

HYPERluminous quasars at the Epoch of Reionization (*HYPERION*). A new regime for the X-ray nuclear properties of the first quasars

L. Zappacosta¹, E. Piconcelli¹, F. Fiore^{2,3}, I. Saccheo^{1,4}, R. Valiante^{1,5}, C. Vignali^{6,7}, F. Vito⁷, M. Volonteri⁸, M. Bischetti^{2,9}, A. Comastri⁷, C. Done¹⁰, M. Elvis¹¹, E. Giallongo¹, F. La Franca^{1,4}, G. Lanzuisi⁷, M. Laurenti^{12,13}, G. Miniutti¹⁴, A. Bongiorno¹, M. Brusa^{6,7}, F. Civano¹⁵, S. Carniani¹⁶, V. D’Odorico^{2,16,3}, C. Feruglio^{2,3}, S. Gallerani¹⁶, R. Gilli⁷, A. Grazian¹⁷, M. Guainazzi¹⁸, A. Marinucci¹⁹, N. Menci¹, R. Middei^{1,13}, F. Nicastro¹, S. Puccetti¹⁹, F. Tombesi^{1,15,20,21}, A. Tortosa¹, V. Testa¹, G. Vietri²², S. Cristiani^{2,3,23}, F. Haardt^{24,25,26}, R. Maiolino^{27,28,29}, R. Schneider^{1,30,5,31}, R. Tripodi^{2,3,9}, L. Vallini⁷, and E. Vanzella⁷

(Affiliations can be found after the references)

July 20, 2023

ABSTRACT

The existence of luminous quasars (QSO) at the Epoch of Reionization (EoR; i.e. $z > 6$) powered by well grown supermassive black holes (SMBH) with masses $\geq 10^9 M_{\odot}$ challenges models of early SMBH formation and growth. To shed light on the nature of these sources we started a multiwavelength program based on a sample of 18 HYPERluminous quasars at the Epoch of Reionization (*HYPERION*). These are the luminous QSOs whose SMBHs must have had the most rapid mass growth during the Universe first Gyr and, hence, acquired the largest mass at their respective epochs. In this paper we present the *HYPERION* sample and report on the first of the three-years planned observations of the 2.4 Ms *XMM-Newton* Multi-Year Heritage program on which *HYPERION* is based. The goal of this program is to accurately characterise the X-ray nuclear properties of QSOs at the EoR. Through a joint X-ray spectral analysis of 10 sources, covering the rest-frame $\sim 2-50$ keV energy range, we report a steep average photon index ($\Gamma \approx 2.4 \pm 0.1$). No absorption is required at levels of $10^{21} - 10^{22} \text{ cm}^{-2}$. The measured average Γ is inconsistent at $\geq 4\sigma$ level with the canonical value ($\Gamma = 1.8 - 2$) measured in QSO at $z < 6$. Such a steep spectral slope is also significantly steeper than that reported in lower- z analog QSOs with similar luminosity or accretion rate, thus suggesting a genuine redshift evolution. Alternatively, we can interpret this result as the presence of a very low, almost unreported at lower- z , energy cutoff $E_{\text{cut}} \approx 20$ keV on a standard $\Gamma = 1.9$ power-law. We also report on mild indications that, on average, *HYPERION* QSOs show higher levels of coronal soft X-rays at 2 keV compared to the accretion disc UV at 2500 \AA than expected by lower- z AGN in the high-luminosity regime. We speculate that either a redshift-dependent coupling between the X-ray corona and accretion disk or intrinsically different coronal properties may account for the steepness of the X-ray spectral slope, especially in the presence of powerful winds. The reported steep slopes, if confirmed also in lower-luminosity regimes, may have an important impact on the design of next-generation X-ray facilities and future surveys aimed at investigating the early Universe.

Key words. X-rays: galaxies – Galaxies: active – Galaxies: high-redshift – Galaxies: nuclei – (Galaxies:) quasars: general – (Galaxies:) quasars: supermassive black holes

1. Introduction

Almost 300 spectroscopically confirmed quasars (QSOs) have been reported to date at $z \approx 6 - 7.6$ (Fan et al. 2022, and references therein) during the Epoch of Reionization (EoR). They are powered by Supermassive Black-Holes (SMBHs) with masses (M_{BH}) from $\sim 10^8 M_{\odot}$ up to $\sim 10^{10} M_{\odot}$ shining with high bolometric luminosities (L_{bol}) in the range $10^{46} - 10^{48} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ ($\sim 10^{13} - 10^{15} L_{\odot}$) close to the Eddington luminosity limit (L_{Edd}), i.e. with Eddington ratio $\lambda_{\text{Edd}} = L_{\text{bol}}/L_{\text{Edd}} \gtrsim 0.2$ (e.g. Willott et al. 2010; Mazzucchelli et al. 2017; Shen et al. 2019).

The mere existence of M_{BH} as large as $\sim 10^9 M_{\odot}$, at EoR, poses serious challenges to theoretical models aimed at explaining how these systems formed in less than 1 Gyr (Volonteri 2010; Johnson & Haardt 2016). If the high- z SMBH progenitors form at $z \approx 20 - 30$ (e.g. Valiante et al. 2016), it would be necessary to have seed BHs of at least $\sim 1000 - 10000 M_{\odot}$ continuously growing at the Eddington rate for $\sim 0.5 - 0.8$ Gyr (assuming a standard radiative efficiency, $\epsilon = 0.1$) to reach the typical M_{BH} reported in $z > 6 - 7$ quasars (see e.g. Wu et al. 2015; Bañados et al. 2018b; Yang et al. 2020; Wang et al. 2021b). This is challenging as it requires the uninterrupted availability of $\sim 10^9 M_{\odot}$ gas sup-

ply throughout the \sim billion years of growth (Johnson & Bromm 2007; Milosavljević et al. 2009). A continuous feeding at the observed $\lambda_{\text{Edd}} < 1$ would instead imply an initial seed mass $> 10^4 M_{\odot}$ for the large majority of currently discovered $z > 6$ QSO.

Theoretical studies (see Inayoshi et al. 2020; Lusso et al. 2023, for recent reviews), indeed, suggest that $z > 6$ SMBHs must have formed from very large initial masses (i.e. the so-called heavy seeds, $10^4 - 10^6 M_{\odot}$), growing at Eddington-limited gas accretion rates (e.g. Volonteri 2010; Valiante et al. 2016). Alternatively, they may have grown efficiently from lower-mass BHs ($\sim 100 M_{\odot}$; light seeds), remnants of Population III stars, through a series of short and intermittent super-Eddington accretion phases (e.g. Volonteri et al. 2015; Pezzulli et al. 2016). However, the viability of these two channels of SMBH formation is still unclear (Johnson & Haardt 2016). BHs may also grow through coalescence with other BHs during galaxy mergers, in the framework of the hierarchical structure formation scenario (Volonteri et al. 2003; Tanaka & Haiman 2009). The merger time-scale of a binary BH is highly uncertain, but is likely to be long (up to few tens of Gyr) especially at high redshift (e.g. Biava et al. 2019; Souza Lima et al. 2020).




Fig. 1. Selection and properties of the *HYPERION* sample. Left: SMBH mass as a function of redshift. All the reported points (diamonds and stars) are the sub-sample of 46 hyperluminous ($L_{\text{bol}} > 10^{47}$ erg s $^{-1}$) quasars with known SMBH masses reported at the end of 2020. The final selected 18 sources are reported as red stars. The curves represent the exponential growth of seed BHs of different masses (labelled in figure) formed at $z = 20$, assuming continuous accretion ($f_{\text{duty}} = 1$) at the Eddington rate ($\lambda_{\text{Edd}} = 1$; see Section 2). The red curve, corresponding to a growing seed of $1000 M_{\odot}$, has been used to select the *HYPERION* sample. Right: Distribution of the *HYPERION* sample in the M_{BH} vs L_{bol} plane (red stars) along with the distribution of the 83 $z > 6$ quasars with available M_{BH} . All M_{BH} are based on single-epoch MgII virial estimator and L_{bol} is from bolometric correction from literature as of 2020. M_{BH} and L_{bol} have been consistently recomputed for all sources assuming the same Λ CDM cosmology and adopting the mass calibration from Vestergaard & Osmer (2009) and a bolometric correction of 5.15 to the 3000Å luminosity from Richards et al. (2006). Dashed lines report the location of sources emitting a fixed fraction of L_{Edd} . The contours report the location of the lower redshift ($z = 0.7 - 1.9$) SDSS-DR7 quasars from Shen et al. (2011) with MgII-derived masses.

The fundamental challenges posed by these sources have prompted a massive effort in following-up the hyperluminous ($L_{\text{bol}} > 10^{47}$ erg s $^{-1}$) quasars at near-infrared (UV/optical rest-frame) and far-infrared/sub-mm wavelengths with the largest and most sensitive observatories and with the best facilities available to date (e.g. Willott et al. 2010; Wang et al. 2013; Venemans et al. 2016; Mazzuchelli et al. 2017; Venemans et al. 2017; Reed et al. 2017; Feruglio et al. 2018; Shen et al. 2019; Onoue et al. 2019; Fan et al. 2019; Schindler et al. 2020; Yang et al. 2021; Farina et al. 2022; Walter et al. 2022; Bischetti et al. 2022). In the X-rays, despite similar dedicated observational efforts (e.g. Brandt et al. 2002; Farrah et al. 2004; Moretti et al. 2014; Page et al. 2014; Gallerani et al. 2017; Ai et al. 2017; Nanni et al. 2018; Bañados et al. 2018a; Pons et al. 2019; Salvestrini et al. 2019; Connor et al. 2020; Wang et al. 2021a; Vito et al. 2021, 2022; Yang et al. 2022; Wolf et al. 2023), our knowledge of the properties of $z > 6$ quasars has been limited by the sensitivity and efficiency of current X-ray observatories and the lack of all-sky X-ray surveys. Despite this, few mostly marginal indications of different nuclear/host properties compared to lower- z QSO analogs have been reported. These indications involve: 1) hints of X-ray photon index steepening (Vito et al. 2019; Wang et al. 2021a); 2) faster/more frequent nuclear winds (Meyer et al. 2019; Schindler et al. 2020; Yang et al. 2021; Bischetti et al. 2022); 3) M_{BH} overgrown compared to host-galaxy dynamical mass with respect to the local scaling relation (e.g. Pensabene et al. 2020; Neeleman et al. 2021; Farina et al. 2022; Tripodi et al. 2023). Given the challenging nature of mas-

sive $z > 6$ QSOs, it is tempting to ascribe all those properties to their peculiar SMBH mass assembly history. However, their confirmation on firmer statistical grounds and their interpretation needs to be carefully evaluated. Indeed, an observational selection solely based on interesting, peculiar, bright sources, the availability of a restricted set of good quality data or the lack of a uniform physically-motivated sample selection may lead to a biased interpretation of these results.

The importance of an X-ray characterization of QSOs at EoR lies on the fact that the X-ray emission carries a nearly instantaneous information on the innermost active galactic nuclei (AGN) accreting regions. Indeed, a fraction of the thermal UV emission radiated by the accretion disc is reprocessed (i.e. Compton up-scattered) in the X-rays (e.g. Haardt & Maraschi 1993) by a compact inner (i.e. 10-20 gravitational radii; e.g. De Marco et al. 2013; MacLeod et al. 2015; Chartas et al. 2016; Kara et al. 2016) optically thin region, the hot corona. Such a radiation has a power-law spectral shape and a typical photon index $\Gamma = 1.8 - 2$ slope. The latter is constant up to $z \sim 5$ (Piconcelli et al. 2005; Vignali et al. 2005; Shemmer et al. 2008; Just et al. 2007; Zappacosta et al. 2018), falling off at high energies with an exponential cutoff at > 100 keV (e.g. Dadina 2008; Vasudevan et al. 2013; Malizia et al. 2014; Ricci et al. 2018) depending on the physical properties of the corona (Fabian et al. 2015, 2017). The photon index has been claimed as a possible indicator of the AGN accretion rate as parameterized by the Eddington ratio λ_{Edd} , i.e. the mass-normalized bolometric luminosity (e.g. Shemmer et al. 2008; Brightman et al. 2013; Trakhtenbrot et al. 2017; Liu et al. 2021;

but see Laurenti et al. 2022 and Kamraj et al. 2022). A tight anti-correlation has long been reported between the accretion disc monochromatic UV luminosity at 2500 Å ($L_{2500\text{Å}}$) and the optical-to-X-ray spectral index (α_{ox}), parametrizing the relative contributions of the accretion disc UV ($L_{2500\text{Å}}$) and corona X-ray (2 keV; $L_{2\text{keV}}$) radiative outputs (e.g. Avni & Tananbaum 1982; Vignali et al. 2003; Steffen et al. 2006; Lusso & Risaliti 2016; Martocchia et al. 2017; Timlin et al. 2020). Physical properties and the relative geometrical configuration of the accretion disc/corona system therefore play a crucial role in shaping the α_{ox} and Γ relations (e.g. Kubota & Done 2018). The validation of the $\alpha_{\text{ox}}-L_{2500\text{Å}}$ relation at very high redshifts may allow us to extend and improve cosmology studies (Risaliti & Lusso 2019) up to those early epochs.

Apart from the marginal indications of steeper Γ in stacked/joint spectral fitting analysis of $z > 6$ QSOs, past X-ray studies have not found other signs of convincing evolutionary properties. However, they suffered from (i) limited constraining power due to low X-ray counts statistics ($< 10 - 15$ net-counts), preventing proper spectral analysis on source-by-source basis, and (ii) a small number of sources with reliable spectral data quality (Nanni et al. 2017; Ai et al. 2017; Gallerani et al. 2017; Nanni et al. 2018; Vito et al. 2019; Pons et al. 2020; Wang et al. 2021a; Medvedev et al. 2021; Wolf et al. 2023; Connor et al. 2020).

In this paper we present 1) a new sample of $z > 6$ QSOs selected with a physically motivated criterion to include the titans among $z > 6$ QSOs: i.e. those powered by SMBHs which appear to have undergone the fastest BH growth compared to other co-eval sources; 2) a *XMM-Newton* Multi-Year Heritage X-ray program on this sample designed to begin the first systematic X-ray spectroscopic exploration of QSOs at EoR; 3) the results of the first year of the *XMM-Newton* program. In Section 2 we present our QSO sample and the *XMM-Newton* Multi-Year Heritage X-ray program. The reduction of the X-ray data from the 1st year of the Heritage program and X-ray photometry is described in Section 3. The X-ray spectral analysis is reported in Section 4. The results, their discussion and relative conclusions are given in Section 5, Section 6 and Section 7, respectively.

