpc with a median of 165 kpc.

The data points in Fig.1 are color coded by the Ly α luminosity, $L(\text{Ly}\alpha)$, calculated from the Galactic extinction corrected line flux, $f(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ ⁴. The $f(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ values are measured from pseudo-NB images using the curve-of-growth method following Marino et al. (2018). The $f(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ values are found to be in the range $10^{-17.7} - 10^{-16.0} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ with a median value of $10^{-17.0} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. The $L(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ spans $10^{41.3} - 10^{42.9} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ with a median value of $10^{42.0} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. Following Verhamme et al. (2018), the FWHM (of the red peak for the handful of double peaked profiles) is calculated directly from the 1D spectrum, without any modelling and without correcting for instrumental broadening, as the velocity width of the Ly α emission line with flux above half of the maximum flux value. The FWHM values span the range 120–528 km s^{-1} with a median value of 240 km s^{-1} . Here we note that 10 LAEs show FWHM lower than the MUSE spectral resolution of $\approx 166 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ at the median Ly α wavelength of our sample.

The UV continuum fluxes, f_{UV} , and the associated errors are derived by integrating the 1D spectra, extracted from the original

³ <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.44765>

⁴ We used the E(B – V) values from Schlafly & Finkbeiner (2011) and the Fitzpatrick (1999) extinction curve to de-redden the fluxes.




Figure 2. Median (left) and mean (right) stacked CGM absorption profiles of H I $\lambda 1215$ (bottom) and C IV $\lambda 1548$ (top). The zero velocity (V_{peak}) is defined by z_{peak} , the redshift of peak Ly α emission. The profiles are normalized to the pseudo-continuum estimated far away from zero velocity. The 1σ errors are calculated from 1000 bootstrap realizations of the LAE sample. The best-fitting Gaussian profiles are shown by the smooth red curves. The centroids of the Gaussians (V_{CGM}), marked by the blue vertical dashed lines, provide the velocity offset, $V_{\text{offset}} \equiv (V_{\text{peak}} - V_{\text{CGM}})$. V_{offset} measured for the different stacked profiles are indicated in the corresponding panels. The weighted average of the V_{offset} values is $171 \pm 8 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ($177 \pm 9 \text{ km s}^{-1}$) for the median (mean) stacked profiles.

cubes (not continuum subtracted) and the corresponding variance cubes using the same segmentation maps used to obtain the 1D Ly α emission spectra. We chose a wavelength range of rest-frame 1410–1640 Å, the same as the wavelength range covering the FWHM of the *GALEX* far-UV transmission curve. No f_{UV} are calculated for the 15 LAEs that are contaminated by low- z continuum sources. About 48% (39/81) of the remaining LAEs are detected in UV continuum emission with $> 5\sigma$ significance. For the 39 continuum detected objects, f_{UV} values (corrected for Galactic extinction) are in the range $10^{-17.0} - 10^{-15.6} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ with a median of $10^{-16.4} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. For the remaining 42 LAEs for which we could place meaningful 5σ upper limits, the f_{UV} values were found to be lower than $10^{-16.4} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. The UV continuum luminosity, L_{UV} , ranges from $10^{42.1} - 10^{43.4} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ for the continuum detected objects (median $10^{42.7} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$). For the non-detections, the upper limits on L_{UV} are in the range of $10^{41.9} - 10^{42.7} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$.

The dust-uncorrected SFRs are calculated from the measured L_{UV} values using the local calibration relation of Kennicutt (1998) corrected to the Chabrier (2003) initial mass function (IMF; see Madau & Dickinson 2014). The SFRs for the continuum detected LAEs span $0.3 - 7.1 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ with a median SFR of $1.3 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. For the continuum un-detected LAEs, the SFRs are $< 1.5 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. The rest-frame equivalent width of the Ly α emission (EW_0) is obtained by dividing the Ly α line flux by the continuum flux density and then divided by $(1 + z_{\text{peak}})$. The continuum flux density is

estimated from the extrapolation of the measured continuum at rest-frame 1500 Å assuming a UV continuum slope (β_{UV}) of -2.0 (Bouwens et al. 2014). The continuum detected objects have EW_0 in the range 9–113 Å with a median EW_0 of 48 Å.

In our redshift range of interest ($z \approx 3-4$), the presence of the non-resonant C III] $\lambda\lambda 1907, 1909$ doublet in the MUSE spectra is an excellent means to obtain the systemic redshift. We detect the C III] $\lambda\lambda 1907, 1909$ doublet for only 3 LAEs, one of them being tentative. Such a low detection rate of the C III] line is consistent with the recent results of Maseda et al. (2017).

