

## The *NuSTAR* Serendipitous Survey: the 80-month catalog and source properties of the high-energy emitting AGN and quasar population

CLAIRE L. GREENWELL,<sup>1</sup> LIZELKE KLINDT,<sup>1</sup> GEORGE B. LANSBURY,<sup>2</sup> DAVID J. ROSARIO,<sup>3,1</sup> DAVID M. ALEXANDER,<sup>1</sup> JAMES AIRD,<sup>4,5</sup> DANIEL STERN,<sup>6</sup> KARL FORSTER,<sup>7</sup> MICHAEL J. KOSS,<sup>8,9</sup> FRANZ E. BAUER,<sup>10,11</sup> CLAUDIO RICCI,<sup>12,13</sup> JOHN TOMSICK,<sup>14</sup> WILLIAM N. BRANDT,<sup>15,16,17</sup> THOMAS CONNOR,<sup>6</sup> PETER G. BOORMAN,<sup>7,18</sup> ADLYKA ANNUAR,<sup>19</sup> DAVID R. BALLANTYNE,<sup>20</sup> CHIEN-TING CHEN,<sup>21,22</sup> FRANCESCA CIVANO,<sup>23</sup> ANDREA COMASTRI,<sup>24</sup> VICTORIA A. FAWCETT,<sup>3</sup> FRANCESCA M. FORNASINI,<sup>25,26</sup> POSHAK GANDHI,<sup>27</sup> FIONA HARRISON,<sup>7</sup> MARIANNE HEIDA,<sup>2</sup> RYAN HICKOX,<sup>28</sup> ELIAS S. KAMMOUN,<sup>29,30,31</sup> LAURANNE LANZ,<sup>32</sup> STEFANO MARCHESI,<sup>33,24,34</sup> GAËL NOIROT,<sup>35</sup> ENCARNI ROMERO-COLMENERO,<sup>36,37</sup> EZEQUIEL TREISTER,<sup>38</sup> C. MEGAN URRY,<sup>39</sup> PETRI VÄISÄNEN,<sup>36,40</sup> AND BRIAN VAN SOELEN<sup>41</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centre for Extragalactic Astronomy, Department of Physics, Durham University, Durham, DH1 3LE, UK

<sup>2</sup>European Southern Observatory, Karl-Schwarzschild str. 2, D-85748 Garching bei München, Germany

<sup>3</sup>School of Mathematics, Statistics and Physics, Herschel Building, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU, UK

<sup>4</sup>Institute for Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Royal Observatory, Edinburgh EH9 3HJ, UK

<sup>5</sup>School of Physics & Astronomy, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester LE1 7RJ, UK

<sup>6</sup>Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Mail Stop 169-221, Pasadena, CA 91109, USA

<sup>7</sup>Cahill Center for Astrophysics, 1216 East California Boulevard, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

<sup>8</sup>Eureka Scientific, 2452 Delmer Street, Suite 100, Oakland, CA 94602-3017, USA

<sup>9</sup>Space Science Institute, 4750 Walnut Street, Suite 205, Boulder, CO 80301, USA

<sup>10</sup>Instituto de Astrofísica and Centro de Astroingeniería, Facultad de Física, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Casilla 306, Santiago 22, Chile

<sup>11</sup>Millennium Institute of Astrophysics, Nuncio Monseñor Sótero Sanz 100, Of 104, Providencia, Santiago, Chile

<sup>12</sup>Instituto de Estudios Astrofísicos, Facultad de Ingeniería y Ciencias, Universidad Diego Portales, Av. Ejército Libertador 441, Santiago, Chile

<sup>13</sup>Kavli Institute for Astronomy and Astrophysics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

<sup>14</sup>Space Sciences Laboratory, 7 Gauss Way, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-7450, USA

<sup>15</sup>Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, The Pennsylvania State University, 525 Davey Lab, University Park, PA 16802, USA

<sup>16</sup>Institute for Gravitation and the Cosmos, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA

<sup>17</sup>Department of Physics, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA

<sup>18</sup>Astronomical Institute, Academy of Sciences, Boční II 1401, CZ-14131 Prague, Czech Republic

<sup>19</sup>Department of Applied Physics, Faculty of Science and Technology, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia

<sup>20</sup>Center for Relativistic Astrophysics, School of Physics, Georgia Institute of Technology, 837 State Street, Atlanta, GA 30332-0430, USA

<sup>21</sup>Science and Technology Institute, Universities Space Research Association, Huntsville, AL 35805, USA

<sup>22</sup>Astrophysics Office, NASA Marshall Space Flight Center, ZP12, Huntsville, AL 35812, USA

<sup>23</sup>NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, USA

<sup>24</sup>INAF - Osservatorio di Astrofisica e Scienza dello Spazio di Bologna, Via Piero Gobetti, 93/3, 40129, Bologna, Italy

<sup>25</sup>Stonehill College, 320 Washington Street, Easton, MA 02357, USA

<sup>26</sup>Center for Astrophysics | Harvard & Smithsonian, 60 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

<sup>27</sup>School of Physics & Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK

<sup>28</sup>Department of Physics and Astronomy, Dartmouth College, 6127 Wilder Laboratory, Hanover, NH 03755, USA

<sup>29</sup>Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica, Università Roma Tre, via della Vasca Navale 84, I-00146 Rome, Italy

<sup>30</sup>IRAP, Université de Toulouse, CNRS, UPS, CNES 9, Avenue du Colonel Roche, BP 44346, F-31028, Toulouse Cedex 4, France

<sup>31</sup>INAF - Osservatorio Astrofisico di Arcetri, Largo Enrico Fermi 5, I-50125 Firenze, Italy

<sup>32</sup>Department of Physics, The College of New Jersey, 2000 Pennington Road, Ewing, NJ 08628, USA

<sup>33</sup>Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia (DIFA) Augusto Righi, Università di Bologna, via Gobetti 93/2, I-40129 Bologna, Italy

<sup>34</sup>Department of Physics and Astronomy, Clemson University, Kinard Lab of Physics, Clemson, SC 29634, USA

<sup>35</sup>Institute for Computational Astrophysics and Department of Astronomy & Physics, Saint Mary's University, 923 Robie Street, Halifax, NS B3H3C3, Canada

<sup>36</sup>South African Astronomical Observatory, PO Box 9, Observatory, South Africa

<sup>37</sup>Southern African Large Telescope, PO Box 9, Observatory, South Africa

<sup>38</sup>Instituto de Astrofísica, Facultad de Física, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Casilla 306, Santiago 22, Chile

<sup>39</sup>Physics Department and Yale Center for Astronomy & Astrophysics, PO Box 208120, New Haven, CT 06520-8120, USA

<sup>40</sup>Finnish Centre for Astronomy with ESO (FINCA), University of Turku, FI-20014 Turku, Finland

<sup>41</sup>Department of Physics, University of the Free State, 9300 Bloemfontein, South Africa

## ABSTRACT

We present a catalog of hard X-ray serendipitous sources detected in the first 80 months of observations by the *Nuclear Spectroscopic Telescope Array* (*NuSTAR*). The *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey 80-month (NSS80) catalog has an unprecedented  $\sim 62$  Ms of effective exposure time over 894 unique fields (a factor of three increase over the 40-month catalog), with an areal coverage of  $\sim 36$  deg<sup>2</sup>, larger than all *NuSTAR* extragalactic surveys. NSS80 provides 1274 hard X-ray sources in the 3 – 24 keV band (822 new detections compared to the previous 40-month catalog). Approximately 76% of the *NuSTAR* sources have lower-energy ( $< 10$  keV) X-ray counterparts from *Chandra*, *XMM-Newton*, and *Swift*-XRT. We have undertaken an extensive campaign of ground-based spectroscopic follow-up to obtain new source redshifts and classifications for 427 sources. Combining these with existing archival spectroscopy provides redshifts for 550 NSS80 sources, of which 547 are classified. The sample is primarily composed of active galactic nuclei (AGN), detected over a large range in redshift ( $z = 0.012$ – $3.43$ ), but also includes 58 spectroscopically confirmed Galactic sources. In addition, five AGN/galaxy pairs, one dual AGN system, one BL Lac candidate, and a hotspot of 4C 74.26 (radio quasar) have been identified. The median rest-frame 10 – 40 keV luminosity and redshift of the NSS80 are  $\langle L_{10-40 \text{ keV}} \rangle = 1.2 \times 10^{44}$  erg s<sup>-1</sup> and  $\langle z \rangle = 0.56$ . We investigate the optical properties and construct composite optical spectra to search for subtle signatures not present in the individual spectra, finding an excess of redder BL AGN compared to optical quasar surveys predominantly due to the presence of the host-galaxy and, at least in part, due to dust obscuration.

*Keywords:* catalogs – galaxies: active – galaxies: nuclei – quasars: general – surveys – X-rays: general

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A major focus of X-ray surveys over the last few decades has been understanding the origin of the Cosmic X-ray Background (CXB). The CXB was first discovered in the early 1960’s (see Giacconi et al. 1962), several years before the identification of the cosmic microwave background (CMB; Penzias & Wilson 1965; Dicke et al. 1965). Unlike the CMB, which is truly diffuse in origin, the CXB is found to be dominated by the emission from high-energy distant point sources (Brandt & Alexander 2015; Brandt & Yang 2021): Active Galactic Nuclei (AGNs), the observed manifestation of the accretion of gas and dust onto a super-massive black hole (see Lynden-Bell 1969). Therefore the CXB essentially provides a fossil record of mass accretion onto super-massive black holes throughout cosmic time. Consequently, ever since the discovery of the CXB over five decades ago, a key objective of high-energy astrophysics has been to measure the properties and evolution of AGN throughout cosmic time using sensitive X-ray observations.

Huge progress in the resolution of the CXB has been made using X-ray telescopes at low energies ( $\lesssim 10$  keV). The most sensitive X-ray surveys with *Chandra* (e.g., Hickox & Markevitch 2007; Cappelluti et al. 2017; Luo et al. 2017) and *XMM-Newton* (e.g., Moretti et al. 2003; De Luca & Molendi 2004; Worsley et al. 2005) have resolved  $\approx 70$ – $90\%$  of the CXB at low energies into AGNs at  $z < 5$ – $6$ . However, the energy flux density of the CXB peaks at 20–30 keV (see e.g. Fig. 2 of Ananna et al. 2020) and, until recently, observatories in this energy range (e.g., *Swift*-BAT; *INTEGRAL*) had only resolved  $\approx 1$ – $2\%$  of the CXB at these energies (e.g., Burlon et al. 2011). The great breakthrough in resolving the peak of the CXB comes from the *Nuclear Spectroscopic Telescope Array* (*NuSTAR*; Harrison et al. 2013). *NuSTAR* is the first orbiting observatory with focusing optics and significant collecting area at  $> 10$  keV, allowing for a  $\approx 2$  orders of magnitude improvement in sensitivity and an order of magnitude improvement in angular resolution over previous non-focusing hard X-ray missions. Importantly, the high-energy coverage at 3 – 79 keV means that *NuSTAR* selects AGNs almost irrespective of the absorbing column as it peels back the curtain of gas and dust, missing only

the most heavily obscured systems (with line-of-sight column densities of  $N_{\text{H}} \geq 10^{23} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ ). This has opened up the possibility to study large, cleanly selected samples of high-energy-emitting AGNs in the distant universe.

The *NuSTAR* extragalactic survey is the largest scientific project undertaken to date with *NuSTAR* (Harrison et al. 2013, 2016a). It has resolved  $\approx 35\%$  of the CXB at 8–24 keV (Harrison et al. 2016a), provided the first measurements of the  $> 10$  keV AGN luminosity function at  $z > 0.1$  (Aird et al. 2015a), and identified heavily obscured AGN (e.g., Civano et al. 2015; Lansbury et al. 2017a; Masini et al. 2018). There are two main components to the *NuSTAR* extragalactic survey: (i) dedicated surveys of well-studied blank-fields ( $\approx 3 \text{ deg}^2$ ) including COSMOS (Civano et al. 2015), ECDFS (Mullaney et al. 2015), EGS (Aird et al., *in prep*), GOODS-N (Aird et al., *in prep*), and UDS (Masini et al. 2018), and (ii) a wide-area ‘‘serendipitous survey’’ performed by searching archival *NuSTAR* observations for background X-ray sources (Alexander et al. 2013; Lansbury et al. 2017b, hereafter L17). The serendipitous survey is the largest component of the extragalactic survey programme, providing the majority ( $\approx 75\text{--}80\%$ ) of *NuSTAR* detected sources.<sup>1</sup> It provides a combination of deep and shallow wide-area coverage, which fills out the  $L_{\text{X}}\text{--}z$  plane and identifies rare CXB source populations not detected in the smaller-area dedicated *NuSTAR* surveys. For example, our first full catalog, the 40-month serendipitous survey catalog (Lansbury et al. 2017b) contained 497 sources over  $13 \text{ deg}^2$ , already a factor  $> 4$  larger volume than the dedicated surveys.

Here we provide an update to L17 with the 80-month serendipitous survey catalog, hereafter NSS80. Due to an increase in the fraction of general observer (GO) observations compared to the 40-month survey catalog (hereafter NSS40), the areal coverage ( $\sim 36 \text{ deg}^2$ ), integrated exposure ( $\sim 62 \text{ Ms}$ ), number of fields (894), and number of sources (1274) in the 80-month catalog are a factor  $\approx 3$  larger than those presented in L17. The most natural comparison survey to the NSS80 is the *Swift*-BAT survey (Baumgartner et al. 2013; Oh et al. 2018), which has identified  $\approx 1600$  sources at  $> 10$  keV in 105-months of observations over the entire sky. Comparable serendipitous X-ray surveys have also been undertaken and regularly updated with the *Chandra* (Evans et al. 2010, 2019), *XMM-Newton* (Webb et al. 2020), and *Swift*-XRT (Evans et al. 2014, 2020) but at lower X-ray energies. A substantially greater number of X-ray sources are detected in these surveys ( $\approx 200,000\text{--}550,000$ ) due to their larger areal coverage and/or greater relative X-ray sensitivity than NSS80 at  $< 10$  keV. These catalogs, both individually and in combination, provide a wealth of resource to the X-ray astronomy community, greatly improving the range of possible studies. The *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey (higher energy than *Chandra*, *XMM-Newton*, and *Swift*-XRT; more sensitive and higher resolution than *Swift*-BAT) is an important member of that line-up.

Our aim in this paper is to present an update to the *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey catalogue, including salient information on the reduction of the *NuSTAR* data and construction of the catalogue, the identification of multi-wavelength counterparts, spectroscopic follow-up observations and identifications, in addition to some brief scientific analyses to motivate further in-depth studies with the NSS80. This approach is consistent with our previous *NuSTAR* survey work (e.g., Alexander et al. 2013; Civano et al. 2015; Harrison et al. 2016a; Lansbury et al. 2017b; Masini et al. 2018). In Section 2 we detail the *NuSTAR* observations, data reduction and source-detection to construct the 80-month catalog. We search for counterparts at lower X-ray energies from *Chandra*, *XMM-Newton*, and *Swift*-XRT, described in Section 3.1, and utilize a probabilistic approach with NWay to reliably cross-match to infrared and optical counterparts, described in Section 3.2.<sup>2</sup> To obtain spectroscopic identifications for the NSS80 sources (redshifts and classifications), we undertake an extensive follow-up campaign with ground-based optical telescopes at multiple latitudes (Section 3.3). To characterise the properties of the NSS80 sources, we use X-ray, multi-wavelength photometry, and optical spectroscopy in Section 4. The basic X-ray properties of the extragalactic NSS80 sample are given in Section 4.1, the MIR properties of the sources are examined in Section 4.2, and in Section 4.3 we explore the optical properties of the AGN, with a particular focus on red quasars and the utilization of composite spectra to determine the origin of their observed optical colors. Finally, in Section 5 we draw conclusions and summarise our results. We assume a concordance flat  $\Lambda$ -cosmology with  $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ ,  $\Omega_M = 0.3$ , and  $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$ .

## 2. THE *NuSTAR* DATA

The *NuSTAR* observatory (Harrison et al. 2013) was launched in 2012 and consists of two grazing-incidence telescopes that focus X-rays onto two focal plane modules (FPMA and FPMB) which cover a co-aligned field-of-view of  $\approx 12' \times 12'$ .

<sup>1</sup> We note that, although Galactic sources are identified in the *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey, the majority are extragalactic; consequently, we consider the NSS80 to be predominantly an extragalactic survey. See Tomsick et al. (2017, 2018) for results on galactic sources detected in the *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey.

<sup>2</sup> NWay provides an improvement on simple distance-based matching, using a wider array of information to find likely matches; see Salvato et al. (2018).

*NuSTAR* is sensitive to photons across the 3 – 79 keV energy range and achieves an angular resolution of 18'' FWHM and a half power diameter of 58'', which enables 2 orders of magnitude improvement in sensitivity over previous X-ray missions with sensitivity to hard ( $\gtrsim 10$  keV) energies. In this work we present our analysis and results for the 3 – 8 keV (soft band), 8 – 24 keV (hard band) and 3 – 24 keV (full band) energy bands (following the energy bands adopted in previous *NuSTAR* survey work, see Alexander et al. 2013; Luo et al. 2014; Aird et al. 2015; Lansbury et al. 2015; Harrison et al. 2016a; Lansbury et al. 2017b), with the 3 – 24 keV band being our main focus since it provides the best sensitivity for the detection of relatively faint sources in the *NuSTAR* extragalactic surveys.<sup>3</sup>

In the following subsections we outline the selection of the *NuSTAR* observations utilized in NSS80 (Section 2.1), describe the data-processing and source-detection approaches (Section 2.2), summarise the properties of the serendipitous survey source catalog (Section 2.3), and highlight key changes between the 40-month and 80-month catalogs (Section 2.4).

### 2.1. The Serendipitous Survey Observations

The NSS80 is comprised of observations taken by *NuSTAR* over the period from 2012 July to 2019 March and provides a significant update over the NSS40 reported in L17 (2012 July to 2015 November).

The *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey is constructed by searching the background regions for sources that are not associated with the original science target in almost every *NuSTAR* pointing that is not associated with a dedicated survey field. Following L17 we excluded observations from:

- dedicated extragalactic survey fields: COSMOS (Civano et al. 2015), ECDFS (Mullaney et al. 2015), EGS (Aird et al., *in prep*), GOODS-N (Aird et al., *in prep*), and UDS (Masini et al. 2018);
- Galactic surveys (Mori et al. 2015; Hong et al. 2016), i.e., all fields within a 2 degree radius of the Galactic Center;
- the Norma Arm survey (Fornasini et al. 2017);
- fields where the total counts exceed  $10^6$  within 120'' of the on-axis position due to a bright science target.

In addition, prior to processing the data, we also excluded solar system fields (i.e., solar, lunar and planetary observations), nebular fields (e.g., supernova remnants), galaxy clusters, and fields of nearby galaxy nuclei (e.g., M31). We further excluded fields found to have bad exposure maps (i.e., bad/hot pixels in exposure maps) or if more than two thirds of the field is contaminated by excess background emission (see Section 2.2 and Figure 3).

Table 1 provides a summary of the *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey information. Overall, NSS80 comprises 1457 individual *NuSTAR* exposures, performed over 894 unique fields, the majority of which come from post-NSS40 observations. These fields yield an overall sky coverage of 36 deg<sup>2</sup> and a cumulative exposure time of 62.0 Ms, both a factor of  $\sim 3$  increase over NSS40 as shown in Table 1. Figure 1 shows how the number of fields included in the NSS samples has gradually increased over time, while the average exposure per pointing has remained roughly constant, driving this overall increase in both the sky coverage and total exposure time. A key contribution to the increase in the number of fields with time is the larger number of GO versus Legacy observations, since the dedicated Legacy survey fields (described above) are excluded from the serendipitous survey. A further contribution to the increased area of NSS80 can be attributed to the *Swift*-BAT snapshot survey (e.g., Oh et al. 2018), which is a Legacy survey comprising of multiple, short exposures. Furthermore, two distinctive spikes in the number of fields are evident: spike 1 (bin 2) includes 128 exposures before GO observations were undertaken with *NuSTAR* during the period January – August 2013, and spike 2 (bin 10) includes 193 Cycle 3 GO observations performed during the period of August 2017 – February 2018. These spikes coincide with a decrease in the average exposure time indicating that more shallow observations were scheduled in these periods.


Table 2 lists the individual exposures in alphabetical order for the first 5 unique fields (i.e. comprising of non-overlapping pointings) in the NSS80 (the full table will be made available online) and provides details including the number of observations and the number of serendipitous sources detected in each unique field. For 28% (247/894)

<sup>3</sup> Adopting a broad band pass ensures that faint sources with low photon counts are still likely to be detected, compensating for the drop in sensitivity at higher energies ( $\sim 8 - 24$  keV) due to the decrease in the effective area with increasing energy and the increased relative contribution of instrumental background compared to lower energies.

**Table 1.** Comparison of included observations in the NSS40 and NSS80 surveys.

	NSS40 (L17)	post-NSS40	NSS80
(1) Obs. start date	2012/08	2015/12	2012/08
(2) Obs. end date	2015/11	2019/04	2019/04
(3) Individual exposures	510	947	1457
(4) Unique fields	331	563	894
(5) Cumulative exp. time	20.4 Ms	41.6 Ms	62.0 Ms
(6) Sky coverage	13 deg <sup>2</sup>		

NOTE— Rows: **(1) & (2)** Observation date range for specific survey. **(3)** Number of individual exposures. **(4)** Number of unique fields, each with contiguous coverage comprised of one or more *NuSTAR* exposures. **(5)** Cumulative exposure time in Ms. **(6)** Total sky area coverage in deg<sup>2</sup>.



**Figure 1.** The average exposure time (blue circles) and the number of *NuSTAR* exposures (green stars) roughly per semester over the full 80-month period. In general, the average exposure time shows little variation between the 40-month (shaded grey area) and post-40-month observations, whilst we see an increase in the number of exposures from the 40-month to the post-40-month survey, resulting in an increase in the total exposure time per semester which can be utilized for the *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey. In total, the 80-month serendipitous survey includes 1457 individual exposures with a cumulative exposure time of 62 Ms.

of the fields there are multiple *NuSTAR* exposures, ranging between two and 15 observations, which are combined together into a single mosaic (see Section 2.2 and Figure 3). The serendipitous survey fields have a median exposure time of 34 ks but cover a wide range in individual exposure times (from  $\sim 100$  s to 1 Ms).

In Figure 2 we show an all-sky map of the 894 unique *NuSTAR* fields, color coded by average exposure time. The white filled circles represent the NSS40, whereas the post-NSS40 fields are shown with filled circles. Both the NSS40 and the post-NSS40 fields comprise pointings across the whole sky, with the latter having a higher density of observations, as also shown in Figure 1. In comparison to the NSS40, the number of post-NSS40 fields has increased by  $\approx 50\%$  for a given amount of serendipitous sources per field; e.g., 169 NSS40 fields have 1-2 detected sources whereas

**Table 2.** Details of the individual NSS80 *NuSTAR* observations for the first 5 unique fields (the full table will be made available online).


ID	Science Target	NSS40	$N_{\text{obs}}$	Obs. ID	Obs. Start Date	R.A. (deg)	Decl. (deg)	$b$ (deg)	$t_{\text{exp}}$ (ks)	$N_{\text{serendips}}$
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
1	1A_0535p262_SADA_18360	...	2	...	...	82.00	26.00	-4.87	0.9	0
1a	...	...	...	90401371001	2018 December 26	...	...	...	0.2	...
1b	...	...	...	90401371002	2018 December 27	...	...	...	0.7	...
2	1E1048d1m5937	...	5	...	...	162.53	-59.89	-0.52	397.9	9
2a	...	...	...	30001024003	2013 July 17	...	...	...	25.7	...
2b	...	...	...	30001024002	2013 July 17	...	...	...	26.6	...
2c	...	...	...	30001024005	2013 July 19	...	...	...	167.7	...
2d	...	...	...	30001024007	2013 July 25	...	...	...	119.1	...
2e	...	...	...	90202032002	2016 August 05	...	...	...	58.9	...
3	1E1530m085	303	1	60061265002	2015 August 07	233.34	-8.70	36.88	23.1	0
4	1E161348m5055	...	3	...	...	244.37	-50.92	-0.27	283.2	3
4a	...	...	...	90201028002	2016 June 25	...	...	...	70.7	...
4b	...	...	...	30301017002	2017 June 02	...	...	...	70.3	...
4c	...	...	...	30301013002	2018 April 29	...	...	...	142.3	...
5	1E1841m045	...	6	...	...	280.33	-4.94	-0.01	346.3	7
5a	...	29a	...	30001025002	2012 November 09	...	...	...	52.4	...
5b	...	29b	...	30001025004	2013 September 05	...	...	...	37.8	...
5c	...	29c	...	30001025006	2013 September 07	...	...	...	70.9	...
5d	...	29d	...	30001025008	2013 September 12	...	...	...	41.6	...
5e	...	29e	...	30001025010	2013 September 14	...	...	...	35.4	...
5f	...	29f	...	30001025012	2013 September 21	...	...	...	108.2	...