Throughout the paper we adopt a Λ CDM cosmology with $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, $\Omega_M = 0.27$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.73$. Errors are reported at 1σ level with upper limits quoted at 90% confidence level.

2. The *HYPERION* Sample and the *XMM-Newton* Heritage Program

The HYPERluminous quasars at the Epoch of Reionization (*HYPERION*) sample is defined by the selection of all the $z > 6$ hyperluminous QSOs ($L_{\text{bol}} \geq 10^{47} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$) known up to 2020 which required an initial seed BH mass of $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}} > 1000 M_\odot$ accreting via continuous exponential growth at the Eddington rate to form the measured SMBH mass. The selection was performed on the 46 unlensed radio-quiet hyperluminous $z > 6$ QSOs known with published SMBH masses at the end of 2020 (i.e. Willott et al. 2010; De Rosa et al. 2011; Mazzucchelli et al. 2017; Wu et al. 2015; Bañados et al. 2018b; Shao et al. 2017; Reed et al. 2019; Wang et al. 2018; Pons et al. 2019; Chehade et al. 2018; Shen et al. 2019; Yang et al. 2020; Wang et al. 2020; Eilers et al. 2020; Andika et al. 2020; Onoue et al. 2019; Matsuoka et al. 2019). The selection criterion of the *HYPERION* QSOs is reported in Fig. 1 as the red curve. The curves represent the time-

dependent exponential mass growth modelled as $M_{\text{BH}} = M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}} \times \exp(t/t_s)$ with e-folding time $t_s = 0.45 \epsilon (1 - \epsilon)^{-1} \lambda_{\text{Edd}}^{-1} f_{\text{duty}}^{-1} \text{ Gyr}$ of seed BHs of different masses (labelled in figure) formed at $z = 20$ (Valiante et al. 2016), assuming continuous accretion at the Eddington rate, i.e. $\lambda_{\text{Edd}} = 1$, radiative efficiency $\epsilon = 0.1$ and active phase duty cycle $f_{\text{duty}} = 1$. Hence this sample includes the "titans" among QSOs, i.e. those powered by the SMBH which had the largest mass assembly over the Universe first Gyr.

Notice that this selection criterion is a convenient way to statistically select the sample of QSOs which are powered by SMBH which experienced the most rapid growth during their formation history. This selection is physically motivated as it allows to identify these sources through a reference curve, starting at a specific $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$, for the continuous Eddington-limited mass growth. Under this assumption the $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$ reported in Table 1 and required by each SMBH to grow its mass has to be considered solely as a proxy for the mass growth rate experienced by each SMBH and not necessarily a physically meaningful quantity.

All *HYPERION* QSOs have been selected in optical-to-mid infrared and benefit from extensive high-quality multi-band photometric/spectroscopic coverage from rest-frame UV (i.e. observed NIR band) to sub-mm/mm band. By definition, NIR spectroscopic data from VLT, Magellan, Gemini, Keck spectrographs are available for all the *HYPERION* QSOs. From these data MgII-based single epoch virial masses and bolometric luminosities from 3000 Å bolometric correction have been derived (e.g. Wu et al. 2015; Mazzucchelli et al. 2017; Bañados et al. 2018b; Reed et al. 2019; Shen et al. 2019). Similarly, photometric data, especially for NIR and sub-mm/mm, are available to different quality levels (e.g. Tripodi et al. 2023; Feruglio et al. 2023, Saccheo et al. in prep.).

We have obtained M_{BH} employing the MgII virial mass estimator by Vestergaard & Osmer (2009) which employs the full-width at half maximum (FWHM) of the MgII line and the 3000 Å continuum luminosity. We also computed L_{bol} via the 3000 Å bolometric correction from Richards et al. (2006). Notice that this choice of virial mass estimator makes our selection conservative and therefore robust as among the MgII virial mass estimators, the one from Vestergaard & Osmer (2009) tends to give the lowest SMBH mass estimates (see e.g. Farina et al. 2022) and hence the lowest $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$. Furthermore, the average E(B-V) estimated through a Spectral Energy Distribution (SED) analysis for the *HYPERION* QSOs is < 0.01 (Saccheo et al. in prep.) and hence the mass estimates are not affected by spectral reddening. Fig. 1 right shows the distribution of the *HYPERION* QSOs in the M_{BH} vs. L_{bol} plane along with the distribution of the 83 $z > 6$ QSOs with estimated masses known by the end of 2020. The *HYPERION* QSOs, distributed in the redshift range $z \approx 6 - 7.5$ (mean $z \sim 6.7$), have an average $\log(L_{\text{bol}}/\text{erg s}^{-1}) \approx 47.3$ and span a mass range $\approx 10^9 - 10^{10} M_\odot$ leading to $\lambda_{\text{Edd}} = 0.3 - 2.6$. Notice that the virial mass estimates uncertainties are dominated by systematics reaching 0.3-0.5 dex (e.g. Shen & Liu 2012). To have a sense of the variation of the estimated masses, if we employ for our selection the Shen et al. (2011) MgII-based mass estimator which typically gives high M_{BH} estimates (Farina et al. 2022), we obtain SMBH masses 0.2 dex higher implying λ_{Edd} smaller by $\sim 40\%$ and $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$ larger by a factor 1.6.

Table 1 lists the 18 selected QSOs in the *HYPERION* sample along with their celestial coordinates, MgII-based redshifts, L_{bol} , M_{BH} , Eddington ratio (λ_{Edd}), required $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$ and $L_{2500\text{Å}}$ obtained through interpolation of photometric points (Saccheo et al. in prep.). All the quantities have been re-evaluated by uniformly

Table 1. The *HYPERION* QSO sample, ordered by decreasing redshift, and its general properties

Name	RA	DEC	z^a	$\log L_{\text{bol}}^b$ erg s $^{-1}$	$\log M_{\text{BH}}^c$ M_{\odot}	λ_{Edd}	$M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$ M_{\odot}	L_{2500}^d erg s $^{-1}$	Ref. ^e
ULAS J1342+0928	13:42:08.10	+09:28:38.6	7.541	47.19	8.90	1.55	19120	46.58 ± 0.02	1
J1007+2115	10:07:58.26	+21:15:29.2	7.494	47.30	9.18	1.05	32460	46.66 ± 0.03	2
ULAS J1120+0641	11:20:01.48	+06:41:24.3	7.087	47.30	9.41	0.62	18230	46.71 ± 0.07	3
DELS J0038-1527	00:38:36.10	-15:27:23.6	7.021	47.36	9.14	1.32	7983	46.79 ± 0.04	4
DES J0252-0503	02:52:16.64	-05:03:31.8	6.99	47.12	9.15	0.74	7679	46.55 ± 0.04	5, 6
VDES J0020-3653	00:20:31.47	-36:53:41.8	6.834	47.16	9.24	0.66	5753	46.64 ± 0.05	7
VHS J0411-0907	04:11:28.62	-09:07:49.7	6.824	47.31	8.80	2.57	2019	46.71 ± 0.03	8
VDES J0244-5008	02:44:01.02	-50:08:53.7	6.724	47.19	9.08	1.02	2814	46.55 ± 0.03	7
PSO J231.6-20.8	15:26:37.84	-20:50:00.7	6.587	47.31	9.50	0.51	4708	46.66 ± 0.06	9
PSO J036.5+03.0	02:26:01.88	+03:02:59.4	6.533	47.33	9.49	0.55	3776	46.78 ± 0.03	9
VDES J0224-4711	02:24:26.54	-47:11:29.4	6.526	47.53	9.36	1.18	2730	46.83 ± 0.04	7
PSO J011+09	00:45:33.57	+09:01:56.9	6.444	47.12	9.15	0.74	1279	46.37 ± 0.02	9
SDSS J1148+5251	11:48:16.64	+52:51:50.2	6.422	47.57	9.74	0.54	4627	46.90 ± 0.02	10
PSO J083.8+11.8	05:35:20.90	+11:50:53.6	6.346	47.16	9.32	0.55	1324	46.69 ± 0.03	11
SDSS J0100+2802	01:00:13.02	+28:02:25.8	6.300	48.24	10.04	1.26	5799	47.56 ± 0.07	12
ATLAS J025-33	01:42:43.70	-33:27:45.7	6.294	47.39	9.57	0.72	1392	46.93 ± 0.01	13
CFHQS J0050+3445	00:50:06.67	+34:45:22.6	6.246	47.29	9.68	0.32	2072	46.67 ± 0.03	10
ATLAS J029-36	01:59:57.97	-36:33:56.6	6.027	47.39	9.82	0.30	1220	46.60 ± 0.03	13

^a: measured from the MgII emission line; ^b: estimated from luminosity 3000Å ($L_{3000\text{\AA}}$, see reference column) from Richards et al. (2006); ^c: measured from single epoch virial mass estimator employing the FWHM of the MgII line and $L_{3000\text{\AA}}$ from Vestergaard & Osmer (2009); ^d: estimated through interpolation of adjacent photometric points (Saccheo et al. in prep.); ^e: References for redshift and parameters to estimate L_{bol} and M_{BH} : 1. Bañados et al. (2018b); 2. Yang et al. (2020); 3. Mortlock et al. (2011); 4. Wang et al. (2018); 5. Wang et al. (2020); 6. Yang et al. (2021); 7. Reed et al. (2019), 8. Pons et al. (2019); 9. Mazzucchelli et al. (2017); 10. Shen et al. (2019); 11. Andika et al. (2020); 12. Wu et al. (2015); 13. Chehade et al. (2018)

adopting a Λ CDM cosmology with $\Omega_M = 0.27$ and $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.73$. Hereafter, we refer to the single QSOs shortening their name, reported in Table 1, as J plus the digits of their RA.

For two *HYPERION* QSOs (J0224 and J0100) good quality archive X-ray data from *XMM-Newton* are already available and their spectral analysis has been presented in Pons et al. (2019) and Ai et al. (2017). For the remaining *HYPERION* QSOs we have an on-going 2.4 Ms *XMM-Newton* Multi-Year Heritage Program (PI L. Zappacosta; Proposal ID 088499), approved in Dec 2020 with a three years time span, to collect unprecedented high quality X-ray data for such a large sample of QSOs at EoR. Specifically, the *HYPERION XMM-Newton* Multi-Year Heritage Program (hereafter *XMM-HYPERION*) is collecting for the first time X-ray data for seven sources and is improving the data quality for already observed nine sources but for which only limited X-ray data quality (either leading to non-detections or to mainly 10-15 net-counts detections, e.g. Vito et al. 2019; Pons et al. 2019; Connor et al. 2020) is available. The aim of *XMM-HYPERION* is to achieve for all QSOs in the sample the high-quality data standard that up to now has been obtained in unlensed QSOs by J0224 and J0100 (i.e. at least 100 net-counts from pn+MOS1+MOS2 data in the 0.5-10 keV band). This would ensure a $\sim 10\%$ accuracy level (1σ) characterization of the X-ray spectral properties photon index of the power-law and unabsorbed 2-10 keV luminosity (L_{2-10}) on these sources.

3. Data reduction and photometry

In this work we report data from the first year of observations of the *XMM-HYPERION* program. In addition, we also perform a re-analysis of the two archival *HYPERION* sources J0224 and J0100, for consistency. In total we are presenting ~ 0.94 Ms of new data on ten sources which increases to ~ 1.04 Ms accounting for the observations of the two archival sources. Ta-

ble 2 presents the details on the considered observations. *XMM-HYPERION* observations have been already completed, with two exposures, for only one out of all the considered targets, i.e. J1342. Observations for the remaining targets in this sub-sample will be completed over the following two years of the *XMM-HYPERION* program with at least one further exposure. The exact schedule of the exposures is flexible and may vary depending on the flux state of each target measured on their first exposure.

The *XMM-Newton* data have been processed with the SAS v19.1.0. Following the standard procedures outlined in the *XMM-Newton* science threads we created through the *epicproc* package newly calibrated event files. We produced the high energy light curves for the EPIC pn and MOS detectors in the energy range 10-12 keV and > 10 keV, respectively. We visually inspected them for the presence of high background flares. Following the recommendations presented in the most updated calibration technical notes¹, we identified the good time intervals by removing the part of the pn observations which were affected by rates higher than 0.4 cts/s (~ 0.41 cts/s for J011). As for the MOS1 and MOS2 exposures, we adopted thresholds in the range 0.12-0.17 cts/s and 0.18-0.22 cts/s, respectively. We determined that for the pn only one observation (J0244) had $\sim 20\%$ of the exposure affected by high background periods. All other sources had their observation impacted by $\sim 40 - 50\%$. As for the MOS exposures, we calculated a percentage of time affected by high backgrounds in the range $\sim 8-27\%$ and $\sim 6-19\%$ for MOS1 and MOS2, respectively. In Table 2 we report nominal and cleaned exposures for each observation.

We first identified the point-like sources across the field of view. We created 0.5-2 keV energy band pn images and run on them the task *edetect_chain* by setting a detection maximum

¹ XMM-SOC-CAL-TN-0018 which is available at <https://xmmweb.esac.esa.int/docs/documents/CAL-TN-0018.pdf>




Fig. 2. EPIC 0.5-2 keV pn, MOS1 and MOS2 camera images for the first J1342 observation reported in Table 2 of the *XMM-HYPERION* program presented in this work. All the images are smoothed by a Gaussian kernel of 3 pixel radius for better visualization. Source and background counts/spectral extraction regions are reported in red and black, respectively. Dashed circular regions indicates areas excluded from the background extraction. Images for the second J1342 exposure (*J1342_2*) and other *XMM-HYPERION* QSOs presented in this work are reported in Appendix A.

Table 2. Journal of the observations of the *HYPERION* targets from the *XMM-HYPERION* (upper part of the table) and archive (lower part of the table).

