

Accurate dust temperature and star formation rate in the most luminous $z > 6$ quasar in the HYPERluminous quasars at the Epoch of Reionization (HYPERION) sample

ROBERTA TRIPODI ^{1,2,3} CHIARA FERUGLIO ^{2,3} FRANCISCA KEMPER ^{4,5,6} FRANCESCA CIVANO ⁷ TIAGO COSTA ⁸
MARTIN ELVIS ⁷ MANUELA BISCHETTI ^{1,2} STEFANO CARNIANI ⁹ FABIO DI MASCIA ⁹ VALENTINA D'ODORICO ^{2,3,9}
FABRIZIO FIORE ^{2,3} SIMONA GALLERANI ⁹ MICHELE GINOLFI ^{10,11} ROBERTO MAIOLINO ^{12,13,14}
ENRICO PICONCELLI ¹⁵ ROSA VALIANTE ¹⁵ AND LUCA ZAPPACOSTA ¹⁵

¹*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Trieste, Sezione di Astronomia, Via G.B. Tiepolo 11, I-34143 Trieste, Italy*

²*INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Trieste, Via G. Tiepolo 11, I-34143 Trieste, Italy*

³*IFPU - Institute for Fundamental Physics of the Universe, via Beirut 2, I-34151 Trieste, Italy*

⁴*Institute of Space Science (ICE), CSIC, Can Magrans, E-08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès, Barcelona, Spain*

⁵*ICREA, Pg. Lluís Companys 23, E-08010 Barcelona, Spain*

⁶*Institut d'Estudis Espacials de Catalunya (IEEC), E-08034 Barcelona, Spain*

⁷*Center for Astrophysics — Harvard & Smithsonian, Cambridge, MA 02138*

⁸*Max-Planck-Institut für Astrophysik, Karl-Schwarzschild-Straße 1, D-85748 Garching b. München, Germany*

⁹*Scuola Normale Superiore, Piazza dei Cavalieri 7 I-56126 Pisa, Italy*

¹⁰*Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia, Università di Firenze, Via G. Sansone 1, 50019, Sesto Fiorentino (Florence), Italy*

¹¹*INAF - Osservatorio di Arcetri, Largo E. Fermi 5, I-50125, Florence, Italy*

¹²*Institute of Astronomy, University of Cambridge, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0HA, UK*

¹³*Kavli Institute for Cosmology, University of Cambridge, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0HA, UK*

¹⁴*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK*

¹⁵*INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma, Via Frascati 33, I-00040 Monte Porzio Catone, Italy*

(Dated: Accepted in ApJL on March 20, 2023)

ABSTRACT

We present ALMA Band 9 continuum observation of the ultraluminous quasi-stellar object (QSO) SDSS J0100+2802, providing a $\sim 10\sigma$ detection at ~ 670 GHz. SDSS J0100+2802 is the brightest QSO with the most massive super massive black hole (SMBH) known at $z > 6$, and we study its dust spectral energy distribution in order to determine the dust properties and the star formation rate (SFR) of its host-galaxy. We obtain the most accurate estimate so far of the temperature, mass and emissivity index of the dust, having $T_{\text{dust}} = 48.4 \pm 2.3$ K, $M_{\text{dust}} = (2.29 \pm 0.83) \times 10^7 M_{\odot}$, $\beta = 2.63 \pm 0.23$. This allows us to measure the SFR with the smallest statistical error for this QSO, $\text{SFR} = 265 \pm 32 M_{\odot} \text{yr}^{-1}$. Our results enable us to evaluate the relative growth of the SMBH and host galaxy of J0100+2802, finding that the SMBH is dominating the process of BH-galaxy growth in this QSO at $z = 6.327$, when the Universe was 865 Myr old. Such unprecedented constraints on the host galaxy SFR and dust temperature can only be obtained through high frequency observations, and highlight the importance of ALMA Band 9 to obtain a robust overview of the build-up of the first quasars' host galaxies at $z > 6$.

Keywords: Interferometers (805) — Quasars (1319) — Supermassive black holes (1663) — AGN host galaxies (2017)

1. INTRODUCTION

In the past decade, the Atacama Large Millimeter/sub-millimeter Array (ALMA), along with the Northern Extended Millimeter Array (NOEMA), the Very Large Array (VLA), and *Herschel*, have probed

the cold gas and dust of quasi-stellar-object (QSO) host galaxies. The dust continuum was detected in many $z \sim 6$ QSOs, with far-infrared (FIR) luminosities of $L_{\text{FIR}} = 10^{11-13} L_{\odot}$ and dust masses of about $M_{\text{dust}} = 10^{7-9} M_{\odot}$ (Decarli et al. 2018; Carniani et al. 2019; Shao et al. 2019). The rest-frame FIR continuum emission originates from dust heated by the ultraviolet (UV) radiation from young and massive stars (Decarli et al. 2018; Venemans et al. 2020; Neeleman et al. 2021) and the active galactic nuclei (AGN) radiation

