

# SPT-CL J2215-3537: A Massive Starburst at the Center of the Most Distant Relaxed Galaxy Cluster

MICHAEL S. CALZADILLA,<sup>1</sup> LINDSEY E. BLEEM,<sup>2,3</sup> MICHAEL McDONALD,<sup>1</sup> MICHAEL D. GLADDERS,<sup>3,4</sup> ADAM B. MANTZ,<sup>5</sup>  
STEVEN W. ALLEN,<sup>5</sup> MATTHEW B. BAYLISS,<sup>6</sup> ANNA-CHRISTINA EILERS,<sup>1</sup> BENJAMIN FLOYD,<sup>7</sup> JULIE HLAVACEK-LARRONDO,<sup>8</sup>  
GOURAV KHULLAR,<sup>9</sup> KEUNHO J. KIM,<sup>6</sup> GUILLAUME MAHLER,<sup>10,11</sup> KEREN SHARON,<sup>12</sup> TAWEEWAT SOMBOONPANYAKUL,<sup>5</sup>  
BRIAN STALDER,<sup>13</sup> ANTONY A. STARK<sup>13</sup>

(SPT COLLABORATION)

<sup>1</sup>Kavli Institute for Astrophysics and Space Research, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

<sup>2</sup>High Energy Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 S. Cass Avenue, Argonne, IL 60439, USA

<sup>3</sup>Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics, University of Chicago, 5640 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, USA

<sup>4</sup>Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of Chicago, 5640 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, USA

<sup>5</sup>Kavli Institute for Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology, Stanford University, 452 Lomita Mall, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

<sup>6</sup>Department of Physics, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221, USA

<sup>7</sup>Faculty of Physics and Astronomy, University of Missouri – Kansas City, 5110 Rockhill Road, Kansas City, MO 64110, USA

<sup>8</sup>Département de Physique, Université de Montréal, Succ. Centre-Ville, Montréal, Québec, H3C 3J7, Canada

<sup>9</sup>Department of Physics and Astronomy and PITT PACC, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260, USA

<sup>10</sup>Centre for Extragalactic Astronomy, Durham University, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE, UK

<sup>11</sup>Institute for Computational Cosmology, Durham University, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE, UK

<sup>12</sup>Department of Astronomy, University of Michigan, 1085 S. University Ave, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA

<sup>13</sup>Center for Astrophysics — Harvard & Smithsonian, 60 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

(Accepted 16 March 2023)

Submitted to ApJ

## ABSTRACT

We present the discovery of the most distant, dynamically relaxed cool core cluster, SPT-CL J2215-3537 (SPT2215) and its central brightest cluster galaxy (BCG) at  $z = 1.16$ . Using new X-ray observations, we demonstrate that SPT2215 harbors a strong cool core, with a central cooling time of 200 Myr (at 10 kpc) and a maximal intracluster medium cooling rate of  $1900 \pm 400 \text{ M}_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ . This prodigious cooling may be responsible for fueling extended, star-forming filaments observed in *Hubble Space Telescope* imaging. Based on new spectrophotometric data, we detect bright [O II] emission in the BCG, implying an unobscured star formation rate (SFR) of  $320^{+230}_{-140} \text{ M}_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ . The detection of a weak radio source ( $2.0 \pm 0.8 \text{ mJy}$  at 0.8 GHz) suggests ongoing feedback from an active galactic nucleus (AGN), though the implied jet power is less than half the cooling luminosity of the hot gas, consistent with cooling overpowering heating. The extreme cooling and SFR of SPT2215 is rare among known cool core clusters, and it is even more remarkable that we observe these at such high redshift, when most clusters are still dynamically disturbed. The high mass of this cluster, coupled with the fact that it is dynamically relaxed with a highly-isolated BCG, suggests that it is an exceptionally rare system that must have formed very rapidly in the early Universe. Combined with the high SFR, SPT2215 may be a high- $z$  analog of the Phoenix cluster, potentially providing insight into the limits of AGN feedback and star formation in the most massive galaxies.

*Keywords:* galaxies: clusters: individual (SPT-CLJ2215-3537) — X-rays: galaxies: clusters

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Galaxy clusters are rich collections of hundreds to thousands of galaxies. However, most of the luminous mass in a cluster is found in a hot ( $T \sim 10^7$  K), X-ray emitting phase that permeates the space between these galaxies. This vast X-ray emitting plasma is called the intracluster medium (ICM). As this ICM cools over time, it releases energy via Bremsstrahlung radiation and falls deeper into the gravitational potential well of the cluster. This cooling steepens the density profile of the cluster, which allows for more frequent interactions within the plasma and further decreases the temperature in the center, leading to what is referred to as a “cool core” (CC) cluster (e.g. Hudson et al. 2010).

At the center of a CC cluster, there is usually one dominant, brightest cluster galaxy (BCG), onto which the cooling flow from the ICM is deposited. In the absence of any heat input, these BCGs are expected to vigorously form stars and contain large reservoirs of molecular gas (see review by Fabian 1994). Instead, observations of large samples of these systems show very little of either, with cooling suppressed, on average, by two orders of magnitude compared to theoretical predictions (e.g. Johnstone et al. 1987; McNamara & O’Connell 1989; Allen 1995; Crawford et al. 1999; Rafferty et al. 2006; O’Dea et al. 2008; Donahue et al. 2015; McDonald et al. 2018). The cooling funneled onto the BCG also makes its way to its central active galactic nucleus (AGN), where accretion onto a supermassive black hole (SMBH) leads to massive outbursts in the form of relativistic outflows of plasma, which in turn deposit heat into the ICM. Such “feedback” in response to feeding establishes the central SMBH as a sort of thermostat that regulates the temperature and the amount of cool gas available for forming stars (see reviews by Fabian 2012; McNamara & Nulsen 2007, 2012; Gaspari et al. 2020; Donahue & Voit 2022). In nearby clusters, this behavior seems tightly regulated (e.g. Hlavacek-Larrondo et al. 2015). We know much less about the behavior of feedback and cooling at higher redshifts, when clusters are still in the process of virializing and the availability of gas and the rate of cosmic star formation were much higher.

Studies of large samples of high-redshift clusters have been enabled by Sunyaev-Zeldovich (SZ) effect-based surveys (e.g. Vanderlinde et al. 2010; Bleem et al. 2015; Planck Collaboration et al. 2016; Hilton et al. 2021), and more recently by more sensitive X-ray survey telescopes like eROSITA (Liu et al. 2022). SZ surveys have


discovered many more galaxy clusters in a mass-limited way, which allows us to study the balance between AGN feedback and ICM cooling over cosmic history (e.g. McDonald et al. 2013). Among the new lessons learned is that this feedback cycle has been in place for at least  $\sim 10$  Gyr (Hlavacek-Larrondo et al. 2015; Ruppin et al. 2022). The fraction of cool cores in clusters has also remained constant with redshift (McDonald et al. 2013, 2017; Ruppin et al. 2021). One might expect different behaviors at early times, as clusters are still rapidly forming and accreting subhaloes, and the average galaxy is more likely to be both star-forming and hosting an AGN (e.g. Hlavacek-Larrondo et al. 2013; Somboonpanyakul et al. 2022). One possible example of this is SpARCS104922.6+564032.5 (“SpARCS1049”,  $z = 1.7$ ), which hosts a starburst that is not centered on any galaxy, i.e. in the absence of AGN feedback (Webb et al. 2015; Hlavacek-Larrondo et al. 2020). Over time such a cooling flow may be quenched by the eventual alignment of the cluster potential between the BCG and AGN due to dynamical friction.