4 RESULTS

The median and mean stacked absorption profiles, normalized to the pseudo-continua estimated at large velocities, of H I Ly α and C IV, arising from the CGM of the LAEs, are shown in Fig. 2. For each transition (H I $\lambda 1215$ or C IV $\lambda 1548$), we have selected the part of the quasar spectrum covering a velocity range of -3000 to $+3000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ with respect to the z_{peak} for a given LAE. The mean and median fluxes for the full sample are then calculated from the PODPy “recovered” pixel optical depths in bins of 50 km s^{-1} . We note here that our main conclusions remain valid even if we use the original quasar spectra for stacking instead of using PODPy recovered spectra. However, in that case the stacked profiles become noisier,

Table 2. Velocity offset measurements for different sub-samples

Sub-sample	Threshold	Median	16 th percentile	84 th percentile	N _{LAE}	V _{offset} (H I) (Median) (7)	V _{offset} (H I) (Mean) (8)	V _{offset} (C IV) (Median) (9)	V _{offset} (C IV) (Mean) (10)	V _{offset} (H I+C IV) (Median) (11)	V _{offset} (H I+C IV) (Mean) (12)
Low- ρ	164.5	114.6	66.1	148.0	48	180 \pm 11	184 \pm 12	157 \pm 23	194 \pm 23	175 \pm 9	186 \pm 10
High- ρ	164.5	214.2	183.7	251.2	48	158 \pm 15	158 \pm 15	196 \pm 23	181 \pm 25	169 \pm 12	164 \pm 12
Low- z_{peak}	3.335	3.083	2.959	3.267	48	189 \pm 14	183 \pm 12	187 \pm 18	191 \pm 15	188 \pm 11	186 \pm 9
High- z_{peak}	3.335	3.556	3.400	3.655	48	160 \pm 8	155 \pm 10	146 \pm 40	196 \pm 31	159 \pm 7	158 \pm 9
Low-FWHM	239.7	195.0	161.6	227.2	48	150 \pm 14	161 \pm 15	133 \pm 20	172 \pm 24	144 \pm 11	164 \pm 12
High-FWHM	239.7	289.2	255.5	356.6	48	190 \pm 12	184 \pm 12	211 \pm 20	235 \pm 24	195 \pm 10	194 \pm 10
Low-FWHM ^a _{resolved}	253.1	214.2	184.2	237.3	43	141 \pm 13	148 \pm 14	121 \pm 17	148 \pm 23	133 \pm 10	148 \pm 11
High-FWHM ^a _{resolved}	253.1	290.5	258.4	376.2	43	194 \pm 15	191 \pm 15	217 \pm 22	226 \pm 21	201 \pm 12	202 \pm 12
Low-FWHM ^b _{matched-z_{peak}}	239.7	201.9	164.3	228.0	31	139 \pm 14	147 \pm 17	116 \pm 24	133 \pm 27	133 \pm 12	143 \pm 14
High-FWHM ^b _{matched-z_{peak}}	239.7	290.5	252.4	387.0	31	199 \pm 12	196 \pm 13	211 \pm 34	233 \pm 20	200 \pm 11	206 \pm 10
Low- $z_{\text{matched-FWHM}}^c$	3.335	3.083	3.000	3.305	37	180 \pm 18	172 \pm 11	183 \pm 21	184 \pm 17	181 \pm 13	175 \pm 9
High- $z_{\text{matched-FWHM}}^c$	3.335	3.570	3.400	3.660	37	157 \pm 7	166 \pm 10	139 \pm 71	122 \pm 53	156 \pm 6	164 \pm 9
Low-log $L(\text{Ly}\alpha)$	41.97	41.76	41.52	41.91	48	161 \pm 11	160 \pm 14	153 \pm 29	205 \pm 23	159 \pm 10	172 \pm 11
High-log $L(\text{Ly}\alpha)$	41.97	42.28	42.05	42.52	48	185 \pm 14	186 \pm 13	219 \pm 46	252 \pm 76	187 \pm 13	187 \pm 12
Low-log SFR ^d	-0.18	-0.38	-0.50	-0.26	33	158 \pm 10	161 \pm 12	147 \pm 22	135 \pm 15	156 \pm 9	150 \pm 9
High-log SFR ^d	-0.18	0.23	0.01	0.49	30	204 \pm 15	192 \pm 13	210 \pm 40	173 \pm 34	204 \pm 14	189 \pm 12
Low-EW ₀ ^d	63.3	33.2	19.8	54.1	29	203 \pm 11	199 \pm 12	220 \pm 37	171 \pm 24	204 \pm 10	193 \pm 10
High-EW ₀ ^d	63.3	94.0	68.8	126.0	30	143 \pm 9	146 \pm 11	144 \pm 17	117 \pm 14	143 \pm 7	134 \pm 8