Source	OBSID ^a	Start date	Nominal Exposure (ks)			Cleaned exposure (ks)		
			pn	MOS1	MOS2	pn	MOS1	MOS2
<i>HYPERION XMM-Newton</i> Heritage program								
J1342_1 ^b	0884990101	2021-07-05 18:18:38	106.5	99.7	97.7	60.3	78.5	78.4
J1342_2 ^b	0884993801	2021-12-24 12:49:15	101.5	98.4	102.6	46.4	68.2	73.8
J1120	0884990401	2021-06-27 18:30:48	71.6	73.4	73.4	36.6	51.5	52.6
J0020	0884991101	2022-01-01 05:50:36	85.8	87.6	87.6	37.4	62.0	63.7
J0244	0884991501	2021-08-04 17:03:07	87.2	89.0	89.0	67.4	81.3	78.5
J231.6	0884991701	2021-07-29 17:30:46	109.5	108.0	106.6	66.9	89.0	89.9
J036.5	0884992001	2021-07-19 18:11:14	84.8	74.6	70.9	47.1	68.0	66.3
J011	0884992101	2021-07-15 18:14:32	81.3	76.9	72.1	46.2	56.0	58.4
J083.8	0884992401	2022-03-14 00:46:23	84.8	86.6	86.6	51.9	74.0	73.6
J0050	0884992601	2021-06-26 18:27:30	42.8	44.6	42.8	26.2	32.9	34.5
J029	0884992901	2022-01-03 17:05:23	84.0	84.5	85.1	55.2	69.2	68.6
<i>HYPERION</i> archival observations								
J0224	0824400301	2018-05-25 11:35:29	32.7	34.5	34.5	14.9	23.8	27.4
J0100	0790180701	2016-06-29 17:53:42	62.4	64.1	64.0	41.1	60.1	55.9

^a: observation ID for each *XMM-Newton* dataset considered; ^b: suffix *_1* and *_2* refer to the first and second exposure for source J1342.

likelihood (DETML²) threshold DETML = 6. This blind search also produced the detection of all the QSO targets, except J011, J0020 and J231.6 (but see later for J0020). We verified the targets detection, accounting for the source position prior and performing forced aperture photometry on the QSO positions. We extracted the source counts on circular regions of radius 20 arcsec (corresponding to $\sim 80\%$ of the on-axis PSF encircled energy fraction at 1.5 keV) centered on the QSO optical position (see Table 1), except for J0244 and J0020 which had a nearby source (28 arcsec and 17 arcsec distant), for which we adopted smaller apertures of 15 arcsec and 12 arcsec radius ($\sim 65 - 70\%$ of the PSF encircled energy fraction), respectively. The background counts were extracted for the MOS cameras on circular apertures of radius in the range 2.5-3.4 arcmin centered on the QSO position. For the pn camera we adopted rectangular regions positioned around the target, rotated roughly with the same detector position angle and with long and short sides in the range 3.6-3.9 arcmin and 1.9-2.7 arcmin, respectively. The background

counts extraction was performed excluding detector circular regions of 40 arcsec radius centered on (1) the contaminant point sources previously identified on the 0.5-2 keV pn image, (2) other sources reported on both MOS cameras and (3) the target QSOs. In case of bright sources we excluded larger regions of 50 arcsec radius. Fig. 2 shows the adopted extraction regions on the 0.5-2 keV images of the three *XMM-Newton* cameras for the first observation of J1342 (*J1342_1*; see Table 2). Images and adopted extraction regions for the second observation of J1342 (*J1342_2*) and other sources are reported in Appendix A.

We computed the $\geq 99\%$ confidence level source detection by calculating the no-source binomial probability and estimated net-counts (with uncertainties) on the 0.5-2 keV (soft band), 2-10 keV (hard band) and 0.5-10 keV (full band) images of the three *XMM-Newton* cameras (see Weisskopf et al. 2007; Vito et al. 2019). We considered as detections the sources with a no-source binomial probability $\leq 1\%$ on either the pn detector or in both the MOS detectors in at least one band. Table 3 reports the measured source counts with uncertainties. All the targets resulted in detections except J011 and J231.6 in broad agreement (J0020 is detected in this case) with the results of source detec-

² DETML = $-\ln P_{md}$, where P_{md} is the probability of detection by chance.

Table 3. Source net-counts from fixed-aperture photometry on the EPIC detectors in the soft, hard and full energy bands

Source	Counts _{0.5–2 keV} (cts)			Counts _{2–10 keV} (cts)			Counts _{0.5–10 keV} (cts)		
	pn	MOS1	MOS2	pn	MOS1	MOS2	pn	MOS1	MOS2
<i>HYPERION XMM-Newton Heritage program</i>									
J1342_1 ^a	41.2 ^{+13.0} _{-12.3}	< 17.6	< 17.2	< 18.6	< 7.6	< 13.3	< 60.7	< 15.1	< 22.5
J1342_2 ^a	29.7 ^{+11.9} _{-11.1}	< 19.1	18.3 ^{+8.3} _{-7.7}	< 17.6	< 9.4	< 10.1	< 50.2	< 19.1	< 29.7
J1120	33.6 ^{+9.2} _{-8.6}	18.3 ^{+7.1} _{-6.3}	20.7 ^{+7.1} _{-6.6}	< 13.6	< 15.1	< 11.2	29.4 ^{+12.8} _{-12.2}	23.4 ^{+9.5} _{-8.9}	21.3 ^{+9.3} _{-8.6}
J0020	14.1 ^{+6.2} _{-5.6}	< 11.5	< 13.7	< 12.0	< 13.3	< 5.1	< 28.1	< 19.9	< 12.2
J0244	59.0 ^{+10.7} _{-10.0}	11.9 ^{+5.9} _{-5.2}	26.7 ^{+7.0} _{-6.3}	< 24.6	< 8.3	< 17.1	68.9 ^{+14.2} _{-13.5}	< 21.5	34.3 ^{+8.9} _{-8.2}
J231.6	< 40.6	< 21.7	< 25.4	< 24.7	< 24.2	< 10.7	< 52.1	< 38.0	< 26.2
J036.5	24.9 ^{+9.7} _{-9.2}	< 16.9	< 17.4	< 17.1	< 21.4	< 22.4	< 41.9	< 31.4	< 33.2
J011	< 26.1	< 13.6	< 9.6	< 18.1	< 16.6	< 8.7	< 33.3	< 23.8	< 12.0
J083.8	40.9 ^{+10.7} _{-10.1}	< 14.5	< 21.4	< 41.2	19.3 ^{+8.6} _{-7.8}	< 26.0	65.1 ^{+16.4} _{-15.7}	23.6 ^{+10.6} _{-10.0}	26.4 ^{+10.4} _{-9.7}
J0050	16.9 ^{+7.7} _{-7.0}	16.1 ^{+6.0} _{-5.4}	11.3 ^{+5.7} _{-4.9}	< 14.1	< 16.7	< 17.7	< 32.8	24.6 ^{+8.1} _{-7.4}	20.6 ^{+8.0} _{-7.3}
J029	< 32.5	< 18.9	< 14.1	< 37.2	< 7.1	< 12.4	39.9 ^{+15.3} _{-14.6}	< 15.9	< 19.6
<i>HYPERION archival observations</i>									
J0224	45.5 ^{+8.9} _{-8.3}	18.0 ^{+6.1} _{-5.6}	21.5 ^{+6.6} _{-5.9}	< 22.1	< 12.5	< 12.7	57.1 ^{+11.5} _{-10.8}	22.8 ^{+7.9} _{-7.1}	26.4 ^{+8.3} _{-7.5}
J0100	157.9 ^{+14.7} _{-14.1}	77.9 ^{+10.3} _{-9.7}	51.6 ^{+8.8} _{-8.2}	43.2 ^{+11.8} _{-11.0}	< 19.8	< 14.0	201.1 ^{+18.7} _{-17.9}	88.2 ^{+12.1} _{-11.5}	56.7 ^{+10.5} _{-9.8}

^a: suffix _1 and _2 refer to the first and second exposure for source J1342.

tion search performed across the field. For the sources J083.8 and J029 this is the first X-ray detection reported.

For the undetected sources, we calculated pn upper limits on fluxes, luminosities and on α_{ox} ³. They are reported in Table 4 along with the spectral measurements for the detected sources (see Section 4). Specifically, we estimated the total counts in the soft and hard band by correcting the fixed aperture photometry of 20 arcsec radius reported in Table 3 and accounting for $\sim 80\%$ of the 1.5 keV total encircled energy fraction. We estimated the fluxes using the X-ray spectral fitting package XSPEC (Arnaud 1996) assuming the spectral response files extracted at the source position and adopting a power-law model with both $\Gamma = 2$ and $\Gamma = 2.4$ (i.e. the average Γ from a joint spectral analysis of the detected sources, see Section 4.2 for details) absorbed by the Galactic column density. The latter is taken from the HI4PI survey (HI4PI Collaboration et al. 2016) as weighted average at the position of each source within a radius of 0.1 deg. We then estimated the unabsorbed 2–10 keV and 2 keV luminosities with XSPEC by assuming the same absorbed power-law spectral model.

4. Spectral analysis

In the following, we report the spectral analysis performed for all the detected sources in Table 3.

4.1. Single source analysis

The source and background spectral extractions were performed on the same regions adopted for the counts extractions. Given the sources low-counts and background dominated regime, before performing the spectral analysis we evaluated the best spectral binning scheme. We simulated different input spectra and evaluated the accuracy of each binning scheme in recovering the input power-law parameters. We tried the following binning schemes: minimum 1, 3, 5, 10 counts per bin and the optimal Kaastra & Bleeker (2016, KB hereafter) grouping. We verified

³ We adopted as a reference the pn detector which is the most efficient detector at < 2 keV energy where most detections occur.

that the KB binning⁴, which provides the optimal binning for data and model accounting for the source spectral shape, the variable spectral resolution and the average photon energy in each bin, is the best scheme to recover unbiased estimates of the parameters, and is also insensitive to the energy over which the spectral analysis is performed. We use the KB scheme for the following spectral analysis. See Appendix B for a detailed description of the simulations.

The spectral analysis was performed with XSPEC v12.11.1. We performed the modelings by using the Cash statistics with direct background subtraction (W-stat in XSPEC; Cash 1979; Wachter et al. 1979). Given the Type 1 nature of these sources, their high redshift and low number of counts in the spectra we adopted a simple power-law model, i.e. assuming no intrinsic N_{H} for the QSOs, modified by the absorption by the Galaxy interstellar medium (adopting HI4PI Collaboration et al. 2016, maps), parameterized by a *tbabs* model in XSPEC). We jointly modelled the three EPIC camera spectra. Given the low-counts regime, we neglect intercalibration shifts between the detectors after checking that they are consistent to unity within the uncertainties. We performed the fits only for the ten detected sources and carried out the analysis in the energy range 0.3–7 keV (corresponding to rest-frame energies from ~ 2 to ~ 50 keV) by leaving free to vary Γ and the normalization.

The best-fit parameters are reported in Table 4 where the uncertainty on the fluxes and luminosities is computed by freezing Γ at its best-fit value. Spectra and best-fit models for the *XMM-HYPERION* targets are reported in Fig. 3. This is the first X-ray spectral analysis reported for the sources J083.8 and J029. Other detected sources were previously observed and analysed with lower quality data, either with *Chandra* and/or *XMM-Newton*. A comparison with previous analysis is reported in Appendix C. Given the background-dominated regime, we verified that changing the spectral analysis energy range to progressively lower/higher observed energies (i.e. 2, 5, 10 keV) does not significantly impact on our results being always less than 10% from

⁴ For this particular binning we used the FTOOLS (<http://heasarc.gsfc.nasa.gov/ftools>) command `ftgrouppha` with group type option "opt".




Fig. 3. *XMM-Newton* pn (black), MOS1 (red) and MOS2 (green) 0.3-7 keV spectra and best-fit models (stepped continuous thick lines) for the 10 detected *HYPERION* QSOs presented in this paper. Spectra have been further rebinned for visual purposes and are reported at their rest-frame energy. Residuals are shown as data minus best-fit model in the bottom panels. For the source J1342 blue, cyan and magenta represent the second data set.

Table 4. Best-fit parameters from the X-ray spectral analysis.

Source	W-stat/dof	Counts ^a pn/MOS ^b	Γ	$F_{0.5-2}$ 10 ⁻¹⁶ erg s ⁻¹ cm ⁻²	F_{2-10} 10 ⁻¹⁶ erg s ⁻¹ cm ⁻²	L_{2-10} 10 ⁴⁴ erg s ⁻¹	$L_{2\text{ keV}}$ 10 ⁴⁴ erg s ⁻¹	α_{ox}
J1342	392.7/319	75/ 48	2.87 ^{+0.43} _{-0.37}	10.54 ^{+1.84} _{-1.81}	3.65 ^{+0.64} _{-0.64}	17.09 ^{+3.05} _{-2.96}	9.86 ^{+1.76} _{-1.71}	-1.48 ^{+0.03} _{-0.03}
J1120	177.0/157	42/ 46	2.59 ^{+0.35} _{-0.32}	21.59 ^{+3.35} _{-3.30}	12.26 ^{+1.88} _{-1.89}	26.71 ^{+4.16} _{-3.96}	12.88 ^{+2.00} _{-1.91}	-1.50 ^{+0.03} _{-0.02}
J0020	156.0/153	27/ 20	2.75 ^{+0.59} _{-0.53}	11.62 ^{+2.47} _{-2.46}	4.64 ^{+0.98} _{-1.00}	12.64 ^{+2.81} _{-2.60}	6.78 ^{+1.51} _{-1.40}	-1.58 ^{+0.04} _{-0.03}
J0244	147.5/157	80/ 62	2.39 ^{+0.24} _{-0.22}	21.53 ^{+2.37} _{-2.32}	15.23 ^{+1.62} _{-1.66}	18.83 ^{+2.08} _{-1.99}	7.87 ^{+0.87} _{-0.83}	-1.52 ^{+0.02} _{-0.02}
J231.6	–	–	2.0 ^c	< 13.56 ^d	< 46.51 ^d	< 10.70 ^d	< 3.32 ^d	< -1.69 ^d
	–	–	2.4 ^c	< 13.28 ^d	< 42.87 ^d	< 13.42 ^d	< 5.65 ^d	< -1.60 ^d
J036.5	182.0/156	24/ 28	3.03 ^{+1.08} _{-0.89}	7.92 ^{+2.24} _{-2.19}	2.31 ^{+0.64} _{-0.65}	9.61 ^{+2.75} _{-2.59}	6.11 ^{+1.75} _{-1.65}	-1.65 ^{+0.05} _{-0.04}
J011	–	–	2.0 ^c	< 13.78 ^d	< 49.85 ^d	< 9.40 ^d	< 2.92 ^d	< -1.54 ^d
	–	–	2.4 ^c	< 13.61 ^d	< 45.66 ^d	< 11.64 ^d	< 4.90 ^d	< -1.45 ^d
J083.8	178.0/158	53/ 42	1.89 ^{+0.39} _{-0.37}	13.22 ^{+2.46} _{-2.47}	28.99 ^{+3.35} _{-3.33}	11.54 ^{+2.19} _{-2.10}	3.28 ^{+0.62} _{-0.60}	-1.66 ^{+0.03} _{-0.03}
J0050	153.4/154	31/ 35	1.89 ^{+0.45} _{-0.40}	19.34 ^{+4.06} _{-4.01}	31.22 ^{+6.38} _{-6.44}	11.81 ^{+2.49} _{-2.36}	3.35 ^{+0.60} _{-0.57}	-1.70 ^{+0.04} _{-0.03}
J029	192.8/157	54/ 19	2.85 ^{+0.60} _{-0.54}	10.43 ^{+2.06} _{-2.12}	3.63 ^{+0.74} _{-0.73}	8.25 ^{+1.71} _{-1.63}	4.71 ^{+0.68} _{-0.93}	-1.65 ^{+0.03} _{-0.03}
J0224	180.0/155	71/ 48	2.10 ^{+0.25} _{-0.22}	54.60 ^{+6.74} _{-6.68}	57.82 ^{+7.02} _{-7.08}	36.47 ^{+4.56} _{-4.35}	12.23 ^{+1.53} _{-1.46}	-1.61 ^{+0.02} _{-0.02}
J0100	146.7/161	206/ 156	2.39 ^{+0.13} _{-0.12}	69.08 ^{+4.25} _{-4.33}	55.40 ^{+3.45} _{-3.41}	57.68 ^{+3.67} _{-3.56}	24.10 ^{+1.53} _{-1.49}	-1.72 ^{+0.01} _{-0.01}

Notes. ^a: 0.3-7 keV net-counts; ^b: MOS1+MOS2 counts; ^c fixed parameter, ^d: 90% upper limit from pn photometry from Table 3 assuming a power-law with the fixed Γ

the best-fit Γ and well within the 1σ uncertainties quoted in Table 4.