Corresponding author: R. Tripodi
roberta.tripodi@inaf.it

(Schneider et al. 2015; Di Mascia et al. 2021; Walter et al. 2022). The latter contribution is usually neglected when modelling the FIR spectral energy distribution (SED) of $z \sim 6$ QSOs, although the AGN heating can contribute 30 – 70% of the FIR luminosity (Schneider et al. 2015; Duras et al. 2017). Moreover, dust masses are often determined with huge uncertainties relying only on single-frequency continuum detections. However, if multi-frequency ALMA observations are available in the rest-frame FIR, probing both the peak and the Rayleigh Jeans tail of the dust SED, the dust temperature and mass can be constrained with statistical uncertainties $< 10 - 20\%$ (e.g. Carniani et al. 2019; Tripodi et al. 2022), resulting into an high accuracy in the determination of the star formation rate (SFR).

In this Letter we present ALMA Band 9 observations of the QSO SDSS J010013.02+280225.8 (hereafter J0100+28) at $z_{\text{[CII]}} = 6.327$ (Wang et al. 2019). Wu et al. (2015) estimated a bolometric luminosity of $L_{\text{bol}} = 4.29 \times 10^{14} L_{\odot}$ and a BH mass of $M_{\text{BH}} = 1.24 \times 10^{10} M_{\odot}$ for J0100+28, making it the most optically luminous QSO with the most massive SMBH known at $z > 6$. Both measurements have been recently confirmed by JWST (Eilers et al. 2022). Wang et al. (2019) performed a multi-frequency analysis of the dust SED, but they could not obtain a precise determination of the dust properties, concluding that J0100+28 has either a high dust emissivity ($\beta \gtrsim 2$) or a high dust temperature ($T_{\text{dust}} \gtrsim 60$ K), or a combination of thereof.

J0100+28 belongs to the HYPERluminous quasars at the Epoch of Reionization (HYPERION) sample of $z > 6$ QSOs, selected to include the QSOs with the most massive SMBH at their epoch, possibly resulting from an exceptional fast mass growth during their accretion history. The sample consists of 17 QSOs with $L_{\text{bol}} = 10^{47.3}$ erg/s, SMBH masses in the range $M_{\text{BH}} = 10^9 - 10^{10} M_{\odot}$, and Eddington ratios $> 0.3 - 0.4$. The HYPERION sample and the details of its selection will be presented in Zappacosta et al. (in prep.).

The goal of this work is to derive the most accurate estimate of the dust mass, dust temperature, and therefore of the SFR for the host galaxy of J0100+28. We adopt a Λ CDM cosmology from Planck Collaboration et al. (2020): $H_0 = 67.4 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, $\Omega_m = 0.315$ and $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.685$. Thus, the angular scale is 5.66 kpc/arcsec at $z = 6.3$.

2. OBSERVATION

We analyse the dataset 2021.2.00151.S from the ALMA 7m array, designed to detect the continuum emission at a frequency of 670.91 GHz in Band 9, and has a total integration time of 2.2 hours. The visi-




Figure 1. 670.9 GHz dust continuum map of QSO J0100+28 (levels $-3, -2, 2, 3, 5,$ and 8σ , $\sigma = 0.8$ mJy/beam). The clean beam (1.97×1.17 arcsec 2) is indicated in the lower left corner of the diagram. The cross indicates the position of the continuum peak.

bility calibration and imaging are performed through the Common Astronomy Software Applications (CASA; McMullin et al. 2007), version 5.1.1-5. We apply `tclean` using natural weighting and a 3σ cleaning threshold. We image the continuum by collapsing all channels, selected by inspecting the visibilities in all spectral windows. We obtain a clean beam of (1.97×1.17) arcsec 2 , corresponding to a spatial resolution of ~ 11 kpc, and an r.m.s. noise of 0.8 mJy/beam in the continuum.

3. ANALYSIS

3.1. QSO continuum emission and dust properties

Figure 1 presents the 670.9 GHz continuum emission map of J0100+28. The peak flux density is 6.99 ± 0.71 mJy/beam. The source is not spatially resolved. We check that the other FIR and radio flux measurements were extracted from a region similar to our resolution¹.

We perform an SED fitting using the continuum emission measured at ~ 671 GHz, together with the emissions presented in Wang et al. (2019) from 32 GHz to 353 GHz, and in Liu et al. (2022) at 1.5, 6 and 10 GHz. Although we are interested in the cold dust properties of the QSO host galaxy, such as T_{dust} , M_{dust} and β , we consider also the contribution of the lower frequency emission to the dust SED, since in general it may not be negligible. Liu et al. (2022) noticed a time variabil-

¹ Wang et al. (2019) used tapered maps at 1.5 arcsec in order not to miss the fainter extended emission. Liu et al. (2022) also tapered their 6 and 10 GHz maps, that had a resolution of ~ 1.5 arcsec, to match the resolution of the 1.5 GHz map (~ 4 arcsec), and they do not find significant differences in flux density between the tapered and the full-resolution maps.