In this work we present the first detailed study of the massive ( $M_{500c} = 7.32 \times 10^{14} M_{\odot}$ ) high-redshift ( $z = 1.16$ ) galaxy cluster SPT-CL J2215-3537 (hereafter SPT2215). This cluster was discovered in the SPTpol Extended Cluster Survey (SPT-ECS; Bleem et al. 2020) and is among the most massive clusters known at  $z > 1$ . Based on *Chandra* imaging, Mantz et al. (2022) determined SPT2215 to be dynamically relaxed, and was considered as part of a larger sample of relaxed clusters in order to provide tighter constraints on cosmological parameters. This study focuses on some of the extraordinary properties of SPT2215 in more detail. In §2, we describe multi-wavelength followup observations of this system and how these were reduced. In §3, we lay out the extreme qualities of this cluster, namely how isolated, relaxed, and star forming the central galaxy is. Finally, we discuss the importance of this cluster in a cosmological context in §4 before summarizing in §5. Throughout this paper, we assume a flat  $\Lambda$ CDM cosmology with  $H_0 = 70$  km s $^{-1}$  Mpc $^{-1}$ ,  $\Omega_m = 0.3$ , and  $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.7$ . This yields a physical scale of 8.25 kpc arcsec $^{-1}$  at the redshift of the cluster. All measurement errors are  $1\sigma$  unless noted otherwise.

## 2. OBSERVATIONS & DATA REDUCTION

### 2.1. X-ray (*Chandra*)

*Chandra* observations of SPT2215 were taken as part of a followup X-ray campaign of SPT SZ-selected clus-



**Figure 1.** Multiwavelength observations of SPT2215, progressively zooming in clockwise through the images. *Top left:* ASKAP 887 MHz radio image cutout showing the presence of a radio source/AGN with an integrated flux of  $2.0 \pm 0.8$  mJy at 0.8 GHz. The ASKAP beam size is shown in gray. *Top right:* 0.5 – 7 keV *Chandra* X-ray image showing a very relaxed ICM morphology and a strongly peaked central surface brightness profile. *Bottom right:* 2-band *HST* composite image of the cluster, with zoomed-in views of the central BCG in the *bottom middle* (*HST* WFC3/F110W) and *bottom left* (*HST* WFC3/F200LP) panels. The bluer F200LP observation shows the presence of extended, blue filaments that likely indicate strong star formation fueled by cooling out of the hot ICM.

ters. The observations presented here were taken with the ACIS-I instrument, for a total of 72.26 ks (ObsIDs: 22653, 24614, 24615; PI: McDonald). These data were reduced and analyzed using the *Chandra* Interactive Analysis of Observations (CIAO) v4.12.1 software with CALDB v4.9.2, in a standard fashion similar to McDonald et al. 2013; Calzadilla et al. 2019; Rupp et al. 2021, 2022. The latest gain and charge-transfer inefficiency corrections were applied, with improved background screening for the VFAINT telemetry mode. Modeling of the global ICM properties was done as in Calzadilla et al. (2022), and the thermodynamic profiles are shown and discussed in subsection 3.1.

To model the emission of the optically-thin, X-ray emitting plasma in this cluster, we use the APEC/AtomDB XSPEC v3.0.9 thermal spectral model (Smith et al. 2001), in addition to PHABS for photoelectric absorption (Morrison & McCammon 1983). We adopt Anders & Grevesse (1989) abundances for consistency with previous literature, and Hydrogen column density  $N_H = 1.07 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-2}$  from the Leiden-Argentine-Bonn survey (Kalberla et al. 2005).

## 2.2. Optical Spectroscopy

As part of an ongoing follow-up campaign of SZ-selected clusters (e.g. Bayliss et al. 2016; Khullar et al. 2019, 2022), the SPT collaboration has gathered optical



spectroscopy of SPT2215 with the LDSS3 instrument on the 6.5m *Magellan* telescopes in Chile. Multi-object spectra were obtained on 25 June 2019 using 1"3 slits placed on the BCG and 16 other high-redshift member galaxy candidates. Observations were made over 7 exposures totaling 2.3h of LDSS3 spectroscopy with the VPH-Red grism ( $1.175\text{\AA pixel}^{-1}$  dispersion) and open filter, bracketed by flat and comparison *HeNeAr* arc frames. The science and arc exposures were bias and flat-field corrected using *pyRAF/IRAF*<sup>1</sup>, specifically with the *imred.ccdred* package. We also use the *response* task from the *twodspec.longslit* to fit for the shape of the lamp spectrum in the dispersion direction before flat-fielding. In the resulting reduced science frames, we identify the BCG spectrum of SPT2215 and trace the slit using the *twodspec* package *apall* to extract a one-dimensional (1D) spectrum with background subtraction. The same traced apertures were used to extract 1D spectra from the arc frames, which were then used to find a wavelength calibration solution with the *identify* task. The *onedspec.refspec* and *dispcor* tasks were then used to assign and apply the wavelength solution to the science frames. Each of the wavelength calibrated science frames were then median combined with cosmic ray rejection using *scombine* to produce a final 1D spectrum of the BCG, with a wavelength range of  $\lambda = [6800, 10500]$  Å, and dispersion of  $2\text{\AA/pixel}$ .

### 2.3. Optical/UV Imaging and Photometry

#### 2.3.1. Hubble Space Telescope ACS/WFC3

SPT 2215 was imaged as part of *Hubble Space Telescope* Cycle 25, 26 *HST*-SNAP program (GO-15307, GO-16017; PI: Gladders). Observations were obtained on UT 2017-10-06 with the Wide Field Camera 3 (WFC3) using the F110W filter (984s) and the F200LP filter (817s). The F110W and F200LP filters sample the restframe emission from about  $4170 - 6480\text{\AA}$  and  $925 - 4600\text{\AA}$ , respectively. Special care had to be taken in the reduction of the F110W data to generate an appropriately flat fielded image reducing the effects of known ‘IR blobs,’ which are small regions where detector sensitivity is lowered by 10 – 15 %. These features were modeled out by analyzing the stacked images of hundreds of similar exposure observations from the archive. After this, the observations were processed in a standard way using STScI’s *DrizzlePac* software package<sup>2</sup> with

*AstroDrizzle* (v3.3.1). Observations from both filters were combined and drizzled to the same pixel grid, with a resulting resolution of  $0"3 \text{ pixel}^{-1}$ . All of the *HST* data used in this paper can be found in MAST: [10.17909/pr0c-c679](https://mast.stsci.edu/uri/mast/10.17909/pr0c-c679).

#### 2.3.2. Magellan PISCO

Optical imaging of SPT2215 were obtained for 300s in  $1"2$  seeing on June 22, 2017 in the *griz* bands using the Parallel Imager for Southern Cosmology Observations (PISCO; [Stalder et al. 2014](#))-installed on the 6.5 m *Magellan* Clay Telescope. The image reduction process is detailed in [Bleem et al. \(2020\)](#). Sources were extracted using Source Extractor ([Bertin & Arnouts 1996](#)), star galaxy separation performed using the SG statistic ([Bleem et al. 2015](#)), and photometric calibration performed using stellar locus regression (SLR) techniques ([High et al. 2009](#)). PISCO astrometry was tied to stars from the Dark Energy Survey public data release ([Abbott et al. 2018](#)).

#### 2.3.3. Magellan FourStar

To complement the optical imaging, 640s of *J* and *H* band near-infrared imaging with the *Magellan/FourStar* ([Persson et al. 2013](#)) was obtained on Oct 02, 2017. As detailed in [Bleem et al. \(2020\)](#), the images were flat fielded with IRAF routines and astrometrically registered and relatively calibrated using the PHOTPIPE pipeline (e.g., [Miknaitis et al. 2007](#)). Absolute photometric calibration was undertaken using SLR. Astrometry was tied to the Two Micron All Sky Survey (2MASS) catalog ([Skrutskie et al. 2006](#)).