NOTE— COLUMNS: **(1)** ID assigned to each field. For fields with multiple *NuSTAR* exposures (i.e.,  $N_{\text{obs}} > 1$ ), each individual component exposure is listed with a letter suffixed to the field ID (e.g., 1a and 1b). **(2)** Object name for the primary science target of the *NuSTAR* observation(s). **(3)** ID assigned to each field in the NSS40 (L17). **(4)** The number of individual *NuSTAR* exposures for a given field. **(5)** *NuSTAR* observation ID. **(6)** Observation start date. **(7)** and **(8)** Right ascension and declination (J2000) coordinates for the aim-point, in decimal degrees. **(9)** The IAU Galactic latitude for the aim-point, in decimal degrees (Blaauw et al. 1960). **(10)** Exposure time (“ONTIME” in the *NuSTAR* image header; ks), for a single FPM (i.e., averaged over FPMA and FPMB). For multiple exposures the total exposure time is recorded. **(11)** The number of serendipitous *NuSTAR* sources detected in a given field.

255 post-NSS40 fields have 1-2 serendipitous detections (see Section 2.2 for further information on source detection procedures). The zoom-in panel shows the Galactic plane fields with  $|b| \leq 10^\circ$ : 174 of the 894 NSS80 fields (19%) lie within the Galactic plane, also a factor of  $\sim 3$  increase over that of NSS40.

## 2.2. Data processing and source-detection

The reduction of the new (i.e. post-40 month) *NuSTAR* serendipitous fields followed the custom pipeline procedure described by L17, which is broadly consistent with the approach adopted in our previous *NuSTAR* survey studies (Mullaney et al. 2015; Aird et al. 2015; Harrison et al. 2016b). An overview of the *NuSTAR* data-reduction steps is shown in Figure 3 and described briefly here, highlighting updates to the L17 procedure (see Section 2.4 below for further discussion of differences between the final NSS80 and the prior NSS40 catalogs).



**Figure 2.** Aitoff projection showing the distribution of the *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey fields on the sky, in Galactic coordinates. The white and color filled circles show the NSS40 and the post-NSS40 data, respectively. The circle sizes correspond to the number of sources detected in a given field, and the colors correspond to the cumulative exposure time (per FPM) for a given field. The white area highlights the region  $\pm 10^\circ$  of the Galactic plane.

Briefly, the raw event files were processed using the NUPIPELINE procedure from the *NuSTAR* Data Analysis Software (NuSTARDAS) v1.9.2<sup>4</sup> (incorporated within the HEASoft v6.24 software suite) and CIAO v4.7.0 to produce calibrated event files. These event files were used to produce counts images for each individual *NuSTAR* exposure (obsID), which comprises FPMA and FPMB data in the full, soft and hard energy bands; we note the pixel size is  $2.46''$ . We produced exposure maps that account for the vignetting across the field-of-view for each energy band (at fixed representative energies of 9.88 keV, 5.42 keV and 13.02 keV for the full, soft and hard bands, respectively) as well as a single exposure map that does not include vignetting effects (used to estimate the background count rate at each pixel; see below).

To optimise the depth of our datasets, we coadded the images and exposure maps from the FPMA and FPMB detectors. This resulted in a total of 9 images and 9 exposure maps per field (3 energy bands for FPMA, FPMB and FPMA+B).<sup>5</sup> We produced single mosaics for each energy band by combining observations covering the same sky region within  $12'$  of the aim point for each obsID (step (iii) in Figure 3). There are 54 observations previously included in NSS40 which were coadded with more recent observations and re-analysed for NSS80. We note that this can lead to small changes in the resulting source lists, including the detection of fainter sources or the loss of sources close to the detection limit (see further details in Section 2.3).


Source-detection [see step (iv) in Figure 3] was performed as described in L17. To summarize, we first produced a “false probability” map for each energy band,<sup>6</sup> which gives the probability that the observed counts within a circular aperture of  $20''$  radius (justified by the tight core of the *NuSTAR* PSF; see Civano et al. 2015; Mullaney et al. 2015) were produced purely by a fluctuation of the background. The expected background is estimated by convolving the image counts with an annular aperture of inner radius  $45''$  and outer radius  $90''$  and re-scaling to the  $20''$  source detection region. These background estimates incorporate counts from any bright target which will impact the sensitivity to faint serendipitous sources. Finally, we created source lists by identifying distinct regions where the false probability is less than  $10^{-6}$  (equivalent to  $\sim 5\sigma$ ; see Mullaney et al. 2015, for full details) using the SExtractor software (Bertin & Arnouts 1996). To produce a master source list, we merged the source lists for the three individual energy bands and removed any sources within a  $90''$  radius of the science target position. See L17 and references therein for a full description<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> <https://heasarc.gsfc.nasa.gov/docs/nustar/analysis/>


<sup>5</sup> The uncombined FPMA and FPMB exposure maps are useful to access regions of excess background contamination; see lower panel of Figure 3.

<sup>6</sup> Regions close to the edge of the FoV, with  $< 10\%$  of the maximum exposure in the 3–24 keV band and thus where the background is poorly characterised, are excluded from the source detection process and estimates of survey area coverage.

<sup>7</sup> As in L17, final source positions are (in order of priority) full-band, soft-band, then hard-band.



**Figure 3.** Upper left panel: Flowchart schematic illustrating the *NuSTAR* data processing steps undertaken to reduce individual fields for the serendipitous survey. A field can comprise multiple exposures (obsIDs) mosaicked into a single counts image as illustrated on the right. Data from the two telescopes, FPMA and FPMB, and the Coadded FPMA+B are indicated as “A”, “B” and “C”, respectively, and the three energy bands are indicated in different colors (3–8 keV, 8–24 keV and 3–24 keV). Upper right panel: Example of real counts images and exposure maps associated with stages (iii) to (v) for one of the included processed fields, i.e., IC 2560. The data shown are for the coadded images and the 3–24 keV energy band only. This illustrates the mosaicking of two exposures with different exposure times and orientations. Information from both the image and the exposure map mosaics is used to perform source-detection (step (iv)). In this example, three serendipitous sources (circled) are detected. Lower panel: Each image mosaic with counts  $< 1 \times 10^6$  is visually assessed to identify regions with excess background contamination (EBC) which includes stray light, ghost rays, aperture background and bright science target. If less than two-thirds of the image is contaminated by excess background, a mask region is created and used to mask detections from the final source list. Images with counts  $> 1 \times 10^6$  or with EBC covering more than two-thirds of the image are excluded from the catalog (38 exposures were removed in this way).




**Figure 4.** Sky coverage (solid angle) of the NSS40 (blue) and NSS80 (green) surveys as a function of aperture-corrected flux sensitivity, for the three main energy bands, i.e., full (3 – 24 keV), soft (3 – 8 keV) and hard (8 – 24 keV). Note the factor of  $\sim 3$  increase in the sky coverage with *NuSTAR* between the 40-month and 80-month catalogs. The sensitivity curves include fields at all Galactic latitudes for both NSS40 and NSS80 (cf. the curves shown in L17 for both the full survey and the subset of fields that lie outside the Galactic plane,  $|b| > 10^\circ$ ).

Once the master source list was created, we visually inspected all the post-processed fields (lower panel in Figure 3) to identify and mask out extended areas that exhibit a high background rate due to stray light, ghost rays, aperture background<sup>8</sup> and/or emission from the science target (illustrated in the lower panel of Figure 3). These custom-made masks were then applied to both the background estimate and source-detection procedures, to produce the final source list. We excluded fields from our analysis when the excess background contamination exceeded two thirds of the field (based on a visual estimation), resulting in the removal of 38 fields. In addition to masking excess background contamination, L17 also created custom-made regions to mask out sky areas which are clearly overlapping with extended optical/IR counterparts associated with the *NuSTAR* science target. However, for NSS80 we included this as a later post-processing step to obtain an X-ray catalog independent of optical/IR information (see Section 2.3). To be consistent in the construction of NSS80 we therefore removed the masked regions for 31 of the 40-month fields with highly extended optical hosts and reprocessed the data. For further details see Section 2.3.

Following L17, we measured count rates, fluxes, net source counts and its errors for each detected source, and estimated upper limits for sources undetected in a given band using the Bayesian approach from Kraft et al. (1991). We also applied the deblending procedure described in Section 2.3.2 of Mullaney et al. (2015), which increases the background estimates for a given source due to the contribution of any other nearby serendipitously detected sources that will not be accounted for in our smoothly varying background maps. We then re-assessed the false probability of these sources using the updated background estimates and excluded sources that no longer met our false probability detection threshold in at least one of the energy bands. This process assumes that the sources are all not capable of being resolved by *NuSTAR* and are considered effectively point-like.

To determine the sensitivity curve for a given background and exposure map, we calculated the flux limit at the detection threshold for every point in the *NuSTAR* image, with the exclusion of the peripheral regions and any regions that are masked due to high background as described above or corresponding to extended optical galaxies and nearby galaxy clusters (see Section 2.3 below). We then summed the sensitivity curves of the 894 unique fields for each of the three energy bands to obtain the total areal coverage of the NSS80, which results in a factor  $\sim 3$  increase in sky coverage compared to NSS40 (see Figure 4). In Figure 5, we also compare NSS40 and NSS80 to the dedicated *NuSTAR* deep-field surveys collectively and the *NuSTAR* survey of the North Ecliptic Pole (NEP) region (Zhao et al. 2021b). The NSS80 has the largest areal coverage at all fluxes but is most comparable to the deep-field surveys near the low

<sup>8</sup> The aperture background refers to unfocussed X-rays that pass between the optics and the focal plane i.e. enter via the unbaffled “sides” of the telescope (see Wik et al. 2014, for further detail).



**Figure 5.** Sky coverage of the NSS40 and NSS80 surveys as a function of flux sensitivity, for the hard (8 – 24 keV) energy band. The green and blue solid lines show the area curves for the overall NSS40 and NSS80 surveys, respectively. We compare with the other completed components of the *NuSTAR* extragalactic surveys program, which include the following dedicated deep-field surveys: COSMOS (dash-dotted black line), ECDFS, EGS, GOODSN and UDS

. The total area for these deep-field surveys is shown as a black solid line. We also compare to cycle 5 of the *NuSTAR* extragalactic survey of the James Webb Space Telescope North Ecliptic Pole (NEP) time-domain field shown in a dotted black line (Zhao et al. 2021b).


flux tail. Consequently the combination of NSS80 with the deep-field surveys allows for a factor  $\sim 2$  improvement in analyses of the faint end of the hard X-ray source population, in addition to an order of magnitude increase at brighter fluxes.

With the total area coverage, we can estimate the number of spurious X-ray detections in NSS80 due to background fluctuations. Our  $36 \text{ deg}^2$  survey corresponds to  $\approx 370,000$  independent  $20''$  radius regions, which with our strict (i.e. low) false probability threshold of  $10^{-6}$  (cf. the higher thresholds adopted in Mullaney et al. 2015; Civano et al. 2015) corresponds to an expectation of 0.37 spurious sources in a given band (Nandra et al. 2005). We thus expect 1.11 spurious X-ray sources due to performing source detection independently over three bands, although we note that this number is conservative as the 3–24 keV band overlaps with the other energy bands and is thus not completely independent.

### 2.3. The Serendipitous Survey Source catalog

The master source list comprises 1488 serendipitous *NuSTAR* sources that are significantly detected in at least one energy band, independently of any prior multi-wavelength information. Based on findings in L17, the majority of the X-ray detected sources in NSS80 are expected to be AGN which should reside in background field galaxies that are not associated with the science target. However, due to the high-sensitivity of *NuSTAR* and the large areal coverage of NSS80, a small and non-negligible fraction are X-ray emitting sources within nearby highly extended galaxies associated with the science target (e.g., X-ray binaries and ultra-luminous X-ray sources), X-ray AGN residing in nearby galaxy clusters, or X-ray emitting sources within the Galaxy. In NSS80 we therefore distinguish between X-ray detected sources lying within highly extended optical galaxies and nearby galaxy clusters from those hosted in fainter field galaxies. To enable easy and efficient use of NSS80, all *NuSTAR* sources residing in highly extended optical galaxies and galaxy clusters are placed in a secondary catalog to complement the primary catalog that is dominated by AGN in field galaxies. To identify *NuSTAR* sources in highly extended optical galaxies or nearby galaxy clusters we selected sources that lay within

- the isophotal radius ( $D_{25}$ ) of RC3 galaxies (Third Reference Catalog of Bright Galaxies; de Vaucouleurs et al. 1995) where the  $R$ -band surface brightness  $\mu_R = 25 \text{ mag arcsec}^{-2}$ , including the SMC and LMC; or
- the radii of Abell clusters obtained from Abell (1958) or, if unavailable, a median value of  $0.5'$  as a radius; or
- the  $2\times$  half-mass radius of Galactic globular clusters (Harris 1996).



**Figure 6.** Example DSS *R*-band cutouts centred on the *NuSTAR* aim point for a given observation (green cross). Sources within the radius of RC3 galaxies (Third Reference Catalog of Bright Galaxies; de Vaucouleurs et al. 1995), Milky Way (Galactic) globular clusters (MWGC) or Abell clusters are flagged as secondary sources and indicated with blue circles. The white circles and the teal-green diamonds mark primary and L17 serendipitous sources, respectively (see Figure 7 for further details).

In addition, source-detections from fields covering the Eta Carinae nebula (e.g., 1E1048d1m5934 and ASASSN\_18fv) are also reported in the secondary catalog. Figure 6 shows example cutouts of identified fields with highly extended optical hosts. The flagged secondary serendipitous sources are marked with blue circles (the primary and L17 sources are indicated with white circles and green diamonds; refer to Figure 7) and the respective optical catalog is flagged in the left corner. We found 214 sources to be associated with highly extended galaxies, galaxy clusters or globular clusters, and we refer to the overall catalog of these sources as the secondary NSS80 catalog; 22/214 secondary NSS80 sources were included in NSS40. By comparison the primary serendipitous survey source catalog contains 1274 sources; hereafter all statistics reported for NSS80 refer to the primary source catalog.

Table 3 provides the numbers of sources in the primary NSS80 catalog that are detected in different energy bands as well statistics regarding optical counterparts, spectroscopic follow-up and successful redshift measurements. The total number detected in the full, soft, and hard bands are 1078 (85%), 706 (55%), and 406 (32%), respectively. In total, we have obtained redshifts for 550 NSS80 sources, of which 547 can be spectroscopically classified; see Figure 16 and Section 3.3 below.

Both the primary and secondary source catalogs are provided as electronic tables. In Appendix A we give a detailed description of the columns that are provided in the catalog. In addition, we also created an online library of the 894 unique fields to allow for quick and easy verification of the X-ray and optical counterpart information for each of the *NuSTAR* fields. The online library will be accessible at <https://www.nustar.caltech.edu/page/59> and in Figure 7 we show an example of one of these fields. In Table 4 we give a summary of the subsets of this primary catalog as discussed in future sections.

**Table 3.** Source statistics for the primary NSS80 catalog.

Band	$N$	$N_{\text{spec}}$	$N_z$	$N_{z,\text{failed}}$	$N_{r,\text{det}}$	$N_{r < 22}$
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Any band	1274	594	550	44	1015	765
F+S+H	257	174	165	9	221	190
F+S only	315	170	157	13	275	212
F+H only	81	35	32	3	68	46
F only	422	166	153	13	326	233
S only	131	39	35	4	88	59
H only	68	10	8	2	37	25

NOTE— COLUMNS: **(1)** F, S, and H refer to sources detected in the full (3–24 keV), soft (3–8 keV), and hard (8–24 keV) energy bands, respectively. “F + H”, for example, refers to sources detected in the full and hard bands only, but not in the soft band, and “S only” refers to sources detected exclusively in the soft band. **(2)** The number of sources detected post-deblending for a given band or set of bands. **(3)** The number of sources for which (ground-based) optical spectroscopic observations were undertaken. **(4)** The number of sources with spectroscopic redshift measurements and the associated percentage (including robust and uncertain counterpart associations based on our NWAY analysis; see Sections 3.2 & 3.3). **(5)** The number of sources for which spectroscopic observations were undertaken, but lack a reliable redshift measurement (the majority of which have faint, red continuum spectra); see Table 15 and Figure B5. **(6)** The number of sources with an associated optical counterpart detected in the  $r$ -band; magnitudes are obtained from SDSS, PanSTARRS, USNOB1 and NSC (NOAO Source Catalog). **(7)** The number of sources with an associated optical counterpart brighter than  $r = 22$  (detectable with current groundbased telescopes).


#### 2.4. Key changes in NSS80 with respect to NSS40

As discussed in Section 2.2, when constructing the NSS80 sample, we mainly adopted the same underlying methodology and data processing procedures as in NSS40 to be consistent between the two *NuSTAR* serendipitous surveys. Nevertheless, there are several significant changes and updates with respect to NSS40. The key differences are summarised below.

- NSS40 combined individual exposures of the same science target to increase the sensitivity. In NSS80 we extend this approach to coadd all exposures performed over the 80-month period within a 12' search radius of the aim point (i.e., all overlapping sky regions were automatically identified and coadded), providing improved sensitivity in fields with multiple overlapping observations.
- NSS40 excluded obsIDs with exposure times  $< 1$  ks from the analysis. NSS80 now coadds all of the data (which satisfied our criteria mentioned in Section 2.1), including any low-exposure time data.
- Preceding source-detection, serendipitous detections which could be associated with highly extended optical/IR hosts were manually masked and removed in NSS40. NSS80 retains these in a secondary catalog, based on a later post-processing step; see Section 2.3.

**Table 4.** Summary of the primary catalog subsets and selection flags.

Subset	Number	Selection Flag	Section	Description
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Primary (all)	1285	–	2.1	The full catalogue, excluding sources within highly extended optical galaxies and clusters
Unique	1274	MAINCAT	2.1	All unique detections, i.e. excluding objects with multiple optical counterpart candidates
Reliable	962	NWAY_RFLAG	3.2	Sources with a high probability NWAY match in either CatWISE20 or PS1-DR2
Spectroscopic	594	SPECCAT	3.3	Sources with spectroscopic observations
BL	287	CLASSIFICATION is ‘BL’ or ‘BL?’	3.3.3	Sources with broad permitted emission line widths ( $FWHM \geq 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ )
NL	198	CLASSIFICATION is ‘NL’ or ‘NL?’	3.3.3	Sources with narrow permitted emission line widths
Extra-galactic	492	SPECCAT, zQUALITY!=‘F’ or ‘C’ and zSPEC> 0	3.3.3	Sources with spectroscopic redshifts indicating extra-galactic origin



**Figure 7.** Example image of the NSS80 survey library. The online library will be accessible at <https://www.nustar.caltech.edu/page/59>. *Left cutout:* The 3 – 24 keV coadded *NuSTAR* image of one of the 894 NSS80 unique fields, Kepler (field ID 413);  $N_{\text{exp}} = 3$  individual exposures (each  $12' \times 12'$ ) are combined with a total exposure time of  $t_{\text{exp}} = 364.36 \text{ ks}$ . For comparison, the NSS40 field ID and total exposure time is recorded in the top right corner. NSS80 detections are marked with white circles and the corresponding serendip number and NSS40 detections are shown with teal-green diamonds – 3 additional *NuSTAR* serendipitous sources are detected in the new post-NSS40 data. The science target is marked with a green cross at the centre of each field (aim point). Fields which are masked post processing due to excess background contamination (e.g., stray light, ghost rays, bright science target) are flagged in the bottom left corner, and the Galactic latitude of the science target is shown in the bottom right corner. *Right cutout:* DSS2 *R*-band image centred on the *NuSTAR* science target position. The same labelling as on the left is used to indicate NSS40 and NSS80 serendipitous sources. Galactic plane fields with latitudes  $|b| < 10^\circ$  are flagged in the bottom left corner.

To quantify how many serendipitous sources were added/removed due to the aforementioned alterations, we assessed overlapping fields between the NSS40 and NSS80. Of the 331 NSS40 unique fields, we reprocessed 50 fields – 6 which include only NSS40 observations while 44 fields include post-NSS40 observations as well. For these 50 fields, we detected an additional 111 sources: 89 sources arise from the deeper or wider data and 22 by including highly extended optical host mask regions originally excluded. 36 NSS40 sources were not detected in our coadded fields; we summarise potential reasons to explain these undetected sources in Table 14. 32 of the 36 undetected NSS40 sources have updated false probabilities, based on the deeper co-added data, that no longer satisfy our detection threshold, indicating that they were likely spurious detections in the NSS40 sample. This is particularly noticeable for NSS40 sources with detections in a single energy band only. Of the remaining 4 undetected NSS40 sources, 1 lies in an excess background region and 3 sources are on the peripheries of coadded fields.

Overall, 444/497 NSS40 sources are included in the primary NSS80 catalog, 17/497 are included in the secondary NSS80 catalog, and 36/497 sources are excluded. Additionally, L17 constructed a secondary catalog of which 8/64 are included in the primary NSS80 and 5/64 in the secondary NSS80 catalog. Hence, in total, 452 and 22 NSS40 sources are included in the primary and secondary NSS80 catalogs, respectively.

### 3. THE MULTI-WAVELENGTH DATA

The compiled NSS80 presented in this work is independent of prior multi-wavelength information. To further explore the source properties, such as luminosities and source classifications, we require multi-wavelength information to draw a more complete picture of the properties and nature of individual sources. Since our primary focus for the NSS80 is extragalactic sources, we also require optical counterparts to establish redshift measurements from which a range of other properties can be inferred. However, since the positional accuracy of *NuSTAR* ranges between  $\approx 8''$  to  $\approx 20''$  for bright to faint sources (90% confidence; see e.g., Lansbury et al. 2017b), it is desirable to have more accurate X-ray positions to search for reliable optical/IR counterparts. To achieve this we first searched for lower-energy (soft) X-ray counterparts with more accurate source positions (see Section 3.1) and, subsequently, searched for IR/optical counterparts to the X-ray sources (see Section 3.2), which were then used in our spectroscopic follow-up campaign (see Section 3.3).

#### 3.1. Lower-energy X-ray Counterparts

To search for lower-energy (soft) X-ray counterparts, we used *Chandra*, *XMM-Newton*, and *Swift*-XRT observations. We cross matched the *NuSTAR* sources to (1) the *Chandra* Source Catalog Release 2.0 (CSC2.0; Evans et al. 2019), (2) the Fourth *XMM-Newton* Serendipitous Source Catalog, Tenth Data Release (4XMM-DR10; Webb et al. 2020) and its stacked version (4XMM-DR10s; Traulsen et al. 2020), and (3) the *Swift*-XRT Point Source Catalogue (2SXPS; Evans et al. 2020), using a search radius of  $30''$  for each *NuSTAR* source position (consistent with L17). There is a trade-off between completeness and the number of false associations when cross-matching between different surveys, and thus here and in Section 3.2 we select cross-matching radii carefully with this balance in mind. As discussed in L17, the uncertainty in the *NuSTAR* positions dominates the errors in the source matching. We would expect to exclude a true match in a very small fraction of cases ( $<0.5\%$ ) and for  $\sim 7\%$  of the associations to be false (L17).

We identified lower-energy X-ray counterparts for 956 *NuSTAR* sources between the four lower-energy X-ray catalogs. In addition, we manually identified a potential lower-energy X-ray counterpart for a further 8 sources which have faint lower-energy X-ray emission (yet not statistically significant) in the vicinity of the *NuSTAR* position (1 *Chandra*, 4 *XMM-Newton* and 3 *Swift*-XRT; see Appendix A), leaving a total of 964 NSS80 sources (76%) with an identified lower-energy X-ray counterpart. Accordingly we were unable to identify lower-energy X-ray counterparts for 310 NSS80 sources, of which 94.5% (293/310) have lower-energy X-ray coverage with either one of the lower-energy X-ray observatories: 34.8% with *Chandra* (ACIS), 51.3% with *XMM-Newton*, and 92.9% with *Swift*-XRT; these sources are flagged in the catalog (see Appendix A). The reason for the non-detections could be that the observations were too shallow to detect faint sources, or it could be attributed to variability given that the observations are non-contemporaneous, or it could be the result of absorption of lower-energy X-ray photons along the line-of-sight. Only  $\sim 1\%$  (17/1274) lack any form of coverage from all of these three lower-energy X-ray observatories (flagged as FLAG\_SOFTX\_COV = NULL in the catalog).