Figure 2. Left panel: SED of J0100+28 using our new ALMA 670.91 GHz data (cyan star), the continuum fluxes from 32 GHz to 353 GHz (Wang et al. 2019), and at 1.5, 6 and 10 GHz (Li et al. 2022) (cyan diamonds). The best-fitting curve is shown as a blue solid line. Right panel: Corner plot showing the posterior probability distributions of T_{dust} , M_{dust} , β . Orange solid lines indicate the best-fitting value for each parameter, while the dashed lines mark the 16th and 84th percentiles for each parameter.

ity among their and previous measurements of the radio continuum in the range [6-10] GHz. For the sake of simplicity, we consider the most recent measurements of the radio continuum emission (i.e., those from Liu et al. 2022). However, we verified that our results do not change by considering all the measurements available in the radio band.

We model the dust continuum with a modified blackbody (MBB) function and the low frequency radio emission using a power law with an exponential cut-off (PLCO). Details about the fitting functions and procedure can be found in the Appendix A. The model has six fitting parameters: dust temperature (T_{dust}), dust mass (M_{dust}), dust emissivity index (β) entering in the MBB function, and the normalization (n), the radio power-law spectral index (α), and the cut-off frequency (ν_{cutoff}) for the PLCO. It is worth to stress that the galaxy is likely characterized by a distribution of dust temperatures, that may reach hundreds of K close to the AGN (see e.g., Walter et al. 2022) and may decrease toward the outskirts, hence the temperature derived from the SED fitting should be interpreted as an

‘effective’ dust temperature². The best-fit model has $T_{\text{dust}} = 48.4 \pm 2.3$ K, $M_{\text{dust}} = (2.29 \pm 0.83) \times 10^7 M_{\odot}$, $\beta = 2.63 \pm 0.23$, $n = 0.08 \pm 0.01$ mJy, $\alpha = 0.48 \pm 0.09$ and $\nu_{\text{cutoff}} = 235 \pm 100$ GHz. Figure 2 shows the observed SED fitted by our best-fit model (left panel) and the posterior distributions for the dust parameters (right panel). Posterior distributions of all parameters is reported in Appendix A. We find a gas-to-dust ratio $\text{GDR} = 236 \pm 155$ based on our M_{dust} estimate and the molecular gas mass obtained by Wang et al. (2019) (see Table 1). This is in agreement with GDRs found in ultraluminous QSOs at $z \sim 2 - 4$ (Bischetti et al. 2021), and in local galaxies at solar metallicities (De Vis et al. 2019). This latter comparison would imply that J0100+28’s host galaxy has already been highly enriched with metals.

We estimate the total infrared (TIR) luminosity for the best-fit model by integrating from 8 to 1000 μm rest-frame, obtaining $L_{\text{TIR}} = 5.30 \pm 0.64 \times 10^{12} L_{\odot}$. This would imply a SFR of $530 \pm 64 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, adopting a Chabrier initial mass function (Chabrier 2003). However, several observations and radiative transfer simu-

² We adopt the term ‘effective temperature’ since we are not able to map the spatial distribution of the dust temperatures across the galaxy, similarly to the definition of the effective temperature of a star.

Table 1. Properties of SDSS J0100+2802

T_{dust}	[K]	48.4 ± 2.3
M_{dust}	[$10^7 M_{\odot}$]	2.29 ± 0.83
β		2.63 ± 0.23
SFR ^(a)	[$M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$]	265 ± 32
GDR		236 ± 155
$M_{\text{gas}}^{(b)}$	[$10^{10} M_{\odot}$]	0.54 ± 0.16
$M_{\text{dyn}}(\text{CV})^{(c)}$	[$10^{10} M_{\odot}$]	~ 890
$M_{\text{dyn}}(\text{VT})^{(d)}$	[$10^{10} M_{\odot}$]	3.25 ± 0.46
$M_{\text{BH}}^{(e)}$	[$10^{10} M_{\odot}$]	1.05

Notes. Quantities above the violet line are from this work, while the other are taken from Wang et al. (2019). ^(a) The SFR is corrected by a factor of 50%, accounting for the contribution of the QSO. ^(b) The gas mass is estimated within a diameter of ~ 1.4 kpc (Wang et al. 2019). ^(c) Dynamical mass estimated using the circular velocity assuming a disk inclination of 5° within 1.8 kpc radius (Wang et al. 2019). ^(d) Dynamical mass estimated using the virial theorem within 1.8 kpc radius (Wang et al. 2019). ^(e) BH mass from MgII emission line (Mazzucchelli et al in prep.).