#### 2.3.4. Spitzer IRAC

Spitzer/IRAC observations at  $3.6$  (*I1*) and  $4.5 \mu\text{m}$  (*I2*) of SPT2215 were obtained as part of a follow-up program to identify galaxy counterparts for high-redshift massive SZ cluster candidates (PID 11096, PI: Bleem). The cluster was observed for 360s on source time in both bands; the data were reduced and photometered following the methodology detailed in [Ashby et al. \(2009\)](#). Astrometry was also tied to the 2MASS catalog.


## 3. ANALYSIS & RESULTS

### 3.1. The Most Distant Relaxed Cool Core Cluster

As mentioned before, SPT2215 was previously determined to be dynamically relaxed in [Mantz et al. \(2022\)](#). This was done by characterizing the morphology of the X-ray emitting ICM, which looks largely spherically symmetric, as seen in the *Chandra* image in the

<sup>1</sup> <https://iraf-community.github.io/pyraf.html>

<sup>2</sup> <https://drizzlepac.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>



**Figure 2.** SPA relaxedness criteria based on the symmetry (S), peakiness (P), and isophotal alignment (A) of ICM X-ray morphology for a sample of clusters (adapted from Mantz et al. 2015). Combined three-dimensional cuts along each of these axes separate clusters into those that are dynamically relaxed (green circles) and unrelaxed (blue circles). SPT2215 is plotted as a red star, and can be seen to pass the above cuts distinguishing it as a relaxed cluster.

top right panel in Figure 1. More quantitatively, using the ICM symmetry, peakiness, and isophotal alignment (SPA) criteria from Mantz et al. (2015) to determine the degree of relaxedness, these measurements yield  $S = 1.24 \pm 0.15$ ,  $P = -0.46 \pm 0.04$ ,  $A = 1.42 \pm 0.16$  Mantz et al. (2022). In Figure 2, we compare the SPA measurements of SPT2215 to the sample of clusters from Mantz et al. (2015), who identify thresholds that separate relaxed and disturbed clusters. We see that the SPA measurements for SPT2215 indeed lie firmly in the relaxed locus in this parameter space.


The dynamical state of this cluster can be further validated by looking at the optical *HST* images shown in Figure 1 (bottom panels), which indicate that the BCG at the center of the frame is exceptionally bright, with an extended diffuse envelope of light. There are no other galaxies out to  $\sim 200$  kpc in projected distance which appear nearly as bright or extended. We only consider this distance in order to minimize contamination from foreground or background galaxies not associated with the cluster. Within this radius, we measure background-subtracted F110W fluxes from  $\sim 10$  kpc radius circular apertures centered on the brightest neighboring galaxies and compare to that of the BCG. The smallest magnitude gap, corresponding to the flux ratio between the BCG and the second brightest galaxy (e.g. Milosavljević et al. 2006; van den Bosch et al. 2007), is  $\Delta M_{1,2} \approx 2.2 \pm 0.1$ . In the literature, systems with  $R$  band gaps of  $\Delta M_{1,2} \gtrsim 1.7$  are classified as fossil groups (e.g. Jones et al. 2003), and are thought to be old, undisturbed systems that have not experienced a significant recent merger (D’Onghia et al. 2005). The large magnitude gap observed here suggests that SPT2215 has not

recently experienced a significant merger, which is consistent with the exceptionally relaxed X-ray morphology.

In addition to the morphological analyses above, we conduct a spectroscopic analysis of the X-ray data to determine thermodynamic properties of the ICM as a function of radius. We extract spectra from both coarse and fine annular bins centered on the BCG ( $\alpha = 22^h 15^m 03^s.9306$ ,  $\delta = -35^\circ 37' 17''.885$ ). The coarse bins are used to fit a PHABS\*APEC model with fixed metallicity ( $Z = 0.3Z_\odot$ ), in order to measure ICM temperature. We use a Vikhlinin et al. (2006) parametric model:

$$T_{3D}(r) = T_0 \frac{(r/r_{\text{cool}})^\alpha + T_{\text{min}}/T_0}{(r/r_{\text{cool}})^\alpha + 1} \frac{(r/r_t)^a}{[1 + (r/r_t)^b]^{c/b}} \quad (1)$$

where  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$  model the outer regions of the profile with a flexible broken power-law. The profile falls off at large radii at around  $r_t$ , while the inner cool core region is defined by  $T_0$ ,  $T_{\text{min}}$ ,  $r_{\text{cool}}$ , and  $\alpha$ . This 3D temperature profile is projected along the line of sight and fit to the extracted coarse temperature profile in projection. To quantify the uncertainty in our best fit model, we perform our fits over 100 Monte Carlo simulations that sample the data points within their errors, assuming Gaussianity. As we only extract four spectroscopic temperature measurements, we freeze a number of parameters in our fits to be able to reliably constrain our temperature model. In all Monte Carlo iterations, we set  $a = 0$  and  $\alpha = 2$ , while the parameters  $b$ ,  $c$ , and  $T_0$  are each randomly sampled in each iteration from the distribution of values found in Vikhlinin et al. (2006) (Table 3) and subsequently fixed. Additionally,  $T_{\text{min}}$  is fixed to the innermost randomly sampled temperature value for any given Monte Carlo iteration. The best temperature




**Figure 3.** ICM thermodynamic profiles for SPT2215. *Top left:* emission measure (EM). *Top right:* temperature ( $k_B T$ ), in units of keV. *Bottom left:* pseudo-entropy, in units of keV cm<sup>2</sup>. *Bottom right:* cooling time, in yrs. In the top panels, green shaded regions represent EM and temperature models from [Vikhlinin et al. \(2006\)](#) (eqns. 3 and 6 respectively) that have been projected along the line of sight and fit to the data which were sampled via the Monte Carlo method. The corresponding unprojected (3D) models in all panels are shown as blue shaded regions. In the bottom panels, a horizontal dashed line marks the entropy ( $K < 30$  keV cm<sup>2</sup>) and cooling time ( $t_{\text{cool}} < 1$  Gyr) cool core thresholds below which we expect to see multiphase cooling, star formation, and AGN activity (e.g. [Cavagnolo et al. 2008](#)).

fit is interpolated at the same radii as the fine annular binning scheme described before, for which we again extract spectra and fit them with the same model. For these finer spectral fits, we fix the interpolated temperature values and allow only the APEC model normalization to vary. These normalizations per unit area can be converted to an emission measure profile, to which we fit a projected [Vikhlinin et al. \(2006\)](#) emission measure (EM) model:

$$n_e n_p(r) = n_0^2 \frac{(r/r_c)^{-\alpha}}{[1 + (r/r_c)^2]^{3\beta - \alpha/2}} \frac{1}{[1 + (r/r_s)^\gamma]^\epsilon} + \frac{n_{02}^2}{[1 + (r/r_{c2})^2]^{3\beta_2}} \quad (2)$$

which is a modified double-beta model with a cusp, rather than a flat core (defined by  $n_0$ ,  $r_c$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ), a steeper outer profile slope (defined by  $r_s$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\epsilon$ ), and a cool core component (defined by  $n_{02}$ ,  $r_{c2}$ , and  $\beta_2$ ). Here,  $n_e$