4.2. Average spectral slope

To obtain a measure of the average spectral slope from this *HYPERION* sub-sample, we performed a joint modeling from all the 10 detected sources. Each QSO dataset, except J0100, contributes to the joint fit with pn+MOS1+MOS2 0.3-7 keV net-counts in the range $\sim 50 - 140$. In the case of J0100, which has more than 300 pn+MOS net-counts, we selected three chunks (chunks1, chunks2 and chunks3) of observations representative of the average pn and MOS net-counts gathered from the other datasets, i.e. with $\sim 50 \pm 20$ and $\sim 40 \pm 15$ net-counts for pn and MOS1+MOS2 detectors, respectively. In order to ensure a random sampling of the observation, the three chunks were selected by adopting a non overlapping count-rate selection of the high-energy light curves used for the high-background screening⁵. We performed joint pn+MOS1+MOS2 spectral analysis of each chunk and verified that with the simple power-law modeling modified by the Galactic absorption, the Γ and the 2-10 keV and 2 keV X-ray luminosities are consistent with those reported for the entire dataset (see Table 4).

We performed the joint modeling of the 10 QSOs exploiting the 11 datasets (including the two observations of J1342) three times, each analysis including one of the three chunks of the J0100 observation. In total we modelled a total of ~ 900 net-counts of spectral data (0.3-7 keV) of which ~ 500 and ~ 400 net-counts are from pn and MOS detectors, respectively. We adopted a simple power-law model absorbed by Galactic interstellar medium, with Γ linked across all the datasets. We included and tied for each detector the cross-calibration constants. We left the linked Γ and the normalizations for each source free to vary. A fit to these data resulted in best-fit values of $\Gamma = 2.44^{+0.11}_{-0.10}$ (including chunk1 of J0100; W – stat/dof = 1922.8/1730), $\Gamma =$

⁵ The three chunks were selected by including time intervals of the observation with the pn/MOS1/MOS2 count-rates ranges 0.19-0.23/0.04-0.06/0.09-0.11 counts s⁻¹ for chunk1, 0.24-0.26/0.065-0.085/0.115-0.135 counts s⁻¹ for chunk2 and 0.27-0.3/0.085-0.115/0.135-0.17 counts s⁻¹ for chunk3.

2.40 ± 0.11 (including chunk2; W – stat/dof = 1934.2/1730) and $\Gamma = 2.41^{+0.11}_{-0.10}$ (including chunk3; W – stat/dof = 1944.0/1730).

We verified the stability of the results as a function of the energy range and measured that the best-fit value changes within the range $\Gamma = 2.39 - 2.46$ with no trend as a function of energy. Errors on Γ increase from 0.10 to 0.13 by restricting the band interval.

We also removed the datasets with the highest number of net-counts (142 total net-counts; J0244) and lowest net-counts (47 and 52 total net-counts; J036.5 and J0020, respectively) obtaining substantially unaffected best-fit Γ values ($\Gamma = 2.37 - 2.42$).

Given the good spectral quality (large number of counts) reached in the joint analysis, we also tried to include an intrinsic absorption term to estimate the average hydrogen column density in QSO at EoR. The absorber may be associated with local absorption in the vicinity of the QSO, or with material further out in dense patches of the intergalactic medium. We obtain best-fit N_{H} ranging from 2.1×10^{21} cm⁻² and 3.7×10^{22} cm⁻² and corresponding slightly steeper Γ in the range 2.42-2.62. However the N_{H} are highly uncertain and consistent with no absorption at $\sim 1.2 - 1.3\sigma$ level. Therefore we conclude that mild absorption ($N_{\text{H}} \approx 10^{21} - 10^{22}$ cm⁻²) is not required in *HYPERION* QSOs.

Finally we performed a fit in the same rest-frame energy range for each source. The common energy range is defined as $0.3 \text{ keV} * (1 + z_{\text{max}}) - 7 \text{ keV} * (1 + z_{\text{min}}) \approx 2.6 - 49 \text{ keV}$, where z_{min} and z_{max} are the highest and lowest redshift covered by the *HYPERION* sample considered in this work. We obtained Γ ranging from 2.37 to 2.47, with uncertainties of the order of 0.11-0.13.

We also tried a power-law model with high energy cutoff (E_{cut}) under the hypothesis that the steepening of the spectrum is due to the cutoff close or within the relatively high energies covered by the spectral data. By setting Γ in the range of canonical values 1.8-2.0 we obtain the energy cutoff E_{cut} in the range 14 – 25 keV in all cases. Specifically, the best-fit E_{cut} values for assumed $\Gamma = 1.9$ are all in the range $\sim 17 - 19$ keV. Indeed we obtained $E_{\text{cut}} = 16.6^{+4.8}_{-3.3}$ keV for J0100 chunk1, $E_{\text{cut}} = 19.4^{+6.7}_{-4.3}$ keV for chunk2 and $E_{\text{cut}} = 18.4^{+6.0}_{-3.9}$ keV for chunk3. All the fits are statistically indistinguishable from the simple power-law case having $|\Delta W - \text{stat}| \lesssim 2$.




Fig. 4. Γ vs λ_{Edd} for a compilation of local/high- λ_{Edd} AGN and high-redshift luminous QSOs. Red stars are the *HYPERION* QSOs presented in this work. Green four-pointed stars are other $z > 6$ QSOs, detected with ≥ 30 net-counts, from the X-ray spectral analysis performed by Vito et al. (2019) and not included in the *HYPERION* sample. Quasars at Cosmic Noon ($z = 2-4$) are reported in purple triangles, (the WISSH QSOs from Zappacosta et al. 2020), empty cyan circles (Shemmer et al. 2006a, 2008) and pink diamond (Nardini et al. 2019; Trefoloni et al. 2023). Local high- λ_{Edd} QSOs Laurenti et al. (2022) and local AGN/NLSy1 (Liu et al. 2021) are reported respectively as blue square and yellow circles. Reported are also the most recent relations from a linear fit to the local AGNs (i.e. Trakhtenbrot et al. 2017; Liu et al. 2021). The uncertainties on λ_{Edd} from QSOs with M_{BH} estimated by single-epoch virial mass estimator are dominated by systematic uncertainties and can be as high as 0.5 dex. The statistical uncertainty on λ_{Edd} for the local AGN/NLSy1 (Liu et al. 2021) whose masses are estimated via reverberation mapping is 0.1 dex and 0.2 dex for the sub-Eddington and super-Eddington sources, respectively.

Notice that in our joint and single source analysis we neglected contributions from a Compton reflection component due to the coronal X-rays inverse Compton-scattered by the surrounding matter. Typically QSOs show low or virtually no reflection (e.g. Vignali et al. 1999; Reeves & Turner 2000; Page et al. 2005; Zappacosta et al. 2018). A non-negligible Compton reflection contribution in the *HYPERION* QSOs would result in even steeper Γ for their power-law continuum.

5. Results

In the following, we compare the X-ray properties inferred from our analysis of the *HYPERION* spectra with those reported for other $z \leq 6$ sources, especially luminosity- and λ_{Edd} - analogs QSOs to assess possible differences linked to radiative output or accretion rate as parameterized by the λ_{Edd} or to the SMBH mass accretion history stage of the SMBH adopting as a proxy $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$.




Fig. 5. Distribution of the average Γ as a function of redshift. The plot includes data from joint spectral analysis or average values from samples of QSOs. In particular, starred data are from joint spectral analysis of samples of $z > 6$ QSOs. Black star with central red circle, green four-pointed star, magenta six-pointed star and three-pointed star are *HYPERION* QSOs, Vito et al. (2019), Wang et al. (2021a) and Nanni et al. (2017) samples, respectively. The empty squares, diamond and circle are averages from stacked spectral analysis of luminous and hyperluminous QSOs from Just et al. (2007), Vignali et al. (2005) and Shemmer et al. (2006b), respectively. The empty triangle represent the average Γ from the PG quasars (Piconcelli et al. 2005). Blue squares are high- λ_{Edd} local QSOs (Laurenti et al. 2022) and purple triangles are hyperluminous high- λ_{Edd} WISSH QSOs (Zappacosta et al. 2020). Pink diamonds are $z \sim 3$ luminous blue quasars from Nardini et al. (2019). Vertical error bars report 1σ uncertainties on Γ while horizontal error bars indicate the redshift range covered by the QSO sample considered in each dataset.

5.1. The steepness of the X-ray spectrum

The Γ measured for each *HYPERION* QSO are on average very steep. Fig. 4 shows the distribution of Γ as a function of λ_{Edd} for our *HYPERION* QSOs and other AGN and QSOs. Recent relations measured for local sample of low-luminosity AGNs involving these two quantities are reported to aid with the interpretation of the plot (Trakhtenbrot et al. 2017; Liu et al. 2021). *HYPERION* sources show on average the steepest values, the large majority exhibiting $\Gamma \geq 2.3$. Other $z > 6$ QSOs with good quality data (i.e. > 30 net-counts) not included in *HYPERION* (i.e. which failed the $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$ selection criterion) from Vito et al. (2019) show flatter Γ values. Other λ_{Edd} -analog QSO samples at lower redshift, i.e. the hyperluminous WISSH $z = 2-3$ QSOs from Zappacosta et al. (2020) and the high- λ_{Edd} nearby ($z < 1$) QSOs from Laurenti et al. (2022, hereafter L22), have noticeably flatter Γ (although with large scatter) in agreement with the canonical $\Gamma = 1.8-2$ values. The reported relations predict $\Gamma \approx 1.9-2.1$ at the average *HYPERION* λ_{Edd} . The average Γ for *HYPERION* QSOs from the joint spectral analysis is inconsistent with the relations at $> 3\sigma$ level.




Fig. 6. Distribution of E_{cut} as a function of L_{2-10} . Light blue and orange filled circles are estimates from a compilation of local AGN (Bertola et al. 2022, and references therein) and $z \approx 2 - 4$ QSOs (Lanzuisi et al. 2019; Bertola et al. 2022). Purple circles are from local super Eddington accreting AGN from Tortosa et al. (2023). Hollow magenta circles are binned average estimated from (Ricci et al. 2018) of a large sample of local AGN from the BAT AGN Spectroscopic Survey (BASS). *HYPERION* average E_{cut} measurement (assuming $\Gamma = 1.9$) from our joint analysis is reported as black star with inner red circle. Green regions are the forbidden regions (for a slab corona model) due to runaway electron-positron pair production (see Svensson 1984) for $\log(M_{BH}/M_{\odot}) = 8.5$ and $\log(M_{BH}/M_{\odot}) = 9.5$.

In the Γ vs. z plot reported in Fig. 5 we show our joint analysis Γ value compared with the results of other, independent, joint analysis studies of $z \gtrsim 6$ QSOs (Nanni et al. 2017; Vito et al. 2019; Wang et al. 2021a). Thanks to the combination of a sizable number of detected sources with the higher quality data gathered by the 1st year of *XMM-HYPERION*, the uncertainty in our average joint value is smaller by a factor 2-3.

We also report in the plot previous joint spectral analysis Γ values from other luminous QSO sample at $1 < z < 6$ (Vignali et al. 2005; Shemmer et al. 2006a; Just et al. 2007), the average value for the WISSH QSOs from Zappacosta et al. (2020), for the local PG QSOs (Piconcelli et al. 2005) and the high- λ_{Edd} L22 QSOs. These are samples of analog sources in terms of L_{bol} and/or λ_{Edd} . All $z < 6$ results from L_{bol} - and λ_{Edd} - analogs sources show consistency with $\Gamma = 1.8 - 2$. The average Γ from all the considered $z < 6$ QSO samples is $\Gamma_{z < 6} = 1.91 \pm 0.04$.

HYPERION QSOs have a Γ value inconsistent with $\Gamma = 2$ at $> 4\sigma$. The same inconsistency level holds with the Γ reported for $z < 6$ sources of similar L_{bol} or λ_{Edd} . In particular Γ for *HYPERION* is inconsistent at $\sim 4.8\sigma$ level with $\Gamma_{z < 6}$. We also measured for the WISSH QSO sample analyzed by Zappacosta et al. (2020), the average Γ obtained by performing the spectral fits from 2 keV, i.e. the same rest-frame low-energy bound probed for the *HYPERION* QSOs. We obtained an average $\Gamma = 1.93 \pm 0.08$ which is consistent with the average value

of $\Gamma = 1.84 \pm 0.07$ inferred from the full bands (i.e. from 0.2-0.3 keV observed frame low energy bound, corresponding to 0.6-0.9 keV rest-frame) spectral modelings. This further indicates that the steepness of the *HYPERION* Γ values does not depend on the probed rest-frame energy range. Consistency between the *HYPERION* Γ value and those from past works analysing $z > 6$ samples is reported at the $1 - 2\sigma$ level. This is due to the large uncertainties reported in past $z > 6$ QSO analysis.