lations suggested that the radiative output of luminous QSOs substantially contributes to dust heating on kpc scale (Schneider et al. 2015; Di Mascia et al. 2021; Walter et al. 2022). Duras et al. (2017) showed that in average $\sim 50\%$ of the total IR luminosity in QSOs with $L_{\text{bol}} > 10^{47} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ is due to dust heated by the AGN radiation. Recently, Di Mascia et al. (2023) found a correction factor of 1/30 for the SFR of the brightest object in their sample. However, the L_{bol} of J0100 is above the range explored in their simulations and, moreover, J0100 has very peculiar properties in terms of UV magnitude and dust temperatures with respect to the simulated QSOs in Di Mascia et al. (2023). Therefore, we consider the average correction proposed by Duras et al. (2017) as the most appropriate choice, and we obtain $\text{SFR} = 265 \pm 32 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

By fitting the dust SED of the QSO J0100+28, we found that our observation in Band 9 favours a dust temperature lower than the effective dust temperatures found in simulations in bright ($L_{\text{bol}} > 10^{13} L_{\odot}$) quasar-hosts (~ 90 K, e.g. Di Mascia et al. 2023). This discrepancy can be due to different dust spatial distributions between the simulated objects and J0100+28, or to limits in the dust modelling and radiative transfer post-processing (e.g. the absence of a dusty torus in Di Mascia et al. 2021). With the current unresolved observation we are not able neither to constrain different

temperature components, nor to determine the temperature distribution across the galaxy. The value found for the emissivity index is higher than $\beta = 1.6$ found for the average SED of high- z QSOs (Beelen et al. 2006). However, as noted by Beelen et al. (2006), large variations of β are found when considering individual QSO SED. Only excluding the Band 9 data, we would obtain a good fit with $\beta < 2$, having then a factor of two higher temperature (see also Wang et al. 2019). This shows that the results can be misguided by relying only on the lowest frequency data points, while Band 9 is essential to reliably estimate dust parameters up to the highest redshifts. Indeed, Novak et al. (2019), using observations up to Band 8 at ~ 404 GHz, could not constrain T_{dust} in the $z = 7.54$ quasar ULAS J1342+0928. This work provides the first measurement of the Band 9 continuum of a luminous QSO host galaxy. Similarly, Bakx et al. (2021) used Band 9 observations to constrain T_{dust} for a galaxy at $z = 7.13$.

It is not straightforward to assess the physical reasons of the high β value. In principle, β depends on the physical properties and chemical composition of the grains, and possibly on environment and temperature. There are cases in which β can be larger than 2 (see e.g., Valiante et al. 2011; Galliano et al. 2018). Spatially resolved studies in low- z galaxies showed a spread of β within a single galaxy, probably due to the temperature mixing or the different properties of the grain populations, or both. The strong anti-correlation between T_{dust} and β can arise from the MCMC fitting procedure itself, mainly if there is a massive amounts of cold dust (i.e., $T \lesssim 10$ K, Galliano et al. 2018). However, in our case, the accurate sampling of the SED from low to high frequency significantly relaxed the strength of $T_{\text{dust}} - \beta$ anti-correlation (Figure 2). Therefore, we are confident that the estimates of β and T_{dust} are not strongly biased due to the effect of this anti-correlation. Finding a physical explanation for the high value of β would require studies of the properties of the dust grains and/or of a detailed analysis of the temperature mixing and is beyond the scope of this paper.

The left panel of Figure 3 shows the ratio of integrated [CII] to TIR luminosity for J0100+28 and a compilation of high redshift QSOs and galaxies (see caption). For J0100+28 we find $L_{[\text{CII}]} / L_{\text{TIR}} \sim 7 \times 10^{-4}$, given $L_{[\text{CII}]} = 3.7 \times 10^9 L_{\odot}$ (Wang et al. 2019). This [CII] deficit is also predicted for high- z galaxies by semi-analytical models of galaxy evolution (e.g. Lagache et al. (2018)), where the [CII] deficit arises from the high intensity of the interstellar radiation field. Our estimate of $L_{[\text{CII}]} / L_{\text{TIR}}$ agrees well with their results at $z \sim 6$ when we extrapolate their predictions at higher L_{TIR} . Carni-




Figure 3. Left panel: [CII]-to-TIR luminosity ratio vs TIR luminosity. We show our result for QSO J0100+28 (green star) compared with QSO J2310+18 at $z = 6.0028$ (red star, see text), two samples of star-forming galaxies at $5 < z < 6$ and $6 < z < 7$ (cyan and blue squares respectively, taken from Lagache et al. 2018), a sample of QSOs at $z > 4.4$ (violet diamonds, from Bischetti et al. 2021 and Decarli et al. 2018). Right panel: BH mass vs dynamical mass for J0100+28 (green star), compared with QSO J2310+18 at $z = 6.0028$ (red star, Tripodi et al. 2022), WISSH QSOs at $z \sim 2 - 4$ (grey diamonds, Bischetti et al. 2021), and luminous $z \sim 4 - 7$ QSOs (grey dots and grey squares, Venemans et al. 2016, 2017; Willott et al. 2013, 2015, 2017; Kimball et al. 2015; Trakhtenbrot et al. 2017; Feruglio et al. 2018; Mortlock et al. 2011; De Rosa et al. 2014; Kashikawa et al. 2015; Neeleman et al. 2021). Black dashed line (and shaded area) is the local relation from Kormendy & Ho (2013). For J0100+28 (J2310+18), the slope of the arrow, with its uncertainty, indicates how much the growth efficiency of the SMBH is increasing (slowing down) with respect to the growth of the host galaxy.