**Figure 4.** Observed spectral energy distribution (SED) for the BCG in SPT2215, including the flux calibrated spectrum (light blue) and optical photometry (dark blue circles) from PISCO *gri* bands, and F200LP and F110W *HST* bands. Additional IR photometry in the *FourStar JH* bands, and *Spitzer I1* (3.6  $\mu$ m) and *I2* (4.5  $\mu$ m) bands were also included in the SED fitting in order to better constrain the BCG stellar mass. The best fit model spectrum obtained with the **prospector** SED fitting software is shown in light red, with the best fit model photometry shown as dark red circles. The input spectrum was flux calibrated using the observed photometry to fit for the shape of the spectrum as a nuisance parameter, and binned by 30 Å here for clarity. In the inset, we show the unbinning, residual rest-frame spectrum after subtracting the best fit stellar continuum, zooming in on the spectral region surrounding strong [O II] emission. We fit this emission to measure an obscured flux of  $\sim 1 \times 10^{-15}$  erg s $^{-1}$  cm $^{-2}$  which implies an unobscured SFR of  $320^{+230}_{-140}$  M $_{\odot}$  yr $^{-1}$ . In the rest frame, the doublet location is consistent with the stellar continuum redshift (vertical dashed lines), and has an instrumental broadening-corrected width of  $400 \pm 50$  km s $^{-1}$ , which could indicate the presence of a strong wind most likely powered by the massive ongoing starburst.

and  $n_p$  correspond to the electron and proton number densities, respectively. In our fits,  $\gamma = 3$  and  $\epsilon = 5$  remain fixed, and all other parameters are allowed to vary and initialized to typical parameters found in Vikhlinin et al. (2006) (Table 2). These fits to the temperature and EM profiles are performed over 100 Monte Carlo realizations in order to get uncertainty regions for the corresponding profiles by sampling data points to fit from their measured uncertainties (assuming Gaussianity).

The resulting best fit EM and temperature profiles can be found in Figure 3. After obtaining the density ( $n_e$ ) profile from the (unprojected) EM profile, we combine these individual profiles to produce unprojected (3D) pseudo-entropy ( $k_B T n_e^{-2/3}$ ), and cooling time profiles ( $t_{\text{cool}} = \frac{(n_e + n_p) k_B T}{n_e n_p \Lambda(k_B T, Z)}$ ). We used the cooling function  $\Lambda(k_B T, Z)$  from Sutherland & Dopita (1993) as parameterized by Tozzi & Norman (2001). Given the central temperature drop (a factor of  $\sim 3\times$ ), and increase in density, we determine that this cluster does in fact contain a cool core. At a radius of 10 kpc, the central entropy and cooling time reach  $\sim 20$  keV cm $^2$  and 200 Myr, respectively. There are also a number of diagnos-

tic criteria that predict where multiphase cooling out of the ICM ensues. For instance, Cavagnolo et al. (2008) were among the first to find a central entropy threshold in the cores of galaxy clusters of  $K = 30$  keV cm $^2$ , or equivalently, where  $t_{\text{cool}} \approx 1$  Gyr, below which strong H $\alpha$  and radio emission can be detected. For SPT2215, the cooling time profile drops below 1 Gyr at a radius of roughly 60 kpc, and the entropy drops below 30 keV cm $^2$  at a radius of roughly 30 kpc. Having met these criteria, we might expect a large amount of cooling multiphase gas to condense and cool out of the hot X-ray emitting phase. As an upper limit to the amount of material that can cool, we calculate a maximal cooling rate of  $\dot{M}_{\text{cool}} \equiv M_{\text{gas}}(r < r_{\text{cool}})/t_{\text{cool}}(r = r_{\text{cool}}) = 1900 \pm 400$  M $_{\odot}$  yr $^{-1}$ , by dividing the gas mass within some cooling radius by the cooling time at that cooling radius. Here, we choose  $r_{\text{cool}} = 116 \pm 15$  kpc as the radius where the cooling time is  $t_{\text{cool}} = 3$  Gyr to probe cooling closer to the core and for ease of comparison to literature  $\dot{M}_{\text{cool}}$  values. This high cooling rate puts SPT2215 in an extreme part of parameter space that only a handful of



other clusters occupy (e.g. Phoenix and RBS797; McDonald et al. 2018).

### 3.2. An Extremely High SFR

Given the extreme cooling rate implied by the *Chandra* X-ray data described in subsection 3.1, we may also expect this condensation to fuel a large amount of star formation. Zooming in on the central BCG, we see in the bottom left panel of Figure 1 a network of filaments in the F200LP filter, which probes restframe emission blueward of  $\sim 4300\text{\AA}$ . These filaments reach a maximum projected extent of  $\sim 20$  kpc, though deeper observations could reveal more emission further out. Filamentary nebulae like these typically signal regions of ionization by young stars, and can be seen in many other strong cooling clusters (e.g. McDonald et al. 2010; Calzadilla et al. 2022). This observation utilizes a very broad F200LP filter that includes a large amount of rest frame UV continuum, so we only use it here for an approximate estimate of the UV-derived SFR. By measuring the flux from a circular aperture ( $2''5 \approx 20$  kpc in radius) centered on the BCG, we measure a UV luminosity of  $(3.7 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{29} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ Hz}^{-1}$ . This luminosity can be converted to a SFR using the Rosa-González et al. (2002) relation, which is calibrated to account for any intrinsic extinction when it is not possible to measure it directly. With this relation, we calculate a SFR of  $\sim 240 \pm 20 \text{ M}_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ .

The high resolution but shallow *HST* imaging data in Figure 1 are complemented by ground-based imaging and spectroscopy using the *Magellan* 6.5m telescopes. In particular, our LDSS3 spectroscopic observations for this cluster are especially helpful in securing an independent optical SFR estimate, as well as a precise redshift. The wavelength-calibrated spectrum obtained from the reduction steps outlined in subsection 2.2 was fit in combination with optical *gri* photometry from PISCO and the F110W and F200LP bands from *HST*, as well as IR photometry using the *JH* bands from *FourStar* and *I1* and *I2* bands from *Spitzer*. The IR bands are especially helpful in constraining the galaxy mass since most of the redder light from the bulk of the stars is redshifted out of the optical bands. This spectrophotometry was fit using the SED fitting code *prospector* (Johnson et al. 2021), primarily in order to correct the shape of the spectrum, which we show in Figure 4. *Prospector* uses Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)-based stellar population synthesis (SPS) based on the Python-FSPS framework (Conroy et al. 2009; Foreman-Mackey et al. 2014), as well as the MILES stellar spectral library (Falcón-Barroso et al. 2011) and MIST isochrones (Choi et al. 2016). Our SED modeling of the stellar

continuum is described by a delayed-tau parametric star formation history of the form  $\text{SFR}(t, \tau) \propto (t/\tau) e^{-t/\tau}$ , as in Khullar et al. (2022), with additional free parameters to capture a burst of recent star formation as well as dust attenuation following Kriek & Conroy (2013, eqns. 1-3), with a variable dust index of  $\delta$ . A description of the priors for each of these parameters may be found in Table 1. To fit only the stellar continuum, we mask parts of the spectrum associated with potential emission lines from [O II], [O III] and the Balmer series for Hydrogen. From these SED fits, we get a best fit redshift of  $z = 1.1598 \pm 0.0005$ . We also measure a BCG remnant stellar mass of  $\log(M_{\text{BCG}}/M_{\odot}) = (11.77 \pm 0.04)$ , with stellar metallicity  $\log(Z/Z_{\odot}) = -0.20 \pm 0.14$ , an age of  $t = 4.5 \pm 0.5$  Gyr, and a star formation e-folding time of  $\tau = 1.56 \pm 0.28$  Gyr. The starburst is estimated to have formed  $11 \pm 9\%$  of the remnant stellar mass, starting at  $64 \pm 16\%$  of the BCG's age. For the dust extinction associated with the old stellar continuum, we measure  $A_{V,s} = 0.68 \pm 0.15$ , and an additional gas or young stellar extinction of  $A_{V,g} = 1.37 \pm 0.41$ .