Of the 964 *NuSTAR* sources with lower-energy X-ray counterparts, 142 sources have been detected with more than one of the lower-energy X-ray observatories: 22 from *Chandra*+*XMM-Newton*; 32 from *Chandra*+*Swift*-XRT; 51 from

**Table 5.** The number of *NuSTAR* serendipitous sources with lower-energy X-ray counterparts.

	CSC2.0	4XMM-DR10s	4XMM-DR10	2SXPS	Any
(1) $N_{\text{Total}} / N_{\text{Coverage}}$	300 / 408	492 / 651	394 / 553	661 / 949	956 / 1249
(2) $N_{\text{Single}}$	211	382	349	617	907
(3) $N_{\text{Multiple}}$	89	110	45	44	214
(4) $N_{\text{Best}}$	300	317	168	171	<sup>†</sup> 956
(5) $\langle \Delta \text{RA} \times \cos(\text{Decl.}) \rangle$	$-0.50 \pm 0.60''$	$0.55 \pm 0.52''$	$0.20 \pm 0.61''$	$-0.28 \pm 0.49''$	
(6) $\langle \Delta \text{Decl.} \rangle$	$0.36 \pm 0.49''$	$-0.13 \pm 0.40''$	$0.20 \pm 0.51''$	$0.71 \pm 0.34''$	
(7) $\langle \theta \rangle$	$10.7''$	$11.2''$	$12.6''$	$10.9''$	


NOTE— Rows: **(1)** The total number of *NuSTAR* sources in the primary catalogue with a lower-energy X-ray counterpart within a search radius of  $30''$  ( $N_{\text{Total}}$ ) compared to the total number of primary *NuSTAR* sources with *Chandra*, *XMM-Newton* and/or *Swift*-XRT coverage ( $N_{\text{Coverage}}$ ); the coverage was determined by matching sources without a soft X-ray counterpart with observations within the default radius on HEASARC, and then checking the exposure maps for non-zero exposure times at the *NuSTAR* coordinates. The final column enumerates the number of unique *NuSTAR* sources with a match in any catalog. **(2)** The number of *NuSTAR* sources with a single match within  $30''$  to the specific lower-energy X-ray catalog. **(3)** The number of *NuSTAR* sources with multiple matches within  $30''$  to the specific lower-energy X-ray catalog. **(4)** The number of *NuSTAR* sources where the position from a given lower-energy X-ray catalog is taken to be the most reliable (i.e., the best), and consequently the adopted, lower-energy X-ray position. The order of preference is: *Chandra*, *XMM-Newton* and then *Swift*-XRT. <sup>†</sup>In addition to the 956 unique sources with automatically matched counterparts described in the table, a further 8 sources (1 *Chandra* + 4 *XMM-Newton* + 3 *Swift*-XRT) were manually identified, resulting in a total of 964 NSS80 sources with a lower-energy X-ray counterpart. **(5) & (6)** The mean positional offsets in right ascension (5) and declination (6) of the *NuSTAR* position relative to the lower-energy X-ray counterpart (see Figure 8 top panel). **(7)** The mean angular offset between the *NuSTAR* and lower-energy X-ray positions in arcsec. These values are computed for all CSC2.0, 4XMM-DR10/s and 2SXPS matches.

*XMM-Newton*+*Swift*-XRT; and 37 from all three lower-energy X-ray observatories. For these sources we adopted the position with the highest accuracy as the ‘best’ lower-energy X-ray counterpart, which are in the following order: CSC2.0, 4XMM-DR10s, 4XMM-DR10 and 2SXPS. Hence, of the 964 lower-energy X-ray counterparts, we have adopted the positions for 300 from CSC2.0, 317 from 4XMM-DR10s, 168 from 4XMM-DR10, 171 from 2SXPS, and 8 manually measured positions using lower-energy X-ray imaging, i.e., one position from *Chandra*, 4 from *XMM-Newton*, and 3 from *Swift*-XRT; see row 4 in Table 5.<sup>9</sup>

Approximately 23% (288/1274) of the *NuSTAR* sources have multiple CSC2.0, 4XMM-DR10/s or 2SXPS matches within our search radius. To identify the best counterpart for these cases, we made the assumption that the lower-energy X-ray source with the brightest flux in the highest available energy band (*Chandra*: 2-7 keV; *XMM-Newton*: 4.5-12 keV; *Swift*-XRT: 2-10 keV) is likely to be the correct counterpart. We note that in some cases we stand the risk of ignoring heavily obscured sources which are faint in lower energies. Three *NuSTAR* sources (one *Chandra* and two *XMM-Newton*) were undetected in solely the highest energy band of the low-energy instrument, for which we used their full band fluxes.

The results from the lower-energy X-ray cross-matching of the primary NSS80 sources are summarized in Table 5. We provide the positions, the angular separation between the lower-energy X-ray counterpart and the *NuSTAR* source, and the number of sources with matches in each catalogue.

<sup>9</sup> The 8 manually measured lower-energy X-ray positions are used only to identify multi-wavelength counterparts, but are excluded from all further X-ray analysis.




**Figure 8.** The positional accuracy of *NuSTAR* as a function of source-detection significance for the 956 NSS80 sources with lower-energy counterparts in pointed archival observations; all matched lower-energy counterparts are plotted. **Top panel:** Astrometric offsets between the *NuSTAR* source and its matched lower-energy X-ray counterpart coordinates from (a) *Chandra*/CSC2.0 (circles), (b) *XMM-Newton*/4XMM-DR10/s (squares and diamonds), and (c) *Swift* -XRT/2SXPS (stars), color-coded by source-detection significance. The negligible mean positional offsets are shown with white markers. **Bottom panel:** The radial offset between the *NuSTAR* source and its best lower-energy X-ray counterpart as a function of the minimum source-detection significance ( $\Delta p_{\text{False,min}}$ ) which increases towards the right (from green to purple color-code). The solid and dash-dot black lines indicate the 90% and 68% confidence limits, respectively, on the *NuSTAR* positional uncertainty for bin sizes of  $\log(p_{\text{False,min}}) = -10$ . The number of sources which each bin contains is given above the solid lines. Since the number of sources becomes small towards high  $p_{\text{False,min}}$  values, we only plot bins for  $\log(p_{\text{False,min}}) < -50$ .

We show the positional offsets between the *NuSTAR* sources and their (a) *Chandra*, (b) *XMM-Newton* and (c) *Swift*-XRT counterparts in the top panel of Figure 8, and list the mean positional offsets for all CSC2.0, 4XMM-DR10/s and 2SXPS matches in rows 5–6 of Table 5 (as well as the mean angular offset between the *NuSTAR* and lower-energy X-ray positions; see row 7). The sources are plotted in color, coded by the source-detection significance (the minimum false probability), and the dashed circles illustrate different search radii: 10'' (inner), 20'' (middle) and 30'' (outer). Evidently, the majority of sources for each lower-energy X-ray observatory lie within a 20'' separation radius (i.e., 94%, 84%, 90%, 90% for CSC2.0, 4XMM-DR10s, 4XMM-DR10 and 2SXPS, respectively), particularly those with more significant detections (i.e., lower  $\Delta p_{\text{False,min}}$  values). The lack of significant positional offsets (i.e., see the median astrometric offsets for each sample in Figure 8) are indicative of consistent astrometry between the X-ray observatories.

The bottom panel of Figure 8 shows the positional accuracy of *NuSTAR* as a function of the detection significance; i.e., the angular separation between the *NuSTAR* position and its best identified lower-energy X-ray counterpart (having a higher likelihood of being correctly matched) versus the minimum false probability of a given source. By assuming zero uncertainty in the lower-energy X-ray position and that NSS80 sources with lower-energy counterparts are representative of the overall population, we determine the 90% and 68% confidence limits on the *NuSTAR* positional uncertainty in bin sizes of  $\log(p_{\text{False,min}}) = -10$ , as indicated with solid and dash-dot horizontal black lines, respectively. From this analysis we find that the 90% confidence limit on the *NuSTAR* positional uncertainty varies from 23'' to 13'' between the least-significant and the most-significant detections.

We estimated the observed-frame 3–8 keV flux ( $F_{\text{soft}}$ ) for the lower-energy X-ray counterparts following the methodology in L17. For CSC2.0, 4XMM-DR10/s and 2SXPS sources we converted to the 3–8 keV flux from the 2–7 keV,



**Figure 9.** Comparison of the 3 – 8 keV *NuSTAR* and < 10 keV X-ray mission fluxes ( $F_{\text{soft}}$ ) for the best *Chandra*/CSC2.0 (green circles), XMM-Newton/4XMM-DR10/s (purple squares and diamonds, respectively), or *Swift*-XRT/2SXPS (blue stars) counterpart matched to the primary NSS80. The different energy bands used to calculate the 3 – 8 keV fluxes for the CSC2.0 are indicated with different symbols, i.e., 2 – 7 keV (solid green circle), 0.1 – 10 keV (white filled, green-edged circle), and 0.5 – 7 keV (white filled, green-edged star). **Top panel:** Distribution of *NuSTAR* to < 10 keV X-ray mission fluxes for each instrument. In both panels, the black solid line shows the 1:1 relation, the black dash-dot lines show a factor of three from this relation, and the red dotted line indicates a factor of 5 below the 1:1 relation. Ten sources have *NuSTAR* 3 – 8 keV flux measurements below the 1:5 relation.

4.5 – 12 keV and 2 – 10 keV<sup>10</sup> flux using a conversion factor of 0.83, 0.92 and 0.62, respectively.<sup>11</sup> We show these fluxes relative to the *NuSTAR*-measured fluxes for the best identified lower-energy X-ray counterparts in Figure 9. It should be noted that 21/300 CSC2.0 counterparts are undetected in the 2 – 7 keV (ACIS) energy band: 1/21 source are detected in the 0.5 – 7.0 keV broad band (NuSTARJ184449+7212.1), 2/21 sources (NuSTARJ095712+6904.8 & NuSTARJ121425+2936.1) only have upper limits in the 0.5 – 7 keV broad band, while the remaining 18/21 sources only have constrained fluxes in the 0.1 – 10 keV HRC wide band<sup>12</sup>. For these sources we used the respective bands in which they are detected to calculate the 3 – 8 keV fluxes. We see a reasonable agreement in the flux measurements between observatories, with the majority of the sources (80% CSC2.0, 90% 4XMM-DR10/s and 93% 2SXPS) lying within a factor of three of the 1:1 relation (see Figure 9). At least a component of the observed scatter is likely to be attributed to intrinsic source variability due to the non-contemporaneous *NuSTAR* and lower-energy X-ray observations. In addition, Civano et al. (2015), Mullaney et al. (2015) and Fornasini et al. (2017) have shown that Eddington bias affects the lower *NuSTAR* fluxes, increasing the spread as the flux limit is approached. Sources at the very lowest fluxes are not commonly detected, contributing to the apparent bias with larger numbers of sources at the lowest X-ray fluxes that are above the 3:1 relation.

<sup>10</sup> For the 2SXPS sources we calculated the soft-band flux using the available band 3 count rate (2–10 keV).

<sup>11</sup> We estimated the conversion factors in WebPIMMS for a Galactic absorption of  $N_{\text{H}} = 0$  and a photon index of  $\Gamma = 1.8$ .

<sup>12</sup> We note that some of these sources may represent the small fraction of expected false associations between soft X-ray and *NuSTAR* sources.

Finally, we assessed the flux contribution from all of the *Chandra*, *XMM-Newton* and *Swift*-XRT sources within a radius of  $30''$  from the *NuSTAR* source by determining their total combined  $3 - 8$  keV flux ( $F_{\text{soft}}^{30}$ ; see Appendix A). We allow us to compare: (a)  $F_{\text{soft}}$  measured by *NuSTAR* ( $F_{\text{soft},\text{NuSTAR}}$ ), in order to assess whether a significant amount of *NuSTAR* flux is coming from other sources; and (b)  $F_{\text{soft}}$  from the best lower-energy counterpart ( $F_{\text{soft,LE}}$ ), to assess the contamination of low energy flux from other sources, less affected by variation and inter-instrument differences. Overall, 6.9% of the NSS80 sources with lower-energy X-ray counterparts have  $F_{\text{soft}}^{30} > 1.2 \times F_{\text{soft,LE}}$ , and 4.9% have  $F_{\text{soft}}^{30} > 1.2 \times F_{\text{soft},\text{NuSTAR}}$ . Only 21 sources have combined fluxes that exceed  $F_{\text{soft},\text{NuSTAR}}$  by a factor of 2. Therefore, we are confident that the *NuSTAR* source is generally dominated by the emission from the brightest lower-energy X-ray counterpart.

### 3.2. Finding IR & optical counterparts using NWAY


Obtaining redshifts for the *NuSTAR* sources requires the identification of the correct optical counterpart. The comparatively large positional uncertainty of *NuSTAR* sources often leads to multiple potential optical counterparts. Consequently, we require an approach to distinguish between true and unrelated optical counterparts, particularly in the absence of more reliable lower-energy X-ray positions. As discussed further in Section 4.2, MIR emission provides a robust identification of AGN activity, particularly for hidden luminous quasars, since the dusty AGN torus radiates predominantly at these wavelengths, while star formation from the host galaxy peaks at FIR wavelengths and is comparatively weak at MIR wavelengths. Therefore we should not consider star-forming galaxies a major source of contaminants in the MIR distributions found in Figure 11. The all-sky *WISE* survey therefore provides an excellent complement to *NuSTAR*: the positional uncertainty of *WISE* sources, particularly in the shorter wavelength *W1* and *W2* bands, is sufficient to be able to reliably identify optical counterparts. Identifying *WISE* counterparts for hard X-ray selected sources can therefore pave the way to locating the correct optical counterpart even for *NuSTAR* sources without a lower-energy X-ray counterpart. This section describes the process of matching MIR and optical counterparts to *NuSTAR* sources both with, and without, lower-energy X-ray counterparts.

L17 adopted a relatively simple closest neighbour approach to identify multi-wavelength counterparts, using the more reliable positions from lower-energy X-ray counterparts, where available, and the distinctive characteristics of AGN with respect to galaxies in the MIR band (as traced using *WISE*). Here we adopt a more sophisticated probabilistic approach using NWAY (v.4.4.2; Salvato et al. 2018) to identify IR and optical counterparts for the NSS80 sources. NWAY uses Bayesian methods to probabilistically match multi-wavelength counterparts to X-ray sources by simultaneously matching  $N$  catalogs in a multi-dimensional parameter space, e.g., astronomical sky coordinates and positional uncertainties, magnitude and color distributions, source density and morphology, etc. Therefore, NWAY is a powerful tool for our task of identifying the correct optical and IR counterparts for *NuSTAR* detected sources, which can include both Galactic populations, such as stars, and extragalactic objects, such as AGN. For our NWAY matching we use CatWISE20 (Marocco et al. 2021), which is a MIR all-sky catalog selected from *WISE* and NEOWISE at  $3.4$  and  $4.6 \mu\text{m}$  (i.e., *W1* and *W2*). In addition, we use Pan-STARRS DR2 (PS1-DR2; Flewelling 2018) which provides coverage at declinations  $\gtrsim -30^\circ$  with a single epoch  $5\sigma$  depth of  $r < 21.8^{13}$ .

In what follows we summarise the main steps of our NWAY matching approach to obtain IR/optical counterparts for our spectroscopic follow-up campaign, as outlined in Figures 10(a) and 10(b). We begin by constructing colour and magnitude priors that are approximately representative of the population by performing a photometrically unbiased cross-match between the NSS80 sources, MIR, and optical catalogs, and then restricting the results from this to secure counterparts only (i.e. high probability matches). With these expected distributions of magnitude and color in hand we can apply them as priors to a round of cross-matching that includes all possible counterparts (i.e. those that had low probabilities in the first cross-match, as well as the high probability matches) and improve the final cross-match probabilities that inform our selection of principal counterparts.

This process and the resulting principal optical counterparts should be understood with some basic information in mind. In general we prioritise counterparts from the X-ray–MIR matching, as AGN are more robustly distinguished in the MIR (see distributions in Figure 11). Selection of optical counterparts follows using a well-defined branching procedure, with the aim of producing the most likely counterpart candidates for the population as a whole. The intention of this is to provide an overview of the properties of counterparts to hard X-ray selected sources (see Sections 4.2 and 4.3). The matches are therefore also manually checked, and in a small minority of cases this overrides

<sup>13</sup> For sources at lower declinations no optical matching was performed with NWAY. Instead we performed positional cross-matching to other optical catalogues; see case ii) for selection of principal counterparts later in this section for details.



**Figure 10.** Flowchart illustrating our NWAY matching strategy which we used to identify CatWISE20 and PS1-DR2 counterparts to the NSS80 sources. **(a)** Round #1 entails the generation of the magnitude and color priors required for Round #2 (magenta outlined box; see Figure 10(b)), by using astrometric information including source positions and their associated uncertainties, and the sky density as a function of magnitude (green outlined boxes) to identify counterparts to the best X-ray position (blue outlined box). Lines are dashed or shown in different colours purely for clarity. **(b)** Round #2 of NWAY which utilizes the priors (magenta) from the matching to lower-energy X-ray counterparts (blue) with  $|b| > 20^\circ$  in Round #1 and flat priors for sources with  $|b| < 20^\circ$ . All matches with probabilities  $> 10\%$  are stored in the final post-processed catalog which include X-ray information, multi-band positions and photometry, and key NWAY information such as the Bayesian match probabilities.

the automatic procedure (see red branch ‘VI corrected’ in Figure 12 and Round #2 part (v)). Users are advised to consider their specific use cases and the appropriate choice of optical counterpart for their application.

★ **Preliminary round: constructing base counterpart catalogs**


An optical and an IR base catalog are first created (separately) by collecting all IR positions from CatWISE20 and optical positions from PS1-DR2 within  $40''^{14}$  of the *NuSTAR* position (see the green outlined boxes in Figure 10(a)).

★ **Round #1: defining magnitude and color priors | Figure 10(a)**

Round #1 uses only astrometric and sky-density information (including positional errors) to identify a “good” counterpart for the NSS80 sources. The expected local sky densities of optical and *WISE* counterparts vary greatly with distance from the Galactic plane, and therefore CatWISE20 and PS1 sky densities were calculated from the actual number counts within  $40''$  of each *NuSTAR* source. The *NuSTAR* source densities were derived using the  $\log N$ - $\log S$  curves reported in Harrison et al. (2016a), adopting the deblended soft-band *NuSTAR* flux.

For X-ray positions, lower-energy coordinates are used where available (see Section 3.1), otherwise the *NuSTAR* position is used. In this work we use 68% positional uncertainties appropriate for input to NWAY, adapted from the various serendipitous catalogue values for sources with soft X-ray matches. For *NuSTAR*-only sources we used the

<sup>14</sup> This matching radius is increased to  $40''$  (as compared to matching with soft X-ray sources within  $30''$ ) to include all potential matches to soft X-ray counterparts, which could be offset by as much as  $30''$ .



**Figure 11.** Magnitude and color distributions (integrated to unity) of the CatWISE20 (top) and PanSTARRS (bottom) matched samples from Round #1, which are used to evaluate priors in Round #2 to identify the “best” IR counterpart for each *NuSTAR* serendipitous source. *WISE* magnitudes are Vega and optical magnitudes are AB. **Top left panel:** The *W1*-magnitude distribution for the best matches vs. all sources (grey shaded area), splitting the former by Galactic latitude; high Galactic latitude sources ( $|b| > 20^\circ$ ) in red and low Galactic latitude sources ( $|b| < 20^\circ$ ) in blue. The black line is a Generalised Logistic distribution fit to the data of the high Galactic latitude sources. The *W1* distribution of the low Galactic latitude sources follows a similar shape to that of the high Galactic latitude sources, with a slightly brighter *W1* tail. **Top right panel:** The *W1*-*W2* color distribution following the same color-code as in the first panel. Here, the *WISE* color of the high Galactic latitude sources, driven by the presence of AGN, is distinct from the low Galactic latitude sources. Moreover, the peak of the distribution is around  $W1-W2 \approx 0.8$ , which is the Stern et al. (2012) criterion for selecting MIR AGN. Therefore, the *W1*-*W2* color distribution can be used as a prior to identifying AGN candidates for optical/IR follow-up spectroscopy. **Bottom left panel:** The *i* magnitude distribution following the same color-code as in the previous panels. The distribution of the low Galactic latitude sources follows a similar shape to that of the high Galactic latitude sources, peaking at a slightly less bright magnitude. **Bottom right panel:** The *g*-*i* color distribution following the same color-code as in the previous panels.

68% positional uncertainties based on  $\log(p_{\text{False,min}})$ , as shown in Figure 8. These values can be found in the catalog (column `e_Xdeg`).

NWAY calculates the probability that each *WISE* or Pan-STARRS source is the correct counterpart to a specific X-ray source ( $p_{\text{Cat,best}}$  and  $p_{\text{PS,best}}$  for CatWISE20 and PS1-DR2, respectively<sup>15</sup>). For X-ray sources with large positional uncertainties such as pure *NuSTAR* sources without lower-energy X-ray information, counterpart identification is often less reliable, which will be captured in the lower probability values returned by NWAY. In addition to the best counterpart match probability, NWAY provides the probability that any of the CatWISE/PS1-DR2 sources is the right counterpart ( $p_{\text{Cat,any}}$  and  $p_{\text{PS,any}}$  for CatWISE20 and PS1-DR2, respectively); a higher probability indicates a lower false-association likelihood. To ensure that we only include sources with a high-probability of a correct match, we applied the following constraints on the matching probabilities and discarded any sources from Round #1 which do not comply:  $p_{\text{CAT/PS,any}} > 0.5$  and  $p_{\text{CAT/PS,best}} > 0.8$ . We treat sources at low Galactic latitudes ( $|b| < 20^\circ$ ) separately since source confusion is high closer to the Galactic plane as a result of the high density of Galactic sources; colour/magnitude priors appropriate to extra-galactic sources do not apply to a population containing a large number of stellar X-ray emitters. A detailed study focusing on Galactic and low latitude sources could improve the counterpart matching for these sources by investigating different potential priors (for example, the top left panel of Figure 11 implies that *W1* may be effective), which may be particularly valuable in these crowded regions. Only two Galactic sources lack a soft X-ray counterpart. No sources outside of the galactic plane that pass these probability cuts lack a soft X-ray counterpart - these matches can therefore be considered reliable and representative of the extra-galactic population.

The high-probability matches of the NSS80 serendipitous sources at high Galactic latitudes are then used to generate *WISE* and optical magnitude distributions in addition to color distributions which all serve as photometric priors for the second round of NWAY matching, as described in Figure 10(b). The *W1* magnitude and *W1*–*W2* color distributions for the CatWISE20 base catalog generated with NWAY are shown in the top panels of Figure 11. *W1*–*W2* color is known to correlate with the presence of an AGN (e.g., Stern et al. 2012; Assef et al. 2018) and *W1* presents the deepest observations, therefore we choose these as our color and magnitude priors. Evidently, the *WISE* color distribution for sources at high Galactic latitudes (blue distribution) provides a valuable way to distinguish between stellar objects and AGN. A similar result holds for PS1-DR2 *i*-band magnitudes and  $g - i$  colors, where reliable counterparts are bluer in the optical compared to the base population from PS1-DR2 (see bottom panels of Figure 11). The *g* and *i* bands are both deep in PS1-DR2, and the  $g - i$  color can be used to select for reddened AGN (e.g., Klindt et al. 2019).

As an input for prior-based calculations, NWAY also requires a distribution of counterparts (*WISE* or optical) that are not associated with X-ray sources. For this, we use the histograms of all sources in our 40" search fields around the *NuSTAR* positions (grey histograms in the top panels of Figure 11). X-ray source counterparts contribute to  $< 2\%$  of these histograms, so they are an excellent representation of the background population.

*At this point, we have two “good” match catalogues: X-ray–optical, and X-ray–IR, which are used to evaluate priors for the more thorough matching in Round 2.*

#### ★ Round #2: improvement of the NWAY matching using priors | Figure 10(b)

Round #2 now uses the optical and MIR priors evaluated after matching in Round #1 (*W1* magnitude, *W1* – *W2* color, *i*-band magnitude, and  $g - i$  color) to help identify the most probable optical counterparts for the NSS80 sources. The primary X-ray source catalog is categorized into low and high Galactic latitude sources with the division at  $|b| = 20^\circ$ .  $|b| < 20^\circ$  sources are matched geometrically (i.e., including positional errors but not using photometric priors) to the base CatWISE20 and PS1-DR2 catalogs, as in Round 1. Counterparts for the  $|b| > 20^\circ$  X-ray sources are identified using the magnitude and color priors from Round #1 as inputs to NWAY; therefore these matches are weighted towards brighter sources and those with AGN-like colors. Figure 11 compares the priors used in this round with the distributions used to construct them. It also shows the distributions for  $|b| < 20^\circ$  sources and all possible matches; the latter can be taken as a reasonable indication of the ‘background’, or unmatched, distributions. We also compare the results of Round #2 with a version of the catalogs created using a positional offset to simulate the chances of a random association (as advised in the NWAY documentation) and assess the probability of a false association based on these results. This informs our selection of threshold cuts in the remainder of this section. For each NSS80 source, the highest probability CatWISE20/PS1-DR2 match is stored in the catalog, if  $p_{\text{CAT/PS,best}} > 10\%$ .