ani et al. (2018) found that the local $L_{\text{[CII]}} - \text{SFR}$ relation for star-forming galaxies (see De Looze et al. 2014) is still valid at high- z , but with a dispersion twice higher than observed locally. Our results agree within $< 1\sigma$ with the correlation of Carniani et al. (2018), and with the results for high- z galaxies of Lagache et al. (2018).

We evaluate the evolutionary state of the SMBH - host galaxy system. Wang et al. (2019) provides two estimates for M_{dyn} , one based on the assumption that the [CII] line arises from a rotating disk with very low inclination, and the other using the virial theorem with the hypothesis that the gas is supported by random motion (see Table 1). Although both estimates carry large uncertainties, the latter is in agreement with the dynamical masses commonly measured for other QSOs at high- z (see right panel of Figure 3) and we adopt it as a lower limit. The molecular gas mass is $M_{\text{gas}} = 5.4 \times 10^9 M_{\odot}$, and this implies a molecular gas fraction $\mu = M_{\text{gas}}/M_{*} = M_{\text{gas}}/(M_{\text{dyn}} - M_{\text{BH}} - M_{\text{gas}}) = 0.4$, which is remarkably lower than the typical gas fractions at $z \sim 3 - 4$ (Tacconi et al. 2018). We define the growth efficiency of the galaxy as $\text{SFR}/M_{\text{g+s}}$, where $M_{\text{g+s}} = M_{\text{gas}} + M_{*}$ and the SFR is corrected for the QSO contribution. We use $M_{\text{g+s}}$, instead of M_{dyn} (as

in Tripodi et al. 2022), since the BH mass is not negligible ($M_{\text{BH}} \sim 40\% M_{\text{dyn}}$, Wang et al. 2019) and can bias our results³. We obtain $M_{\text{g+s}} = 2.01 \times 10^{10} M_{\odot}$, therefore $\text{SFR}/M_{\text{g+s}} = 1.3 \times 10^{-8} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. On the other hand, we derive a BH growth efficiency⁴, $(1 - \epsilon)\dot{M}_{\text{BH}}/M_{\text{BH}} = 2.5 \times 10^{-8} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, where we use the BH mass derived from MgII (Table 1), and assume a radiative efficiency $\epsilon = 0.1$ (e.g. Marconi et al. 2004). The right panel of Figure 3 shows M_{BH} versus M_{dyn} for J0100+28, J2310+18 (Tripodi et al. 2022) and a compilation of QSOs at different redshifts, comparing them with the local $M_{\text{BH}} - M_{\text{dyn}}$ relation. The majority of QSOs, including J0100+28, lie above the local relation in the BH dominance regime (Volonteri 2012). However, this tension can be partially softened if accounting for the uncertainties on the dynamical mass estimates. These

³ To be consistent, we re-compute the growth efficiency of the galaxy for J2310 using $M_{\text{g+s}}$, and we changed the slope of the arrow with the respect to the one shown in Tripodi et al. (2022). However, the results do not change significantly, since $M_{\text{g+s}} \simeq M_{\text{dyn}}$ for J2310.

⁴ $\dot{M}_{\text{BH}} = L_{\text{bol}}/(\epsilon c^2)$, where ϵ is the radiative efficiency, and c is the speed of light.

mainly depend on the determination of the disk inclination and can be significantly high for some QSOs (Valiante et al. 2014; Pensabene et al. 2020). This is also the case of J0100+28, whose M_{dyn} can be in principle as high as $10^{12} M_{\odot}$ (see Table 1). For J0100+28, we found $(1 - \epsilon)\dot{M}_{\text{BH}}/M_{\text{BH}} > \text{SFR}/M_{\text{g+s}}$, suggesting that the BH is still dominating the process of BH-galaxy growing in this QSO at $z = 6.327$. This result is still valid if considering lower SFR (adopting the correction by Di Mascia et al. 2023) and/or higher M_{dyn} (i.e. higher $M_{\text{g+s}}$ at fixed BH mass), since the galaxy growth factor would be even smaller. Our results do not consider the gas inflow. However, we expect this term to contribute on average to both SFR and $M_{\text{g+s}}$, leaving their ratio mostly unaffected. On the other hand, in QSO J2310+18 at $z \sim 6$ AGN feedback might be slowing down the accretion onto the SMBH, while the host galaxy grows fast (Tripodi et al. 2022; Bischetti et al. 2022). The different evolutionary state of J0100+28 and J2310+18, separated by only ~ 60 Myr (i.e. $\Delta z \sim 0.3$), arise mainly from the difference in their BH mass (i.e., $M_{\text{BH},\text{J0100+28}} \sim 2 \times M_{\text{BH},\text{J2310+18}}$) and in SFR (i.e., $\text{SFR}_{\text{J0100+28}} \sim 0.2 \times \text{SFR}_{\text{J2310+18}}$). In principle, SFR/M_* is a better probe of the galaxy growth, however this is not available for most high redshift QSOs. For J0100+28, using SFR/M_* would not affect our results since $M_{\text{g+s}} \approx M_*$. For J2310, $M_* \ll M_{\text{g+s}}$, therefore resulting in an even flatter slope. The BH dominated growth of J0100+28 matches the qualitatively expectations for the evolutionary state of the HYPERION QSOs, that were selected to be the most luminous QSOs with the most massive SMBH at their epochs.