The best fit stellar continuum (seen in Figure 4) is subtracted from this flux calibrated spectrum, and in the residual spectrum we look for the presence of [O II] which indicates star formation (e.g. Kennicutt 1998; Kewley et al. 2004). We shift the residual observed spectrum to the rest-frame and fit a double Gaussian to this [O II] $\lambda\lambda 3726, 2739$  doublet, tying the velocity dispersions and wavelengths of the two lines, as well as a straight line to approximate any remaining residual continuum. Our fit in Figure 4 (inset) yields an [O II] flux of  $(1.0 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{-15} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ , or a luminosity of  $2.6 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . To appropriately calculate an intrinsic (dereddened) flux, we use the extinction measurement for young stars ( $A_{V,g}$ ) cited above, which results in a color excess of  $E(B - V) = 0.34 \pm 0.10$ , assuming  $R_V = 4.05$ . We thus estimate an intrinsic [O II] flux of  $(6.4^{+4.6}_{-2.7}) \times 10^{-15} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ , or a luminosity of  $(4.8^{+3.5}_{-2.0}) \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ , and use the SFR- $L_{[\text{O II}]}$  relation from Kewley et al. (2004) to calculate a SFR of  $320^{+230}_{-140} \text{ M}_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ . This SFR is in good agreement with the  $600 \pm 110 \text{ M}_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$  predicted from the empirically-calibrated relation between unobscured SFR and obscured [O II] luminosity from Rosa-González et al. (2002), which can be used when a direct measurement of the extinction is not possible. For robustness, we also tried our SED fitting with the dust attenuation curve of Calzetti et al. (2000), and found a similar extinction and SFR estimate. As a final check, these optically-derived SFR estimates are also consistent with the independent UV SFR estimate inferred from the shallow *HST* data mentioned above. Such a high level of star



formation makes SPT2215 stand out among most CC clusters, with only a handful of others exceeding  $100 \text{ M}_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$ .

Another noteworthy feature of the [O II] detection is the broad line width. With an instrumental broadening-corrected rest frame width of  $\sigma = 400 \pm 50 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  – compared to a typical dispersion of roughly  $150 \pm 100 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  (e.g. [Hamer et al. 2016](#); [Gaspari et al. 2018](#)) – the [O II] emission could be a potential outflow/wind. The total 2D spectrum does not show much structure in the emission in the spatial direction, so a rotation scenario seems unlikely. For comparison, the spatially-integrated spectrum of the Phoenix cluster has a linewidth of  $\sigma \sim 350 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  ([McDonald et al. 2012](#)). A spatially-resolved spectroscopic study of SPT2215 would allow us to understand the origin of this broad, spatially-extended emission feature.

#### 4. DISCUSSION


The fact that SPT2215 is a strong cool core at such a high redshift gives us a new, unique window into AGN feeding and feedback. In order to investigate the “feedback” side, we look for the presence of a radio source. We find a faint radio source (see [Figure 1](#), top left panel) with an integrated flux density of  $2.0 \pm 0.8 \text{ mJy}$  at 0.8 GHz detected with the ASKAP radio array ([Johnston et al. 2008](#)). This is below the SUMSS (6 mJy beam $^{-1}$  limit) detection limit, and as such it is not detected in this survey. After k-correction using a spectral index<sup>3</sup> of  $\alpha = -0.7$ , the 0.8 GHz ASKAP flux corresponds to a 1.4 GHz radio luminosity of  $9.3 \times 10^{40} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . Though our *Chandra* X-ray data are not deep enough to detect potential cavities and directly calculate an associated cavity power ( $P_{\text{cav}}$ ), we can use the 1.4 GHz radio luminosity and the scaling relation from [Cavagnolo et al. \(2010\)](#) to estimate  $\log(P_{\text{cav}}/10^{42} \text{ erg s}^{-1}) = 2.6 \pm 0.3 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.8 \text{ (int. scatter)}$ . From our X-ray analysis, we also estimate a cooling luminosity of  $L_{\text{cool}} = (3.7 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{45} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ , which is the bolometric (0.01 – 100 keV) X-ray luminosity measured within a radius of 116 kpc, where the  $t_{\text{cool}}$  profile reaches 3 Gyr. These measurements yield a ratio of  $\log(P_{\text{cav}}/L_{\text{cool}}) = -1.0 \pm 0.8$  (where the uncertainty is dominated by the scatter in the  $P_{\text{cav}}-L_{1.4 \text{ GHz}}$  relation), which suggests that the ICM cooling is overwhelming AGN feedback in this system by an order of magnitude. This measured  $P_{\text{cav}}/L_{\text{cool}}$  ratio is suggestive of a strong imbalance between heating and cooling, but is ultimately consistent with the large amount of scatter found in  $P_{\text{cav}}/L_{\text{cool}}$  as a function of redshift ([Ruppin et al. 2022](#)).

With a massive cool core and a  $P_{\text{cav}}/L_{\text{cool}} \approx 0.1$ , it may be no surprise that we measure such a high SFR. Perhaps more noteworthy is the fact that, compared to its maximal cooling rate of  $\dot{M}_{\text{cool}} \sim 1900 \text{ M}_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$ , we calculate a cooling conversion efficiency of  $\epsilon_{\text{cool}} \equiv \text{SFR}/\dot{M}_{\text{cool}} = 17 \pm 10 \%$ . It may be argued that the radius where we measure  $L_{\text{cool}}$  and  $\dot{M}_{\text{cool}}$  is somewhat arbitrary, so for comparison, we calculate these at the radius of  $\sim 20 \text{ kpc}$ , where we actually observe the cooling filaments ([Figure 1](#), lower left panel). At this smaller radius,  $t_{\text{cool},20} \approx 0.3 \text{ Gyr}$ ,  $\dot{M}_{\text{cool},20} = 610 \pm 220 \text{ M}_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ,  $L_{\text{cool},20} = (8.4 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ , and the resulting cooling conversion efficiency is much higher at  $\epsilon_{\text{cool},20} = 52 \pm 36 \%$ . In most low-redshift systems, cooling is suppressed by about two orders of magnitude on average, with  $\epsilon_{\text{cool}} \sim 1\%$ . However, [Calzadilla et al. \(2022\)](#) find that  $\epsilon_{\text{cool}}$  scales directly with  $\dot{M}_{\text{cool}}$  (see also [Fogarty et al. 2017](#); [McDonald et al. 2018](#)). The high value of  $\epsilon_{\text{cool}}$  measured in SPT2215 is consistent with this trend towards increasingly efficient cooling in the strongest cool cores, though the reason for this trend is still not understood ([Calzadilla et al. 2022](#)).

The simplest explanation for the high star formation rate in SPT2215 is that cooling is exceeding heating in this system. This is supported by the observation that the cooling luminosity is a factor of two higher than the jet power, which ought to lead to a large residual cooling flow. However, the jet power here is being constrained via the radio luminosity, which can vary by factors of several on  $\sim 10$  year timescales (e.g., [Dutson et al. 2014](#)), which makes it difficult to reliably connect it to the time-averaged jet power. With deeper observations, we could detect or put limits on the presence of X-ray cavities, which would provide an estimate of the long term jet power output, providing a better basis for comparison to the cooling luminosity.