All the previous comparisons suggest that the Γ of *HYPERION* QSOs is steeper regardless of the QSOs luminosity or accretion rate and hence that it is due to an evolutionary effect. Given the *HYPERION* QSOs selection criterion this evolutionary effect is possibly linked to the particularly fast SMBH mass growth history undergone by these sources.

In order to check this hypothesis, we divided the 10 *HYPERION* QSOs in two equal size samples according to their SMBH growth history and hence based on their required M_{BH}^{seed} . Specifically we selected: (i) a high M_{BH}^{seed} sample (i.e. $M_{BH}^{seed} \approx 4 - 30 \times 10^3 M_{\odot}$; including J1342, J1120, J0100, J0020, J036.5) and (ii) a low M_{BH}^{seed} sample (i.e. $M_{BH}^{seed} \approx 1 - 3 \times 10^3 M_{\odot}$; including J0244, J0224, J0050, J083.8, J029). X-ray data for each sample include an approximately equal number of pn+MOS1+MOS2 counts, with 410 and 495 net-counts for the high- M_{BH}^{seed} and low- M_{BH}^{seed} samples, respectively. We performed a joint spectral analysis for each sample. For the high- M_{BH}^{seed} sample we obtained $\Gamma = 2.64 - 2.7$ (depending to the J0100 chunk used), with uncertainty of ~ 0.16 , and for the low- M_{BH}^{seed} sample we obtained $\Gamma = 2.21 \pm 0.13$, a difference that is significant at the $2.1 - 2.4\sigma$ level. The average redshift of each sample is 6.86 and 6.37 for the high- M_{BH}^{seed} and low- M_{BH}^{seed} samples, respectively. Therefore the Γ difference can be also due to a redshift (i.e. temporal) dependence. Indeed, redshift and M_{BH}^{seed} in this sample correlate with a Spearman rank correlation coefficient of ~ 0.8 . This is probably due to Malmquist bias as the virial mass estimators are luminosity dependent. A joint analysis on the five lowest/highest redshift QSOs ($z = 6.29$ and $z = 6.94$, respectively) gives $\Gamma = 2.21 - 2.29$ and $\Gamma = 2.64_{-0.16}^{+0.17}$ with ~ 0.14 uncertainties, confirming the increasing Γ trend with redshift. However, this Γ steepening, if confirmed, is happening in $\sim 10^8$ years which is a very short period of time for a any likely redshift-dependent mechanism to act on cosmological timescales. Hence, we support the hypothesis that the steepening (if confirmed by additional data) is dependent on M_{BH}^{seed} and hence on the rapid mass growth of the SMBH.

A steep spectrum can also be mimicked by a power-law with canonical $\Gamma = 1.9$ and high-energy cutoff at relatively low energies. Our data are not able to discriminate between a simple power-law or a cutoff power-law model, hence we cannot rule out this possibility. Fig. 6 shows the distribution of energy cutoff E_{cut} as a function of L_{2-10} . The *HYPERION* QSOs considered in this work are compared to $z < 0.5$ lower-luminosity AGN and to $z = 2 - 4$ hyperluminous lensed QSOs (Lanzuisi et al. 2019; Bertola et al. 2022) as well as to local super-Eddington accreting AGN from Tortosa et al. (2023). The *HYPERION* value of E_{cut} is at extremely low energies and, although consistent with few measurements for low-luminosity AGN, is inconsistent with the few measurements for QSOs at similar L_{2-10} . Furthermore, it is far from the forbidden area in which runaway electron-positron pair production would act as thermostat lowering the temperature of the corona and hence E_{cut} (see Svensson 1984; Stern et al. 1995). The forbidden region extent is M_{BH} dependent and is calculated from Fabian et al. (2015) assuming a slab geometry (we do not show the, less extended and hence less conservative, hemisphere geometry regions).




Fig. 7. Bolometric X-ray luminosity as a function of L_{bol} and λ_{Edd} . Left: K_{bol}^X vs. L_{bol} for a compilation of broad-line mostly high- z QSOs and local AGN. The sources are reported as in Fig. 4. Lower limits for the *HYPERION* QSOs are estimated assuming a power-law with fixed $\Gamma = 2.4$ (see Section 3 and Table 4). We also added COSMOS Type 1 AGN (pink dots) from Lusso et al. (2010). Solid and dashed black lines represent the fitting relation reported in Duras et al. (2020) and its 1σ spread. Dotted lines report fixed value of 2-10 keV luminosity in units of erg s⁻¹ in the K_{bol}^X vs. L_{bol} plane. Right: K_{bol}^X vs λ_{Edd} for the same sources reported in left panel and with SMBH measures available. Solid and dotted black lines represent the fitting relation reported in Duras et al. (2020) and its 1σ spread.

Ricci et al. (2018) found a statistically significant anti-correlation between E_{cut} and λ_{Edd} for a sample of local AGN from the BASS survey (Koss et al. 2017) and up to $\lambda_{\text{Edd}} \approx 0.4$. An extrapolation of this relation to the average $\lambda_{\text{Edd}} = 0.8$ (or $\lambda_{\text{Edd}} = 0.5$ if adopting the mass estimator from Shen et al. 2011) of the *HYPERION* sub-sample studied in this work indicates values as low as 100 keV (i.e. accounting for the uncertainty given by the median absolute deviation of this relation). Our E_{cut} is inconsistent at $> 3\sigma$ level with the trend of this relation (i.e. the 3σ upper bound is ~ 60 keV).

5.2. Comparing the X-ray contribution to the UV/bolometric radiative output

We also check the behaviour of the X-ray coronal luminosity of the *HYPERION* QSOs to the bolometric radiative output. The bolometric correction $K_{\text{bol}}^X = L_{\text{bol}}/L_{2-10}$ has a somewhat flat trend at Seyfert-like luminosities progressively increasing toward higher luminosity sources (e.g. Marconi et al. 2004; Lusso et al. 2012; Duras et al. 2020). Fig. 7 left, shows the bolometric correction K_{bol}^X as a function of L_{bol} . The *HYPERION* QSOs are in agreement with the trend delineated by other data (except the nearby optically-selected high- λ_{Edd} QSO from L22) and described by the relation of Duras et al. (2020). Despite this, the location of the *HYPERION* QSOs in the $\lambda_{\text{Edd}} - K_{\text{bol}}^X$ plane as reported in the right panel of Fig. 7, appears to be in disagreement with the trend reported by Duras et al. (2020). This disagreement is shared by all QSO samples and highlights the lack of a clear dependence between K_{bol}^X and λ_{Edd} . This is mainly due by the steep L_{bol} dependence of K_{bol}^X at high-luminosity

regimes⁶. This is not well sampled by Duras et al. (2020) and is dominated by the bulk of low-luminosity highly accreting AGN population.

We now investigate the α_{ox} parametrizing the slope between the monochromatic luminosities at 2 keV and 2500 Å and defined as $\alpha_{\text{ox}} = \log(L_{2 \text{ keV}}/L_{2500 \text{ Å}})/\log(\nu_{2 \text{ keV}}/\nu_{2500 \text{ Å}})$. Fig. 8 report α_{ox} vs. $L_{2500 \text{ Å}}$ for several AGN samples spanning > 4 decades in $L_{2500 \text{ Å}}$ along with best-fit relations from Lusso & Risaliti (2016) and Martocchia et al. (2017). Unlike other hyperluminous or high- λ_{Edd} QSOs exhibiting, on average, a weaker X-ray emission compared to the UV one, the *HYPERION* QSOs exhibit, on average, slightly higher 2 keV luminosities which almost systematically exceeds the expectation of the α_{ox} vs $L_{2500 \text{ Å}}$ relations with no sources exhibiting the X-ray weakness typically shown by a consistent fraction of sources in the WISSH and L22 samples. Indeed, at the mean $\log L_{2500 \text{ Å}}$, the Lusso & Risaliti (2016) relation, providing the more accurate parameterization of the bulk of the AGN population, predict $\alpha_{\text{ox}} = -1.69$ while the average for the detected *HYPERION* QSOs has $\alpha_{\text{ox}}^{\text{hyp}} = -1.61 \pm 0.030$. This translates to an average $\Delta\alpha_{\text{ox}} = 0.08$. We computed the distribution of the $\Delta\alpha_{\text{ox}}$ values for *HYPERION* and the Lusso & Risaliti (2016) QSOs detected with a signal-to-noise ratio $SNR > 5$ (see Fig. 9) and performed a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test on the detected data to check the difference between the two datasets. The two distributions mildly differ with a null-hypothesis probability $P_{\text{null}} = 0.0576$. We further check this disagreement performing 10000 random draws of $\Delta\alpha_{\text{ox}}$ in sub-samples of 10 sources (i.e. the same size of the

⁶ The only exception being the lower luminosity L22 sample which mainly deviates because of their overall X-ray weakness, possibly a result of an optical selection coupled to the high- λ_{Edd} requirement.




Fig. 8. α_{OX} vs $L_{2500\text{\AA}}$ for a compilation of AGN catalogs. Symbols are referred to the AGN samples as in Fig. 4 except for the green dots which are detected AGN with signal-to-noise ratio $SNR > 5$ from Lusso & Risaliti (2016). Upper limits for the *HYPERION* QSOs are estimated assuming a power-law with fixed $\Gamma = 2.4$ (see Section 3 and Table 4). Dashed line is the linear fit from Martocchia et al. (2017) while solid line refers to the best-fit relation from Lusso & Risaliti (2016) and for the sub-sample with $SNR > 5$, $E(B-V) \geq 0.1$ and $1.6 \leq \Gamma_{1-5} \leq 2.8$, Γ_{1-5} being the photon index estimated between the luminosities at 1 keV and 5 keV. Light blue crosses and asterisks present the values predicted by the QSOSED model (Kubota & Done 2018) assuming average *HYPERION* parameters and spin $a = 0$ and $a = 1$, respectively. They are reported from top-left to bottom-right from $\log \dot{m} = -1$ to $\log \dot{m} = 0.2$ in steps of $\Delta \log \dot{m} = 0.2$.

detected *HYPERION* QSO sample reported in this work) from the Lusso & Risaliti (2016) sample. We verified that their average $\Delta\alpha_{\text{OX}}$ do not exceed that shown by the *HYPERION* QSOs for 98.4% of the time and, therefore, that the disagreement of our sources is not strong. This result is also slightly at variance with the α_{OX} previously estimated for $z > 6$ QSOs by other works (Vito et al. 2019; Wang et al. 2021a). This is mainly due to the fact that they assumed a $\Gamma = 2$ to derive $L_{2\text{ keV}}$. Hence, we can partly explain this as the combination of steep Γ and unchanged integrated L_{2-10} , (i.e. in line with the values expected by the $K_{\text{bol}}^{\text{X}}$ vs L_{bol} relation). Indeed, at fixed L_{2-10} , a change in Γ slope from 2 to 2.4 increases $L_{2\text{ keV}}$ by a factor ~ 1.3 and hence α_{OX} by a quantity ~ 0.11 , in agreement with $\Delta\alpha_{\text{OX}}^{\text{hyp}}$.

Assuming a best-fit power-law model with a high-energy cutoff and canonical $\Gamma = 1.9$, would result in average $\alpha_{\text{OX}} = -1.65 \pm 0.071$, i.e. somewhat softer and more in line with the α_{OX} vs $L_{2500\text{\AA}}$ relations, hence exhibiting a $\Delta\alpha_{\text{OX}} = 0.042$.

Notice that at this high luminosity regime there is a clear contrast between the *HYPERION* QSOs and the QSOs at Cosmic Noon ($z = 2 - 4$). Indeed, the latter QSOs are characterized by flatter slopes (on average $\Gamma \approx 1.85$) translating to α_{OX} smaller by a quantity ~ 0.2 than those shown by the former QSOs. Furthermore a fraction corresponding to $\sim 30\%$ of the WISSH QSOs and the luminous blue QSOs at $z = 3$ analyzed by




Fig. 9. Normalized distributions of the $\Delta\alpha_{\text{OX}}$ relative to the relation from Lusso & Risaliti (2016) (see Fig. 8) for *HYPERION* QSOs (red filled histogram) and the AGN detected with $SNR > 5$ from Lusso & Risaliti (2016) (dashed hollow histogram). The grey region marks the position of the X-ray weak sources.

Zappacosta et al. (2020) and Nardini et al. (2019) are characterized by intrinsic X-ray weakness further lowering their average α_{OX} values.

6. Probing a new regime in the nuclear properties of QSOs at EOR

The measured X-ray properties of *HYPERION* QSOs clearly differ from luminosity-analog and λ_{Edd} -analog QSOs at lower z . Steep X-ray spectral slopes (regardless of whether they are due to steep Γ or to a low-energy onset of the power-law cutoff) as measured here are previously unreported among the QSO population. They are more typical of lower M_{BH} ($< 10^6 M_{\odot}$) highly accreting low-luminosity AGN such as the narrow line Sy1 (NLSy1) galaxies (e.g. Miniutti et al. 2009; Ludlam et al. 2015). The steep Γ measured for the *HYPERION* QSOs are also a confirmation of results reported on single but peculiar $z > 6$ sources such as the very bright radio loud (Medvedev et al. 2021) or narrow-line quasars (Wolf et al. 2023) for which $\Gamma = 2.5 \pm 0.2$ (90% errors) and $\Gamma = 3.2^{+0.7}_{-0.6}$ have been obtained.

It is possible that the steepness derives from a different geometry of the accretion disc/corona system, a different coupling between the accretion disc and the corona, or to peculiar coronal properties.