We compare our results with ‘zoom-in’ simulations of QSOs using the moving-mesh code AREPO, following BH growth and feedback via energy-driven outflows (Costa et al. 2014, 2015). We found that simulations reproduce BHs only up to masses $\sim 10^9 M_{\odot}$ that have host galaxies with dynamical masses $\sim 10^{11} M_{\odot}$. These are considerably more massive than J0100+28 host-galaxy. The growth of the system is characterised by intermittent phases, where the BH and galaxy-dominated growth phases change on short timescales. Hence, the diagnostic power of the relation $(1 - \epsilon)\dot{M}_{\text{BH}}/M_{\text{BH}} - \text{SFR}/M_{\text{g+s}}$ needs to be validated in larger samples that we plan to investigate in a forthcoming work.

In summary, this work allowed us to measure the SFR with the smallest statistical error, reaching an accuracy

of $\sim 15\%$ for the QSO J0100+28. Such unprecedented constraints on the host galaxy SFR (and T_{dust}) highlight the critical role of ALMA Band 9 to obtain a robust overview of the build-up of SMBHs and their massive host galaxies at the epoch of Reionisation. The systematic uncertainty on the SFR is still high due to the uncertainty in the estimate of the QSO contribution. Recently, Tsukui et al. (2023) estimated this contribution for a $z = 4.4$ QSO using high resolution ALMA observations up to band 9. Given our current unresolved observation, we are not able to use the same approach. However, we plan to determine this correction factor in forthcoming works using both high resolution observations and radiative transfer models to reproduce the observed SED.

Acknowledgments. We thank the anonymous referee for the comments and suggestions that helped us improving this work. This paper makes use of the following ALMA data: ADS/JAO.ALMA#2021.2.00151.S. ALMA is a partnership of ESO (representing its member states), NFS (USA) and NINS (Japan), together with NRC (Canada), MOST and ASIAA (Taiwan) and KASI (Republic of Korea), in cooperation with the Republic of Chile. The Joint ALMA Observatory is operated by ESO, AUI/NRAO and NAOJ. RT acknowledges financial support from the University of Trieste. RT, CF, FF, MB acknowledge support from PRIN MIUR project ‘‘Black Hole winds and the Baryon Life Cycle of Galaxies: the stone-guest at the galaxy evolution supper’’, contract #2017PH3WAT. FK acknowledges the Spanish program Unidad de Excelencia Marıa de Maeztu CEX2020-001058-M, financed by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033. SC is supported by the European Union (ERC, WINGS,101040227). RM acknowledges ERC Advanced Grant 695671 QUENCH, and support from the UK Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC). RM also acknowledges funding from a research professorship from the Royal Society.

Facilities: ALMA

Software: astropy, CASA (v5.1.1-5, McMullin et al. 2007)

REFERENCES

- Bakx, T. J. L. C., Sommovigo, L., Carniani, S., et al. 2021, MNRAS, 508, L58, doi: [10.1093/mnrasl/slab104](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnrasl/slab104)
- Beelen, A., Cox, P., Benford, D. J., et al. 2006, ApJ, 642, 694, doi: [10.1086/500636](https://doi.org/10.1086/500636)