Notes– (1) The sub-sample for which V_{offset} is measured. (2) The threshold value of the parameter based on which the sub-sample is made: ρ in kpc, FWHM in km s^{-1} , $L(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ in erg s^{-1} , SFR in $M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, and EW_0 in \AA . (3) The median value of the parameter for the sub-sample. (4) 16th percentile of the parameter. (5) 84th percentile of the parameter. (6) Number of LAEs in the sub-sample. (7) The velocity offset in km s^{-1} measured from the median stacked H I profile. (8) The same as (7) but for the mean stacked H I profile. (9) The same as (7) but for the median stacked C IV profile. (10) The same as (7) but for the mean stacked C IV profile. (11) The weighted average of V_{offset} measured from the median stacked H I and C IV profiles. (12) The same as (11) but measured from the mean stacked H I and C IV profiles.

^aThe LAEs with FWHM smaller than the MUSE resolution ($< 166 \text{ km s}^{-1}$) are excluded.

^bThe z_{peak} is matched for these two sub-samples.

^cThe FWHM is matched for these two sub-samples.

^dThe LAEs that are blended with low- z continuum objects are excluded. The threshold value is chosen in such a way that the number of LAEs in both sub-samples are similar. Only the continuum-detected objects above (below) the threshold value are used to construct the high-log SFR (low-EW₀) sub-sample. All the objects below (above) the threshold value are used to construct the low-log SFR (high-EW₀) sub-sample. Only 9/33 and 10/30 LAEs in the low-log SFR and high-EW₀ sub-samples, respectively, are detected in UV continuum. Upper (lower) limits in the low-log SFR (high-EW₀) sub-samples are considered as detections for the median and percentile calculations.

particularly when we split the sample into different sub-samples. We thus chose to use the PODY recovered spectra. The stacked profiles for the full sample using the original spectra are shown in Fig. A1.

Fig. 2 shows the first measurements of the CGM of LAEs in absorption for a statistically meaningful sample (see Díaz et al. 2015; Fumagalli et al. 2016; Zahedy et al. 2019; Mackenzie et al. 2019; Lofthouse et al. 2020, for individual examples). We detect absorption signals for H I and C IV with $> 5\sigma$ significances. Note that, none of the stacked absorption profiles are centered on the 0 km s^{-1} defined by the redshift of peak Ly α emission, z_{peak} . All profiles show velocity offset, $V_{\text{offset}} > 170 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. Here $V_{\text{offset}} = (V_{\text{peak}} - V_{\text{CGM}})$, where V_{CGM} is the velocity centroid of the CGM absorption profile, and V_{peak} is the velocity corresponding to z_{peak} . The V_{offset} measured for the median (mean) stacked H I profile is $171 \pm 9 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ($176 \pm 10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$). The velocity offsets and the associated errors are determined from Gaussian fits to the stacked spectra along with the error spectra determined by bootstrapping the LAE sam-

ple.⁵ The median and mean stacked C IV profiles show V_{offset} of $171 \pm 22 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ and $181 \pm 24 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, respectively. Owing to the relative weakness of the C IV absorption, the estimated errors on the corresponding V_{offset} measurements are larger. Nevertheless, the stacked C IV profiles provide independent measurements of V_{offset} , and are fully consistent with the H I measurements. The weighted average of the V_{offset} values measured from the median and mean stacked profiles are $171 \pm 8 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ and $177 \pm 9 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, respectively. Such offsets imply that the z_{peak} values are systematically redshifted with respect to the systemic redshifts, consistent with the results from the observations of non-resonant rest-frame UV/optical

⁵ Note that the possible covariance between the neighboring pixels are ignored in our fits. The V_{offset} distributions obtained from the bootstrapped spectra suggest that such ignorance could lead to underestimations of the true uncertainties by a factor of 1.3–1.5 for the H I profiles.




Figure 3. The inverse variance weighted average of the velocity offsets measured from the H I and C IV absorption profiles for the different sub-samples listed in Table 2. The velocity offsets measured from the median and mean stacked profiles are indicated by the filled squares and open circles respectively. The red and blue points correspond to the “high” and “low” sub-samples (Table 2), respectively. V_{offset} shows significant trends with FWHM, SFR, and EW_0 .

nebular emission/absorption lines (e.g., Steidel et al. 2010; Shibuya et al. 2014; Verhamme et al. 2018).

In order to investigate possible trends between V_{offset} and other parameters (e.g., z_{peak} , ρ , FWHM), we generated stacked H I and C IV absorption profiles for several sub-samples corresponding to different parameters, as summarized in Table 2. The velocity offsets and corresponding uncertainties, determined from Gaussian fits to the stacked H I and C IV profiles (as in Fig. 2), for the different sub-samples are also listed in the table. The last two columns (columns 11 & 12) provide the combined constraints on V_{offset} , obtained from the inverse variance weighted average of the velocity offsets measured from the H I and C IV profiles, and are illustrated in Fig. 3. We will only use these weighted average V_{offset} values in all further discussions.