<sup>15</sup>  $p_{\text{best}}$  is the *relative* probability that each potential counterpart is correct; it assumes that one of the matches found is correct.  $p_{\text{any}}$  provides the probability that any one of the potential counterparts is correct.  $p_{\text{best}}$  is therefore equivalent to adopting  $p_{-i}$  (Salvato et al. 2018) as the best potential counterpart to each NSS80 source.

We now have two “improved” match catalogues: *X-ray–optical*, and *X-ray–IR*, which contain a potential match for each NSS80 source. These catalogues must then be assessed to select a preferred counterpart, which we refer to as the ‘principal counterpart’. The goal of this process is to characterise the general optical and MIR properties of the NSS80 sources (see Sections 4.2 and 4.3) and prepare for spectroscopic follow-up (see Section 3.3).

**Final step: identification of principal counterpart | Figure 10(b) and Figure 12**

Finally, the two catalogs are combined to form a refined catalog, with a single NWAY match in each of CatWISE20 and PS1-DR2 for each NSS80 source. This refined catalog includes X-ray information, multi-band positions and photometry (which can be expanded according to one’s preferences), and key NWAY information such as  $p_{\text{CAT/PS, best}}$  and  $p_{\text{CAT/PS, any}}$  – all of these will be included in the online NSS80 catalog; see Appendix A<sup>16</sup>. The next part of this section describes selecting the best available optical counterpart, which is the NWAY-selected source in the majority of cases<sup>17</sup>.

When selecting the final principal optical counterparts, subsets of the NSS80 sources are dealt with in different ways, depending on the available optical or lower-energy X-ray data and the results of the NWAY matching, as outlined below. Generally we consider the *CatWISE20* match to be the primary counterpart, with optical associations secondary; Figure 11 shows that the MIR distribution of best NWAY matches is more distinct from that of all possible matches than the equivalent comparison using optical distributions (for extra-galactic sources). We note that in all cases the results were visually inspected (with imaging in all cases, and optical spectra where available; see Section 3.3) by several of the authors, to assess the results. If multiple convincing counterparts are seen then the match is not flagged as reliable, although the results are not changed for a significant number of sources. We consider the following cases, with each following a branch of Figure 12:

- i) **Sources with a lower-energy X-ray match, at least one *CatWISE20* match, and at least one PS1 match within 2.7" of the *CatWISE20* position:** As mentioned in Section 3.1, 964/1274 NSS80 sources have a lower-energy X-ray counterpart and, therefore, will have more reliable multi-wavelength counterpart associations than those with *NuSTAR*-only positions. Of the 964 lower-energy X-ray sources, 850 have a *CatWISE20* match to the lower-energy X-ray position,<sup>18</sup> of which 573 have at least one PS1 association found by NWAY (Pan-STARRS only covers declinations  $\gtrsim -30^\circ$ ; 627/850 sources with soft X-ray and *CatWISE20* matches fall in this region). However, given that the two catalogs were independently matched to the lower-energy X-ray positions, the PS1 position is not necessarily an exact match to the *CatWISE20* position. A maximum angular separation of 2.7" between the PS1 and *CatWISE20* positions removes counterparts where the probability of a correct match is  $\lesssim 0.1\%$  based on positional uncertainty alone (with probabilities converted from e.g., Lake et al. 2012). Hence, for the 573 with lower-energy X-ray + *CatWISE20* + a PS1 counterpart from NWAY within 2.7" of the *CatWISE20* position, we adopt this PS1 source as the principal optical counterpart and it is flagged as *PS1-NWAY*<sup>19</sup>. If the position from NWAY is too distant but a match can be found in PS1 by matching manually then this is labelled *PS1-MAN* (31 sources<sup>20</sup>).
- ii) **Sources with a lower-energy X-ray match, at least one *CatWISE20* match, but no PS1 match within 2.7"':** The lower-energy X-ray + *CatWISE20* + PS1 sources with angular separations  $> 2.7''$  between the *CatWISE20* and PS1 positions (with a mean separation of 7.1") are less reliable and possibly different sources altogether. To identify potential optical counterparts for the 34 sources with PS1 matches rejected in the previous step, as well as the 277/850 lower-energy X-ray + *CatWISE20* counterparts which lack a PS1 association from NWAY, we matched, in order of priority, to (1) the SDSS photometric catalog DR12 (Alam et al. 2015), (2) the second data release of the NOIRLab Source Catalog (NSC2; Nidever et al. 2021), (3) the Dark Energy Survey Data Release 2 (DES-DR2; Abbott et al. 2016), and (4) the USNOB1 catalog (Monet et al. 2003), using a 2.7" positional uncertainty. These matches were done based on the closest available source and identify 228 optical counterparts. They are labelled according to the catalog used<sup>21</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> Each most probable PS1 NWAY match is kept in the catalog (regardless of whether it is selected as the principal counterpart), and are found in the columns with the suffix *-PS1*, columns 119-132.


<sup>17</sup> Counterpart information in the catalog has the suffix *-cpart*, columns 134-146.

<sup>18</sup> The majority of these have a greater than 30% *CatWISE20* match probability,  $p_{\text{CAT, best}}$ .

<sup>19</sup> A *PS1-NWAY* match within 2.7" of the *CatWISE20* position will be selected even if there is a closer potential optical counterpart that is not found by NWAY.

<sup>20</sup> These numbers can be found for any label by filtering the catalog on the column *OOrig\_cpart*.

<sup>21</sup> The number of sources matched to other catalogs in this step are SDSS: 2; NSC2: 200; DES2: 6; USNOB1: 5.



**Figure 12.** A flowchart of the principal adopted optical counterparts to the NSS80 sources. The actions in green represent NSS80 sources with lower-energy X-ray + CatWISE20 counterparts with an optical match within  $2.7''$  from the *WISE* position. Optical matches are retrieved from PS1-DR2 (either from our NWAY matching or manually), SDSS, NSC2, DES2 or USNOB1. The purple actions indicate lower-energy X-ray + optical matches which lack a CatWISE20 association. For these sources we matched the *Chandra*, *XMM-Newton* or *Swift*-XRT positions (softX  $\equiv$  lower-energy X-ray) to the aforementioned optical catalogues using characteristic positional uncertainties of  $2.5''$ ,  $5''$  or  $6''$ , respectively. The blue actions represent *NuSTAR*-only X-ray + CatWISE20 positions matched to the aforementioned optical surveys (prioritising NWAY matches where available) using a matching radius of  $2.7''$ ; these optical matches are only used for the purposes of spectroscopic follow-up. NSS80 sources that lack any optical association (some of which may be too faint/distant) are indicated with grey actions. In red is shown the contribution of objects with a visually selected optical match - these include, for example, objects where cross-matching limits for other branches are exceeded slightly but on visual inspection a clear match is found. This results in an optical completeness of  $\sim 86\%$  ( $1098/1274$ ) for the NSS80 catalog:  $844/964$  lower-energy X-ray and  $254/310$  *NuSTAR*-only X-ray associations. This information is available in the NSS80 catalog; see Appendix A.

- iii) **Sources with a lower-energy X-ray match, but no CatWISE20 match:** 114/964 lower-energy X-ray counterparts lack any CatWISE20 association (i.e. a CatWISE20 NWAY match with  $p_{\text{Cat,best}} > 0.1$ ); 79% (90/114) of these sources are at low Galactic latitudes. If an NWAY PS1 match is available for these sources this is used, and if not a PS1-DR2 match based on angular separation alone is attempted using the *Chandra*, *XMM-Newton* and *Swift*-XRT positions, with positional offset limits of  $2.5''$ ,  $5''$  and  $6''$ , respectively. These values are used instead of the individual source probabilities used in NWAY because the goal in this case is different; we aim to select a single closest match and exclude distant and therefore unlikely matches, rather than statistically assessing the probabilities. If no PS1-DR2 is found, we move to the aforementioned optical catalogues, identifying counterparts for 86/114 sources in this category. Matches made in this way have flags with the suffix *-softX*.

In total we have identified optical associations for  $\sim 85\%$  (824/964) of the NSS80 sources with lower-energy X-ray counterparts. The remaining 140/964 lower-energy X-ray sources lack any optical association at this stage: i.e. we find no optical source down to the magnitude limits of the searched optical catalogs within a matching radius of  $2.7''$  (when there is a CatWISE counterpart), or the matching radius of the soft X-ray counterpart (when there is no CatWISE counterpart)<sup>22</sup>.


- iv) **Sources with no lower-energy X-ray match:** For the 310/1274 NSS80 sources without lower-energy X-ray counterparts, the X-ray positional error circle from *NuSTAR* is comparatively large, so unique counterparts cannot be identified with high confidence (see Figure 13). However, from our NWAY matching we were able to secure a potential *WISE* association for all 310 sources with a  $p_{\text{Cat,best}} \gtrsim 0.1$ ; note that NuSTARJ182353+0742.0 is a borderline case with  $p_{\text{Cat,best}} = 0.095$  and  $p_{\text{Cat,any}} = 0.53$ . To search for an optical counterpart for these sources, for the purposes of optical spectroscopic follow-up only (i.e., to retrieve an optical position and *r*-magnitude if detected), we cross-matched the CatWISE20 position to the aforementioned optical surveys using a  $2.7''$  search radius, starting by checking the position of the NWAY PS1 match, then moving onto a manual PS1 match, and finally working through the other optical catalogs. In total we obtained a potential optical counterpart for 243/310 *NuSTAR*-only X-ray sources. Matches made in this way have flags with the suffix *-CatWISE*, and should be viewed with more caution than those with soft X-ray counterparts.
- v) **Visually inspected sources:** Finally, as each source was visually inspected we find a small number (21/1274) where it is appropriate to override the procedural matching explained in this section. The majority of these are sources that fail a matching distance criterion by only a small amount but on visual inspection appear likely to be a correct match. For example, if a PS1 source is further than  $2.7''$  from the CatWISE20 counterpart, but it is within the match radius for the soft X-ray counterpart and in a region with few nearby sources we may choose to manually select the optical counterpart. Matches made in this way have flags with the suffix *-VI*, and should also be treated with appropriate caution.

This step increases the optical completeness of the NSS80 catalog from  $\sim 85\%$  (1077/1274) to  $\sim 86\%$  (1098/1274): 844/964 lower-energy X-ray and 254/310 *NuSTAR*-only X-ray associations; see Appendix A for an abbreviated code indicating the origin of the adopted optical counterpart to the *NuSTAR* source.

Our selection process to identify the principal adopted optical counterpart is summarised in Figure 12. Not all NWAY matches will be true counterpart associations since the cross-matching depends on X-ray counterpart information (i.e. positional uncertainty, which is influenced by source and background counts), whether a soft X-ray counterpart can be found (generally these have much smaller positional uncertainties than *NuSTAR* and thus improve cross-matching), the Galactic latitude of the source (i.e., source confusion easily occurs for high density fields usually within the Galactic plane) and the depth of the optical/IR imaging surveys (e.g., shallow imaging can miss counterparts that are evident in deeper surveys), to mention but a few. Figure 13 shows the distribution of NWAY match probabilities ( $p_{\text{CAT/PS,best}}$ ) for the “best” CatWISE20 (top panel) and PanSTARRS (bottom panel) candidates, both for *NuSTAR*-only (open) and improved lower-energy X-ray positions (filled). Evidently, the CatWISE20/PS1-DR2 probabilities are low in the absence of more reliable lower-energy X-ray positions.

We therefore attempted to identify a subset of our NSS80 that have high-probability matches based on our NWAY analysis to minimise false associations—henceforth described as ‘reliable’ counterparts—and provide this information

<sup>22</sup> Sources which lack an optical counterpart may do so because their counterpart is faint/distant.



**Figure 13.** A histogram of the distribution of match probabilities for the NWAY CatWISE20 (top panel) and PanSTARRS (bottom panel) candidates before applying the  $>10\%$   $p_{\text{Cat/PS1,best}}$  cut at the end of Round #2, both for *NuSTAR*-only (open) and improved lower-energy X-ray positions (filled). The high quality probability cut ( $p_{\text{Cat/PS1,best}} \geq 0.4$ ) is plotted with a dash-dotted line. Evidently, in the absence of more reliable lower-energy X-ray positions, NWAY returns low probabilities for the CatWISE20/PS1-DR2 matches. Left panel shows all sources; middle and right panels show high and low Galactic latitude sources respectively.


in the catalog (NWAY\_RFlag; Table 11). We first identified high-probability CatWISE20 matches with thresholds of  $p_{\text{Cat,best}} > 0.4$  and  $p_{\text{Cat,any}} > 0.5$ . The expected rate of false associations based on matching with randomised catalogs (as in Salvato et al. 2018) around each *NuSTAR* /soft X-ray position gives a 1.4% chance of false association if a soft X-ray source is present, and 12.6% if there is no soft X-ray source, improving to 0.5% and 9.6% respectively when limited to  $|b| > 10^\circ$ . We supplement the reliable CatWISE20 counterparts with reliable PS1-DR2 counterparts, if present, for sources that fail the CatWISE20 probability criterion, by applying the same higher probability cut on their PS1-DR2 probabilities (i.e.,  $p_{\text{PS,best}} > 0.4$  and  $p_{\text{PS,any}} > 0.5$ ). In total, 963/1274 NSS80 sources have a reliable CatWISE20 or PS1-DR2 counterpart, of which 76% (726) are high Galactic latitude sources. 370 of these only have a reliable CatWISE20 counterpart and 103 only PS1-DR2; many of these do have an NWAY match that is below the 0.4/0.5 thresholds. The remaining 321 NSS80 sources have low-probability NWAY counterparts and should, therefore, be used with caution to avoid biasing the results.

Finally, we have a single principal match catalog, checked at each stage for the most reasonable match. All selected matches are included, and particularly high probability matches are flagged as reliable. This subset can be selected with the flag *NWAY\_RFlag*; see Table 4.

Figure 14 shows the distribution of astrometric offsets between the X-ray source and the adopted CatWISE20 (top panel) and optical (Pan-STARRS, SDSS, NSC2, DES, and USNOB1; bottom panel) counterpart, for the high probability NWAY-selected samples (filled symbols) and for sources with low NWAY probabilities (open, grey-edged crosses). Sources with Galactic latitudes  $|b| > 20^\circ$  are plotted with circles, squares/diamonds and stars for NSS80 sources with CSC2, 4XMMDR10/s and 2SXPS counterparts, respectively. The low Galactic latitude sources identified with NWAY based solely on geometric information are shown with crosses.

In Figure 15 we show histograms of the *WISE* (top panels) and optical ( $g,r$  and  $i$ ; middle panels) magnitudes<sup>23</sup> for the high probability NWAY-selected samples at high (green) and low (peach) Galactic latitudes, respectively. The median magnitudes of the low Galactic latitude sources are on average 1-2 magnitudes brighter than the high Galactic latitude sources.

<sup>23</sup> All PanSTARRS magnitudes quoted in the NSS80 catalog are, in order of preference, Kron, PSF, or the default aperture magnitudes. They are flagged in the columns *mag\_type\_PS1* and *mag\_type\_cpant* for NWAY and selected counterpart magnitudes, respectively. The Kron magnitudes are better for extended sources, which would constitute the larger number of counterparts for the *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey given their apparent redshift distributions. Thus if a Kron magnitude is available, it is used, and if not we check for the other types. If users perform a detailed study on individual sources we advise a check that the magnitude is appropriate for their application.



**Figure 14.** Astrometric offsets between the lower-energy X-ray counterpart coordinates and the *WISE* (top row) and the adopted optical (bottom row) coordinates, color-coded using the *NuSTAR* detection likelihood ( $p_{\text{false,min}}$ ), for NWAY-identified counterparts flagged as reliable. The high Galactic latitude lower-energy X-ray counterparts are from CSC2 (left column; circles), 4XMM-DR10/s (middle left column; squares and diamonds, respectively), 2SXPS (middle right column; stars), and *NuSTAR* only (right column; plus symbols). Low Galactic latitude sources are plotted with color-coded crosses and sources with less reliable counterpart associations are indicated with open grey-edged crosses. The dashed (dotted) circles correspond to the  $1\sigma$  ( $2\sigma$ ) search radii for each lower-energy X-ray telescope:  $1.2''$  ( $2.5''$ ),  $2.4''$  ( $5''$ ),  $3.4''$  ( $6''$ ),  $12''$  ( $24''$ ) for *Chandra*, *XMM-Newton*, *Swift-XRT*, and *NuSTAR*, respectively. The white circle, square, diamond, star, and plus indicates the median astrometric offset for each of the extragalactic samples. Note the different scale for the *NuSTAR*-only section.

In addition the  $W1 - W2$  and  $g - i$  colors for all the sources satisfying the NWAY high probability cuts are shown in the bottom panels of Figure 15. The median  $W1 - W2$  for high Galactic latitude sources is similar to the AGN threshold of  $W1 - W2 = 0.8$  presented in Stern et al. (2012).


### 3.3. Optical spectroscopy

To maximise the scientific impact of the *NuSTAR* observations and to explore the intrinsic source properties, we carried out a major, coordinated spectroscopic campaign using a broad range of telescopes across the globe to obtain redshifts of the NSS80 sources. The analysis of, and classifications obtained from, these new spectroscopic data and those from pre-existing spectroscopy, are described in Section 3.3.3.

#### 3.3.1. Dedicated Follow-up Campaign

L17 obtained spectroscopic redshifts for 276 of the 497 *NuSTAR* serendipitous sources through multi-year observing programmes in both hemispheres. For NSS80 we continued the multi-year spectroscopic follow-up campaign with the following telescopes (see Section 4.4.2):

- In the **Northern hemisphere** we used a combination of the 5.1 m Hale Telescope at the Palomar Observatory (Decl.  $\gtrsim -21^\circ$ ; P.I. F. A. Harrison and D. Stern) and 10 m Keck I at the W. M. Keck Observatory ( $-35^\circ \lesssim \text{Decl.} \lesssim 75^\circ$ ; P.I. F. A. Harrison), targeting brighter targets preferentially with the former, and fainter targets with the latter;
- In the **Southern hemisphere** we used a combination of the 8.2 m Very Large Telescope (VLT) at the European Southern Observatory (Unit Telescope 1 (UT1);  $-70^\circ \lesssim \text{Decl.} \lesssim 10^\circ$ ; P.I. G. B. Lansbury and L. Klindt), and the 11 m Southern African Large Telescope (SALT) which is part of the South African Astronomical Observatory in Sutherland ( $-80^\circ \lesssim \text{Decl.} \lesssim 20^\circ$ ; PI L. Klindt).



**Figure 15.** Distributions of the MIR and optical magnitudes and colors for the high probability NWAY-selected counterpart samples at high Galactic latitudes ( $|b| > 20^\circ$ ; green) and low Galactic latitudes ( $|b| < 20^\circ$ ; peach). The median of each distribution is plotted with a dash-dotted line. The dashed black lines indicate the distributions constructed in NWAY round #1 and used as priors in round #2. *Top four panels:* magnitude distributions for the four photometric WISE bands, for the sources with successful CatWISE20 matches satisfying the high probability cut. *Middle three panels:* the  $g$ -band,  $r$ -band and  $i$ -band magnitudes (corrected for Galactic extinction) for all the sources satisfying the NWAY high probability cuts. *Bottom two panels:* the  $W1 - W2$  and  $g - i$  colors for all the sources satisfying the NWAY high probability cuts. These colors are used as priors for NWAY. The dash-dotted, grey line indicates the Stern et al. (2012) AGN threshold of  $W1 - W2 > 0.8$ . WISE magnitudes are Vega and optical magnitudes are AB.

This multi-latitude campaign resulted in spectroscopic redshifts and classifications for 550 NSS80 sources (including those in L17, 2 galaxy and 4 AGN pairs), as summarized in Table 6. We provide the date of the observing run, the telescope and instrument used, and the total number of sources observed, for both visitor and service mode observations; this key observing information is listed for each individual source in the spectroscopic catalog (see Appendix E.1 and Table 15). This subset can be selected from the primary catalog with the flag *SpecCAT*; see Table 4. The reader can refer to Table 4 in L17 for a summary of the NSS40 spectroscopic follow-up observations.

We note that all instruments are on-slit spectrographs. A further 44 NSS80 sources were followed up, but we failed to obtain a reliable redshift measurement: 33/44 sources are optically faint (7 undetected in the  $r$ -band and 26 with

$r > 20$ ), 9/44 sources have low S/N spectra due to compromised observations (either due to weather conditions or telescope failures), one source is optically-undetected, but given its radio and X-ray emission it is possibly a radio-lobe associated with the science target, and the remaining source is a BL Lac candidate with a power-law continuum lacking spectral features; see Table 15 and Figure B5. Hence, 680/1274 (53%) NSS80 sources have not yet been targeted for spectroscopic follow-up.

### 3.3.2. Spectroscopic observations & data reductions

Since the spectral features of the NSS80 sources are not known *a priori*, we adopt a broad wavelength coverage with sufficient spectral resolution to search for, identify and accurately measure any spectral features. Therefore, two grating angles were selected for each target observation with Keck,<sup>24</sup> Palomar and SALT, whereas a broad wavelength coverage was achieved with a single camera station for VLT. This allowed us to access the 3200 Å – 9000 Å visible wavelength range and cover commonly known AGN and quasar emission and absorption lines across a range of redshifts. For example, at lower redshifts (e.g.,  $z = 0.3$ ), emission lines such as Mg II  $\lambda 2800$ , [Ne V]  $\lambda 3346$  and  $\lambda 3426$ , [O II]  $\lambda 3728$ , [Ne III]  $\lambda 3869$ , H $\delta$   $\lambda 4102$ , H $\gamma$   $\lambda 4340$ , H $\beta$   $\lambda 4861$ , [O III]  $\lambda 4959$  and  $\lambda 5007$ , [O I]  $\lambda 6300$  and  $\lambda 6364$ , [N II]  $\lambda 6548$  and  $\lambda 6584$ , H $\alpha$   $\lambda 6563$ , and [S II]  $\lambda 6716$  and  $\lambda 6731$  are covered, and at higher redshifts (e.g.,  $z = 2$ ), lines such as Ly $\alpha$   $\lambda 1216$ , Si IV  $\lambda 1398$ , C IV  $\lambda 1549$ , He II  $\lambda 1640$ , C III]  $\lambda 1909$ , C II]  $\lambda 2326$ , and Mg II  $\lambda 2800$  are covered. For all our observations we adopted a slit width of 1 – 1.5'', depending on the seeing, and configured the spectrographs to obtain low-resolution spectra (i.e., a resolving power of  $R \sim 1000$ ), which is sufficient to achieve our science goals.

For the majority of observations a total of two exposures were obtained (with the exception of very bright targets), and in the case where dithering<sup>25</sup> was requested, 1 horizontal tile and 2 vertical tiles with a maximum offset size of 10'' were obtained. Calibration images (flat fields and arc frames) were also recorded, and spectrophotometric standard stars were observed in the different instrument configurations for flux calibration. It should be noted that, due to the design of SALT, the spectra cannot be absolute flux calibrated. This is due to the moving pupil during exposures and tracking which consequently changes the effective area of the telescope. Therefore, the standards were only used for relative spectral (shape) calibration.

The spectroscopic data reductions included basic CCD pre-reductions, spectral calibration, background subtraction, spectral extraction and flux calibration. The tasks available in IRAF (see Massey et al. 1992) were used to perform the reduction and analysis processes for the Keck, Palomar and SALT spectra, and the ESOREFLEX 2.9.1 pipeline was used to reduce the VLT/FORS2 spectra. For more details see Section 4.4 of Klindt (2022). The final flux-calibrated optical spectra described herein are available in Appendix E.1 and will be made available on the NSS80 webpage; see Section A.2 in L17 for the NSS40 optical spectra).

### 3.3.3. Spectral Classification and Analysis

To assist in the measurement of spectroscopic redshifts, we used the open-source Manual and Automatic Redshifting Software (MARZ; Hinton et al. 2016) by matching the observed flux calibrated input spectra (FITS file format) against a library of stellar, galaxy and AGN templates available in the MARZ web application; see fig. 6 in Hinton et al. (2016) for a visual display of the twelve (5 stellar + 6 galaxy + 1 AGN) current templates available in MARZ.<sup>26</sup> Via this manual template comparison approach, the object type can easily be identified and the spectrum can be redshifted to align the observed spectral lines with the template (for moderate to high S/N spectra). From this, MARZ provides a redshift solution, however, it does not assign uncertainties to the redshifts (see Yuan et al. 2015, for more details). For low S/N spectra where template comparison and line identification are arduous, we identified potential spectral features and used a look-up table of wavelength ratios based on the emission and absorption lines observed in AGN and galaxy spectra for spectral lines. The redshift solution is then determined by cross-matching the observed wavelength ratios of the identified lines to the rest wavelength ratios based on the emission and absorption lines observed in AGN. Sources with low S/N spectra or dubious redshift measurements are flagged in the catalogue.