- Bischetti, M., Feruglio, C., Piconcelli, E., et al. 2021, *A&A*, 645, A33, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202039057](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202039057)
- Bischetti, M., Feruglio, C., D'Odorico, V., et al. 2022, *Nature*, 605, 244, doi: [10.1038/s41586-022-04608-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04608-1)
- Carniani, S., Maiolino, R., Amorin, R., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 478, 1170, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty1088](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty1088)
- Carniani, S., Gallerani, S., Vallini, L., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 489, 3939, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stz2410](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz2410)
- Chabrier, G. 2003, *PASP*, 115, 763, doi: [10.1086/376392](https://doi.org/10.1086/376392)
- Costa, T., Sijacki, D., & Haehnelt, M. G. 2015, *MNRAS*, 448, L30, doi: [10.1093/mnrasl/slu193](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnrasl/slu193)
- Costa, T., Sijacki, D., Trenti, M., & Haehnelt, M. G. 2014, *MNRAS*, 439, 2146, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stu101](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu101)
- da Cunha, E., Groves, B., Walter, F., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 766, 13, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/766/1/13](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/766/1/13)
- De Looze, I., Cormier, D., Lebouteiller, V., et al. 2014, *A&A*, 568, A62, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201322489](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201322489)
- De Rosa, G., Venemans, B. P., Decarli, R., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 790, 145, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/790/2/145](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/790/2/145)
- De Vis, P., Jones, A., Viaene, S., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 623, A5, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201834444](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201834444)
- Decarli, R., Walter, F., Venemans, B. P., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 854, 97, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aaa5aa](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aaa5aa)
- Di Mascia, F., Carniani, S., Gallerani, S., et al. 2023, *MNRAS*, 518, 3667, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stac3306](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stac3306)
- Di Mascia, F., Gallerani, S., Behrens, C., et al. 2021, *MNRAS*, 503, 2349, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stab528](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab528)
- Duras, F., Bongiorno, A., Piconcelli, E., et al. 2017, *A&A*, 604, A67, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201731052](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201731052)
- Eilers, A.-C., Simcoe, R. A., Yue, M., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2211.16261, doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2211.16261](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.16261)
- Feruglio, C., Fiore, F., Carniani, S., et al. 2018, *A&A*, 619, A39, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201833174](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833174)
- Foreman-Mackey, D., Hogg, D. W., Lang, D., & Goodman, J. 2013, *PASP*, 125, 306, doi: [10.1086/670067](https://doi.org/10.1086/670067)
- Galliano, F., Galametz, M., & Jones, A. P. 2018, *ARA&A*, 56, 673, doi: [10.1146/annurev-astro-081817-051900](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-astro-081817-051900)
- Kashikawa, N., Ishizaki, Y., Willott, C. J., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 798, 28, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/798/1/28](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/798/1/28)
- Kimball, A. E., Lacy, M., Lonsdale, C. J., & Macquart, J. P. 2015, *MNRAS*, 452, 88, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stv1160](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv1160)
- Kormendy, J., & Ho, L. C. 2013, *Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 51, 511, doi: [10.1146/annurev-astro-082708-101811](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-astro-082708-101811)
- Lagache, G., Cousin, M., & Chatzikos, M. 2018, *A&A*, 609, A130, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201732019](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201732019)
- Li, J., Venemans, B. P., Walter, F., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 930, 27, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac61d7](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac61d7)
- Liu, Y., Wang, R., Momjian, E., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 929, 69, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac5c50](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac5c50)
- Marconi, A., Risaliti, G., Gilli, R., et al. 2004, *MNRAS*, 351, 169, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2004.07765.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2004.07765.x)
- McMullin, J. P., Waters, B., Schiebel, D., Young, W., & Golap, K. 2007, in *Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series*, Vol. 376, *Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XVI*, ed. R. A. Shaw, F. Hill, & D. J. Bell, 127
- Mortlock, D. J., Warren, S. J., Venemans, B. P., et al. 2011, *Nature*, 474, 616, doi: [10.1038/nature10159](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10159)
- Neeleman, M., Novak, M., Venemans, B. P., et al. 2021, *ApJ*, 911, 141, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/abe70f](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/abe70f)
- Novak, M., Bañados, E., Decarli, R., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 881, 63, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab2beb](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab2beb)
- Pensabene, A., Carniani, S., Perna, M., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 637, A84, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201936634](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201936634)
- Planck Collaboration, Aghanim, N., Akrami, Y., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 641, A6, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201833910](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833910)
- Schneider, R., Bianchi, S., Valiante, R., Risaliti, G., & Salvadori, S. 2015, *A&A*, 579, A60, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201526105](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201526105)
- Shao, Y., Wang, R., Carilli, C. L., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 876, 99, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab133d](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab133d)
- Tacconi, L. J., Genzel, R., Saintonge, A., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 853, 179, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aaa4b4](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aaa4b4)
- Trakhtenbrot, B., Lira, P., Netzer, H., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 836, 8, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/836/1/8](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/836/1/8)
- Tripodi, R., Feruglio, C., Fiore, F., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 665, A107, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202243920](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202243920)
- Tsukui, T., Wisnioski, E., Krumholz, M. R., & Battisti, A. 2023, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2302.07272, doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2302.07272](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.07272)
- Valiante, R., Schneider, R., Salvadori, S., & Bianchi, S. 2011, *MNRAS*, 416, 1916, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.19168.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.19168.x)
- Valiante, R., Schneider, R., Salvadori, S., & Gallerani, S. 2014, *MNRAS*, 444, 2442, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stu1613](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu1613)
- Venemans, B. P., Walter, F., Zschaechner, L., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 816, 37, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/816/1/37](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/816/1/37)
- Venemans, B. P., Walter, F., Decarli, R., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 837, 146, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa62ac](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa62ac)
- Venemans, B. P., Walter, F., Neeleman, M., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 904, 130, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/abc563](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/abc563)
- Volonteri, M. 2012, *Science*, 337, 544, doi: [10.1126/science.1220843](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1220843)
- Walter, F., Neeleman, M., Decarli, R., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 927, 21, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac49e8](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac49e8)
- Wang, F., Wang, R., Fan, X., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 880, 2, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab2717](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab2717)