Regardless of what the true  $P_{\text{cav}}/L_{\text{cool}}$  ratio is, a significant power imbalance in one system is unlikely to explain the overall trend towards increasingly efficient cooling in the most massive cool cores such as SPT2215. An alternative explanation relates to the idea that cool cores are in a stable cycle between cooling and feedback. If accretion of cold gas onto a supermassive black hole can trigger jets which, in turn, can lift low-entropy gas to larger radii in the cluster, then cooling will be suppressed for roughly a rise and freefall time, before the cycle starts anew (e.g., [Prasad et al. 2020](#)). If this system is like a harmonic oscillator between cooling cycles, then the frequency of oscillation will depend on the depth of the potential. That is, the low-entropy gas will return to the cluster center much faster in a cluster with a deeper central potential than in a cluster with a shallow central

<sup>3</sup> where flux density  $S_\nu$  scales with frequency as  $S_\nu \propto \nu^\alpha$



**Figure 5.** SFR vs maximal cooling rate ( $\dot{M}_{\text{cool}}$ , at a radius where  $t_{\text{cool}} = 3$  Gyr) data from Calzadilla et al. (2022), with SPT2215 overlaid, in addition to the Phoenix cluster. Lines of constant cooling efficiency ( $\epsilon \equiv \text{SFR}/\dot{M}_{\text{cool}}$ ) indicate that over 10% of SPT2215’s maximum possible ICM cooling contributes into forming stars.

potential. If this freefall timescale is shorter than the timescale for consuming the reservoir of cold, dense gas via star formation, then that reservoir will constantly be replenished, leading to higher average star formation rates compared to systems where star formation can cycle between on and off. This is a hypothesis that we can, and intend to, test via the combination of state-of-the-art simulations and data for a large variety of cool core clusters (e.g. Calzadilla et al. 2022).

SPT2215 is similar to many of the most well-studied, extreme cool core clusters at low redshifts, but it is rare in that we observe it at such high redshift. As a point of contrast, it was recently argued that the even higher redshift ( $z = 1.7$ ) galaxy cluster SpARCS1049 was rapidly forming stars ( $\text{SFR} \sim 860 \text{ M}_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ) from a cooling flow, facilitated by a recent dynamical encounter that physically separated the low-entropy gas from the central galaxy, allowing for cooling in the absence of local feedback (Webb et al. 2015; Hlavacek-Larrondo et al. 2020). Over time, SpARCS1049 may be expected to relax, leading to suppression of the cooling flow once it is aligned with and directed towards the BCG and central SMBH. In this sense, SPT2215 may be a potential intermediate step between a system like SpARCS1049 and other relaxed low-redshift systems, as the ICM cooling is centered on a BCG and there are signs of weak ra-

dio emission, possibly from a very recently “activated” AGN.

On the other hand, the high level of relaxedness in SPT2215 implies that, if a dynamical interaction triggered some initial cooling episode, it likely happened long ago. More realistically, SPT2215 and SpARCS1049 may represent two distinct avenues to rapid cooling of the ICM, either via a strong dynamical encounter that physically separates low-entropy gas from the source of feedback, or via a potential so deep that the freefall time of uplifted gas is shorter than the consumption time of the cold reservoir. Instead, SPT2215 seems to be a high- $z$  analog of the Phoenix cluster, not only in how intensely star forming it is, but also in how massive and relaxed it is. Our SED fitting results in subsection 3.2 suggest the BCG itself is exceptionally massive, with a surviving stellar mass of  $M_{\text{BCG}} = (5.9 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{11} \text{ M}_{\odot}$ . This inferred mass is consistent with that predicted by the scaling relations between stellar mass and the combination of *Spitzer* magnitudes and  $g-r$  colors found in Zhu et al. (2010, eqns. 6-7). Such an extraordinary mass at this redshift implies that SPT2215 may have had a head start in its accretion history, allowing it to grow extremely quickly. This is a trait that SPT2215 shares with the Phoenix cluster, which is also exceptionally massive and shows no sign of a recent merger, indicating rapid, early growth. Why such a rapid growth followed by a period of relaxedness ought to lead to over-cooling of the core remains an open question, but it seems unlikely to be a coincidence.

## 5. SUMMARY

SPT2215 is a unique cluster in that it is the most distant yet found of a remarkable set of extreme cool cores. Using multiwavelength imaging and spectral observations, we have demonstrated that this system consists of a strongly cooling X-ray core (at a radius of 10 kpc, the central entropy and cooling time reach  $\sim 20 \text{ keV cm}^2$  and 200 Myr, respectively, and the maximal ICM cooling rate at a radius where the cooling time reaches 3 Gyr is  $\dot{M}_{\text{cool}} \sim 1900 \text{ M}_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ). This cool core is at the center of a dynamically relaxed cluster, which appears to be fueling a massive starburst ( $320^{+230}_{-140} \text{ M}_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ) in a highly-evolved central giant elliptical galaxy. Further X-ray observations (Mantz et al. in prep.) will allow more precise thermodynamic profile modeling, measurement of gas fraction, and further constraints on cosmological models. Our shallow *HST* data already reveal hints of complex star forming filaments, which will benefit from deeper observations with *HST* or perhaps even *JWST/NIRSpec* IFU in order to more precisely measure SFRs and reddening, and further understand the under-

lying process of cluster star formation in a previously untapped redshift regime.

Based on observations made with the NASA/ESA *Hubble Space Telescope*, obtained at the Space Telescope Science Institute, which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., under NASA contract NAS 5-26555. These observations are associated with program numbers 15307, 15661, and 16001. The authors acknowledge support from programs HST-GO-15307.008-A, HST-GO-15661.001, and HST-GO-16001.002, provided through grants from the STScI under NASA contract NAS5-26555. The authors also acknowledge additional financial support for this work, provided by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration through *Chandra* Award Number GO0-21124A issued by the *Chandra* X-ray Center, which is operated by the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory for and on behalf of the National Aeronautics Space Administration under contract NAS8-03060. The South Pole Telescope program is supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) through grants PLR-1248097 and OPP-1852617. Partial support is also provided by the NSF Physics Frontier Center grant PHY-1125897 to the Kavli Institute of Cosmological Physics at the University of Chicago, the Kavli Foundation, and the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation through grant GBMF#947 to the University of Chicago. Argonne National Laboratory’s work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics, under contract DE-AC02-06CH11357. This paper used data gathered with the 6.5 m *Magel-*

*lan* Telescopes located at Las Campanas Observatory, Chile. We thank the staff of Las Campanas for their dedicated service, which has made these observations possible. The scientific results reported in this article are based on observations made by the *Chandra* X-ray Observatory, and this research has made use of software provided by the *Chandra* X-ray Center (CXC) in the application package, CIAO. MSC acknowledges support from the NASA Headquarters under the Future Investigators in NASA Earth and Space Science and Technology (FINESST) award 20-Astro20-0037. AAS acknowledges support from NSF award 2109035. GM acknowledges funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No MARACHAS - DLV-896778.