During the full 80-month period, including L17, we obtained redshift measurements for 550 *NuSTAR* sources, of which we spectrally classified 547 (this accounts for 43% of the NSS80 primary catalog): 427 were obtained via our


<sup>24</sup> Keck/LRIS is a double spectrograph, consisting of a blue and red channel. However, only the grating angle on the red side is adjustable, while the blue side grism is fixed.

<sup>25</sup> Dithering is important for fringing corrections, especially at longer wavelengths for standard CCD arrays such as SALT/RSS and VLT/FORS2. Keck/LRIS and Palomar/DBSP, on the other hand, have thick, red-sensitive CCDs on their red arms which have negligible fringing.

<sup>26</sup> Hinton et al. (2016) compiled the library of templates from RUNZ (originally developed for the use of the 2dF galaxy redshift survey; Colless et al. 2001) and AUTOZ with original templates from 2dF (Colless et al. 2001), WiggleZ (Drinkwater et al. 2010), the Gemini Deep Survey (Abraham et al. 2004), SDSS DR2 (SubbaRao et al. 2002) and galaxy eigenspectra from Bolton et al. (2012).

**Table 6.** Chronological list of the optical spectroscopic follow-up campaign of NSS80 sources post L17; see L17 for the details of the NSS40 spectroscopic follow-up campaign. Listed for visitor mode observations are the ID assigned to each observing run, the date of the observing run, the telescope and instrument used and the number of sources observed. For service mode observations we also provide the observing period (semester) and the observing run end date. The different telescope instruments include the Double Spectrograph (DBSP), the Low Resolution Imaging Spectrometer (LRIS), the Focal Reducer and low dispersion Spectrograph (FORS2), and the Robert Stobie Spectrograph (RSS).

Run ID	UT Start Date	Telescope	Instrument	$N_{\text{src}}$
Visitor mode				
1	2016 October 02	Palomar	DBSP	3
2	2016 November 27	Keck	LRIS	3
3	2017 April 28	Keck	LRIS	16
4	2017 July 21	Keck	LRIS	15
5	2017 July 27	Palomar	DBSP	7
6	2017 September 14	Palomar	DBSP	2
7	2017 September 16	Keck	LRIS	9
8	2017 November 22	Palomar	DBSP	2
9	2018 March 18	Keck	LRIS	8
10	2018 June 06	Palomar	DBSP	9
11	2018 July 16	Keck	LRIS	4
12	2018 September 09	Palomar	DBSP	2
13	2018 October 03	Keck	LRIS	6
14	2019 March 07	Keck	LRIS	1
15	2019 July 22	Palomar	DBSP	3
16	2019 July 28	Palomar	DBSP	1
17	2019 August 02	Palomar	DBSP	1
18	2019 August 23	Palomar	DBSP	1
19	2019 October 26	Palomar	DBSP	7
20	2019 December 24	Keck	LRIS	15
21	2020 June 16	Palomar	DBSP	5
22	2020 September 12	Palomar	DBSP	5
23	2020 September 25	Palomar	DBSP	24
24	2020 October 23	Palomar	DBSP	28
Service mode				
25	P100	VLT	FORS2	13
26	P101	VLT	FORS2	12
27	P102	VLT	FORS2	9
28	P103	VLT	FORS2	17
29	2017-SEM1+SEM2	SALT	RSS	4
30	2018-SEM1+SEM2	SALT	RSS	10
31	2019-SEM1+SEM2	SALT	RSS	8
32	2020-SEM1	SALT	RSS	3




**Figure 16.** A pie-chart of the NSS80 source classifications obtained via our spectroscopic follow-up campaign. In total, there are 612 source entries in the NSS80 spectroscopic catalog: 594 unique spectroscopic entries and 18 additional entries. Of the 594 unique entries, we have classified 492 as extragalactic sources, including 284 BL (or BL?), 194 NL (or NL?), one galaxy cluster, 10 galaxies, and three unclassified sources with redshift measurements from literature. We have also classified 58 Galactic sources at  $z = 0$ . There are a further 43 sources that lack a reliable redshift measurement, 28 of which are unclassified due to the lack of spectral lines, but a power-law continuum is detected in all of the cases, 14 sources have counterpart uncertainties due to the lack of a lower-energy X-ray counterpart or high optical source density, one source is a *Fermi* BL Lac candidate. The remaining one source is a hotspot of 4C 74.26 (radio quasar), which was targeted as the primary *NuSTAR* science target; see Figure 17. In addition to the unique entries, we obtained spectra for a further 18 sources: three AGN pairs of which one pair is a dual AGN system, two AGN-galaxy pairs, one galaxy pair, and one unclassified pair (see Figure 18), 7 sources with photometric redshifts, and four sources which are potentially the correct counterpart opposite to the one selected; 3/4 are fainter lower-energy X-ray sources (2 BLs + 1 phot- $z$  source of unknown type) nominally closer to the *NuSTAR* source than the selected (X-ray brighter) BL counterpart, and the remaining source is an optically bright NL galaxy at a different redshift than the NWAY-selected NL counterpart (which is associated with the primary *NuSTAR* science target).

optical follow-up campaign and 123 from archival data (primarily SDSS DR16; Ahumada et al. 2020; see Table 15 for details). The source classifications and redshift measurements for all NSS80 sources with optical spectra are provided as supplementary material in Appendix E.1. The majority of the sources have robust redshift measurements obtained from two or more spectral lines, whilst 21/550 sources have a single-line measurement; these sources are flagged as “quality B” redshift measurements. Sources were selected for follow-up based on target visibility, chances of success given optical magnitude and instrument characteristics, and where possible higher probability counterparts were chosen. However, many targets were included in telescope observing programs as filler targets and thus the selection is not completely uniform.

Based on the spectroscopic redshift measurements, 492/550 NSS80 sources are extragalactic and 58 are Galactic. The extragalactic sources are classified through visual inspection of the flux-calibrated spectra into the following general classes, and subsets can be selected from the primary catalog using the *Classification* column (see Table 4):

- **Broad line object (BL)** if any permitted line is significantly broader than the forbidden lines, or if a single line measurement for our quality “B” spectra satisfies the standard definition of a broad-line, i.e.,  $FWHM \geq 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  (measured in IRAF);
- **Narrow line object (NL)** if the permitted lines are of similar width to the narrow forbidden lines;
- **Galaxy (Gxy)** if only absorption lines are detected.

Based on this simple classification scheme, we find that 58% (284/492) are BL AGN, 39% (194/492) are NL objects and 2% (10/492) are galaxies (Gxy); see Figure 16. We also classify 1/492 source as a galaxy cluster (GC1str; NuSTARJ132535-3825.6) and 3/492 sources have redshift measurements obtained from the literature, but lack spectroscopic classification. We append the optical classification with a “?” symbol for 29 sources (12 BL? + 17 NL?) where it is ambiguous whether the permitted lines are broad or not. Regardless of the optical classification, the vast majority of the sources are expected to be AGN due to the detection of X-ray emission at high X-ray energies of  $> 3 \text{ keV}$ , which is further confirmed for most sources by the identification of strong optical emission lines often superimposed on a



**Figure 17.** Multi-wavelength imaging of the luminous X-ray hotspot in 4C 74.26 (e.g., Erlund et al. 2010), the primary *NuSTAR* science target. The hotspot, which coincides with a radio-bright lobe of 4C 74.26, is detected with both lower-energy (i.e., *Chandra*, *XMM-Newton* and *Swift-XRT*) and hard X-ray observatories such as *NuSTAR*.

power-law spectrum. The 58 Galactic sources are not classified here but based on the NSS40 results, they are likely to include, for example, cataclysmic variables, X-ray binaries, and active stars; 40% (23/58) of the Galactic sources are at low Galactic latitudes ( $|b| < 10^\circ$ ). The number of Galactic *NuSTAR* sources has increased by a factor of  $\sim 3$  from the NSS40 to the NSS80 catalog. These sources will be further investigated through an additional follow-up campaign (see e.g., Tomsick et al. 2018, for a study of the L17 Galactic sources). There are also 43 NSS80 targets which we followed-up, but failed to obtain a reliable redshift measurement. For all these cases a faint (often red) continuum is detected, one of which is a *Fermi* BL Lac candidate (NuSTARJ081003-7527.2) with a featureless power-law spectrum (Ackermann et al. 2016). Possible reasons for the lack of spectroscopic identifications for these sources are given in Section 3.3.4. Finally, the remaining source (NuSTARJ204256+7503.1) is a hotspot associated with the primary *NuSTAR* science target 4C 74.26, a radio quasar at  $z = 0.104$  (e.g., Erlund et al. 2007, 2010). Figure 17 shows multi-wavelength imaging of the *NuSTAR*-detected hotspot at a projected distance of  $\sim 580$  kpc from the quasar. Hence, in total, there are 594 unique source entries in the NSS80 spectroscopic catalog given in Table 15.

In addition to the unique spectroscopic entries, we obtained spectra for a further 18 cases where two potential optical/IR counterparts were identified – this gives a total of 612 entries in the NSS80 spectroscopic catalog (i.e., 18 *NuSTAR* sources have duplicate entries to capture information for both targeted counterparts). Notably, among these there are 6 sources with companions (i.e., in pairs with  $\Delta z < 0.1$ ): three AGN pairs, two AGN-galaxy (AGN-Gxy) pairs, and one galaxy pair. In Figure 18 optical spectra of the three AGN pairs are shown (the main target spectra are plotted in black and their companions in peach), and Figure 19 show the two AGN-galaxy pairs and the galaxy-galaxy pair. We also show the spectra of a candidate source pair (NuSTARJ020614+6449.3) at low Galactic latitude, for which both sources only have a faint, red continuum detected. The source information for these systems is provided in Table 7. For the three AGN and two AGN-galaxy-pairs the projected physical distances are in the range  $\sim 15$ –160 kpc. These include:

**Table 7.** Source information for the three AGN pairs, two AGN-Gxy pairs, one galaxy pair, and one pair of unknown type.


NSS80 name	NSS80 field	<i>NuSTAR</i> detection	$z$	$L_{10-40\text{keV}}$ ( $\text{erg s}^{-1}$ )	PFlag	Pair type	Angular distance (arcsec)	Physical distance (kpc)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
NuSTARJ054231+6054.4	BY_Cam	S+H+F	0.257	$4.07 \times 10^{44}$	0	NLAGN + NLAGN	4.7	19.1
NuSTARJ091534+4054.6	NGC_2785	F	1.298	$6.41 \times 10^{44}$	0	BLAGN + BLAGN	16.3	138.6
NuSTARJ120530+1649.9	IRAS12032p1707	S+H+F	0.216	$2.37 \times 10^{43}$	1	BLAGN + NLAGN	45.5	159.4
NuSTARJ022742+3331.5	CXOJ022727d5p333443	S+H+F	0.09	$6.33 \times 10^{42}$	0	NLAGN + NL	8.9	15.1
NuSTARJ184552+8428.2	1RXSJ184642d2p842506	S+H+F	0.233	$4.92 \times 10^{43}$	1	NLAGN + Gxy	8.1	30.3
NuSTARJ021454-6425.9	RBS0295	F	0.068	$1.21 \times 10^{42}$	1	Gxy + Gxy	22.2	29.04
NuSTARJ020614+6449.3	3C 58	F	–	–	–	Unknown	1.99	–

NOTE— COLUMNS: **(1)** Unique *NuSTAR* source name. **(2)** Object name for the primary science target of the *NuSTAR* observation(s), i.e., the field name. **(3)** The energy bands for which the source is detected: soft (S; 3–8 keV), hard (H; 8–24 keV), and full (F; 3–24 keV) bands. **(4)** The spectroscopic redshift of the *NuSTAR* source. **(5)** The rest-frame 10–40 keV luminosity; see Figure 26. **(6)** A binary flag indicating sources that show evidence for being associated with the primary science target of their respective *NuSTAR* observations, according to the definition  $\Delta(z) < 0.05 cz$ . **(7)** The type of sources for each pair: BLAGN refers to quasars, NLAGN to narrow-line AGN (from BPT diagnostics), NL to narrow-line objects (e.g., star forming galaxies), and Gxy to galaxies (absorption lines only). **(8)** The angular distance for each pair. **(9)** The projected physical distance for each pair.


- **NuSTARJ054231+6054.4**, a dual AGN system at  $z = 0.257$ , comprising a pair of likely merging, obscured AGN (in X-rays, there is lower-energy X-ray coverage with *Swift*-XRT but no detection; in optical, their spectra show only narrow lines). The term dual AGN refers to a system where two AGN at the same redshift are identified at a small separation angle. Koss et al. (2016) reported on the first dual AGN identified with *NuSTAR*, i.e., SWIFTJ2028.5+2543 – a system where both nuclei are heavily obscured to Compton thick ( $N_{\text{H}} \approx (1 - 2) \times 10^{24} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ ).
- **NuSTARJ091534+4054.6**, a BL AGN pair at  $z = 1.298$ , comprising two closely associated quasars;
- **NuSTARJ120530+1649.9**, an AGN pair including a BL AGN (WISEAJ120530.63+164941.4; Ahn et al. 2012; Toba et al. 2014) and a NL AGN at  $z = 0.217$ . This pair is at the same redshift as the primary *NuSTAR* science target (WISEAJ120547.71+165107.9; Darling & Giovanelli 2006) and is, therefore, associated with the luminous IR galaxy (see Table 8).
- **NuSTARJ022742+3331.5**, an AGN-Gxy pair at  $z = 0.09$  which is composed of a “borderline” NL AGN and a star-forming galaxy (confirmed by BPT diagnostics). The NL AGN is detected in all three *NuSTAR* bands;
- **NuSTARJ184552+8428.2**, an AGN-Gxy pair at  $z = 0.233$  comprising a NL AGN and an early-type galaxy companion, which are in the same halo as the *NuSTAR* science target (see Table 8). The NL AGN is detected in all three *NuSTAR* bands with a soft band luminosity of  $L_{3-8\text{keV}} = 1.91 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ , indicating that it is indeed an X-ray AGN.

The galaxy pair (NuSTARJ021454-6425.9) is comprised of a galaxy at  $z = 0.068$  and a galaxy companion at  $z = 0.075$ ; the latter is associated with the primary *NuSTAR* science target (RBS0295; Schwope et al. 2000); see Table 8. The pair of sources are undetected in the *NuSTAR* soft and hard energy bands with a full band luminosity of  $L_{3-24\text{keV}} = 1.52 \times 10^{42} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  which may be a spurious detection, considering also its low *NuSTAR* detection probability [ $\log(P_{\text{false,min}}) \sim -6.2$ ] and lack of a lower-energy X-ray identification.


The 18 additional spectroscopic entries also include four sources that could potentially be the correct counterparts rather than the one selected in the unique catalog entry; see Figure 20. Three are fainter lower-energy X-ray sources [(a)–(c)] nominally closer to the *NuSTAR* source than the selected (X-ray brighter) BL counterpart. The correct counterpart for the remaining source (d) is the choice between an optically bright NL AGN ( $z = 0.036$ ) associated with the BAT-detected primary *NuSTAR* science target (LEDA178130; Jones et al. 2004, 2009; Lansbury et al. 2017b; Koss et al. 2022), or a NL galaxy ( $z = 0.137$ ) 12.5'' from the NWAY-selected NL AGN, which lacks a lower-energy X-ray



**Figure 18.** Optical spectra for the three NSS80 AGN pairs: (a) a dual AGN system of merging, obscured AGN, (b) a BL AGN (i.e., quasar) pair, and a (c) BL AGN + NL AGN pair. For each source pair the two spectra are plotted in the left panel and a  $30'' \times 30''$  Pan-STARRS (or DECam for sources with declinations  $< -25^\circ$ ) *i*-band image centred on the *NuSTAR* position is shown on the right. **Spectrum panel:** Shown on the top are the unique *NuSTAR* ID and source name, in the upper left corner the observing telescope and run identification number (corresponding to Table 6), and in the upper right corner the source classification and redshift. Sky subtraction has been performed, but some features may remain: for example the 7600 Å absorption feature. **Image panel:** All *WISE* detections are shown with ‘X’ marks, color-coded in  $W1 - W2$  colors: non-AGN like sources with  $W1 - W2 < 0.8$  (green), AGN-like sources with  $W1 - W2 > 0.8$  (red), and non-AGN like sources based on the  $W1 - W2$  color, but with a bright  $W3$  detection (peach). The *NuSTAR* 25'' and 30'' error circles are plotted in a dash-dotted and a solid black line, respectively. The lower energy X-ray position is marked with a blue cross and the respective error circle, the CatWISE20 position is indicated with a green crosshair, a *WISE* color-coded star and a green 2.7'' error circle, the PS1-DR2 position is shown with a purple 2'' error circle, and the spectroscopically observed pair of sources are marked with a red and a peach crosshair corresponding to the spectrum (black and peach).



**Figure 19.** Optical spectra for the two AGN-Gxy pairs [(a)+(b)], one galaxy pair (c), and one pair of sources of unknown type (d). The spectroscopically observed pair of sources are marked with a red and a peach crosshair corresponding to the spectrum (black and peach), or a red and a green crosshair if one of the sources is the CatWISE20 counterpart. See Figure 18 for the symbol key.



**Figure 20.** Optical spectra for the NSS80 sources with two counterpart candidates. Three of the four candidates [(a)–(c)] are fainter lower-energy X-ray sources nominally closer to the *NuSTAR* source than the selected (X-ray brighter) BL counterpart. The correct counterpart for the remaining source (d) is either an optically bright NL AGN ( $z = 0.036$ ) associated with the BAT-detected primary *NuSTAR* science target or a NL galaxy ( $z = 0.137$ ) which lacks a lower-energy X-ray counterpart. See Figure 18 for the symbol key.

**Table 8.** NSS80 sources which show evidence for being associated with the primary *NuSTAR* science target according to the definition  $\Delta(cz) < 0.05 cz$ .

Serendip Name (1)	Serendip Type (2)	$z_{\text{serendip}}$ (3)	Primary Target (4)	Primary Type (5)	$z_{\text{target}}$ (6)	BASS (7)
NuSTARJ002544+6818.8	NL	0.012	LEDA136991	Sy2	0.012	1
NuSTARJ010736-1732.3	NL	0.021	IC1623	GPair	0.02	0
NuSTARJ012215+5002.2	-	0.021	MCG+8-3-18	Sy2	0.021	1
NuSTARJ021454-6425.9	Gxy	0.075	RBS295	Sy1	0.074	1
NuSTARJ024144+0512.3	NL	0.07	IRAS02394+0457	Sy2	0.07	1
NuSTARJ035902-3011.7	NL	0.093	SARS059.33488-30.34397	Sy1.9	0.097	1
NuSTARJ040702+0346.8	NL	0.088	3C105	Sy2	0.088	1
NuSTARJ050559-2349.9	NL	0.036	LEDA178130	Sy2	0.035	1
NuSTARJ054349-5536.7	BL	0.272	WISEJ054357.21-553207.5	QSO	0.273	0
NuSTARJ065805-5601.2	NL?	0.296	Bullet Cluster	GxyCluster	0.296	1
NuSTARJ065842-5550.2	NL	0.297	Bullet Cluster	GxyCluster	0.296	0
NuSTARJ071422+3523.9	NL	0.015	MCG+6-16-28	Sy2	0.015	1
NuSTARJ120530+1649.9	BL	0.216	WISEAJ120547.71+165107.9	LIRG	0.218	0
NuSTARJ125442-2657.1	Gxy	0.058	CTS18	Sy1.2	0.059	1
NuSTARJ151253-8124.3	NL	0.069	2MASXJ15144217-8123377	Sy1.2	0.069	1
NuSTARJ165105-0129.4	NL	0.041	2MASXJ16510578-0129258	Sy2	0.04	1
NuSTARJ184552+8428.2	NL	0.233	1RXSJ184642.2+842506	Sy1	0.225	1
NuSTARJ190813-3925.7	Gxy	0.075	IGRJ19077-3925	Sy1	0.075	1
NuSTARJ224536+3947.1	NL	0.081	3C452	Sy2	0.081	1

NOTE— COLUMNS: **(1)** The unique NSS80 name for each serendipitous source. **(2)** Spectroscopic classification of the NSS80 serendipitous source. **(3)** Spectroscopic redshift of the NSS80 serendipitous source obtained with our follow-up campaign. **(4)** The primary *NuSTAR* science target name. **(5)** Source type of the *NuSTAR* science target name. **(6)** Redshift of the *NuSTAR* science target. **(7)** A binary flag indicating *NuSTAR* science targets which are BASS DR2 sources (Koss et al. 2022).

counterpart; the former takes preference of being the correct counterpart to the NSS80 source since it is a confirmed AGN. These sources will be further investigated through our multi-wavelength follow-up campaign.

In addition to the 550 spectroscopically confirmed redshifts, we also obtained photometric redshifts from the literature for an additional 7 NSS80 sources (from Salvato et al. 2009; Richards et al. 2009; Bilicki et al. 2014; Masini et al. 2020); flagged as “quality C” redshift measurements in the catalog and we append the optical classification with a “C”. We exclude these 7 sources with phot- $z$  measurements from any redshift-dependent analysis given the larger uncertainty on phot- $z$  measurements. Overall the current spectroscopic completeness for the primary NSS80 catalog is 43% (550/1274); this improves to 52% (508/981) for sources at high Galactic latitudes ( $|b| > 10^\circ$ ). Further on-going optical spectroscopic campaigns will increase the spectroscopic completeness of the NSS80, in addition to further lower-energy X-ray observations to improve the number of sources with reliable lower-energy X-ray counterparts.

For all *NuSTAR* sources with spectroscopic identifications, we assign an “associated” flag to those that have a velocity offset from the science target smaller than 5% of the total science target velocity, i.e.,  $\Delta(cz) < 0.05 cz$ , following L17. Based on this, 19 spec- $z$  NSS80 sources show evidence for being associated with the primary *NuSTAR* science target and are, therefore, excluded from any subsequent analysis. Table 8 provides source information for these serendipitous sources and their associated *NuSTAR* science target (of which 15 are BASS DR2 sources; see Koss et al. 2022).

### 3.3.4. Comparison between confirmed spectroscopic and NWAY identified AGN

A significant fraction of the optical spectroscopic follow-up programme was based on the approach outlined in L17 using closest counterparts for lower-energy X-ray sources and/or counterparts with AGN-like MIR properties from *WISE*. Here we investigate how the optical counterpart identified from that approach compares to that found using the NWAY approach described in Section 3.2. We note that a disagreement between the counterparts does not necessarily mean that the incorrect counterpart was followed-up; due to the probabilistic approach of NWAY the ‘best’ selected counterpart will not always be the true one (see discussion of false probabilities in Section 3.2). For example, the clear identification of AGN signatures in the optical spectrum provides compelling evidence that the correct optical source

was followed-up, given the low probability of selecting a clear optical AGN by chance. Therefore, to provide easy access to the IR/optical counterpart information (i.e., magnitudes), we include binary flags in the catalog (NWAY\_CatWISE, NWAY\_PS1) indicating whether the spectroscopic target position matches to the NWAY-identified CatWISE20 and PS1-DR2 counterparts. In total, 515/594 unique spectroscopic targets (Section 3.3.3) coincide with the CatWISE20 positions, and 388/594 with the NWAY-identified PS1-DR2 positions.

To assist in the interpretation of our results in Section 4, we classify the spectroscopically classified sources as either reliable or uncertain (see Cpart\_RFlag in Appendix A). The majority of the reliable sources will have positional offsets of  $< 5''$ , mostly assisted by the identification of lower-energy X-ray counterparts, while the majority of the uncertain sources will have larger positional offsets (see Appendix D). However, as our previous analysis was limited to using catalogued data it will not take into account potential anomalies such as the presence of nearby bright sources, close-separation systems, and image artifacts. We therefore supplemented our analyses with a visual inspection of all spectroscopically-targeted NSS80 sources using the detailed optical finding charts; see Appendix E.1 for the post-NSS40 finding charts (and optical spectra) and Appendix E.2 for the NSS40 finding charts.<sup>27</sup>

Overall, on the basis of the combination of these analyses, we determined 91% (449/492) of the spectroscopically classified extragalactic sources to be reliable (274 BLs + 166 NLs); only 13/449 sources fail our high probability cut defined in Section 3.2, mostly due to the lack of lower-energy X-ray or MIR information. The remaining 43 sources are flagged as uncertain (13 of which do not have any NWAY matches satisfying our high probability cut), either due to source confusion as a result of high source density, multiple potential counterpart associations, or shallow IR/optical coverage. Of the 58 spectroscopically classified Galactic objects, we identify 30 as reliable spectroscopic counterparts (28 of which satisfy the NWAY high probability cut) and flagged the other 28 as uncertain. We note that counterpart identification is more challenging in these cases (see e.g., Tomsick et al. 2018). We use this reliable spectroscopic sample for our science analysis in Section 4, unless otherwise indicated.