It is evident from Fig. 3 that V_{offset} does not show any significant trend with ρ and $L(\text{Ly}\alpha)$. The difference in V_{offset} between the corresponding “high” and “low” sub-samples, calculated for both the mean and median stacked profiles, has $<2\sigma$ significance. There is a 2.2σ (2.2σ) difference between the V_{offset} values measured from the median (mean) stacked profiles of the low- and high- z_{peak} sub-samples. However, we note that the trend is actually driven by FWHM, owing to a 3.4σ anti-correlation between z_{peak} and FWHM (Spearman rank correlation coefficient, $r_s = -0.35$)⁶. Indeed, the difference reduces to $<2\sigma$ when the low- and high- z_{peak} sub-samples are matched in FWHM.

There is a 3.4σ (1.9σ) difference in the V_{offset} for the high-FWHM and low-FWHM sub-samples measured from the median (mean) stacked profiles. The difference increases for the $\text{FWHM}_{\text{resolved}}$ sub-samples, in which we excluded the LAEs with

FWHM smaller than the MUSE resolution, to 4.4σ (3.3σ for the mean stack). Since we noted an anti-correlation between z_{peak} and FWHM, it is important to investigate whether the trend between V_{offset} and FWHM remains when the low- and high-FWHM sub-samples are matched in z_{peak} . In fact, we do find a 4.1σ (3.7σ for the mean stack) difference in V_{offset} between the low- and high-FWHM sub-samples when they are matched in z_{peak} . In addition, a clear difference, with $>2.5\sigma$ significance, is seen in V_{offset} measured for the low- and high-SFR sub-samples, for both the mean and median stacked profiles. Finally, the strongest difference ($>4.5\sigma$) in V_{offset} is seen between the low- and high- EW_0 sub-samples, with higher EW_0 yielding a smaller velocity offset. In the next section we discuss the possible implications of these new results in the context of existing observational and theoretical studies.

5 DISCUSSION

Simple, idealized models of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ radiation transfer with a central ionizing point source surrounded by a homogeneous, spherically symmetric shell of gas with a range of neutral hydrogen column density ($N(\text{H I})$), dust opacity, velocity, and temperature (the so-called “shell model”, see e.g., Zheng & Miralda-Escudé 2002; Verhamme et al. 2006) have been surprisingly successful in explaining a large variety of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ line profiles (e.g., Hashimoto et al. 2015; Gronke 2017). Using the shell model, Verhamme et al. (2018) found a correlation between FWHM and V_{offset} (see also Claeysens et al. 2019). The left panel of Fig. 4 shows the weighted average V_{offset} , measured from the median stacked CGM absorption (H I and C IV) profiles, against the median FWHM of the low- and high- $\text{FWHM}_{\text{resolved}}$ sub-samples (blue squares). Consistent with the model prediction, the stacked CGM absorption profiles show larger velocity offsets for the high- $\text{FWHM}_{\text{resolved}}$ sub-sample (Table 2). The dashed line shows the empirical relation between V_{offset} and FWHM obtained

⁶ The anti-correlation between z_{peak} and FWHM is likely due to the fact that the MUSE resolution improves from $\approx 180 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ to $\approx 150 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ between $z \approx 3.0$ and 3.6 .




Figure 4. Left: V_{offset} as a function of FWHM of the Ly α line. The star symbols represent LAEs from the literature for which the systemic redshifts are known (see Verhamme et al. (2018) for details). The dashed line and the shaded region represent the best-fit linear relation, $V_{\text{offset}} = 0.9(\pm 0.14) \times \text{FWHM} - 34(\pm 60) \text{ km s}^{-1}$, for the star symbols and its 1σ range, respectively, as found by Verhamme et al. (2018). The blue squares represent our weighted average V_{offset} measurements for the FWHM $_{\text{resolved}}$ sub-samples as in Table 2. The dotted straight line connecting the blue squares has a slope (0.89) and an intercept (-58 km s^{-1}) that are fully consistent with the empirical relation of Verhamme et al. (2018). Right: Weighted average V_{offset} , measured from the median stacked profiles, as a function of SFR for our sample (blue squares). The orange filled circle represents the measurement from Rakic et al. (2011) for $z \approx 2.3$ LBGs. The best-fit linear relation between $\log V_{\text{offset}}$ and $\log \text{SFR}$ ($\log V_{\text{offset}} = (0.16 \pm 0.03) \log \text{SFR} + (2.26 \pm 0.02)$) for those three points is indicated by the dashed line. The open diamonds and the open triangles represent data points from Shibuya et al. (2014) and Trainor et al. (2015), respectively (see text). The filled diamond and the filled triangle represent the median SFR and the median V_{offset} of the corresponding samples, with the error bars indicating the standard deviations. In both panels, the error bars along the x-axis indicate 68 percentile ranges.