Kubota & Done (2018) present a framework of a radially stratified accretion disc with standard outer disc, inner warm Comptonizing and a innermost hot corona regions, adopting a truncated disc geometry with the corona dissipating power in the inner hot accretion flow (see Fig. 2 in Kubota & Done 2018). By imposing in the model a fixed $0.02L_{\text{Edd}}$ fractional dissipation from the hot flow they are able to obtain an increasing hard X-ray Γ dependence on the Eddington-normalized accretion rate

($\dot{m} = \dot{M}/\dot{M}_{\text{Edd}}$, where \dot{M} is the mass accretion rate and $\dot{M}_{\text{Edd}} = L_{\text{Edd}}/c^2$). The relation they found is somewhat steeper than the most recent Γ vs λ_{Edd} relations reported in Fig. 4. Their model is however in broad agreement with the measured α_{ox} vs $L_{2500\text{\AA}}$ relations. In Fig. 8 we show the prediction of their QSOSED model (a simplified variant of their model with assumptions tuned for QSOs) for a non rotating (i.e. spin parameter $a = 0$) and maximally rotating ($a = 0.998$) SMBH, for different $\log \dot{m}$ from -1 to 0.2 and adopting the average $\log(M_{\text{BH}}/M_{\odot}) = 9.43$ value for the *HYPERION* QSOs. For each $\log \dot{m}$ step, we normalized the model to the *HYPERION* average $L_{2-10} = 1.7 \times 10^{45}$ erg s $^{-1}$.

The α_{ox} predicted by QSOSED for non rotating SMBH is consistent with the α_{ox} measured for the *HYPERION* QSOs. A maximally spinning SMBH case disagrees with the data predicting flatter α_{ox} . Hence, the preference for the null spin case would suggest a scenario of chaotic SMBH accretion flows rather than a more regular secular flow of accretion from the galaxy disc which would instead lead to a conservation of the angular momentum. Fig. 10 shows the Γ vs α_{ox} plot for the *HYPERION* QSOs and their joint/average value compared to the QSOSED model predictions. Predicted values are in good agreement with the QSO data suggesting for the *HYPERION* QSOs an average $\log \dot{m} \approx -0.4$ (which is close to the average Γ and α_{ox} for the sample analysed here) for the non-spinning BH case.

In Section 5.1 we report a marginal indication that Γ is further steepening at higher redshifts and/or for the sources requiring for their SMBH formation the highest $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$. In the framework of the Kubota & Done (2018) model and in general taking as a reference the anticorrelation trend of Γ vs λ_{Edd} , a redshift dependence would translate in higher accretion rate, meaning that the highest redshift sources are still accreting, on average, at high \dot{m} compared to the bin with measured flatter Γ . The more likely $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$ sub-sample division case points to a scenario in which the fastest SMBH mass accretion history are still highly accreting compared to those which had slower accretion pathways and would probably result on average in future even more massive SMBH.

6.1. On the origin of the steep X-ray spectral slopes

We can parameterize the steep spectral slope also with a power-law with canonical $\Gamma = 1.9$ and a low high-energy cutoff. We measured $E_{\text{cut}} \approx 20$ keV which is very low compared to the currently measured values reported in Fig. 6 but well constrained as it falls within the rest-frame energy band. We are not able to discriminate between a simple power-law model and one with the addition of a low-energy cutoff. In this regard it is worth to mention that the high quality spectrum (i.e. 1400 net-counts at 0.2-10 keV) analyzed by Medvedev et al. (2021) for the $z = 6.18$ radio loud QSO CFHQS J142952+544717 does not show any signature of such a low-energy cutoff, providing a lower limit at 30-50 keV, according to the different model parameterization (although a possible X-ray jet component may impact the cutoff detectability). Since our result applies to a well defined population of QSOs, it is worth discussing the possibility that also a low-energy cutoff could have originated the reported steep spectral slopes. Interestingly, a few local highly accreting Seyfert 1 galaxies with low energy cutoff similar (i.e. 20-30 keV) to those measured in *HYPERION* QSOs have already been reported (Vasudevan et al. 2013; Kamraj et al. 2018).

These values corresponds to coronal temperatures as low as $\sim 7 - 10$ keV. There are a number of possible explanations to account for such low temperature coronae. They involve either the interaction (coupling) between a highly accreting accretion




Fig. 10. Γ vs α_{ox} for *HYPERION* QSOs compared to the QSOSED model prediction. Red stars are single *HYPERION* QSOs, while the black star with central red circle show the average α_{ox} and joint best-fit Γ for the detected *HYPERION* QSOs. Light blue crosses and asterisks are the model predictions (for $a = 0$ and $a \approx 1$, respectively) whose label report the $\log \dot{m}$ value.

disc and the corona or peculiar physical states of the corona. In super-Eddington sources, such as the NLSy1, the strong soft disc radiation field is capable to effectively increase the Compton cooling of the corona, leading to a steep spectrum with a low-energy cutoff (Pounds et al. 1995). Recent JWST observations support the hypothesis of super-Eddington accreting AGNs in the early universe ($z > 8$; e.g. Larson et al. 2023; Maiolino et al. 2023). In this case we can expect for them similar X-ray nuclear properties (i.e. steep photon index and/or relatively low-energy cutoff).

Radiatively-driven winds launched from the accretion disc of highly-accreting SMBH can provide an alternative explanation for the steep spectral slopes. If these winds had mass ejection rates larger than the disc mass accretion rates, it is possible that they carry away matter from the innermost disc regions at a rate higher than the mass accretion rate effectively causing the truncation of the disk well before the innermost stable orbit. This would force the corona to be irradiated and hence Compton-cooled by softer seed photons (Laor & Davis 2014; Kara et al. 2017). A recent result reported by Bischetti et al. (2022), in the XQR-30 sample (D’Odorico et al. 2023) of bright $z \sim 6$ QSOs, show a very high fraction of broad-absorption line winds, i.e. a factor 2.4 larger than in low- z QSOs, with velocities up to 17% the speed of light. This may lend support to this scenario accounting also for a redshift evolution (see also Bischetti et al. 2023). So far only two *HYPERION* QSOs have been reported to host a BAL (i.e. J0038 and J231.6, Wang et al. 2018; Bischetti et al. 2022). This indicates a BAL fraction of $11_{-7}^{+14}\%$, where the uncertainties accounts for Poisson statistics, to be compared to the $47_{-12}^{+16}\%$ reported in the XQR-30 sample. Assuming a 47% BAL fraction, the probability of having only

two BAL in a sample of 18 QSOs (as in *HYPERION*) by chance is 0.2%. Notice, however, that homogeneous high-quality spectroscopic datasets (i.e. $\text{SNR} \gtrsim 15$, $R \sim 6000$) for all *HYPERION* QSOs are not available. Hence, a dedicated study to compare the occurrence of BAL in the *HYPERION* and XQR-30 samples, at the same sensitivity level is currently not possible. In any case, a non detection of a large BAL fraction is per se not an indication of lack of nuclear winds. CVI emission line blueshifts (relative to MgII) have been measured for a large part of the *HYPERION* QSOs in several works indicating fast broad-line winds up to $5000 - 6000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (e.g. Mazzucchelli et al. 2017; Meyer et al. 2019; Shen et al. 2019; Schindler et al. 2020; Yang et al. 2021).

A similar disc-truncation scenario may also occur if the inner disc regions are impacted by tidal disruption-like events (TDEs) which increase the accretion rate of the inner regions as a consequence of fast angular momentum removal of the perturbed accreting material by bound debris streams (Chan et al. 2019) as recently suggested for the reported changing-look event in the low-luminosity local AGN 1ES 1927+654 (Ricci et al. 2020; Masterson et al. 2022). Such events, which in the most extreme cases may lead to the corona destruction as the magnetic field pattern powering the corona is suppressed, are expected to show a X-ray softer-when-brighter behaviour (Sobolewska & Papadakis 2009). This cannot be explored with this dataset given the large uncertainties in Γ for each source. It is interesting though to notice that in the re-brightening phase of 1ES 1927+654, the X-ray spectrum appears very soft (i.e. with a steep $\Gamma \gtrsim 3$) like some of our QSOs and with an additionally low $E_{\text{cut}} < 20 \text{ keV}$. In order for this scenario to be applicable to our $z > 6$ QSOs these events needs to be frequently recurring so that statistically the sources are caught on average with a soft spectrum. Optimistic TDE rates for $10^9 - 10^{10} M_{\odot}$ SMBHs are in the range $\sim 5 \times 10^{-6} - 10^{-5} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Stone & Metzger 2016). This implies a TDE event every $1 - 2 \times 10^5 \text{ yr}$. Chan et al. (2019) speculates that it will take at most decades before the disk and therefore the corona return in the unperturbed state. This timescale is orders of magnitudes shorter than the TDE timescale and makes this scenario unfeasible.

Alternatively, peculiar corona properties may result in lower temperatures. In high optical depth coronae, disc seed photons may undergo multiple scatterings before leaving the corona, hence effectively lowering its temperature (Tortosa et al. 2017). Finally in hybrid coronae models (Zdziarski et al. 1993; Fabian et al. 2017) in which thermal and non thermal particles coexist in a highly magnetized plasma, the heating and cooling processes are faster than the electron cooling time by inverse Compton. In this case even a small fraction of non thermal electrons having MeV energies can cause intense runaway electron-positron pair-production. The cooled pairs may afterward redistribute their energy to the thermal particles therefore lowering the temperature of the corona. Although attractive, for these scenarios still a redshift dependence justification cannot be easy to justify.

Finally, an interesting scenario may couple the presence of optically thick coronae to the occurrence of nuclear winds which, as we already discussed, may provide a justification for a $z > 6$ redshift dependence, in sources characterized by Eddington or super-Eddington accretion flows (Kawanaka & Mineshige 2021). In these sources the radiation-driven wind can act as a low-temperature, optically thick corona where the optical depth is larger for higher mass outflow rate winds. This give rise to progressively softer (steeper) spectra. If this is indeed the scenario, then this could be an indication that these sources are accreting at super critical rates, much larger than what λ_{Edd} may imply.

6.2. Implications for the $z > 6$ AGN population and their detectability in the X-rays

Our result represents one of the most significant difference reported so far between QSOs at EoR and those at lower redshifts. Given the sample selection, in principle this result should be only valid for the QSO population whose SMBHs underwent a fast mass growth history. This includes also the recently discovered $z \approx 8 - 10$ JWST AGN (Larson et al. 2023; Maiolino et al. 2023; Bogdan et al. 2023) which would require $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}} = 10^3 - 10^4 M_{\odot}$ (in Fig. 1, left) and hence are expected to have experienced fast mass growth. The mild indication (at the 2σ level) of an increasing Γ with increasing $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$, if confirmed, could imply a flattening of Γ for QSOs requiring a less extreme $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$ /mass growth. This would reconcile the X-ray properties of the less extreme *HYPERION* QSOs with those reported for normal lower- z QSOs. However the real fraction of sources with low $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$ and the presence of a relation between Γ and $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$ are still an open issue. Hence, we cannot exclude that our results may apply to the entire $z > 6$ QSO or AGN population. If this is the case, this may have an important impact on the source detectability in future X-ray surveys and on our capabilities to study and understand nuclear accretion mechanisms at EoR.

Indeed, the predicted 0.5-2 keV and 2-10 keV fluxes for sources with a given 0.5-10 keV luminosity are a factor of ~ 1.9 and ~ 4.1 fainter assuming a power-law with $\Gamma = 2.4$ instead of a canonical $\Gamma = 1.9$ value. Alternatively, assuming a power-law with a E_{cut} at 20 keV and $\Gamma = 1.9$ at the average redshift of the *HYPERION* sample, $z = 6.7$, these factors change to ~ 1.3 and ~ 4.2 , respectively. In this case, at higher redshifts (e.g. $z = 8$) the detection would be even harder as the factors would increase to ~ 1.4 and ~ 5.3 , respectively.

This issue must be considered when defining the sensitivity capabilities and the design of next-generation X-ray observatories (e.g. ATHENA, Lynx) especially aiming at the highest-redshift Universe that we are currently probing with JWST. This is a fundamental step to extend our current understanding of the yet undiscovered AGN population of which the QSOs we are currently studying may represent the tip of the iceberg. Indeed, recent JWST observations suggest that previously known high-redshift star-forming galaxies may harbor an AGN in their nucleus (Cameron et al. 2023; Maiolino et al. 2023; Übler et al. 2023). The disclosure of these previously "hidden" AGN may have a role in explaining the high UV luminosity density of luminous galaxies (Trinca et al. in prep.) observed at $z \gtrsim 8$ (Donnan et al. 2023; Harikane et al. 2023; Bouwens et al. 2023).

7. Conclusions and future prospects

In this paper, we have presented the *HYPERION* sample of QSOs at the Epoch of Reionization selected for their fast SMBH growth history. Indeed, *HYPERION* QSOs are powered by SMBHs that would descend from seeds of $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}} > 10^3 M_{\odot}$ at $z = 20$, if accreting continuously at the Eddington rate. The sample consists of 18 QSOs at redshifts $z \approx 6 - 7.5$ (mean $z \sim 6.7$) with average luminosity $L_{\text{bol}} \approx 10^{47.3} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ and $M_{\text{BH}} \approx 10^9 - 10^{10} M_{\odot}$. *HYPERION* builds on a 2.4 Ms *XMM-Newton* Multi-Year Heritage Program (three years) designed to accurately characterize, for the first time on a statistically sound sample, the X-ray nuclear properties of QSOs at the Epoch of Reionization. In this paper we report on the spectral analysis of the first year of *XMM-Newton* observations of *HYPERION*. We have analyzed *XMM-Newton* observations of twelve *HYPERION* QSOs for a total exposure of $\sim 1 \text{ Ms}$. New *XMM-HYPERION*

observations for ten sources have been presented in this paper. These include the first X-ray detection/spectral analysis ever reported for two sources (J083.8 and J029). All the QSOs have been detected with the exception of two sources (J231.6 and J011).