In Figure 21 we show  $r$ -band magnitude distributions for the reliable optical NSS80 sources (i.e. those satisfying our NWAY high probability cut; light purple), overlaid with the NSS80 sources with reliable spectroscopic classifications (purple). Of the 958 high probability counterparts, 721 sources have available constrained  $r$ -band magnitudes with a mean magnitude of  $\langle r_{\text{NWAY}} \rangle = 19.73$ . Of the 492 extragalactic NSS80 sources, 399 are flagged as reliable (based on our visual comparison between the NWAY identified counterpart and the spectroscopic target) and have available constrained  $r$ -magnitudes (excluding 19 sources with evidence for being associated with the *NuSTAR* targets for their respective observations): 261 BLs, 132 NLs and 6 other sources (four galaxies and 2 unclassified), with average magnitudes of  $\langle r_{\text{BL}} \rangle = 19.53$ ,  $\langle r_{\text{NL}} \rangle = 19.3$  and  $\langle r_{\text{Other}} \rangle = 16.58$ , respectively. Overall, our spectroscopic campaign is targeting the majority of the sources (in terms of  $r$ -band magnitude) but misses the faintest sources.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section we exploit the X-ray data, multi-wavelength data, and optical spectroscopy to characterise the properties of the NSS80 sources. The basic X-ray properties of the extragalactic NSS80 sources (see selection in Table 4) are given in Section 4.1 while in Section 4.2 we explore the MIR colors of these sources. In Section 4.3 we investigate the optical properties of the NSS80 AGN, with particular focus on quasars, utilizing detailed composite spectra to explore the origin of their observed optical colors.


### 4.1. X-ray characteristics of the NSS80 sources

#### 4.1.1. *NuSTAR* source counts, count rates & fluxes

Altogether there are 1274 NSS80 sources with significant detections in at least one *NuSTAR* energy band – a factor of three improvement over that of NSS40 reported in L17. Similarly to other *NuSTAR* surveys (e.g., Civano et al. 2015; Mullaney et al. 2015; Lansbury et al. 2017b; Masini et al. 2020), 32% (412/1274) of the sample is detected in the 8-24 keV band, which is unique to *NuSTAR* amongst focusing X-ray observatories.

The basic properties of the NSS80 sources are given in Table 9. We find a large range ( $\sim 6$ –1700 ks) in the net exposure time per source for the combined telescopes FPMA+B (cleaned and vignetting-corrected;  $t_{\text{net}}$ ), with a median of  $\sim 80$  ks. For the sources with detections in the 3 – 8 keV, 8 – 24 keV, and 3 – 24 keV bands the lowest (deblended) net source counts ( $S_{\text{net}}$ ) are 12, 11, and 19, respectively. The source with the highest  $S_{\text{net}}$  in all three energy bands is still *NuSTAR* J043727–4711.5, a BL AGN at  $z = 0.051$ , as reported in L17, with  $S_{\text{net}}$  values of 11,337,

<sup>27</sup> The individual spectroscopic data for each followed-up NSS80 source will be made available at <https://www.nustar.caltech.edu/page/59>.



**Figure 21.** *Top panel:*  $r$ -band magnitude distributions for the high probability NSS80 sources (i.e., adopted optical counterparts satisfying our NWAY probability cut) with constrained  $r$ -magnitudes (721/953; light purple), overlaid with the constrained  $r$ -band magnitude distribution of the spectroscopically-classified extragalactic (399/492) and Galactic (24/58) NSS80 sources with reliable counterpart associations shown in filled purple and white, purple-edged histograms, respectively. The 19 sources with evidence for being associated with the *NuSTAR* science targets for their respective observations are excluded. *Bottom panel:* The  $r$ -magnitude distribution separated by spectroscopic classification: BL objects are shown in blue, NL objects are shown in green, and “Other” (including 4 galaxies and 2 unclassified sources) are shown in peach. The vertical lines mark the median  $r$ -magnitude for the respective subsamples. Overall the current spectroscopic completeness for the primary NSS80 catalog is 43% (550/1274), missing the faintest sources; this improves to 52% (508/981) for sources at high Galactic latitudes,  $|b| > 10^\circ$ .

6,653 and 17,943 counts, respectively. The median  $S_{\text{net}}$  values in the respective bands are 62, 67, and 82, respectively. Finally, we find a range in the net count rates of 0.09–37.1, 0.07–44.3, and 0.12–72.2  $\text{ks}^{-1}$ , and median values of 0.8, 0.8, and 1.04  $\text{ks}^{-1}$  for the soft, hard and full band energies, respectively.

The flux distributions of detected and undetected NSS80 sources for a given band are shown in Figure 22 in comparison to the NSS40 flux distributions. The faintest fluxes are  $6.65$  and  $9.93 \times 10^{-15} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$  for detected sources in the 3–8 keV and 8–24 keV bands, respectively, and  $1.15 \times 10^{-14} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$  for full-band source-detections. The brightest fluxes in the NSS80 catalog correspond to two sources: NuSTARJ043727-4711.5, a BL AGN at  $z = 0.051$ , with a soft band flux of  $2.49 \times 10^{-12} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ , and NuSTARJ153602-5749.0, a Galactic source ( $z = 0$ ), with hard and full band fluxes of  $6.15$  and  $6.79 \times 10^{-12} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ , respectively. The source with the brightest flux in L17,

**Table 9.** X-ray characteristics of the NSS80 sources with significant detections in the soft (3 – 8 keV), hard (8 – 24 keV) and full (3 – 24 keV) bands, respectively. The listed data include the minimum, maximum and median values for the net exposure times ( $t_{\text{net}}$ ; ks), the net source counts ( $S_{\text{net}}$  counts), the net count rates ( $\text{CTRT}_{\text{net}}$ ;  $\text{ks}^{-1}$ ), and the X-ray fluxes. The Median Absolute Deviation (MAD) is taken as the uncertainty on the median values.

<i>NuSTAR</i> energy band	$t_{\text{net,min}}$ (ks)	$t_{\text{net,max}}$ (ks)	$\langle t_{\text{net}} \rangle$ (ks)
3 – 8 keV	7.6	1657.4	79.8
8 – 24 keV	6.1	1617.9	76.4
3 – 24 keV	8.9	1656.4	78.3
	$S_{\text{net,min}}$ (counts)	$S_{\text{net,max}}$ (counts)	$\langle S_{\text{net}} \rangle$ (counts)
3 – 8 keV	12 ± 7	11,337 ± 114	62 ± 45
8 – 24 keV	11 ± 5	6,653 ± 88	67 ± 48
3 – 24 keV	19 ± 29	17,943 ± 143	82 ± 55
	$\text{CTRT}_{\text{net,min}}$ ( $\text{ks}^{-1}$ )	$\text{CTRT}_{\text{net,max}}$ ( $\text{ks}^{-1}$ )	$\langle \text{CTRT}_{\text{net}} \rangle$ ( $\text{ks}^{-1}$ )
3 – 8 keV	0.09 ± 0.04	37.1 ± 0.4	0.8 ± 0.5
8 – 24 keV	0.07 ± 0.03	44.3 ± 1.3	0.8 ± 0.6
3 – 24 keV	0.12 ± 0.05	72.2 ± 1.6	1.04 ± 0.7
	$\text{Flux}_{\text{X,min}}$ ( $\text{erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}$ )	$\text{Flux}_{\text{X,max}}$ ( $\text{erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}$ )	$\langle \text{Flux}_{\text{X}} \rangle$ ( $\text{erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}$ )
3 – 8 keV	$(6.65 \pm 2.68) \times 10^{-15}$	$(2.49 \pm 0.025) \times 10^{-12}$	$(5.18 \pm 3.56) \times 10^{-14}$
8 – 24 keV	$(9.93 \pm 4.07) \times 10^{-15}$	$(6.15 \pm 0.17) \times 10^{-12}$	$(11.31 \pm 7.86) \times 10^{-14}$
3 – 24 keV	$(11.55 \pm 4.43) \times 10^{-15}$	$(6.79 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-12}$	$(9.82 \pm 6.83) \times 10^{-14}$

NuSTARJ075800+3920.4 (BL AGN at  $z = 0.095$ ) is recorded in our secondary NSS80 catalog,<sup>28</sup> with soft, hard, and full band fluxes of 3.50, 4.99, and  $8.8 \times 10^{-12} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ ; the median fluxes in the NSS80 catalog are  $(5.18 \pm 3.56)$ ,  $(11.31 \pm 7.86)$ , and  $(9.82 \pm 6.83) \times 10^{-14} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ , respectively. The serendipitous survey pushes to fluxes  $\sim$  two orders of magnitude fainter than those achieved by previous-generation hard X-ray observatories such as *INTEGRAL* (e.g., Malizia et al. 2012) and *Swift*-BAT (Oh et al. 2018); see Section 4.1.3.


#### 4.1.2. Band Ratios

In obscured objects, as optical depth increases with decreasing energy, relatively larger numbers of hard X-ray photons are detected in comparison to soft X-rays due to the preferential obscuration of lower-energy X-ray emission due to photoelectric absorption. With its capability of focusing high-energy photons, *NuSTAR* is well-suited to categorise the obscured population of AGN and to search for heavily obscured sources of up to Compton-thick (CT;  $N_{\text{H}} \gtrsim 1.5 \times 10^{24} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ ) levels of obscuration (e.g., Marchesi et al. 2018, 2019; Torres-Albà et al. 2021a; Zhao et al. 2021a). The ratio in count rates between the hard and soft X-ray bands, defined as the band ratio, is indicative of the amount of intrinsic obscuration along the line of sight to the nucleus of an X-ray emitting source and can, therefore, be used as a basic estimate of the amount of obscuration to (crudely) identify CT sources from their extreme band ratios. This technique has been successfully demonstrated in several previous *NuSTAR* studies (e.g., Gandhi et al. 2014; Baloković et al. 2014; Lansbury et al. 2017a; Torres-Albà et al. 2021b), and we use this definition in this work for consistency with the literature.

Figure 23 shows the 8 – 24 keV to 3 – 8 keV band ratios ( $\text{BR}_{\text{Nu}}$ ) for the NSS80 sample<sup>29</sup> as a function of the 3 – 24 keV (full band) count rate (CTRT). In order to examine the results for extragalactic sources only, we remove sources which are spectroscopically confirmed as having  $z = 0$  and exclude sources with Galactic latitudes below  $|b| = 10^\circ$ , for which there is significant contamination to the non-spectroscopically identified sample from Galactic sources. A large variation in  $\text{BR}_{\text{Nu}}$  is observed across the sample corresponding to spectral slopes (applying to a single absorbed power law model with fixed Galactic  $N_{\text{H}}$ ) ranging from  $\Gamma_{\text{eff}} \approx 3$  (at the softest values) to  $\Gamma_{\text{eff}} \approx -0.5$  (at the hardest values).

<sup>28</sup> Flagged with our optical masking as within the radius of an Abell cluster.

<sup>29</sup>  $\text{BR}_{\text{Nu}}$  is calculated as in Lansbury et al. (2017b). Where both hard and soft count rates have defined values, uncertainties are propagated as standard. Where one is an upper limit, the resulting  $\text{BR}_{\text{Nu}}$  is thus an upper/lower limit and if both are upper limits the value is undefined. These are flagged as described in Appendix A.




**Figure 22.** *NuSTAR* flux distributions in the soft (top), hard (middle), and full (bottom) energy bands for the NSS40 (blue) and NSS80 (green) samples. For each band, the filled histogram shows the flux distribution for sources independently detected in that band (the number of these sources,  $N_{\text{det}}$ , is indicated in the upper right corner), and the open histogram shows the distribution of flux upper limits for sources undetected in that band, but independently detected in at least one other band ( $N_{\text{undet}}$ ).

To include weak and non-detections in the NSS80 catalog, we also calculate “stacked” medians in  $\text{BR}_{\text{Nu}}$  per count rate (in bins of  $1 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) by summing the net count rates of all NSS40 (blue-edged diamonds) and NSS80 (green-edged circles) sources. The results are consistent with a flat relation in the average band ratio versus count rate, and a constant average effective photon index of  $\Gamma_{\text{eff}} \approx 1.5$ , suggesting at least modest amounts of obscuration on average within the sample (compared to  $\Gamma_{\text{eff}} \sim 1.8$  for typical unobscured sources; see e.g., Ricci et al. 2017). Furthermore, we find no evidence of a relationship between band ratio and count rate in the higher energy 3–24 keV band, as found by previous studies at  $< 10 \text{ keV}$  (e.g., Della Ceca et al. 1999; Mushotzky et al. 2000; Alexander et al. 2003). The absence of such a trend may partly be attributed to the fact that X-ray spectra of AGN are less strongly affected by absorption in the high-energy *NuSTAR* band.

When using the  $\text{BR}_{\text{Nu}}$  alone to identify obscured AGN, additional knowledge of the source is required to estimate the absorbing column density ( $N_{\text{H}}$ ), as key spectral features (e.g., the photoelectric absorption cut-off) are shifted across the observed energy band for sources at different redshifts. Therefore, potentially highly obscured AGN can be identified using the  $\text{BR}_{\text{Nu}}$  values complemented by the source’s redshift information, as demonstrated in Lansbury et al. (2017a). The  $\text{BR}_{\text{Nu}}$  values as a function of redshift are plotted for the spectroscopically-identified NSS80 sample in Figure 24. We plot tracks for a range of column densities ( $N_{\text{H}} = 10^{23-24} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ ) to provide an estimate of the absorbing columns giving rise to the observed band ratios of the NSS80 sources. We find that the majority of extragalactic NSS80 sources ( $z > 0$ ) have  $\text{BR}_{\text{Nu}}$  values in the range of 0.4–1.4, with a median of  $0.8 \pm 0.3$  which breaks down into a median of  $0.7 \pm 0.2$  for the BLs and a slightly higher value of  $0.9 \pm 0.2$  for the NLs (as illustrated with the blue and green histograms, respectively). In comparison to the column density tracks, the majority of the extragalactic NSS80 serendipitous sources have  $N_{\text{H}}$  values of  $< 3 \times 10^{23} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ , with only a minority (14/82 BL and 13/55 NL constrained sources), predominantly at low redshift, with significantly higher absorbing column densities.

We apply the same basic approach to that used in Lansbury et al. (2017a) to identify potentially heavily obscured sources, i.e., a  $\text{BR}_{\text{Nu}} > 1.7$  cut (red dotted line in Figure 24) which corresponds to an effective (i.e., observed) photon index of  $\Gamma_{\text{eff}} \lesssim 0.6$  (motivated by observed CT AGN in other *NuSTAR* programs; e.g., Baloković et al. 2014; Gandhi et al. 2014; Civano et al. 2015; Lansbury et al. 2015). The sample is limited to NSS80 sources with spectroscopic redshifts and constrained  $\text{BR}_{\text{Nu}}$  values (or lower limits). Based on this analysis, 22 sources stand out as CT-candidates:




**Figure 23.** The *NuSTAR* 8–24 to 3–8 keV band ratio ( $BR_{Nu}$ ) versus full band (3–24 keV) count rate for the NSS80 sources. Constrained  $BR_{Nu}$  values are shown in black, and those with upper or lower limits are shown in grey. The dotted horizontal lines indicate the equivalent X-ray spectral slope ( $\Gamma_{eff}$ ) for a given band ratio. Highly obscured NSS40 serendipitous sources (Lansbury et al. 2017a), with  $BR_{Nu}$  values that correspond to  $\Gamma_{eff} < 0.7$ , are marked with red diamonds. The blue diamonds and the green circles show the median  $BR_{Nu}$  value per count rate bin of size  $1 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$  for the NSS40 and NSS80 sources, respectively.

10 sources detected in all three *NuSTAR* bands, 8 with hard- and full band detections and 4 only detected in the hard band. Of these, 7 are reported in Lansbury et al. (2017a), increasing the number of NSS-selected candidate CT AGN by a factor of  $\sim 3$ ; however, the 8<sup>th</sup> source in Lansbury et al. (2017a), *NuSTAR* J165346+3953.7, is undetected in the NSS80 catalog. Note that 3/22 sources show evidence for being associated with the primary *NuSTAR* science target based on  $\Delta(cz) < 0.05 cz$  (see Table 8). The basic properties of these candidate CT AGN are provided in Table 10. The majority (18/22) are spectroscopically classified as NL systems, consistent with expectations for obscured AGN; the other systems are classified as either low-redshift galaxies or BL AGN. We note that  $BR_{Nu}$  provides a crude estimate of the absorbing columns, and a more detailed investigation of the *NuSTAR* spectra and multi-wavelength properties of the 15 newly identified CT-candidates is required to strengthen the interpretation of these high- $BR_{Nu}$  sources as highly absorbed systems and provide significantly improved constraints on the space density of CT AGN (see e.g., Yan et al. 2019). However, based on the X-ray spectral analysis presented in Lansbury et al. (2017a), we expect at least 50% of these candidates to be CT AGN (i.e., at least 4 of the 8 CT-candidates). Importantly, 3 of these 4 systems would not have been identified as candidate CT AGN without *NuSTAR* data.

#### 4.1.3. Redshift-luminosity plane

Overall, on the basis of our optical spectroscopic campaign (described in Section 3.3) we have classified 492 NSS80 sources as extragalactic: 449 of which have reliable counterpart identifications and 43 sources with uncertain counterpart associations based on our NWAY assessment in Section 3.3.4 (which are indicated with white filled symbols in all figures). We exclude from our analysis the 7 additional sources with photometric-redshift measurements from the literature and those with reliable counterparts closely associated with the targets of the *NuSTAR* observations, leaving 433 sources.

The redshift distribution for the 433 extragalactic NSS80 sources with reliable counterpart associations is shown in Figure 25, excluding sources with evidence for being associated with the *NuSTAR* targets for their respective observations (see Table 8). The redshifts cover a large range, from  $z = 0.012 - 3.43$ , with a median of  $\langle z \rangle = 0.56$ . For the 166 extragalactic objects with independent detections in the high-energy band (8–24 keV), to which *NuSTAR* is uniquely sensitive, the median redshift is  $\langle z \rangle = 0.34$ . Roughly comparable numbers of NL and BL objects are identified



**Figure 24.** *NuSTAR* band ratio ( $BR_{\text{Nu}}$ ) versus redshift for the NSS80 sources, color-coded by source classification: Galactic sources ( $z = 0$ ; grey circle), broad emission-line objects (BL; blue circle), narrow emission-line objects (NL; green circle), unclassified sources (peach circle), galaxies (Gxy; peach ‘X’), AGN/galaxy pairs (peach star), dual AGN (purple star), and highly obscured AGN observed in NSS40 (red diamond; Lansbury et al. 2017a). Sources associated with the primary *NuSTAR* science target are excluded.  $BR_{\text{Nu}}$  values with upper or lower limits are faded using the respective classification colors. The dashed lines show tracks for a simple absorbed power law model (assuming  $\Gamma = 1.8$ ) and Galactic absorption of  $N_{\text{H,Gal}} = 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-2}$  for a range of column densities along the line-of-sight to the nucleus. The distribution of constrained band ratios for the full NSS80 sample is shown on the right in faded grey, overlaid with the distribution of the BL (filled blue) and NL (open green) objects. The median constrained band ratio of the NSS80 sample is  $\sim 0.8$ .

for  $z < 1$  (132 and 147, respectively) but comparison of redshift distributions shows a significant difference, with a larger fraction of BL sources found at higher redshifts. This is supported by a larger median redshift for BL sources of  $\langle z \rangle = 0.80$ . This result is not unexpected since BL AGN at a given redshift are typically brighter in the optical band than NL AGN of the same intrinsic luminosity (i.e., the BL AGN are less obscured in the optical); see Figures 21 & 25.

In Figure 26 we show the redshift–luminosity plane for the rest-frame 10–40 keV band, calculated from the observed frame *NuSTAR* fluxes (following the same approach as in L17), assuming an effective photon index of  $\Gamma_{\text{eff}} = 1.8$  (typical of AGN detected by *NuSTAR*; see Alexander et al. 2013)<sup>30</sup>. For comparison, the *Swift*-BAT AGN Spectroscopic Survey (BASS) DR2 (Koss et al. 2022) is plotted with grey crosses. The *Swift*-BAT 14–150 keV fluxes were used to calculate

<sup>30</sup> If we instead choose a photon index closer to the median of this sample the resulting change in luminosity is not large. For example, a decrease in  $\Gamma_{\text{eff}}$  from 1.8 to 1.5 causes a small increase of  $\sim 10\%$  in 10–40 keV luminosity, assuming median redshift and 3–24 keV flux.

**Table 10.** Candidate obscured NSS80 AGN with  $BR_{\text{Nu}} > 1.7$ .


<i>NuSTAR</i> object name	Short name	R.A.	Decl.	Det.	$BR_{\text{Nu}}$	$z_{\text{spec}}$	Type	$L_{10-40\text{keV}}$
(1)	(2)	(°)	(°)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	( $\text{erg s}^{-1}$ )
		(3)	(4)					(9)
NuSTARJ010739-1139.1	J010739	16.914801	-11.65257	F S H	$2.2 \pm 0.5$	0.048	NL	$7.99 \times 10^{42}$
NuSTARJ022951-0856.4	J022951	37.46319	-8.94133	F H	$> 1.8$	0.300	NL	$1.63 \times 10^{43}$
NuSTARJ035951-3009.9	J035951	59.96408	-30.16580	H	$> 2.4$	0.685	NL	$2.85 \times 10^{44}$
*NuSTARJ050559-2349.9	J050559	76.49839	-23.83168	F H	$> 3.8$	0.036	NL	$8.97 \times 10^{41}$
NuSTARJ082303-0502.7	J082303	125.76385	-5.04649	F H	$> 2.0$	0.313	NL	$9.81 \times 10^{43}$
NuSTARJ094910+0022.9	J094910	147.29356	0.38186	F H	$> 3.7$	0.093	NL	$1.63 \times 10^{42}$
NuSTARJ103456+3939.6	J103456	158.73575	39.66031	F S H	$3.3 \pm 0.6$	0.151	NL	$2.41 \times 10^{43}$
NuSTARJ115658+5508.2	J115658	179.24379	55.13830	F H	$> 3.3$	0.080	NL	$7.03 \times 10^{42}$
NuSTARJ141056-4230.0	J141056	212.73727	-42.50139	F S H	$1.9 \pm 0.8$	0.067	NL	$2.48 \times 10^{42}$
NuSTARJ144406+2506.3	J144406	221.02819	25.10514	F H	$> 2.3$	1.539	NL?	$1.05 \times 10^{45}$
NuSTARJ150225-4208.3	J150225	225.60725	-42.13960	F S H	$5.4 \pm 1.2$	0.054	Gxy	$6.18 \times 10^{42}$
NuSTARJ150646+0346.2	J150646	226.69512	3.77105	F S H	$3.6 \pm 0.6$	0.034	NL	$1.37 \times 10^{42}$
*NuSTARJ151253-8124.3	J151253	228.22496	-81.40501	F S H	$1.8 \pm 0.6$	0.069	NL	$9.26 \times 10^{42}$
NuSTARJ153445+2331.5	J153445	233.68763	23.52592	H	$> 3.5$	0.160	NL	$4.82 \times 10^{42}$
NuSTARJ160817+1221.4	J160817	242.07274	12.35752	H	$> 1.9$	0.181	NL	$1.34 \times 10^{43}$
NuSTARJ163126+2357.0	J163126	247.85845	23.95061	F H	$> 1.7$	0.751	BL	$3.97 \times 10^{44}$
*NuSTARJ190813-3925.7	J190813	287.05529	-39.42912	H	$> 3.1$	0.075	Gxy	$2.46 \times 10^{42}$
NuSTARJ194234-1011.9	J194234	295.64177	-10.19846	F S H	$3.2 \pm 1.6$	0.849	NL?	$4.58 \times 10^{44}$
NuSTARJ214320+4334.8	J214320	325.83368	43.58032	F S H	$1.8 \pm 0.2$	0.013	NL	$5.86 \times 10^{41}$
NuSTARJ224225+2942.0	J224225	340.60580	29.70105	F S H	$2.1 \pm 0.7$	0.304	BL	$1.57 \times 10^{43}$
NuSTARJ224925-1917.5	J224925	342.35456	-19.29294	F S H	$1.7 \pm 0.9$	0.445	NL	$3.32 \times 10^{43}$
NuSTARJ231840-4223.0	J231840	349.66942	-42.38454	F H	$> 1.9$	0.464	NL	$9.68 \times 10^{43}$

NOTE—The sources are listed in order of increasing right ascension. The shaded green rows mark the extremely hard NSS40 sources reported in Lansbury et al. (2017a). Note that J150646 is now detected in all three bands, whilst in the 40-month it was only detected in the hard band. COLUMNS: (1) *NuSTAR* serendipitous source name. \*Sources which show evidence for being associated with the primary *NuSTAR* science target according to the definition  $\Delta(cz) < 0.05 cz$ ; see Table 8. (2) Abbreviated *NuSTAR* source name adopted here. (3) and (4) *NuSTAR* right ascension and declination J2000 coordinates in decimal degrees. (5) The *NuSTAR* energy bands for which the source is independently detected. F, S, and H correspond to the full (3 – 24 keV), soft (3 – 8 keV), and hard (8 – 24 keV) bands, respectively. (6) *NuSTAR* photometric band ratio. (7) Source spectroscopic redshift obtained from emission-line fitting in IRAF or by matching the observed flux calibrated input spectra (FITS file format) against a library of stellar, galaxy and AGN templates available in the MARZ web application; see Section 3.3.3. All redshifts are robust, except for J144406 and J194234 where fewer lines (or low S/N lines) are identified, and J050559 which has two candidate soft X-ray and *WISE* counterparts. (8) Source spectroscopic classification. (9) Non-absorption-corrected, rest-frame 10 – 40 keV luminosity.