by Verhamme et al. (2018) from the sample of LAEs with known systemic redshifts as indicated by the star symbols. Verhamme et al. (2018) used the LST_LINEFIT routine of Cappellari et al. (2013), which includes a procedure for the rejection of outliers, and obtained a slope of 0.9 ± 0.14 , an intercept of $-34 \pm 60 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, and an intrinsic scatter of $72 \pm 12 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. The slope (0.89) and intercept (-58 km s^{-1}) we obtain from the stacked CGM absorption profiles are fully consistent with Verhamme et al. (2018). Note that the trend between V_{offset} and FWHM found by Verhamme et al. (2018) was determined via observations of the interstellar medium (ISM) properties (nebular emission lines) whereas we confirm the same trend using CGM observations.

Steidel et al. (2010) obtained a mean velocity offset of $445 \pm 27 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ between Ly α and systemic redshifts defined by the H α lines for a sample of 41 $z \approx 2.3$ LBGs. The total baryonic masses estimated for those LBGs are $\geq 10^{10} - 10^{11.5} M_{\odot}$. Using a sample of 22 NB-selected (with a typical bandwidth of $\approx 100 \text{ \AA}$) LAEs with Ly α equivalent widths $> 50 \text{ \AA}$, Shibuya et al. (2014) obtained an average velocity offset between Ly α and nebular redshifts of $234 \pm 9 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. The stellar mass (M_{*}) estimates for the LAEs in their sample range between $\approx 10^9$ and $10^{10} M_{\odot}$. Clearly, the NB-selected LAEs exhibit a smaller velocity offset compared to the broadband-(UV color) selected LBGs (as already noted by Hashimoto et al. 2013, 2015; Shibuya et al. 2014). Hashimoto et al. (2015) argued that the low V_{offset} of LAEs compared to LBGs are related to smaller $N(\text{H I})$ in LAEs. Note that, both LBGs and NB-selected LAEs show higher velocity offsets (by factors of ≈ 2.6 and ≈ 1.4 , respectively) compared to what we measure for the MUSE-detected LAEs.

Using the mean H I CGM absorption profile of ≈ 300 UV color selected galaxies in the redshift range 2 – 3, Rakic et al. (2011) estimated $V_{\text{offset}} = 295 \pm 35 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, which is ≈ 1.7 times higher than what we obtained for our sample. The galaxies in Rakic et al. (2011) were drawn from Steidel et al. (2010)

with a typical halo mass of $\sim 10^{12} M_{\odot}$ (Rakic et al. 2013). Using clustering properties of LAEs, Khostovan et al. (2019) found a strong, redshift-independent correlation between $L(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ normalized by the characteristic line luminosity, $L^*(z)$, and dark matter halo mass. According to their Eq. 13, the median $L(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ of our sample of $\approx 10^{42} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ ($L(\text{Ly}\alpha)/L^*(z) = 0.2$)⁷ would correspond to a halo mass of $M_h \sim 10^{10.8} M_{\odot}$, corresponding to a stellar mass of $M_{*} \sim 10^{8.0} M_{\odot}$ (Moster et al. 2013), assuming LAEs are average main sequence galaxies. Additionally, the median SFR ($1.3 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) of our sample corresponds to $M_{*} \sim 10^{8.6} M_{\odot}$ (Behroozi et al. 2019) and $M_h \sim 10^{11.1} M_{\odot}$ (Moster et al. 2013). Clearly, the MUSE-detected LAEs in our sample are, on average, at least an order of magnitude lower in mass than the LBG sample of Rakic et al. (2011). Higher mass galaxies tend to have higher SFR which, in turn, can drive high velocity, galactic-scale winds causing higher (red) shift of the Ly α emission line.

We find a positive (negative) trend between V_{offset} and SFR (EW_0), consistent with the findings of Erb et al. (2014). The anticorrelation between V_{offset} and EW_0 is understood in terms of higher optical depth of gas with near systemic velocity (Steidel et al. 2010; Erb et al. 2014). The right panel of Fig. 4 shows the V_{offset} measured from the median stacked profiles against the median SFRs of the low- and high-SFR sub-samples. In addition, we show the V_{offset} measurement from Rakic et al. (2011) for their sample of $z \approx 2.3$ LBGs with a median SFR of $\approx 25 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Turner et al. 2014; Steidel et al. 2014). A positive trend between V_{offset} and SFR is evident in the log – log plot. A linear least-squares fit to the data points results in a slope of 0.16 ± 0.03 and an intercept of 2.26 ± 0.02 , indicating a sub-linear relationship $V_{\text{offset}} \propto \text{SFR}^{0.16 \pm 0.03}$.