*Facilities:* CXO, *HST*. NSF/US Department of Energy 10m South Pole Telescope (SPTpol). Magellan 6.5m Telescopes (Clay/LDSS3C, Clay/PISCO, Baade/FourStar)

*Software:* astropy (Astropy Collaboration et al. 2013), numpy (Harris et al. 2020), scipy (Virtanen et al. 2020), pandas (Reback et al. 2022), CIAO (Fruscione et al. 2006), XSPEC (Arnaud 1996). Prospector (Johnson et al. 2021), python-FSPS (Foreman-Mackey et al. 2014), SEDpy (Johnson 2021), matplotlib (Hunter 2020), seaborn (Waskom 2021), jupyter/IPython Notebooks (Kluyver et al. 2016), SAOImage DS9 (Joye & Mandel 2003), pyRAF (Science Software Branch at STScI 2012), Source Extractor (Bertin & Arnouts 1996)

## REFERENCES

- Abbott, T. M. C., Abdalla, F. B., Allam, S., et al. 2018, *ApJS*, 239, 18. doi:10.3847/1538-4365/aae9f0
- Allen, S. W. 1995, *MNRAS*, 276, 947. doi:10.1093/mnras/276.3.947
- Anders, E. & Grevesse, N. 1989, *GeoCoA*, 53, 197. doi:10.1016/0016-7037(89)90286-X
- Arnaud, K. A. 1996, *Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems V*, 101, 17
- Ashby, M. L. N., Stern, D., Brodwin, M., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 701, 428. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/701/1/428
- Astropy Collaboration, Robitaille, T. P., Tollerud, E. J., et al. 2013, *A&A*, 558, A33. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201322068
- Bayliss, M. B., Ruel, J., Stubbs, C. W., et al. 2016, *ApJS*, 227, 3. doi:10.3847/0067-0049/227/1/3
- Bertin, E. & Arnouts, S. 1996, *A&AS*, 117, 393. doi:10.1051/aas:1996164
- Bleem, L. E., Stalder, B., Brodwin, M., et al. 2015, *ApJS*, 216, 20. doi:10.1088/0067-0049/216/1/20
- Bleem, L. E., Stalder, B., de Haan, T., et al. 2015, *ApJS*, 216, 27. doi:10.1088/0067-0049/216/2/27
- Bleem, L. E., Bocquet, S., Stalder, B., et al. 2020, *ApJS*, 247, 25. doi:10.3847/1538-4365/ab6993
- Calzadilla, M. S., McDonald, M., Donahue, M., et al. 2022, *arXiv:2207.01624*
- Calzadilla, M. S., McDonald, M., Bayliss, M., et al. 2019, *ApJL*, 887, L17. doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ab5b07
- Calzetti, D., Armus, L., Bohlin, R. C., et al. 2000, *ApJ*, 533, 682. doi:10.1086/308692
- Cavagnolo, K. W., McNamara, B. R., Nulsen, P. E. J., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 720, 1066. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/720/2/1066
- Cavagnolo, K. W., Donahue, M., Voit, G. M., et al. 2008, *ApJL*, 683, L107. doi:10.1086/591665

- Choi, J., Dotter, A., Conroy, C., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 823, 102. doi:10.3847/0004-637X/823/2/102
- Conroy, C., Gunn, J. E., & White, M. 2009, *ApJ*, 699, 486. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/699/1/486
- Crawford, C. S., Allen, S. W., Ebeling, H., et al. 1999, *MNRAS*, 306, 857. doi:10.1046/j.1365-8711.1999.02583.x
- D’Onghia, E., Sommer-Larsen, J., Romeo, A. D., et al. 2005, *ApJL*, 630, L109. doi:10.1086/491651
- Donahue, M., Connor, T., Fogarty, K., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 805, 177. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/805/2/177
- Donahue, M. & Voit, G. M. 2022, *PhR*, 973, 1. doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2022.04.005
- Dutson, K. L., Edge, A. C., Hinton, J. A., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 442, 2048. doi:10.1093/mnras/stu975
- Fabian, A. C. 1994, *ARA&A*, 32, 277. doi:10.1146/annurev.aa.32.090194.001425
- Fabian, A. C. 2012, *ARA&A*, 50, 455. doi:10.1146/annurev-astro-081811-125521
- Falcón-Barroso, J., Sánchez-Blázquez, P., Vazdekis, A., et al. 2011, *A&A*, 532, A95. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201116842
- Fogarty, K., Postman, M., Larson, R., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 846, 103. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aa82b9
- Foreman-Mackey, D., Sick, J., & Johnson, B. 2014, Zenodo
- Fruscione, A., McDowell, J. C., Allen, G. E., et al. 2006, *Proc. SPIE*, 6270, 62701V. doi:10.1117/12.671760
- Gaspari, M., McDonald, M., Hamer, S. L., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 854, 167. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aaa1b
- Gaspari, M., Tombesi, F., & Cappi, M. 2020, *Nature Astronomy*, 4, 10. doi:10.1038/s41550-019-0970-1
- Hamer, S. L., Edge, A. C., Swinbank, A. M., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 460, 1758. doi:10.1093/mnras/stw1054
- Harris, C.R., Millman, K.J., van der Walt, S.J. et al. 2020, *Nature* 585, 357–362. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2.
- High, F. W., Stubbs, C. W., Rest, A., et al. 2009, *AJ*, 138, 110. doi:10.1088/0004-6256/138/1/110
- Hilton, M., Sifón, C., Naess, S., et al. 2021, *ApJS*, 253, 3. doi:10.3847/1538-4365/abd023
- Hlavacek-Larrondo, J., Fabian, A. C., Edge, A. C., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 431, 1638. doi:10.1093/mnras/stt283
- Hlavacek-Larrondo, J., McDonald, M., Benson, B. A., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 805, 35. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/805/1/35
- Hlavacek-Larrondo, J., Fabian, A. C., Edge, A. C., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 421, 1360. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.20405.x
- Hlavacek-Larrondo, J., Rhea, C. L., Webb, T., et al. 2020, *ApJL*, 898, L50. doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ab9ca5
- Hudson, D. S., Mittal, R., Reiprich, T. H., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 513, A37. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/200912377
- Hunter, J. D. 2020, *Computing in Science & Engineering*, 9, 3. doi:10.1109/MCSE.2007.55
- Johnson, B. & Leja, J. 2017, Zenodo
- Johnson, B. D. 2021, Zenodo
- Johnson, B. D., Leja, J., Conroy, C., et al. 2021, *ApJS*, 254, 22. doi:10.3847/1538-4365/abef67
- Johnston, S., Taylor, R., Bailes, M., et al. 2008, *Experimental Astronomy*, 22, 151. doi:10.1007/s10686-008-9124-7
- Johnstone, R. M., Fabian, A. C., & Nulsen, P. E. J. 1987, *MNRAS*, 224, 75. doi:10.1093/mnras/224.1.75
- Jones, L. R., Ponman, T. J., Horton, A., et al. 2003, *MNRAS*, 343, 627. doi:10.1046/j.1365-8711.2003.06702.x
- Joye, W. A. & Mandel, E. 2003, *Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XII*, 295, 489
- Kalberla, P. M. W., Burton, W. B., Hartmann, D., et al. 2005, *A&A*, 440, 775. doi:10.1051/0004-6361:20041864
- Kennicutt, R. C. 1998, *ARA&A*, 36, 189. doi:10.1146/annurev.astro.36.1.189
- Kewley, L. J., Geller, M. J., & Jansen, R. A. 2004, *AJ*, 127, 2002. doi:10.1086/382723
- Khullar, G., Bleem, L. E., Bayliss, M. B., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 870, 7. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aaeed0
- Khullar, G., Bayliss, M. B., Gladders, M. D., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 934, 177. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ac7c0c
- Kluyver, T., Ragan-Kelley, B., Pérez, F., et al. 2016, *IOS Press*, 87. doi:10.3233/978-1-61499-649-1-87
- Kriek, M. & Conroy, C. 2013, *ApJL*, 775, L16. doi:10.1088/2041-8205/775/1/L16
- Leja, J., Johnson, B. D., Conroy, C., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 837, 170. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aa5ffe
- Lidman, C., Suherli, J., Muzzin, A., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 427, 550. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2012.21984.x
- Liu, A., Bulbul, E., Ghirardini, V., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 661, A2. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/202141120
- Mantz, A. B., Allen, S. W., Morris, R. G., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 449, 199. doi:10.1093/mnras/stv219
- Mantz, A. B., Morris, R. G., Allen, S. W., et al. 2022, *MNRAS*, 510, 131. doi:10.1093/mnras/stab3390
- McDonald, M., Benson, B. A., Vikhlinin, A., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 774, 23. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/774/1/23
- McDonald, M., Gaspari, M., McNamara, B. R., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 858, 45. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aabace
- McDonald, M., Allen, S. W., Bayliss, M., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 843, 28. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aa7740
- McDonald, M., Stalder, B., Bayliss, M., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 817, 86. doi:10.3847/0004-637X/817/2/86
- McDonald, M., Bayliss, M., Benson, B. A., et al. 2012, *Nature*, 488, 349. doi:10.1038/nature11379