$L_{10-40\text{keV}}$  values assuming an effective photon index of  $\Gamma_{\text{eff}} = 2.0$  for the  $K$ -correction factor (using the median slope of 2). As can be seen, the NSS80 sources span the knee of the X-ray luminosity function out to  $z \approx 1$  (Aird et al. 2015), as opposed to  $z \approx 0.1$  for the *Swift*-BAT AGN.

Of the 433 extragalactic NSS80 sources with reliable counterpart associations, 99% (427/433) are within the luminosity range of  $L_{10-40\text{keV}} \approx 10^{42} - 10^{46} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ , with a median luminosity of  $1.2 \times 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . These values are consistent with the NSS40 catalog. The faintest source in the L17 sample, however, with  $L_{10-40\text{keV}} = 1.0 \times 10^{39} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ , is recorded in the secondary NSS80 catalog (see Section 2.3 and Appendix B), since the NL AGN at  $z = 0.002$  is hosted by the galaxy IC750. Hence, the least luminous source in the primary NSS80 catalog is NuSTAR J010736-1732.3 (NL AGN at  $z = 0.021$ ) with  $L_{10-40\text{keV}} = 2.6 \times 10^{40} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . As in L17, the source at the other extreme end in luminosity is NuSTAR J052531-4557.8: a radio-bright BL AGN at  $z = 1.479$  with  $L_{10-40\text{keV}} = 8.8 \times 10^{45} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ , also classified as a blazar in the literature (e.g., Massaro et al. 2009) which means that the X-ray luminosity may be inflated by beaming effects. The most distant source detected is still the optically unobscured quasar, NuSTAR J232728+0849.3 at a  $z = 3.43$ , reported in the NSS40.

We also compare to the luminosity-redshift plane of BASS, as shown in Figure 26. The *Swift*-BAT and *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey are complementary to one another, with the former providing a statistical sample of AGN in the nearby universe ( $z < 0.1$ ) selected in hard X-rays, and the latter providing its counterpart for the distant universe. Consequently there is little overlap between the two surveys, which sample different regions of the  $L_x$ - $z$  parameter



**Figure 25.** Redshift distribution for the 433 spectroscopically identified extragalactic NSS80 sources with reliable counterpart identifications (light purple), excluding 19 sources with evidence for being associated with the *NuSTAR* targets for their respective observations. *Left panel:* The distribution for the subset of NSS80 sources which are independently detected in the hard band (8–24 keV; dark purple). *Right panel:* The redshift distribution separated by spectroscopic classification: BL objects are shown in blue, NL objects are shown in green, and “Other” (including four galaxies and two unclassified sources) are shown in peach. The vertical lines mark the median redshifts for the respective subsamples.

space, with the exception of four *NuSTAR* sources outlying in Figure 26 which have very high fluxes at the detection threshold of *Swift*-BAT (all BASS detected):


- **NuSTAR J043727-4711.5:** a BL AGN at  $z = 0.051$ ;  $L_{10-40\text{keV}} = 2.5 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ .
- **NuSTAR J091912+5527.8:** a NL AGN at  $z = 0.049$ ;  $L_{10-40\text{keV}} = 2.0 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ .
- **NuSTAR J103135-4206.0:** a NL AGN at  $z = 0.061$ ;  $L_{10-40\text{keV}} = 2.2 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ .
- **NuSTAR J180958-4552.6:** a (beamed) BL AGN at  $z = 0.07$ ;  $L_{10-40\text{keV}} = 2.8 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ .

Overall, the *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey provides the higher-redshift component of *Swift*-BAT and fills out the broadest range of luminosities and redshifts in comparison to other *NuSTAR* surveys, e.g., the *NuSTAR*-ECDFS survey (Mullaney et al. 2015), *NuSTAR*-COSMOS survey (Civano et al. 2015) and *NuSTAR*-UDS (Masini et al. 2018).

In the following sections we further explore the optical and MIR properties of the extragalactic NSS80 sources.

#### 4.2. MIR properties of the NSS80 AGN

The MIR emission from AGN is typically due to the reprocessing of accretion-disc radiation by circumnuclear dust, and suffers little extinction relative to other wavelengths (e.g. Nishiyama et al. 2008; Netzer 2015; Hickox & Alexander 2018); however, a non-negligible fraction can also be produced by star formation in the host galaxy (e.g. Stern et al. 2005; Hickox & Alexander 2018). Color selections using the *WISE* telescope bands ( $3.4 \mu\text{m}$ ,  $4.6 \mu\text{m}$ ,  $12 \mu\text{m}$ , and  $22 \mu\text{m}$ ; e.g., Assef et al. 2010; Jarrett et al. 2011; Stern et al. 2012; Mateos et al. 2012, 2013; Assef et al. 2013) can separate bright AGN from host-galaxy light (from stars and the interstellar medium) through the identification of a red MIR spectral slope, and have thus become widely applied. These selections have the potential to identify large samples of AGN with less bias against heavily obscured systems. However, their effectiveness worsens toward lower AGN luminosities, where the AGN component of the MIR spectrum can be swamped by the emission from the host galaxy. For example, Cardamone et al. (2008) and LaMassa et al. (2019) found that most X-ray selected AGN in the (deep) GOODS field and Stripe 82-X respectively would not have been found by standard MIR color selection. Lyu et al. (2022) show similar results for SED-selected AGN in the GOODS-S/HUDF region. Notably, the MIR host emission contribution increases with redshift due to the increase in cosmic SFR density, too, thus it is progressively harder to select AGN at the same luminosity at higher redshifts. By comparison, *NuSTAR* selects AGN almost irrespective




**Figure 26.** Rest-frame 10–40 keV luminosity ( $L_{10-40 \text{ keV}}$ ) versus redshift for the extragalactic NSS80 sources with reliable counterparts, separated into different spectroscopic classes: broad emission-line objects (BL; blue circle), narrow emission-line objects (NL; green circle), unclassified sources (peach circle), galaxies (Gxy; peach ‘X’), AGN/galaxy pairs (peach star), dual AGN (purple star), and sources with uncertain counterpart identification (white filled circles with green and blue edges). For comparison, the *Swift*-BAT AGN Spectroscopic Survey (BASS) DR2 (Koss et al. 2022) is plotted with grey crosses. The *Swift*-BAT 14–150 keV fluxes were used to calculate  $L_{10-40 \text{ keV}}$  values assuming an effective photon index of  $\Gamma_{\text{eff}} = 2.0$  for the  $K$ -correction factor. The grey dash-dotted lines indicate an observed-frame X-ray flux range of  $0.02\text{--}2 \times 10^{-12} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ , i.e., spanning two orders of magnitude. The black dash-dotted line highlights the evolution of the knee of the X-ray luminosity function ( $L^*$ ) with redshift (Aird et al. 2015).

of the relative strength of the AGN to the host galaxy since the X-ray emission from galaxy processes is weak in comparison to the AGN, particularly at the 3–24 keV energies probed by *NuSTAR*. Here we investigate the MIR properties of our NSS80 sources, and consider the results with respect to the AGN selection criteria.

As CatWISE20 contains only  $W1$  and  $W2$  photometry, for the purposes of examining the further properties of the sample we match all sources with an NWAY CatWISE20 counterpart to their nearest AllWISE (Wright et al. 2010; Mainzer et al. 2011,<sup>31</sup>) source within a maximum radius of  $4''$ . This results in 865 matches, including 312/523 upper limits for  $W3/W4$  respectively.  $W1$  and  $W2$  magnitudes are roughly consistent between CatWISE20 and AllWISE values except in a small minority of sources, implying that the  $W3$  and  $W4$  can be used for comparison with the caveat that there may be additional uncertainty due to the different photometric pipelines. In Figure 27 we plot the *WISE* colors ( $W1 - W2$  versus  $W2 - W3$ ) of the spectroscopically confirmed extragalactic NSS80 sample with reliable counterpart associations and  $W3$  detections, i.e., well-defined *WISE* colors (see Section 3.2) and compare to the selection ‘‘wedge’’ defined by Mateos et al. (2012) to identify AGN with red MIR power-law SEDs. In this comparison we further limit our analysis to the sources with significant detections in all three of the relevant, shorter wavelength *WISE* bands ( $W1$ ,  $W2$  and  $W3$ ; centred at  $3.4 \mu\text{m}$ ,  $4.6 \mu\text{m}$  and  $12 \mu\text{m}$ , respectively). Considering sources with optical spectroscopic classifications, the fractions for the overall BL AGN (top panel) and NL AGN (bottom panel) samples are  $f_{\text{wedge, BL}} = 80\%$  (148/185) and  $f_{\text{wedge, NL}} = 42\%$  (36/86), respectively. Therefore, NL AGN are less

<sup>31</sup> <http://wise2.ipac.caltech.edu/docs/release/allwise/>




**Figure 27.** *WISE* color-color diagram for the extragalactic NSS80 sources color coded by X-ray luminosity and spectroscopic classification following the color scheme in Figure 29: BL objects (blue circle), NL objects (green circle), and AGN/galaxy pairs (peach star). BL and NL sources with  $L_{10-40\text{ keV}} \geq 10^{44}\text{ erg s}^{-1}$  are indicated with dark blue and green circles, whilst the light blue and green circles codify the lower luminosity BLs and NLs with  $L_{10-40\text{ keV}} < 10^{44}\text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . The Mateos et al. (2012) wedge which identifies AGN with red MIR power-law SEDs with a spectral index  $\alpha \leq -0.3$  is indicated with a solid black line. We also compare with the AGN color cut of Stern et al. (2012,  $W1 - W2 > 0.8$ ; black dotted line). In the *top panel* we show the *WISE* colors of the BLAGN subdivided into low (light blue) and high (dark blue)  $L_{10-40\text{ keV}}$ . Our identified Nu-rQSOs (i.e., red BL AGN) based on their  $g - i$  color are plotted with red stars; see Section 4.3 and Figure 29. The *bottom panel* shows the *WISE* colors for the *NuSTAR* NLs separated into  $L_{10-40\text{ keV}} < 10^{44}\text{ erg s}^{-1}$  (light green) and  $L_{10-40\text{ keV}} \geq 10^{44}\text{ erg s}^{-1}$  (dark green). Two AGN/galaxy pairs are plotted with peach stars and two galaxies with white crosses.

likely to be identified as AGN based on MIR colors alone. If we use the “X-ray quasar” threshold<sup>32</sup> of  $10^{44}\text{ erg s}^{-1}$  in the 10 – 40 keV band to distinguish between faint and luminous X-ray BLs/NLs, we find that this is largely driven by the lower luminosity objects with  $L_X$  below the X-ray quasar threshold: only 35% (23/66) low- $L_X$  lie inside the wedge, while 80% (16/20) of the high- $L_X$  NL AGN have AGN-like MIR colors. On the other hand, the bulk of the BL AGN with  $L_X > 10^{44}\text{ erg s}^{-1}$  lie within the wedge (95%; 117/123 high- $L_X$ ). Of the  $L_X < 10^{44}\text{ erg s}^{-1}$  BL AGN, 65% (40/62) have AGN-like MIR colors.

If we subdivide the BL AGN sample on the basis of their  $g - i$  optical color (selecting the reddest 10%, as in Klindt et al. 2019; see Section 4.3 and Figure 29), we find a lower fraction of red BL AGN (Nu-rQSOs) lie within the wedge than found for the control BL AGN (Nu-cQSOs): 67% (49/73) versus 98% (101/103). Of the 49 Nu-rQSOs with AGN-like MIR colors, 33 sources have  $L_X > 10^{44}\text{ erg s}^{-1}$  (85% of the overall high- $L_X$  Nu-rQSOs) and the remaining 16 have  $L_X$  values below the X-ray quasar threshold (47% of the overall low- $L_X$  Nu-rQSOs). Hence, we can deduce from the MIR colors that the majority of Nu-rQSOs (especially at low- $L_X$ ) are more host-galaxy dominated than the Nu-cQSOs. This is broadly consistent with our finding on the basis of optical analyses in the following section.

<sup>32</sup> The X-ray quasar threshold is often adopted to define X-ray quasars which roughly agrees with the classical optical quasar definition:  $M_B \leq -23$  (Schmidt & Green 1983) and the approximate value for  $L_{X,*}$ ; see Figure 26.




**Figure 28.** The bolometric luminosity-redshift plane for the (spectroscopically reliable) extragalactic NSS80 sources compared to SDSS optical quasars. The bolometric luminosity ( $L_{\text{bol}}$ ) for the NSS80 sources is inferred from the rest-frame 10–40 keV luminosity using a bolometric correction of  $BC = 25$  (assuming that  $L_{10-40\text{keV}}$  makes up  $\sim 4\%$  of  $L_{\text{bol}}$ ). Following the color scheme in Figure 29 the following subsamples are plotted: BL objects (blue circle), NL objects (green circle), unclassified sources (peach circle), galaxies (Gxy; peach ‘X’), AGN/galaxy pairs (peach star), dual AGN (purple star), and sources with uncertain counterpart identification (white filled circles with green and blue edges). The  $g-i$  selected rQSOs (see Figure 29) are highlighted with red stars and the SDSS DR7 quasars are plotted using shaded grey circles. Compared to the optically-selected SDSS quasars, the X-ray selected *NuSTAR* serendipitous sources are typically  $\sim 0.3$  dex less luminous. The grey dotted line indicates the X-ray quasar threshold of  $L_{10-40\text{keV}} = 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . The median  $L_{\text{bol}}$  for the extragalactic NSS80 sample is  $7.19 \times 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  at the median redshift of the NLs ( $\langle z_{\text{NL}} \rangle = 0.3$ ), and  $5.94 \times 10^{45} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  at the BL median redshift ( $\langle z_{\text{BL}} \rangle = 0.82$ ), as indicated with green and blue dash-dotted lines, respectively. Grey lines show KDE contours of the SDSS DR7 quasars at 68%, 95%, and 99.7%, for comparison with the distribution of NSS80 sources.

#### 4.3. Optical photometric and spectroscopic properties

Optical selection of quasars, using for example SDSS photometry, will miss the most reddened quasars due to their colors overlapping the stellar loci in most SDSS color-color diagrams, and a comparatively shallow optical survey flux limit (e.g., Richards et al. 2003). However, since X-rays penetrate circumnuclear obscuration with minimal contribution from the host galaxy, they provide the potential to construct a more complete census of the full quasar population, ranging from heavily obscured sources (e.g., ERQs; Goulding et al. 2018), thinly-veiled red quasars (e.g., rQSOs; Klindt et al. 2019, hereafter K19), and host-galaxy dominated systems. Here we focus on the optical photometric and spectroscopic properties of the NSS80 sources subdivided on the basis of X-ray luminosity and optical spectroscopic classification.

The NSS80 is the largest-area *NuSTAR* survey and picks up the most X-ray luminous AGN over  $\sim 36 \text{ deg}^2$ . However, the NSS80 region is a factor  $\sim 300\times$  smaller than the SDSS and consequently will miss the most luminous systems. To place the NSS80 survey into context, and to further motivate our following analyses which make use of SDSS DR7 quasars, in Figure 28 we compare the bolometric luminosity-redshift plane of both surveys. For the NSS80 sources we calculate bolometric luminosities from the rest-frame 10 – 40 keV luminosity, assuming that the 10 – 40 keV luminosity makes up 4% of the total luminosity (see e.g., Lansbury et al. 2017a). The SDSS bolometric luminosities are available in Shen et al. (2011); however, they are inferred from rest-frame UV-optical continuum measurements and have not been corrected for dust extinction. Consequently, the  $L_{\text{bol}}$  values are likely to be significantly underestimated in the SDSS rQSOs (which makes up 10% or more of typical quasar samples; see e.g., Richards et al. 2003). Overall there is good overlap between NSS80 and SDSS at the lower luminosity end although, as expected, NSS80 misses the most luminous systems. The median  $L_{\text{bol}}$  for the extragalactic NSS80 sample is  $7.62 \times 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  at the median redshift of the NLs ( $\langle z_{\text{NL}} \rangle = 0.30$ ), and  $5.93 \times 10^{45} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  at the BL median redshift ( $\langle z_{\text{BL}} \rangle = 0.80$ ). By comparison, the SDSS



**Figure 29.** The  $g-i$  color versus redshift for extragalactic NSS80 sources with reliable counterpart associations (also excluding those that are possible associated with the primary *NuSTAR* science target), plotted in the different spectroscopic classifications: BL objects (blue circle), NL objects (green circle), unclassified sources (peach circle), galaxies (Gxy; peach ‘X’), AGN/galaxy pairs (peach star), dual AGN (purple star), and sources with uncertain counterpart identification (white filled circles with green and blue edges). The AGN/galaxy and dual AGN companions are plotted with white filled stars with peach and purple edges, respectively. BL and NL sources with  $L_{10-40\text{keV}} \geq 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  are indicated with dark blue and green circles, whilst the light blue and green circles codify the lower luminosity BLs and NLs with  $L_{10-40\text{keV}} < 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . SDSS selected rQSOs (reddest 10% of the  $g-i$  distribution; K19) are superimposed on the distribution of the SDSS DR7 uniform sample (shaded grey circles). We use the rQSO track to identify 106 red NSS80 BL sources; of these, 67% (71/106) are at redshifts  $z \leq 1$ . Using the same track, we identify a control sample comprising 145 BL AGN (52% of which are at  $z \leq 1$ ). There is a bias against NLs at higher redshifts, given that all NLs (with constrained  $g$  and  $i$  magnitudes) are at  $z \leq 1$ .

sample have median bolometric luminosities of  $1.73 \times 10^{45} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  (0.38 dex higher) and  $1.07 \times 10^{46} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  (0.26 dex higher) at redshifts equal to  $\langle z_{\text{NL}} \rangle$  and  $\langle z_{\text{BL}} \rangle$ , respectively.

To provide a basic characterization of the optical properties of the extragalactic NSS80 sources with reliable optical counterpart associations, in Figure 29 we show the  $g-i$  color versus redshift of the 371 extragalactic sources with constrained  $g-i$  colors and compare to the SDSS DR7 uniformly-selected quasar sample and the rQSOs identified in K19; we note that the optical colors are corrected for Galactic extinction following K19. For quasar-dominated systems,  $g-i$  color provides a basic measurement of the amount of optical reddening due to dust (e.g., Fawcett et al. 2020), although emission from the host galaxy can have a significant impact on the optical colors for lower luminosity and/or heavily obscured AGN. At a given redshift, a range in  $g-i$  color is observed for the BLs and NLs<sup>33</sup>.

We use the  $g-i$  color threshold from K19 to identify red quasars (corresponding to the 10% most reddened in SDSS; threshold is shown as the bottom edge of rQSOs in Figure 29), finding that 42% (106/251) of the NSS80 BL AGN<sup>34</sup> with reliable counterpart associations and detections in the  $g$ - and  $i$ -band have red  $g-i$  colors (we coin these sources as Nu-rQSO); we note that in this basic comparison, we reasonably assume no significant differences in the  $g$ -band and  $i$ -band pass bands between the various different optical photometric surveys. Among these is the higher-redshift AGN pair (NuSTARJ091534+4054.6) at  $z = 1.298$ , with both BL AGN identified as red quasars based on their  $g-i$  color. The remaining 145/251 BLs we use as a control sample which represents “normal” unobscured quasars (Nu-cQSO). Of the 114 NLs with reliable counterpart associations and constrained  $g$  and  $i$  magnitudes, 105 are found to lie within the rQSO  $g-i$  region, meaning that 92% of the NLs appear red in their optical colors. Since no clear broad emission lines

<sup>33</sup> As can be seen in Figure 29, the  $g-i$  color distribution changes with redshift as different portions of the quasar and host-galaxy emission enter the observed-frame optical bands. Consequently, we only consider the optical color of the sources with a reliable counterpart and redshift. We note that the redshift and luminosity distributions of the subset of BL sources with measured  $g-i$  color are similar to the distributions for all BL sources and can therefore be considered representative.

<sup>34</sup> We can use the NSS80 BL AGN as a quasar sample since they have spectral lines with widths  $FWHM \gtrsim 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ .


are seen in these sources we expect the optical emission to be dominated by the host galaxy, a result also suggested from the optical spectroscopy (see Section 4.4). As the Nu-rQSOs have identified broad emission lines, to first order we would expect the optical colors to be typically due to dust reddening. Overall, the  $g - i$  optical color threshold adopted in Figure 29 corresponds to 10% of the SDSS quasars in K19 while 42% of the *NuSTAR* BL AGN exceed this threshold. This larger fraction of rQSOs in NSS80 compared to the SDSS could be due to a greater contribution from dust-reddened quasars; however, since SDSS probes more luminous quasars than NSS80, we should keep in mind that a larger fraction could be optically red due to emission from the host galaxy. A combination of template fitting to the UV–MIR photometry, guided by the optical spectroscopic features (e.g., continuum shape, emission, and absorption lines) would be able to constrain the relative contributions to the reddening from the host galaxy and dust extinction but is beyond the scope of the current study.

#### 4.4. Composite spectra of the NSS80 AGN

To provide more direct constraints on the origin of the optical colors of the NSS80 sources we utilize the spectroscopic data. In this analysis we construct composite spectra for subsets of the NSS80 spectroscopic sample, divided on the basis of spectral type, optical color, and X-ray luminosity. These composite spectra allow us to search for subtle signatures missed in individual source spectra, such as the absorption features from the host galaxy (e.g., rest-frame Ca II H+K; G-band; Mg I; Na I-D). The overall continuum shape of the spectra can provide insights on the relative contributions from dust reddening and host-galaxy emission/absorption: in comparison to typical quasars, a drop in continuum flux at blue wavelengths can indicate reddening due to dust, whereas an increase in flux at longer wavelengths can indicate reddening due to host-galaxy contamination.

In Figure 30 we show rest-frame composite spectra for the extragalactic NSS80 sources subdivided into 274 BLs (dark blue solid line; top panel) and 166 NLs (green solid line; middle panel). We compare these composites to the high-quality X-Shooter composite spectra of a subsample of the K19 rQSOs at  $1.45 < z < 1.65$ , which are luminosity matched in rest-frame  $6 \mu\text{m}$  luminosity and redshift to the K19 control quasars (cQSOs). The X-shooter composite spectra are produced in Fawcett et al. (2022) using geometric mean stacks, and have a continuous spectral coverage from  $\sim 3000 - 25,000 \text{ \AA}$ . To stack the NSS80 spectra, we followed the same approach as Fawcett et al. (2022): the spectra were first corrected for Galactic extinction, using the Schlegel et al. (1998) map and the Fitzpatrick (1999) Milky Way extinction law, and shifted to rest frame wavelengths. Each spectrum was then re-binned to a common wavelength grid and normalized at  $4000 \text{ \AA}$ . It is worth noting that the spectra contributing to these stacks were obtained via different instruments and therefore will have different spectral resolutions. Therefore, any interpretation should be mainly limited to the spectral shape, with analysis of emission or absorption lines limited to broad comparisons. To ensure reasonably representative composite spectra we only include data when at least 15 sources contribute at a given rest-frame wavelength. The scatter within each stack subset varies; e.g. the cQSOs have a lower scatter than rQSOs due to the nature of their populations. However, the scatter is not large enough in any subset to make the comparison of their average properties invalid.