⁷ $\log L^*(z = 3.3)/\text{erg s}^{-1} = 42.68_{-0.06}^{+0.07}$, see Table 2 of Khostovan et al. (2019)

The relation holds over almost 2 orders of magnitude range in SFR. We note here that the low–log SFR bin is dominated by upper limits (24/33). Thus, the inferred slope of the trend will be shallower if the true SFR values are much smaller than the estimated upper limits.

Note that the SFRs in our sample are not corrected for dust, whereas the SFRs for the LBG sample of Rakic et al. (2011) are dust-corrected. Using the mean β_{UV} of -2.03 estimated for $\sim 0.1L^*$ galaxies at $z \approx 4$ by Bouwens et al. (2014) and the relationship between β_{UV} and UV extinction (A_{1600}) from Meurer et al. (1999)⁸, we obtain a mild ≈ 0.15 dex correction in SFR for our sample. Incorporating such a correction factor in SFR provides a consistent best-fitting relationship between V_{offset} and SFR (i.e., a slope of 0.17 ± 0.04 and an intercept of 2.23 ± 0.02).

The open diamonds and the open triangles in the right panel of Fig. 4 represent individual LAEs from Shibuya et al. (2014) and Trainor et al. (2015), respectively, for which the SFRs and V_{offset} values, measured from non-resonant nebular lines, are known. The SFRs for the Trainor et al. (2015) sample are calculated from the H α luminosities using Kennicutt (1998) relation. The SFRs of all these LAEs have been corrected to the Chabrier (2003) IMF. The median SFRs and the median V_{offset} values of these samples are indicated by the corresponding filled symbols. If we include these two points in the fit, we obtain a slope of 0.15 ± 0.03 and an intercept of 2.26 ± 0.02 , which are fully consistent with what we obtained earlier. Here standard deviations of the individual measurements are used as uncertainties. The results remain consistent (slope = 0.12 ± 0.03 and intercept = 2.25 ± 0.02) within the 1σ allowed ranges in slope and intercept even if we use standard errors instead of standard deviations.

The correlation between SFR and V_{offset} can be explained as follows. Galaxies with higher SFRs are likely to drive higher velocity winds. Higher velocity winds will enhance and shift the red Ly α peak to a longer wavelength resulting in a larger velocity offset (see Fig. 8 of Laursen et al. 2009, for example). Using the scaling relations between SFR and M_* (SFR $\propto M_*$ at $z \approx 4$; see e.g., Fig. 3 of Behroozi et al. 2019), and between M_* and M_h ($M_* \propto M_h^2$ at $z \approx 4$; e.g., Moster et al. 2013), we obtain $V_{\text{offset}} \propto V_{\text{cir}}$, where $V_{\text{cir}} (\propto M_h^{1/3} \propto M_*^{1/6} \propto \text{SFR}^{1/6})$ is the halo circular velocity. It is interesting to note that in models of momentum driven galactic outflows the wind speed scales as V_{cir} (e.g., Murray et al. 2005; Heckman et al. 2015). Moreover, models of Ly α radiative transfer suggest that V_{offset} is twice the shell expansion velocity (e.g., Verhamme et al. 2006). Indeed, Rakic et al. (2011) found that for $z \approx 2.3$ LBGs, V_{offset} is about twice the blueshift of the interstellar absorption lines thought to arise in galactic winds. Hence, if the Ly α emission is back scattered off an outflowing medium, we expect $V_{\text{offset}} \propto V_{\text{cir}}$ which is consistent with our results. Alternatively, a static medium (or a medium without a clear bulk flow) with higher $N(\text{H I})$ for higher V_{cir} can also explain the correlation.

6 SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

Determining accurate redshifts for LAEs is challenging owing to the resonant scattering of Ly α photons with neutral hydrogen present in the ISM and in the CGM. Here we use CGM absorption lines, detected in the spectra of 8 background quasars, of 96 LAEs at $z \approx 3.3$ to calibrate the Ly α redshifts statistically. These LAEs are detected in 8 MUSE fields centered on the 8 bright quasars

with redshifts 3.7–3.8. Our method for calibrating Ly α redshifts, which was pioneered by Rakic et al. (2011), relies on the assumption that the average (stacked) CGM absorption profiles of LAEs must be centered on the systemic velocity. This simply follows from the fact that the LAEs are randomly oriented with respect to the background quasars. Therefore, the CGM absorption, originating in outflows/accretion/co-rotating gas-disks, should have no preferred line of sight velocities. We measured $V_{\text{offset}} = 171 \pm 8 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ and $177 \pm 9 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, from the median and mean stacked absorption profiles, respectively. The V_{offset} obtained for the MUSE-detected LAEs in our sample is smaller than that measured for LBGs in the literature, likely due to the lower masses of LAEs compared to LBGs. V_{offset} shows positive trends with FWHM and a negative trend with EW_0 . Finally, a sub-linear relation is obtained between V_{offset} and SFR, which, in turn, suggests that V_{offset} scales as the halo circular velocity.