- McDonald, M., Veilleux, S., Rupke, D. S. N., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 721, 1262. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/721/2/1262
- McNamara, B. R. & Nulsen, P. E. J. 2012, *New Journal of Physics*, 14, 055023. doi:10.1088/1367-2630/14/5/055023
- McNamara, B. R. & Nulsen, P. E. J. 2007, *ARA&A*, 45, 117. doi:10.1146/annurev.astro.45.051806.110625
- McNamara, B. R. & O’Connell, R. W. 1989, *AJ*, 98, 2018. doi:10.1086/115275
- McNamara, B. R. & O’Connell, R. W. 1993, *AJ*, 105, 417. doi:10.1086/116440
- Miknaitis, G., Pignata, G., Rest, A., et al. 2007, *ApJ*, 666, 674. doi:10.1086/519986
- Milosavljević, M., Miller, C. J., Furlanetto, S. R., et al. 2006, *ApJL*, 637, L9. doi:10.1086/500547
- Morrison, R. & McCammon, D. 1983, *ApJ*, 270, 119. doi:10.1086/161102
- O’Dea, C. P., Baum, S. A., Privon, G., et al. 2008, *ApJ*, 681, 1035. doi:10.1086/588212
- Persson, S. E., Murphy, D. C., Smee, S., et al. 2013, *PASP*, 125, 654. doi:10.1086/671164
- Planck Collaboration, Ade, P. A. R., Aghanim, N., et al. 2016, *A&A*, 594, A27. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201525823
- Prasad, D., Sharma, P., Babul, A., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 495, 594. doi:10.1093/mnras/staa1247
- Rafferty, D. A., McNamara, B. R., Nulsen, P. E. J., et al. 2006, *ApJ*, 652, 216. doi:10.1086/507672
- Reback, J., jbrockmendel, McKinney, W., et al. 2022, Zenodo
- Rosa-González, D., Terlevich, E., & Terlevich, R. 2002, *MNRAS*, 332, 283. doi:10.1046/j.1365-8711.2002.05285.x
- Ruppin, F., McDonald, M., Hlavacek-Larrondo, J., et al. 2022, arXiv:2207.13351
- Ruppin, F., McDonald, M., Bleem, L. E., et al. 2021, *ApJ*, 918, 43. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ac0bba
- Science Software Branch at STScI 2012, *Astrophysics Source Code Library*. ascl:1207.011
- Simcoe, R. A., Burgasser, A. J., Schechter, P. L., et al. 2013, *PASP*, 125, 270. doi:10.1086/670241
- Skrutskie, M. F., Cutri, R. M., Stiening, R., et al. 2006, *AJ*, 131, 1163. doi:10.1086/498708
- Smith, R. K., Brickhouse, N. S., Liedahl, D. A., et al. 2001, *ApJL*, 556, L91. doi:10.1086/322992
- Somboonpanyakul, T., McDonald, M., Noble, A., et al. 2022, *AJ*, 163, 146. doi:10.3847/1538-3881/ac5030
- Stalder, B., Stark, A. A., Amato, S. M., et al. 2014, *Proc. SPIE*, 9147, 91473Y. doi:10.1117/12.2054933
- Sutherland, R. S. & Dopita, M. A. 1993, *ApJS*, 88, 253. doi:10.1086/191823
- Tozzi, P. & Norman, C. 2001, *ApJ*, 546, 63. doi:10.1086/318237
- van den Bosch, F. C., Yang, X., Mo, H. J., et al. 2007, *MNRAS*, 376, 841. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2007.11493.x
- Vanderlinde, K., Crawford, T. M., de Haan, T., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 722, 1180. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/722/2/1180
- Vikhlinin, A., Kravtsov, A., Forman, W., et al. 2006, *ApJ*, 640, 691. doi:10.1086/500288
- Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T. E., et al. 2020, *Nature Methods*, 17, 261. doi:10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2
- Waskom, M. L., 2021, *The Open Journal*, 6, 60. doi:10.21105/joss.03021
- Webb, T., Noble, A., DeGroot, A., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 809, 173. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/809/2/173
- Zhu, Y.-N., Wu, H., Li, H.-N., et al. 2010, *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 10, 329. doi:10.1088/1674-4527/10/4/004

# APPENDIX

**Table 1.** Free parameters used in **Prospector** SED fitting

Parameter	Description	Priors
$z_{\text{obs}}$	Observed redshift (initialized to mean $z$ from <a href="#">Bleem et al. (2020)</a> )	TopHat: $[z - 0.001, z + 0.001]$
$M_{\text{BCG}} (M_{\odot})$	Total stellar mass formed	Log <sub>10</sub> uniform: $[10^9, 10^{13}]$
$\log(Z/Z_{\odot})$	Stellar metallicity in log solar units	Clipped normal: $\mu = 0.0, \sigma = 0.3, \text{range}=[-2.0, 0.5]$
$t_{\text{age}}$	Age of galaxy	TopHat: $[0, \text{age of universe at } z_{\text{obs}}]$
$\tau$	e-folding time of star formation history in Gyr	Log <sub>10</sub> uniform: $[0.01, 3.0]$
$d_2$	Optical depth for stellar light attenuation by dust for old stars using extinction curve from <a href="#">Kriek &amp; Conroy (2013, eqn. 1)</a> , where observed flux $I = I_0 e^{-d_2}$	TopHat: $[0, 20]$
dust ratio	Ratio to convert from dust attenuation optical depth from old stars ( $d_2$ ) to additional attenuation for young stars	Clipped normal: $\mu = 2.3, \sigma = 0.3, \text{range}=[0, 3.0]$
$\delta$	Dust index in <a href="#">Kriek &amp; Conroy (2013)</a> extinction curve (eqn. 1)	TopHat: $[-2.0, 0.5]$
$f_{\text{burst}}$	Fraction of total stellar mass formed in a recent star formation burst	TopHat: $[0, 0.5]$
$f_{\text{age,burst}}$	Time at which burst happens, as a fraction of $t_{\text{age}}$	TopHat: $[0.1, 1]$
$\sigma_v$	Velocity smoothing in $\text{km s}^{-1}$	TopHat: $[150, 500]$
spec <sub>norm</sub>	Spectrum normalization factor to match photometry	Log <sub>10</sub> uniform: $[0.005, 5.0]$
spec <sub>jitter</sub>	Part of pixel outlier mixture model, to marginalize over poorly modeled noise like residual sky lines or missing absorption lines	TopHat: $[1, 10]$
spec <sub>outlier</sub>	Multiplicative noise inflation term	TopHat: $[0.0001, 1]$
$(p_1, p_2, p_3)$	Continuum calibration (Chebyshev) polynomial	TopHat: n=3: $[-0.2/(n+1), 0.2/(n+1)]$