Our main findings are summarized as follows:

- the X-ray spectral analysis on individual sources using simple power-law models on spectra with 50-140 net-counts (pn+MOS, 0.3-7 keV) resulted in a wide range of $\Gamma \approx 1.9-3$, with the large majority of sources (80%) exhibiting steep $\Gamma \gtrsim 2.1$;
- a power-law joint spectral analysis of the 10 detected sources resulted in an average $\Gamma \approx 2.4 \pm 0.1$. Moderate absorption (i.e. $\sim 10^{21} - 10^{22} \text{ cm}^{-2}$) is not required. The steep Γ value rules out for the first time (at the $\sim 4 \sigma$ level) a canonical $\Gamma = 2$ and the average Γ reported in $z < 6$ QSOs of similar luminosity or λ_{Edd} . This implies that the steepness of the X-ray spectrum in *HYPERION* QSOs is an evolutionary signature of the *HYPERION* QSOs regardless of the QSO radiative output and SMBH accretion rate;
- a joint spectral analysis with a $\Gamma = 1.9$ power-law and a high energy cutoff model resulted into a very low-energy $E_{\text{cut}} \sim 20 \text{ keV}$. This value, if confirmed with future *XMM-HYPERION* data, is unreported at such high luminosities and redshifts;
- The X-ray bolometric correction is in line with the trend reported for the bulk of AGN at high luminosity regimes. However, we find that the optical-to-X-ray spectral index α_{ox} (and $\Delta\alpha_{\text{ox}}$) is slightly higher than the α_{ox} vs. $L_{2500\text{\AA}}$ relations reported for large AGN samples. This is a consequence of the *HYPERION* QSOs steep X-ray spectral slopes.

We interpret the steep spectral slopes as an indication of cool coronae originated either by (i) the interaction with the soft radiation field of the accretion disc or (ii) the peculiar properties of the X-ray corona itself. In the first case the disc is supposed to be highly accreting or truncated in the inner regions possibly by nuclear winds with high mass outflow rate. Alternatively, enhanced cooling may be due to multiple scattering in high optical depth coronae, or to highly energetic non-thermal electrons cooling and interacting with thermal electrons in hybrid coronae models. We think that the inner disc truncation scenario by disc winds with a high mass flux offers at the moment, unlike other scenarios, a robust explanation of the Γ redshift evolution as it relies on redshift-dependent results found for nuclear winds.

The *XMM-HYPERION* program presented here constitute a remarkable leap forward in the nuclear characterization of QSOs at EoR. More *XMM-Newton* data are coming. They will strengthen our findings and extend them to the entire *HYPERION* sample. This will allow us to assess the rate at which Γ steepens as a function of redshift or the mass growth history (adopting $M_{\text{BH}}^{\text{seed}}$ as a proxy). Broad-band UV/X-ray physical models for the continuum from the accretion disc/corona system will be applied to these data jointly with quasi-simultaneous UV rest-frame data which we are progressively collecting during the three years of the *XMM-HYPERION* program. Our data will enable us to shed light on the coupling between the X-ray and the broad-line properties. Furthermore together with sub-mm/mm data we will be able to investigate the impact of the QSO X-ray radiation field affecting the excitation of the molecular medium, that can be constrained by targeting high-J transitions of the CO molecule rotational ladder.

If the nuclear properties reported here for the *HYPERION* QSOs are confirmed to be typical of the whole QSO population

at EoR, the distinctive steep spectral slopes obtained from our analysis will have an important impact on the source detectability in future X-ray surveys. In particular, the soft and hard band fluxes for sources of a given luminosity will be ~ 2 and ~ 4 times fainter than expected for a power-law with canonical flatter spectral index. The hard band fluxes will be even fainter at higher redshifts if the true spectral model consist in standard $\Gamma = 1.9$ power-law with low-energy ($\sim 20 \text{ keV}$) cutoff. Accounting for this will have an impact on the design and the capabilities of the future X-ray flagship observatories aiming at probing nuclear accretion in the early Universe.

Acknowledgements. We thank the anonymous referee for the constructive comments which helped clarify several aspects of the paper. The analysis and results presented in this work are based on observations obtained with *XMM-Newton* an ESA science mission with instruments and contributions directly funded by ESA Member States and NASA. We thank the *XMM-Newton* Science Operation Centre and Norbert Schartel for their help, prompt support and advise for the scheduling and optimisation of the *XMM-HYPERION* program. The authors acknowledge financial support from the Bando Ricerca Fondamentale INAF 2022 Large Grant "Toward an holistic view of the Titans: multi-band observations of $z > 6$ QSOs powered by greedy supermassive blackholes". LZ and FT acknowledge support from INAF "Progetti di Ricerca di Rilevante Interesse Nazionale" (PRIN), Bando 2019 "Piercing through the clouds: a multiwavelength study of obscured accretion in nearby supermassive black holes". GM was partly supported by grant n. PID2020-115325GB-C31 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033. CD acknowledges support from the STFC consolidated grant ST/T000244/1. We thank Stefano Bianchi, Ciro Pinto and Luigi Stella for useful discussions.

References

- Ai, Y., Fabian, A. C., Fan, X., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 470, 1587
 Andika, I. T., Jahnke, K., Onoue, M., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 903, 34
 Arnaud, K. A. 1996, in *Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series*, Vol. 101, *Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems V*, ed. G. H. Jacoby & J. Barnes, 17
 Avni, Y. & Tananbaum, H. 1982, *ApJ*, 262, L17
 Bañados, E., Connor, T., Stern, D., et al. 2018a, *ApJ*, 856, L25
 Bañados, E., Venemans, B. P., Mazzucchelli, C., et al. 2018b, *Nature*, 553, 473
 Bertola, E., Vignali, C., Lanzuisi, G., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 662, A98
 Biava, N., Colpi, M., Capelo, P. R., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 487, 4985
 Bischetti, M., Feruglio, C., D'Odorico, V., et al. 2022, *Nature*, 605, 244
 Bischetti, M., Fiore, F., Feruglio, C., et al. 2023, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2301.09731
 Bogdan, A., Goulding, A., Natarajan, P., et al. 2023, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2305.15458
 Bouwens, R., Illingworth, G., Oesch, P., et al. 2023, *MNRAS*, 523, 1009
 Brandt, W. N., Schneider, D. P., Fan, X., et al. 2002, *ApJ*, 569, L5
 Brightman, M., Silverman, J. D., Mainieri, V., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 433, 2485
 Cameron, A. J., Katz, H., Rey, M. P., & Saxena, A. 2023, *MNRAS*, 523, 3516
 Cash, W. 1979, *ApJ*, 228, 939
 Chan, C.-H., Piran, T., Krolik, J. H., & Saban, D. 2019, *ApJ*, 881, 113
 Chartas, G., Rhea, C., Kochanek, C., et al. 2016, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, 337, 356
 Chehade, B., Carnall, A. C., Shanks, T., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 478, 1649
 Connor, T., Bañados, E., Mazzucchelli, C., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 900, 189
 Dadina, M. 2008, *A&A*, 485, 417
 De Marco, B., Ponti, G., Cappi, M., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 431, 2441
 De Rosa, G., Decarli, R., Walter, F., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 739, 56
 D'Odorico, V., Bañados, E., Becker, G. D., et al. 2023, *MNRAS*, 523, 1399
 Donnan, C. T., McLeod, D. J., Dunlop, J. S., et al. 2023, *MNRAS*, 518, 6011
 Duras, F., Bongiorno, A., Ricci, F., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 636, A73
 Eilers, A.-C., Hennawi, J. F., Decarli, R., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 900, 37
 Fabian, A. C., Lohfink, A., Belmont, R., Malzac, J., & Coppi, P. 2017, *MNRAS*, 467, 2566
 Fabian, A. C., Lohfink, A., Kara, E., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 451, 4375
 Fan, X., Banados, E., & Simcoe, R. A. 2022, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2212.06907
 Fan, X., Wang, F., Yang, J., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 870, L11
 Farina, E. P., Schindler, J.-T., Walter, F., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 941, 106
 Farrah, D., Priddey, R., Wilman, R., Haehnelt, M., & McMahon, R. 2004, *ApJ*, 611, L13
 Feruglio, C., Fiore, F., Carniani, S., et al. 2018, *A&A*, 619, A39
 Feruglio, C., Maio, U., Tripodi, R., et al. 2023, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2304.09129
 Gallerani, S., Zappacosta, L., Orofino, M. C., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 467, 3590

- Haardt, F. & Maraschi, L. 1993, *ApJ*, 413, 507
- Harikane, Y., Nakajima, K., Ouchi, M., et al. 2023, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2304.06658
- HI4PI Collaboration, Ben Bekhti, N., Flöer, L., et al. 2016, *A&A*, 594, A116
- Inayoshi, K., Visbal, E., & Haiman, Z. 2020, *ARA&A*, 58, 27
- Johnson, J. L. & Bromm, V. 2007, *MNRAS*, 374, 1557
- Johnson, J. L. & Haardt, F. 2016, *PASA*, 33, e007
- Just, D. W., Brandt, W. N., Shemmer, O., et al. 2007, *ApJ*, 665, 1004
- Kaasta, J. S. & Bleeker, J. A. M. 2016, *A&A*, 587, A151
- Kamraj, N., Brightman, M., Harrison, F. A., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 927, 42
- Kamraj, N., Harrison, F. A., Baloković, M., Lohfink, A., & Brightman, M. 2018, *ApJ*, 866, 124
- Kara, E., Alston, W. N., Fabian, A. C., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 462, 511
- Kara, E., García, J. A., Lohfink, A., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 468, 3489
- Kawanaka, N. & Mineshige, S. 2021, *PASJ*, 73, 630
- Koss, M., Trakhtenbrot, B., Ricci, C., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 850, 74
- Kubota, A. & Done, C. 2018, *MNRAS*, 480, 1247
- Lanzuisi, G., Gilli, R., Cappi, M., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 875, L20
- Laor, A. & Davis, S. W. 2014, *MNRAS*, 438, 3024
- Larson, R. L., Finkelstein, S. L., Kocevski, D. D., et al. 2023, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2303.08918
- Laurenti, M., Piconcelli, E., Zappacosta, L., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 657, A57
- Liu, H., Luo, B., Brandt, W. N., et al. 2021, *ApJ*, 910, 103
- Ludlam, R. M., Cackett, E. M., Gültekin, K., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 447, 2112
- Lusso, E., Comastri, A., Simmons, B. D., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 425, 623
- Lusso, E., Comastri, A., Vignali, C., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 512, A34
- Lusso, E. & Risaliti, G. 2016, *ApJ*, 819, 154
- Lusso, E., Valiante, R., & Vito, F. 2023, in *Handbook of X-ray and Gamma-ray Astrophysics*. Edited by Cosimo Bambi and Andrea Santangelo, 122
- MacLeod, C. L., Morgan, C. W., Mosquera, A., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 806, 258
- Maiolino, R., Scholtz, J., Witstok, J., et al. 2023, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2305.12492
- Malizia, A., Molina, M., Bassani, L., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 782, L25
- Marconi, A., Risaliti, G., Gilli, R., et al. 2004, *MNRAS*, 351, 169
- Martocchia, S., Piconcelli, E., Zappacosta, L., et al. 2017, *A&A*, 608, A51
- Masterson, M., Kara, E., Ricci, C., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 934, 35
- Matsuoka, Y., Onoue, M., Kashikawa, N., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 872, L2
- Mazzucchelli, C., Bañados, E., Venemans, B. P., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 849, 91
- Medvedev, P., Gilfanov, M., Sazonov, S., Schartel, N., & Sunyaev, R. 2021, *MNRAS*, 504, 576
- Meyer, R. A., Bosman, S. E. I., & Ellis, R. S. 2019, *MNRAS*, 487, 3305
- Milosavljević, M., Bromm, V., Couch, S. M., & Oh, S. P. 2009, *ApJ*, 698, 766
- Miniutti, G., Ponti, G., Greene, J. E., et al. 2009, *MNRAS*, 394, 443
- Moretti, A., Ballo, L., Braitto, V., et al. 2014, *A&A*, 563, A46
- Mortlock, D. J., Warren, S. J., Venemans, B. P., et al. 2011, *Nature*, 474, 616
- Nanni, R., Gilli, R., Vignali, C., et al. 2018, *A&A*, 614, A121
- Nanni, R., Vignali, C., Gilli, R., Moretti, A., & Brandt, W. N. 2017, *A&A*, 603, A128
- Nardini, E., Lusso, E., Risaliti, G., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 632, A109
- Neeleman, M., Novak, M., Venemans, B. P., et al. 2021, *ApJ*, 911, 141
- Onoue, M., Kashikawa, N., Matsuoka, Y., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 880, 77
- Page, K. L., Reeves, J. N., O'Brien, P. T., & Turner, M. J. L. 2005, *MNRAS*, 364, 195
- Page, M. J., Simpson, C., Mortlock, D. J., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 440, L91
- Pensabene, A., Carniani, S., Perna, M., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 637, A84
- Pezzulli, E., Valiante, R., & Schneider, R. 2016, *MNRAS*, 458, 3047
- Piconcelli, E., Jimenez-Bailón, E., Guainazzi, M., et al. 2005, *A&A*, 432, 15
- Pons, E., McMahon, R. G., Banerji, M., & Reed, S. L. 2020, *MNRAS*, 491, 3884
- Pons, E., McMahon, R. G., Simcoe, R. A., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 484, 5142
- Pounds, K. A., Done, C., & Osborne, J. P. 1995, *MNRAS*, 277, L5
- Reed, S. L., Banerji, M., Becker, G. D., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 487, 1874
- Reed, S. L., McMahon, R. G., Martini, P., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 468, 4702
- Reeves, J. N. & Turner, M. J. L. 2000, *MNRAS*, 316, 234
- Ricci, C., Ho, L. C., Fabian, A. C., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 480, 1819
- Ricci, C., Kara, E., Loewenstein, M., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 898, L1
- Richards, G. T., Lacy, M., Storrie-Lombardi, L. J., et al. 2006, *ApJS*, 166, 470
- Risaliti, G. & Lusso, E. 2019, *Nature Astronomy*, 3, 272
- Salvestrini, F., Risaliti, G., Bisogni, S., Lusso, E., & Vignali, C. 2019, *A&A*, 631, A120
- Schindler, J.-T., Farina, E. P., Bañados, E., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 905, 51
- Shao, Y., Wang, R., Jones, G. C., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 845, 138
- Shemmer, O., Brandt, W. N., Netzer, H., Maiolino, R., & Kaspi, S. 2006a, *ApJ*, 646, L29
- Shemmer, O., Brandt, W. N., Netzer, H., Maiolino, R., & Kaspi, S. 2008, *ApJ*, 682, 81
- Shemmer, O., Brandt, W. N., Schneider, D. P., et al. 2006b, *ApJ*, 644, 86
- Shen, Y. & Liu, X. 2012, *ApJ*, 753, 125
- Shen, Y., Richards, G. T., Strauss, M. A., et al. 2011, *ApJS*, 194, 45
- Shen, Y., Wu, J., Jiang, L., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 873, 35
- Sobolewska, M. A. & Papadakis, I. E. 2009, *MNRAS*, 399, 1597
- Souza Lima, R., Mayer, L., Capelo, P. R., Bortolas, E., & Quinn, T. R. 2020, *ApJ*, 899, 126
- Steffen, A. T., Strateva, I., Brandt, W. N., et al. 2006, *AJ*, 131, 2826
- Stern, B. E., Poutanen, J., Svensson, R., Sikora, M., & Begelman, M. C. 1995, *ApJ*, 449, L13
- Stone, N. C. & Metzger, B. D. 2016, *MNRAS*, 455, 859
- Svensson, R. 1984, *MNRAS*, 209, 175
- Tanaka, T. & Haiman, Z. 2009, *ApJ*, 696, 1798
- Timlin, J. D., Brandt, W. N., Ni, Q., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 492, 719
- Tortosa, A., Marinucci, A., Matt, G., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 466, 4193
- Tortosa, A., Ricci, C., Ho, L. C., et al. 2023, *MNRAS*, 519, 6267
- Trakhtenbrot, B., Ricci, C., Koss, M. J., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 470, 800
- Trefoloni, B., Lusso, E., Nardini, E., et al. 2023, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2305.07699
- Tripodi, R., Feruglio, C., Kemper, F., et al. 2023, *ApJ*, 946, L45
- Übler, H., Maiolino, R., Curtis-Lake, E., et al. 2023, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2302.06647
- Valiante, R., Schneider, R., Volonteri, M., & Omukai, K. 2016, *MNRAS*, 457, 3356
- Vasudevan, R. V., Brandt, W. N., Mushotzky, R. F., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 763, 111
- Venemans, B. P., Walter, F., Decarli, R., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 845, 154
- Venemans, B. P., Walter, F., Zschaechner, L., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 816, 37
- Vestergaard, M. & Osmer, P. S. 2009, *ApJ*, 699, 800
- Vignali, C., Brandt, W. N., & Schneider, D. P. 2003, *AJ*, 125, 433
- Vignali, C., Brandt, W. N., Schneider, D. P., & Kaspi, S. 2005, *AJ*, 129, 2519
- Vignali, C., Comastri, A., Cappi, M., et al. 1999, *ApJ*, 516, 582
- Vito, F., Brandt, W. N., Bauer, F. E., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 630, A118
- Vito, F., Brandt, W. N., Ricci, F., et al. 2021, *A&A*, 649, A133
- Vito, F., Mignoli, M., Gilli, R., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 663, A159
- Volonteri, M. 2010, *A&A Rev.*, 18, 279
- Volonteri, M., Haardt, F., & Madau, P. 2003, *ApJ*, 582, 559
- Volonteri, M., Silk, J., & Dubus, G. 2015, *ApJ*, 804, 148
- Wachter, K., Leach, R., & Kellogg, E. 1979, *ApJ*, 230, 274
- Walter, F., Neeleman, M., Decarli, R., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 927, 21
- Wang, F., Davies, F. B., Yang, J., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 896, 23
- Wang, F., Fan, X., Yang, J., et al. 2021a, *ApJ*, 908, 53
- Wang, F., Yang, J., Fan, X., et al. 2021b, *ApJ*, 907, L1
- Wang, F., Yang, J., Fan, X., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 869, L9
- Wang, R., Wagg, J., Carilli, C. L., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 773, 44
- Weisskopf, M. C., Wu, K., Trimble, V., et al. 2007, *ApJ*, 657, 1026
- Willott, C. J., Albert, L., Arzoumanian, D., et al. 2010, *AJ*, 140, 546
- Wolf, J., Nandra, K., Salvato, M., et al. 2023, *A&A*, 669, A127
- Wu, X.-B., Wang, F., Fan, X., et al. 2015, *Nature*, 518, 512
- Yang, J., Fan, X., Wang, F., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 924, L25
- Yang, J., Wang, F., Fan, X., et al. 2021, *ApJ*, 923, 262
- Yang, J., Wang, F., Fan, X., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 897, L14
- Zappacosta, L., Comastri, A., Civano, F., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 854, 33
- Zappacosta, L., Piconcelli, E., Giustini, M., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 635, L5
- Zdziarski, A. A., Lightman, A. P., & Maciolek-Niedzwiecki, A. 1993, *ApJ*, 414, L93