Stacked CGM absorption profiles, as we obtained here, are a powerful tool to calibrate Ly α redshifts in a statistical manner, which can be applied to samples without systemic redshifts. Nevertheless, obtaining rest-frame optical nebular line diagnostics using future VLT/KMOS, Keck/MOSFIRE, and/or JWST/NIRSpec observations would be extremely useful to determine the systemic redshifts on a galaxy-by-galaxy basis, and to understand the physical properties of these high- z , presumably low-mass galaxies.

Acknowledgements: We thank the anonymous referee for useful suggestions. This study is based on observations collected at the European Organisation for Astronomical Research in the Southern Hemisphere under ESO programme(s): 094.A-0131(B), 095.A-0200(A), 096.A-0222(A), 097.A-0089(A), and 099.A-0159(A). SM acknowledges support from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, Germany. SM thanks Christian Herenz for useful discussion. SC gratefully acknowledges support from Swiss National Science Foundation grant PP00P2_163824. JB acknowledges support by FCT/MCTES through national funds by grant UID/FIS/04434/2019 and through Investigador FCT Contract No. IF/01654/2014/CP1215/CT0003. NB and JZ acknowledge support from ANR grant ANR-17-CE31-0017 (3DGasFlows). AC and JR acknowledge support from the ERC starting grant 336736-CALENDS. MA acknowledges support from European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 721463 to the SUNDIAL ITN, and from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (MINECO) under grant number AYA2016-76219-P. MA also acknowledges support from the Fundación BBVA under its 2017 programme of assistance to scientific research groups, for the project “Using machine-learning techniques to drag galaxies from the noise in deep imaging”. FL and AV acknowledge support from the ERC starting grant ERC-757258-TRIPLE.

APPENDIX A: STACKED PROFILES GENERATED USING THE ORIGINAL QUASAR SPECTRA

In Fig. A1 we compare the stacked profiles generated using the original spectra and the PODPy recovered spectra. From the comparison we conclude that the masking of inconsistent pixels using PODPy does not have an appreciable effect on the measured V_{offset} .

REFERENCES

Aguirre A., Schaye J., Theuns T., 2002, *ApJ*, 576, 1

⁸ $A_{1600} = 4.43 + 1.99 \times \beta_{UV}$




Figure A1. Median (left) and mean (right) stacked CGM absorption profiles of H I (bottom) and C IV (top) generated using the original quasar spectra. The corresponding profiles using PODPy recovered spectra are shown in red for comparison. The strong H I profiles do not show a considerable difference. The relatively weak C IV transition look noisier, particularly for the mean stack, compared to the PODPy recovered stack. The weaker member of the C IV $\lambda\lambda 1548, 1550$ doublet, which is eliminated by PODPy, is also seen here. The V_{offset} values measured from the stacked H I profiles, as indicated in the figure, are fully consistent with those obtained in Fig. 2. Thus, the use of PODPy recovered spectra instead of the original quasar spectra does not have a significant effect on the V_{offset} measurements.

Bacon R., et al., 2010, in *Ground-based and Airborne Instrumentation for Astronomy III*, p. 773508, doi:10.1117/12.856027

Behroozi P., Wechsler R. H., Hearin A. P., Conroy C., 2019, *MNRAS*, p. 1134

Bouwens R. J., et al., 2014, *ApJ*, 793, 115

Cantalupo S., Porciani C., Lilly S. J., Miniati F., 2005, *ApJ*, 628, 61

Cantalupo S., et al., 2019, *MNRAS*, 483, 5188

Cappellari M., et al., 2013, *MNRAS*, 432, 1862

Cassata P., et al., 2011, *A&A*, 525, A143

Chabrier G., 2003, *PASP*, 115, 763

Claeysens A., et al., 2019, *MNRAS*, p. 2141

Cowie L. L., Songaila A., 1998, *Nature*, 394, 44

Díaz C. G., Ryan-Weber E. V., Cooke J., Koyama Y., Ouchi M., 2015, *MNRAS*, 448, 1240

Dijkstra M., Haiman Z., Spaans M., 2006, *ApJ*, 649, 14

Erb D. K., et al., 2014, *ApJ*, 795, 33

Fitzpatrick E. L., 1999, *PASP*, 111, 63

Fumagalli M., Cantalupo S., Dekel A., Morris S. L., O’Meara J. M., Prochaska J. X., Theuns T., 2016, *MNRAS*, 462, 1978