Willott, C. J., Bergeron, J., & Omont, A. 2015, ApJ, 801,
123, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/801/2/123](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/801/2/123)
—. 2017, ApJ, 850, 108, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa921b](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa921b)

Willott, C. J., Omont, A., & Bergeron, J. 2013, ApJ, 770,
13, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/770/1/13](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/770/1/13)
Wu, X.-B., Wang, F., Fan, X., et al. 2015, Nature, 518, 512,
doi: [10.1038/nature14241](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14241)

APPENDIX

A. POSTERIOR DISTRIBUTIONS

We model the dust continuum with a MBB function given by

$$S_{\nu_{\text{obs}}}^{\text{obs}} = S_{\nu/(1+z)}^{\text{obs}} = \frac{\Omega}{(1+z)^3} [B_{\nu}(T_{\text{dust}}(z)) - B_{\nu}(T_{\text{CMB}}(z))](1 - e^{-\tau_{\nu}}), \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\Omega = (1+z)^4 A_{\text{gal}} D_{\text{L}}^{-2}$ is the solid angle with A_{gal} , and D_{L} is the surface area and luminosity distance of the galaxy, respectively (Carniani et al. 2019). The dust optical depth is

$$\tau_{\nu} = \frac{M_{\text{dust}}}{A_{\text{galaxy}}} k_0 \left(\frac{\nu}{250 \text{ GHz}} \right)^{\beta}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

with β the emissivity index and $k_0 = 0.45 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}$ the mass absorption coefficient (Beelen et al. 2006). The solid angle is estimated using the continuum mean size from resolved observations (Wang et al. 2019). The effect of the CMB on the dust temperature is given by

$$T_{\text{dust}}(z) = (T_{\text{dust}})^{4+\beta} + T_0^{4+\beta} [(1+z)^{4+\beta} - 1]^{\frac{1}{4+\beta}}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

with $T_0 = 2.73 \text{ K}$. We also considered the contribution of the CMB emission given by $B_{\nu}(T_{\text{CMB}}(z) = T_0(1+z))$ (da Cunha et al. 2013).

We model the low frequency radio emission using a PLCO that is

$$F_{\nu_{\text{rest}}} = n \times (\nu_{\text{rest}}/\nu_0)^{-\alpha} \times \exp(-\nu_{\text{rest}}/\nu_{\text{cutoff}}) \quad (\text{A4})$$

where n is the normalization, α is the radio power-law spectral index, ν_0 and ν_{cutoff} are the reference frequency and the cutoff frequency, respectively. We set $\nu_0 = 59 \text{ GHz}$ to ease the fitting procedure and in order to minimize the covariance between n and α . This choice does not affect our results.

The total model has six fitting parameters: dust temperature (T_{dust}), dust mass (M_{dust}), β entering in the MBB function, and n , α , and ν_{cutoff} for the PLCO. We explore the six dimensional parameter space using a Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm implemented in the EMCEE package (Foreman-Mackey et al. 2013). We assume uniform priors for the fitting parameters: $10 \text{ K} < T_{\text{dust}} < 300 \text{ K}$, $10^5 M_{\odot} < M_{\text{dust}} < 10^9 M_{\odot}$, $1.0 < \beta < 3.0$, $0.001 \text{ mJy} < n < 0.5 \text{ mJy}$, $0.01 < \alpha < 1.0$, $75.0 \text{ GHz} < \nu_{\text{cutoff}} < 500 \text{ GHz}$. The best-fit model has $T_{\text{dust}} = 48.4 \pm 2.3 \text{ K}$, $M_{\text{dust}} = (2.29 \pm 0.83) \times 10^7 M_{\odot}$, $\beta = 2.63 \pm 0.23$, $n = 0.08 \pm 0.01 \text{ mJy}$, $\alpha = 0.48 \pm 0.09$ and $\nu_{\text{cutoff}} = 235 \pm 100 \text{ GHz}$, obtained from a MCMC with 60 chains, 6000 trials and a burn-in phase of ~ 100 . Figure 4 shows the posterior distributions of the six fitting parameters T_{dust} , M_{dust} , β , n , α , and ν_{cutoff} .




Figure 4. Corner plot showing the six dimensional posterior probability distributions of T_{dust} , M_{dust} , β , n , α , and ν_{cutoff} . Orange solid lines on the posterior probability distributions indicate the best-fitting value for each parameter, while the dashed lines mark the 16% and 84% percentiles for each parameter.