¹ INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma, via di Frascati 33, 00078 Monte Porzio Catone, 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 Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica, Università Roma Tre, Via della Vasca Navale 84, 00146 Roma, Italy

⁵ INFN, Sezione Roma1, Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma La Sapienza, Piazzale Aldo Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, Italy

⁶ Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia 'Augusto Righi', Università degli Studi di Bologna, via P. Gobetti, 93/2, 40129 Bologna, Italy

⁷ INAF-Osservatorio di Astrofisica e Scienza dello Spazio di Bologna, via Piero Gobetti, 93/3, I-40129 Bologna, Italy

⁸ Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris, Sorbonne Université, CNRS, UMR 7095, 98 bis bd Arago, 75014 Paris, France

⁹ Dipartimento di Fisica, Sezione di Astronomia, Università di Trieste, via Tiepolo 11, I-34143 Trieste, Italy

¹⁰ Centre for Extragalactic Astronomy, Department of Physics, Durham University, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE, UK

¹¹ Center for Astrophysics — Harvard & Smithsonian, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

¹² INFN - Sezione di Roma "Tor Vergata", Via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133 Roma, Italy

- ¹³ Space Science Data Center, SSSC, ASI, Via del Politecnico snc, 00133 Roma, Italy
- ¹⁴ Centro de Astrobiología (CAB), CSIC-INTA, Camino Bajo del Castillo s/n, ESAC campus, 28692 Villanueva de la Cañada, Spain
- ¹⁵ NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA
- ¹⁶ Scuola Normale Superiore, Piazza dei Cavalieri 7, I-56126 Pisa, Italy
- ¹⁷ INAF–Osservatorio Astronomico di Padova, Vicolo dell’Osservatorio 5, I-35122, Padova, Italy
- ¹⁸ European Space Agency, ESTEC, Keplerlaan 1, 2201 AZ Noordwijk, The Netherlands
- ¹⁹ ASI - Agenzia Spaziale Italiana, Via del Politecnico snc, I-00133 Roma, Italy
- ²⁰ Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”, Via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133 Roma, Italy
- ²¹ Department of Astronomy, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA
- ²² INAF - Istituto di Astrofisica Spaziale e Fisica Cosmica Milano, Via A. Corti 12, 20133 Milano, Italy
- ²³ INFN–National Institute for Nuclear Physics, via Valerio 2, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
- ²⁴ DiSAT, Università degli Studi dell’Insubria, Via Valleggio 11, I-22100 Como, Italy
- ²⁵ INFN, Sezione di Milano-Bicocca, Piazza della Scienza 3, I-20126 Milano, Italy
- ²⁶ INAF, Osservatorio Astronomico di Brera, Via E. Bianchi 46, I-23807 Merate, Italy
- ²⁷ Cavendish Laboratory, University of Cambridge, 19 J. J. Thomson Ave., Cambridge CB3 0HE, UK
- ²⁸ Kavli Institute for Cosmology, University of Cambridge, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0HA, UK
- ²⁹ Department of Physics & Astronomy, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK
- ³⁰ Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma La Sapienza, Piazzale Aldo Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, Italy
- ³¹ Sapienza School for Advanced Studies, Viale Regina Elena 291, I-00161 Roma, Italy

Appendix A: XMM-Newton EPIC detectors images of the XMM-HYPERION QSOs in the 0.5-2 keV

We present here pn, MOS1 and MOS2 0.5-2 keV images of the observations reported in Table 2. For each detector we report source and background region files adopted for photometry and spectral extraction. The figure for exposure J1342_1, i.e. the first observation of J1342 is reported in Fig. 2.

Appendix B: Optimal spectral binning for low counts spectra

In order to evaluate the optimal binning for our spectra we simulated spectra for steep and flat Γ and evaluated the accuracy (i.e. the difference between input and best-fit simulated value in units of the input value) in recovering the input Γ and L_{2-10} values. We take as a reference, the spectra in our sample with 60-70 net-counts (pn+MOS, 0.3-10 keV). Specifically, for the steep and flat Γ we adopted the input best-fit values reported in Table 4 for J029 and J0050, respectively. Hence we simulated 10000 set of spectra for each Γ case evaluating the following binning schemes: unbinned, binned at minimum 1,3,5 and 10 counts and the optimal sampling from Kaastra & Bleeker (2016), hereafter called KB. For each binning scheme, we also evaluated the energy range dependence in the following intervals 0.3-2 keV, 0.3-5 keV, 0.3-7 keV and 0.3-10 keV. In general, we found that the binning scheme plays a negligible role in the accuracy of our results, especially compared to the size of our statistical errors (i.e. the scatter of the distribution of the best-fit values), which are always almost a factor of few up to 1-2 orders of magnitude larger at all energy intervals probed. Hence possible systematics in the fitting process are in general compensated by the larger statistical uncertainties. Fig. B.1 show the accuracy in recovering the average Γ and L_{2-10} as a function of binning and energy range. In general, unbinned results are very inaccurate especially in energy intervals including background-dominated upper energy bounds (i.e. > 2 keV) and can bias the recovered values by more than 10%. On average, going to larger bins improves the accuracy of the parameter estimation to sub-percent or percent level for flat or steep input Γ , respectively, and to few percent level in case of L_{2-10} . The KB binning scheme consistently recovers at least a factor of 2-3 more accurate results at all energies regardless of the input Γ (showing larger accuracies for flat Γ).

Appendix C: Comparison with previous analysis of the XMM-HYPERION detected source

In this section we will compare our best-fit Γ and L_{2-10} reported in Table 4 with previous analysis carried on the same sources with already archived observations.

J1342. A 45 ks *Chandra* observation of J1342 has been analyzed by Bañados et al. (2018a) and Vito et al. (2019). The source was detected with ~ 14 net-counts (0.5-7 keV). They attempted a basic spectral analysis with a power-law model with Galactic absorption with similar results. Vito et al. (2019) found $\Gamma \approx 1.97^{+1.16}_{-0.92}$ and $L_{2-10} = 14.95^{+11.51}_{-7.60} \times 10^{44}$ erg s $^{-1}$ (errors at 90% level). These values are consistent at $\lesssim 1 \sigma$ level.

J1120. A ~ 340 ks *XMM-Newton* observation divided in three exposures has been analyzed by several authors (Page et al. 2014; Moretti et al. 2014; Nanni et al. 2017; Vito et al. 2019). The observation resulted heavily contaminated by background flares ($\sim 50\%$ in pn). The last analysis by Vito et al. (2019) obtained $\Gamma = 2.08^{+0.74}_{-0.64}$ and $L_{2-10} = 6.56^{+3.59}_{-3.27} \times 10^{44}$ erg s $^{-1}$ (errors

at 90% level). The Γ is consistent a $\sim 1\sigma$ level with our value. The luminosity L_{2-10} is inconsistent at $\sim 4.5\sigma$ level. Hence the source appears to have increased its luminosity by a factor of ~ 4 .

J0020. A 25 ks *XMM-Newton* observation was analyzed by Pons et al. (2020). According to the authors the source resulted undetected with a $L_{2-10} < 4.76 \times 10^{45}$ erg s $^{-1}$ upper limit. Their estimate is consistent with our luminosity value.

J0244. A 17 ks *XMM-Newton* observation was analyzed by Pons et al. (2020). According to the authors the source resulted undetected with a $L_{2-10} < 4.37 \times 10^{45}$ erg s $^{-1}$ upper limit. Their estimate is consistent with our luminosity value.

J036.5. A 25 ks *Chandra* observation was analyze by Vito et al. (2019). The source was detected with 5.5 net-counts. They attempted a spectral analysis obtaining a $\Gamma \approx 2.1^{+2.2}_{-1.5}$ and $L_{2-10} < 20.53 \times 10^{44}$ erg s $^{-1}$. A ~ 17 ks *XMM-Newton* observation was also analyzed by Pons et al. (2020). They did not detect the source and only obtained a very high upper limit on the luminosity of $L_{2-10} < 17.62 \times 10^{45}$ erg s $^{-1}$. All measurements are consistent with our best-fit values.

J0050. A 34 ks *Chandra* observation was analyzed by Vito et al. (2019). The source was detected with 7.4 net-counts. They attempted a spectral analysis obtaining a $\Gamma \approx 2.1^{+2.0}_{-1.2}$ and $L_{2-10} = 8.2^{+8.8}_{-5.0} \times 10^{44}$ erg s $^{-1}$. Their values are consistent with ours at $< 1\sigma$ level.

J0224. For this source only a 26 ks *XMM-Newton* is available in the archive. This is the observation we have analysed in this work. A previous analysis of this observation was carried out by Pons et al. (2020). They obtained $\Gamma = 1.82^{+0.29}_{-0.27}$ and $L_{2-10} = 2.92 \pm 0.43 \times 10^{45}$ erg s $^{-1}$. These values are consistent at $< 1.2\sigma$ level with ours.

J0100. For this source a 15 ks *Chandra* observation and a ~ 65 ks *XMM-Newton* observation are archived. We have analysed the longer *XMM-Newton* observation which provides a factor > 20 more net-counts than the *Chandra* one. The *XMM-Newton* observation was analyzed by Ai et al. (2017) and by Vito et al. (2019). The latter obtained $\Gamma = 2.52^{+0.23}_{-0.22}$ and $L_{2-10} = 67.55^{+9.63}_{-8.93} \times 10^{44}$ erg s $^{-1}$ (errors at 90% level). These values are consistent with our analysis. Their Γ is consistent at $< 1\sigma$ level while the luminosity show consistency at $\sim 1.5\sigma$ level.




Fig. A.1. EPIC 0.5–2 keV pn, MOS1 and MOS2 camera images for sources of the *XMM-HYPERION* program presented in this work (J1342_1 is reported in Fig. 2). All the images are smoothed by a Gaussian kernel of 3 pixel radius for better visualization. Source and background counts/spectral extraction regions are reported in red and black, respectively. Dashed circular regions indicates areas excluded by the background extraction.




Fig. A.1. continued




Fig. A.1. continued




Fig. B.1. Accuracy, as a function of binning scheme and energy range, in recovering the input Γ and L_{2-10} through a set of 10000 spectral simulations.