Gawiser E., et al., 2007, *ApJ*, 671, 278

Gronke M., 2017, *A&A*, 608, A139

Gronwall C., et al., 2007, *ApJ*, 667, 79

Hagen A., et al., 2016, *ApJ*, 817, 79

Hao C.-N., Huang J.-S., Xia X., Zheng X., Jiang C., Li C., 2018, *ApJ*, 864, 145

Hashimoto T., Ouchi M., Shimasaku K., Ono Y., Nakajima K., Rauch M., Lee J., Okamura S., 2013, *ApJ*, 775, 140

Hashimoto T., et al., 2015, *ApJ*, 812, 157

Hayes M., 2015, *PASA*, 32, e027

Heckman T. M., Alexandroff R. M., Borthakur S., Overzier R., Leitherer C., 2015, *ApJ*, 809, 147

Inami H., et al., 2017, *A&A*, 608, A2

Kennicutt Jr. R. C., 1998, *ARA&A*, 36, 189

Khostovan A. A., et al., 2019, *MNRAS*, 489, 555

Laursen P., Razoumov A. O., Sommer-Larsen J., 2009, *ApJ*, 696, 853

Leclercq F., et al., 2017, *A&A*, 608, A8

Lofthouse E. K., et al., 2020, *MNRAS*, 491, 2057

Mackenzie R., et al., 2019, *MNRAS*, 487, 5070

Madau P., Dickinson M., 2014, *ARA&A*, 52, 415

Malhotra S., Rhoads J. E., 2002, *ApJ*, 565, L71

Marino R. A., et al., 2018, *ApJ*, 859, 53

Maseda M. V., et al., 2017, *A&A*, 608, A4

Meurer G. R., Heckman T. M., Calzetti D., 1999, *ApJ*, 521, 64

Moster B. P., Naab T., White S. D. M., 2013, *MNRAS*, 428, 3121

Murphy M. T., Kacprzak G. G., Savorgnan G. A. D., Carswell R. F., 2019, *MNRAS*, 482, 3458

Murray N., Quataert E., Thompson T. A., 2005, *ApJ*, 618, 569

Muzahid S., Srianand R., Arav N., Savage B. D., Narayanan A., 2013, *MNRAS*, 431, 2885

Neufeld D. A., 1990, *ApJ*, 350, 216

O’Meara J. M., et al., 2015, *AJ*, 150, 111

Rakic O., Schaye J., Steidel C. C., Rudie G. C., 2011, *MNRAS*, 414, 3265

Rakic O., Schaye J., Steidel C. C., Booth C. M., Dalla Vecchia C., Rudie G. C., 2013, *MNRAS*, 433, 3103

Rauch M., et al., 2008, *ApJ*, 681, 856

Rauch M., Becker G. D., Haehnelt M. G., 2016, *MNRAS*, 455, 3991

Schaye J., Aguirre A., Kim T.-S., Theuns T., Rauch M., Sargent W. L. W., 2003, *ApJ*, 596, 768

Schlafly E. F., Finkbeiner D. P., 2011, *ApJ*, 737, 103

Shibuya T., et al., 2014, *ApJ*, 788, 74

Shibuya T., et al., 2018, *PASJ*, 70, S14

Sobral D., Santos S., Matthee J., Paulino-Afonso A., Ribeiro B., Calhau J., Khostovan A. A., 2018, *MNRAS*, 476, 4725

Steidel C. C., Erb D. K., Shapley A. E., Pettini M., Reddy N., Bogosavljević M., Rudie G. C., Rakic O., 2010, *ApJ*, 717, 289

Steidel C. C., et al., 2014, *ApJ*, 795, 165

Trainor R. F., Steidel C. C., Strom A. L., Rudie G. C., 2015, *ApJ*, 809, 89

Turner M. L., Schaye J., Steidel C. C., Rudie G. C., Strom A. L., 2014,

[MNRAS](#), 445, 794

Urrutia T., et al., 2019, [A&A](#), 624, A141

Verhamme A., Schaerer D., Maselli A., 2006, [A&A](#), 460, 397

Verhamme A., et al., 2018, [MNRAS](#), 478, L60

Weilbacher P. M., et al., 2020, [A&A](#), 641, A28

Wisotzki L., et al., 2016, [A&A](#), 587, A98

Zahedy F. S., Rauch M., Chen H.-W., Carswell R. F., Stalder B., Stark A. A.,
2019, arXiv e-prints,

Zheng Z., Miralda-Escudé J., 2002, [ApJ](#), 568, L71

This paper has been typeset from a \TeX/L\TeX file prepared by the author.