The BL composite (dark blue) shows strikingly similar permitted lines to the SDSS quasar X-Shooter composites. However, the *NuSTAR* composite has stronger forbidden lines (e.g., [Ne V], [O II] and [Ne III]) and has a different overall continuum shape with a sharper decrease to UV-blue wavelengths and a rise to red wavelengths. These differences are consistent with that expected by a modest host-galaxy contribution not present in the more luminous SDSS quasars with a light screen of dust reddening suppressing the UV-blue emission. The NL composite (green) is distinctly different from the cQSO and rQSO SDSS composites with weak UV-blue emission and strong red emission. It shows a continuum shape more consistent with a composite of Type 2 SDSS quasars (purple; Yuan et al. 2016). Furthermore, numerous strong forbidden lines, including [Ne V], [O II], [Ne III], [O III], [O I] and [S II], and narrow permitted lines are evident. The strong [Ne V] and [O III], in particular, indicate the presence of an optical NLAGN. The spectral shape of the NL composite is consistent with that expected for a host-galaxy dominated spectrum due to the AGN emission being completely obscured in the optical waveband, as expected given the lack of broad permitted lines. Direct evidence for a dominant host-galaxy component is vividly seen from the strong host-galaxy absorption features, i.e., Ca II H&K, G-band, Mg I and Na I-D. Further differences are seen in the BL composite when we split it into Nu-rQSOs (peach) and Nu-cQSOs (light blue); see Figure 29. Both the Nu-rQSOs and Nu-cQSOs show evidence for modest dust reddening due to suppressed UV-blue emission: the weaker shorter-wavelength broad lines relative to  $H\alpha$  ( $H\beta$ ; Mg II; C III]) for the Nu-rQSOs suggest greater dust reddening than that seen in the Nu-cQSOs. These characteristics are qualitatively consistent with those seen in the SDSS X-Shooter composites. However, in stark contrast to the



**Figure 30.** Composite spectra of the spectroscopically confirmed NSS80 BL (top panel;  $N_{\text{stack}} = 274$ ) and NL (middle panel;  $N_{\text{stack}} = 166$ ). The BL sample is subdivided (bottom panel) into typical quasars (Nu-cQSO; solid blue line) and red quasars (Nu-rQSO; solid peach line). Firstly, we compare to composite X-Shooter spectra of SDSS quasars, plotted with red and blue dotted lines (Fawcett et al. 2022). The signature AGN emission lines and galaxy absorption lines are plotted with grey dotted and dashed lines, respectively. We also compare to a composite of SDSS Type II AGN from Yuan et al. (2016); purple dotted line. The spectra are shifted to rest-frame wavelengths and normalized at 4000 Å for illustrative purposes. The source threshold when (geometric mean) stacking the data is 15. Evidence for a larger host galaxy contribution in the *NuSTAR* objects compared to SDSS are visible, while towards shorter wavelengths strong evidence for reddening in the NL objects and, some in the BL AGN, can be seen.

X-Shooter composites, the Nu-rQSOs and Nu-cQSOs show a rise in the continuum emission to red wavelengths, which is most prominent in the Nu-rQSOs, likely due to an increasing contribution from the host galaxy.


Given the evidence for host-galaxy contributions to the NSS80 composites and the lower overall bolometric luminosities of the NSS80 sources in comparison to the SDSS quasars, we subdivided the NSS80 AGN according to their luminosities using the quasar X-ray threshold of  $L_{10-40\text{ keV}} = 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . Figure 31 shows the composites for the NL systems, Nu-cQSOs and Nu-rQSOs split into low- $L_X$  ( $L_{10-40\text{ keV}} < 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ ) and high- $L_X$  ( $L_{10-40\text{ keV}} > 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ ) subsamples, with 3300–5300 Å zoom-ins plotted in Figure 32 to emphasise the prominent AGN and any host-galaxy absorption features. The rest-wavelength coverage for each composite is now more limited since the X-ray luminosity selection corresponds broadly to a redshift selection and hence effectively narrower redshift ranges than the overall composites in Figure 30. Despite this limitation, some similarities and differences are apparent across each of the composite pairs. Overall, the low- $L_X$  and high- $L_X$  systems within each spectral class have similar emission-line features and UV-blue continuum shapes. However, the low- $L_X$  systems all have increased emission at red wavelengths in comparison to the high- $L_X$  systems, consistent with a relative increase in the host-galaxy contribution for a decrease in the luminosity of the AGN. This result is qualitatively similar to that seen in the *WISE* MIR color analyses (see Figure 27 and Section 4.2). As for the overall composites, more direct evidence for a host-galaxy component is seen from the identification of strong host-galaxy absorption, most strikingly in the low- $L_X$  NL systems but also evident from the sometimes weak identification of Ca II H+K in all of the composites. Greater insight on the host-galaxy and AGN properties, including constraints on the stellar mass and populations, can be gained from detailed fitting of the composite spectra and SEDs using AGN and stellar population models. However, that goes beyond the scope of this study.

In K19 we showed that the red optical colors of SDSS rQSOs are predominantly due to reddening of a normal blue quasar, results which have been subsequently confirmed via detailed broad-band UV-far-IR SED fitting (Calistro Rivera et al. 2021) and broad-band UV-near-IR spectral analysis (Fawcett et al. 2022). It is worth bearing in mind that these thinly veiled dust-obscured optical quasars may represent the detectable end of a more heavily extinguished luminous AGN population which will be missed by SDSS because of their colors (e.g., Glikman et al. 2004; Banerji et al. 2012; Eisenhardt et al. 2012; Ross et al. 2015; Hamann et al. 2017; see Table 2.1 in Klindt 2022 for a summary of dust-reddened quasars). By comparison, our analyses of the Nu-rQSOs have shown that a substantial contribution of the red optical emission is due to a host-galaxy component rather than dust-reddening of the quasar in the lower luminosity objects. On the other hand, dust obscuration (which dominates the shape at the blue end of the spectrum) plays a key role in the excess red colors for the more luminous BL objects. Hence, it is important to keep in mind the differences in the typical luminosities between the SDSS quasars and the NSS80 sources (see Figure 28). Indeed, in their broad-band SED fitting of SDSS quasars, Calistro Rivera et al. (2021) found that the host galaxy is likely to dominate in the lower-luminosity rQSOs (and to make a significant contribution in cQSOs), corresponding broadly to the luminosities of the NSS80 sources (see Fig. 5 of Calistro Rivera et al. 2021). Consequently, caution must be applied when adopting a simple  $g - i$  optical color cut for lower-luminosity quasars and AGN.


## 5. SUMMARY

In this work, we present the *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey 80-month catalogue (NSS80) – the most recent and largest survey undertaken with *NuSTAR*. The NSS80 succeeds the 40-month catalogue (NSS40) reported in Lansbury et al. (2017b) and incorporates data from the full 80 month period (2012 July to 2019 March) of telescope operation. The data include 894 unique fields (563 newly published data from the post-NSS40 period), with a total areal coverage of 36 deg<sup>2</sup>, and a cumulative exposure time of  $\approx 62$  Ms. Due to an increase in the fraction of general observer (GO) observations over the NSS40 catalogue, the areal coverage, integrated exposure, number of fields, and number of sources in the NSS80 are a factor  $\approx 3$  larger than those presented in Lansbury et al. (2017b). Furthermore, we have characterized the *NuSTAR* detected AGN in terms of their X-ray, optical, and IR properties. Below we summarize the main results:

- Overall, we detect 1,488 sources which are significant post-deblending (i.e., after accounting for contamination of the photon counts from nearby sources). To enable easy and efficient use of the NSS80, 214 *NuSTAR* sources residing in highly extended optical galaxies and galaxy clusters are placed in a secondary catalogue available in Appendix B to complement the primary catalogue which constitutes 1274 X-ray sources (Appendix A), the majority of which are dominated by AGN in fainter field galaxies. Of these, 412 are independently detected in the hard (8–24 keV) energy band; see Section 2.3.



**Figure 31.** Composite spectra of the spectroscopically confirmed NLAGN (top), Nu-cQSO (middle) and Nu-rQSO (bottom) subdivided into low (light green, light blue and peach, respectively) and high (dark green, dark blue and red, respectively) luminosity bins. As in Figure 30, we compare to composite X-Shooter spectra of SDSS quasars, plotted with red and blue dotted lines (Fawcett et al. 2022), and composite spectra of SDSS Type 2 QSOs (Yuan et al. 2016), plotted with a purple dotted line. The signature AGN emission lines and galaxy absorption lines are plotted with grey dotted and dashed lines, respectively; see Figure 32 for zoom-ins of the spectral lines. The spectra are shifted to rest-frame wavelengths and normalized at 4000  $\text{\AA}$  for illustrative purposes.



**Figure 32.** Zoom-ins (3300–5300Å) of the prominent AGN spectral lines in Figure 31 of the spectroscopically confirmed NLAGN, Nu-cQSO and Nu-rQSO subdivided into low (light green, light blue and peach, respectively) and high (dark green, dark blue and red, respectively) luminosity bins. The composite X-Shooter spectra of luminosity-redshift matched SDSS rQSOs and cQSOs (Fawcett et al. 2022) are plotted in red and blue dotted lines, and composite spectra of SDSS Type 2 QSOs (Yuan et al. 2016) as a purple dotted line for comparison.

- Key improvements made in the construction of the NSS80 catalogue over those adopted for the NSS40 catalogue include (1) mosaicing of overlapping fields from different observational programs to increase the sensitivity and (2) masking of fields with large optical/IR hosts post-processing to construct a secondary catalogue of sources which previously were excluded altogether. Overall, we find 91% of NSS40 sources are retained in NSS80, while 36 NSS40 sources are undetected in NSS80. For the majority of these undetected sources, the deeper data have improved the false probability estimates and, consequently, eliminate low-significance detections.
- The full band (3–24 keV) fluxes cover a range of  $f_{3-24\text{ keV}} \approx 10^{-14}$  to  $10^{-11}$  erg s $^{-1}$  cm $^{-2}$ , with a median value of  $\langle f_{3-24\text{ keV}} \rangle = 9.82 \times 10^{-14}$  erg s $^{-1}$  cm $^{-2}$ ; see Section 4.1.1. The *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey has the largest areal coverage at all fluxes compared to the *NuSTAR* deep-field surveys in well-studied fields (e.g., COSMOS, ECDFS, EGS, GOODS-N, and UDS), reaching similar flux depths. Consequently, the combination of NSS80 with the deep-field surveys allows for a factor  $\approx$  two improvement in analyses of the faint end of the hard X-ray source population compared to that from just the deep-field surveys; see Section 2.2. Furthermore, in Section 4.1.3 we show that NSS80 reaches  $\approx$  two orders of magnitude fainter than the *Swift*-BAT all sky survey.
- A large range in the observed band ratios of the NSS80 spectroscopically confirmed AGN is seen at 3–24 keV (Section 4.1.2). This implies a range of observed photon indices going from very soft  $\Gamma_{\text{eff}} \approx 3$  to very hard  $\Gamma_{\text{eff}} \approx 0$ . Contrary to that previously found for lower energy X-ray bands, our results show no evidence for an anti-correlation between band ratio and X-ray count rate.
- To study the multi-wavelength properties of the *NuSTAR* serendipitous sources, we required lower-energy X-ray ( $< 10$  keV) counterparts with higher positional accuracies to reliably match to optical and IR counterparts. To search for lower-energy X-ray counterparts, we utilised *Chandra* (CSC2), *XMM-Newton* (4XMM-DR10/s), and *Swift*-XRT (2SXPS). In total, we identified a lower-energy X-ray counterpart for 76% (964/1274) of the primary NSS80 catalogue detected in surveys or archival data from the four lower-energy X-ray catalogues. The remaining 310 NSS80 sources lack lower-energy X-ray counterparts, which can be attributed to either insufficient or zero lower-energy X-ray coverage or, in the minority of cases, a false *NuSTAR* detection (e.g., sources with detection probabilities close to the threshold;  $\log(P_{\text{false,min}}) \approx -6$ ). We find that the lower-energy X-ray counterpart fluxes are generally in agreement with the *NuSTAR* fluxes for the 3–8 keV (soft) energy band. A maximum variation of a factor of  $\approx 5$  between the lower-energy X-ray and *NuSTAR* flux observations is identified, which can be attributed to source variability detected in the non-contemporaneous X-ray observations and Eddington bias; see Section 4.1. This variability can have two origins: either a change in intrinsic AGN luminosity, or a change in the line-of-sight column density, due to the non-uniform distribution of the obscuring material surrounding the accreting SMBH.
- In NSS40 a relatively simple closest neighbour approach was used to identify multi-wavelength counterparts for follow-up spectroscopy. In the NSS80 catalogue, however, we adopted a more sophisticated probabilistic approach with NWAY to identify IR (CatWISE20) and optical (PS1-DR2) counterparts; see Section 3.2. The bulk of the NSS80 sources (95%) have at least one NWAY match with a match probability  $> 10\%$ , 74% of which coincide with a lower-energy X-ray counterpart, and the remaining 26% have *NuSTAR*-only X-ray positions (due to insufficient or no lower-energy X-ray coverage). Overall we find 953 high probability CatWISE20/PS1 counterpart matches to the NSS80 sources, of which  $\sim 76\%$  are at extragalactic latitudes  $|b| > 20^\circ$ .
- Optical spectroscopic identifications (i.e., redshift measurements and source classifications) have successfully been obtained for 547 sources; see Section 3.3.3. An additional three sources have redshift estimates, but lack source classifications. We obtained spectroscopic identifications for the majority of sources (427) via our extensive campaign of ground-based spectroscopic follow-up, using a range of observatories at multiple geographic latitudes; see Section 3.3.2. We spectroscopically confirm 58 sources as Galactic objects. Of the 492 extragalactic sources (AGN), 284 (57.7%) are classified as broad-line AGN (BL), 194 (39.4%) are narrow-line sources, 10 are galaxies (Gxy; absorption line spectra), one is a galaxy cluster, and three are unclassified, but have redshift measurements from literature. Among these there are three AGN pairs of which one pair is a dual AGN system, two AGN-galaxy pairs, and one galaxy pair. For a further 43 sources a faint continuum (often red) is detected, lacking spectral features and, consequently, spectroscopic identifications. One of these sources is a BL Lac candidate, and another is a pair of (extremely faint) sources of unknown type. The remaining one source is a hotspot of

4C 74.26 (radio quasar), which was targeted as the primary *NuSTAR* science target. While similar numbers of NLs and BLs are identified at lower redshifts ( $z \lesssim 1$ ), there is a bias against detections of high-redshift NLs that are optically fainter, and against the detection of highly obscured AGN; see Section 4.1.3.

- The NSS80 AGN have redshifts covering a wide range, from 0.012 to 3.43, with a median redshift of  $\langle z \rangle = 0.56$ ; see Section 4.1.3. The rest-frame 10–40 keV luminosities also span a wide range of  $L_{10-40\text{ keV}} \approx 10^{42-46} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ , with a median value of  $\langle L_{10-40\text{ keV}} \rangle = 1.2 \times 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ . Previous X-ray missions with sensitivity at  $> 10 \text{ keV}$  were able to sample the AGN population below the knee of the X-ray luminosity function ( $L_*$ ) for redshifts up to  $z \approx 0.05$ , and *NuSTAR* extends this to  $z \approx 1$ . Using the *NuSTAR* band ratio, we identify 22 Compton-thick candidate sources: 7 are identified in the NSS40 catalogue and 15 are newly identified sources with the post-NSS40 observations; see Section 4.1.2.
- We use the distribution of *WISE*  $W1 - W2$  and  $W2 - W3$  colors for the extragalactic NSS80 sources, since the reprocessed emission from the AGN’s circumnuclear dust is distinguishable from star light (which peaks in the FIR regime) at MIR wavelengths (predominantly for high luminosity AGN); see Section 4.2. We find that 95% of high- $L_X$  BL AGN will successfully be selected using the AGN wedge, whilst NL AGN are have a significantly lower chance of being identified as AGN based on their MIR colors alone. This is largely driven by the lower luminosity objects with 10 – 40 keV luminosities below the X-ray quasar threshold. It is notable that a number of luminous *NuSTAR*-selected BL AGN are not selected in the MIR – this appears to be driven by the intrinsic AGN properties. Furthermore, from the MIR colors, we can deduce that  $> 90\%$  of the MIR light in two-thirds of the objects come from an AGN, while approximately a third are host dominated.
- Given that hard X-rays are largely unbiased against dust obscuration up to CT levels, *NuSTAR* facilitates the discovery of rare and extreme sources such as red quasars. We therefore explore the optical and IR properties of the NSS80 AGN sample, with particular focus on red quasars and the narrative that X-rays may be telling about this peculiar subpopulation of AGN; see Section 4.3. Forty-two percent (106/251) of the BL AGN with robust counterpart associations have red  $g - i$  colors; half of which have luminosities exceeding the X-ray quasar threshold and, therefore, are potentially dust reddened quasars. The remaining 145 BLs have  $g - i$  colors consistent with the typical quasar population. Furthermore, 92% of the NLs appear red in their optical colors; however, the majority are low luminosity objects with  $L_{10-40\text{ keV}} < 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  and, therefore, will have host-galaxy dominated emission. Altogether, the NSS80 AGN are typically 0.3 dex less luminous than SDSS quasars, with a median bolometric luminosity of  $\langle L_{\text{bol,X}} \rangle = 5.93 \times 10^4 \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  at the median BL AGN redshift of  $\langle z \rangle \approx 0.8$ .
- Finally, we present optical spectra composites to study the spectral properties of the NSS80 AGN to investigate the driving force behind the colors of the NSS80 red quasars; see Section 4.4. Overall, for all spectral types, the host-galaxy features are more prominent in the low- $L_X$  when compared to the high- $L_X$  systems: these signatures are enhanced emission at red wavelengths and host-galaxy absorption features, although these are weak in some of the composites. This is consistent with basic expectations for a decreasing AGN contribution relative to the host galaxy emission. Hence, our spectroscopic analysis indicates that reddening from the presence of a host galaxy can have a large contribution to the optical colors in the hard X-ray selected population of lower-luminosity quasars.

Our future work will focus on further follow-up studies of the current NSS80 sources, aiming to complete the spectroscopic follow-up of the catalog and to obtain detailed analysis of sources with  $> 8 \text{ keV}$  detections, which are unique to *NuSTAR*.

The NSS80 is a valuable legacy of the *NuSTAR* observatory and provides a powerful sample for future studies of the hard X-ray emitting population. Our total sample size (1,488 sources) is relatively modest compared to the samples of hundreds of thousands of sources compiled with *XMM-Newton*, *Chandra* or *Swift* (e.g. Webb et al. 2020; Evans et al. 2019, 2020)—achieved thanks to the larger fields-of-view, higher sensitivities and longer lifetimes of these observatories compared to *NuSTAR*—or the much larger samples (at soft X-ray energies) that are now being provided by dedicated surveys with *eROSITA* (Merloni et al. 2012; Predehl et al. 2021; Brunner et al. 2022). In contrast to these prior studies, we have been careful to ensure our sample consists only of truly serendipitous detections and excludes any

source associated with the targets of the observations, which is vital for carrying out scientific studies that require an unbiased sampling of the population (see also Delaney et al. 2023). Our sample remains unique in accessing faint sources at hard ( $\gtrsim 8$  keV) X-ray energies with a high degree of spectroscopic completeness, providing an important constraints on the obscured AGN population outside the local Universe.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper is jointly led by L.K. and C.L.G.: the original draft was primarily produced by L.K., and formed a major component of her PhD thesis, and the modifications made to the draft following an extensive referee report were carried out by C.L.G.. We acknowledge financial support from: the Faculty of Science Durham Doctoral Scholarship (L.K.), European Southern Observatory (ESO) postdoctoral research fellowship (G.B.L. and M.H.), the Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC; D.M.A. and D.J.R. through grant code ST/P000541/1; D.M.A. and C.L.G. through grant codes ST/T000244/1 and ST/X001075/1), and STFC Ernest Rutherford Fellowship (J.A. through grant code ST/P004172/1). The work of D.S. and T.C. was carried out at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under a contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (80NM0018D0004). F.E.B. acknowledges support from ANID-Chile BASAL AFB-170002, ACE210002, and FB210003, FONDECYT Regular 1200495 and 1190818, and Millennium Science Initiative Program – ICN12\_009. P.G.B. acknowledges financial support from the Czech Science Foundation project No. 22-22643S. W.N.B. acknowledges financial support from the V.M. Willaman Endowment. V.A.F. acknowledges funding from a United Kingdom Research and Innovation grant (code: MR/V022830/1). E.S.K. acknowledges financial support from the Centre National d’Etudes Spatiales (CNES). S.M. acknowledges funding from the the INAF “Progetti di Ricerca di Rilevante Interesse Nazionale” (PRIN), Bando 2019 (project: “Piercing through the clouds: a multiwavelength study of obscured accretion in nearby supermassive black holes”). G.N. acknowledges funding support from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) of Canada through a Discovery Grant and Discovery Accelerator Supplement, and from the Canadian Space Agency through grant 18JWST-GTO1. C.R. acknowledges support from Fondecyt Regular grant 1230345 and ANID BASAL project FB210003. E.R.C. and P.V. acknowledges the support of the South African National Research Foundation. E.T. acknowledges support from FONDECYT Regular 1190818 and 1200495, ANID grants CATA-Basal AFB-170002, ACE210002, and FB210003, and Millennium Nucleus NCN19\_058. C.M.U. would like to acknowledge support from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration via ADAP Grant 80NSSC18K0418.

We extend gratitude to Sam Tweety Anthony, Subhash Bose, Tea Freedman-Susskind, Tyler George, Elena González Egea, Feiyang Liu, Dan MacMillan, Jeff Maggio, Adric Riedel, Michael Rivkin, Manika Sidhu, Jamie Soon, Thomas Venville, Yerong Xu, and Emily Zhang for their support during the ground-based follow-up observations. We thank Victoria Fawcett for her valuable contribution by producing the composite spectra presented in Section 4.4.

This work was supported under NASA Contract No. NNG08FD60C, and made use of data from the *NuSTAR* mission, a project led by the California Institute of Technology, managed by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. We thank the *NuSTAR* Operations, Software and Calibration teams for support with the execution and analysis of these observations. This research has made use of the *NuSTAR* Data Analysis Software (NuSTARDAS) jointly developed by the ASI Science Data Center (ASDC, Italy) and the California Institute of Technology (USA).

Facilities: *Chandra*, ESO La Silla, Keck, *NuSTAR*, Palomar, SALT, SDSS, *Swift*, *WISE*, *XMM-Newton*.

Some of the data presented herein were obtained at the W. M. Keck Observatory, which is operated as a scientific partnership among the California Institute of Technology, the University of California and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Observatory was made possible by the generous financial support of the W. M. Keck Foundation. Some of the observations reported in this paper were obtained with the Southern African Large Telescope (SALT) under programs 2017-1-SCI-053, 2017-2-SCI-037, and 2018-2-MLT-006 (PI: Lizelke Klindt). The Wide-field Infrared Survey Explorer (*WISE*) is a joint project of the University of California, Los Angeles, and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory/California Institute of Technology, funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The National Radio Astronomy Observatory is a facility of the National Science Foundation operated under cooperative agreement by Associated Universities, Inc. Funding for the SDSS and SDSS-II has been provided by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the Participating Institutions, the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Energy, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Japanese Monbukagakusho, the Max Planck Society, and the Higher Education Funding Council for England. The SDSS is managed by the Astrophysical Research Consortium for the Participating Institutions. The Participating Institutions are the American Museum of Natural History,

Astrophysical Institute Potsdam, University of Basel, University of Cambridge, Case Western Reserve University, University of Chicago, Drexel University, Fermilab, the Institute for Advanced Study, the Japan Participation Group, Johns Hopkins University, the Joint Institute for Nuclear Astrophysics, the Kavli Institute for Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology, the Korean Scientist Group, the Chinese Academy of Sciences (LAMOST), Los Alamos National Laboratory, the Max-Planck-Institute for Astronomy (MPIA), the Max-Planck-Institute for Astrophysics (MPA), New Mexico State University, Ohio State University, University of Pittsburgh, University of Portsmouth, Princeton University, the United States Naval Observatory, and the University of Washington. This research uses services or data provided by the Astro Data Lab, which is part of the Community Science and Data Center (CSDC) program at NSF's National Optical-Infrared Astronomy Research Laboratory. NOIRLab is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy (AURA), Inc. under a cooperative agreement with the National Science Foundation.

*Software:* Astropy (Astropy Collaboration et al. 2013, 2018, 2022), Matplotlib (Hunter 2007), NumPy (Harris et al. 2020) and SciPy (Virtanen et al. 2020).

## APPENDIX

## A. DESCRIPTION OF THE PRIMARY NSS80 SOURCE CATALOGUE

The primary *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey source catalogue, containing 1274 sources in total; available as an electronic table on the NSS80 webpage. Here we describe the columns of the catalogue, which are summarized in Table 11.

**Column 1:** The unique source identification number, in order of increasing right ascension (R.A.).

**Column 2:** The unique *NuSTAR* source name, following the IAU-approved format: *NuSTAR* JHHMMSS±DDMM.m, where m is the truncated fraction of one arcminute for the arcseconds component of the declination (decl.).

**Column 3:** The unique *NuSTAR* field and source index.

**Column 4:** The unique L17 source identification number.

**Column 5:** The unique L17 *NuSTAR* field and source index.

**Columns 6,7:** The *NuSTAR* R.A. and decl. coordinates (J2000), as described in Section 2.3. *Units:* degr.

**Column 8,9:** The IAU 1958 Galactic latitude and longitude. *Units:* degr.

**Columns 10–12:** A binary flag indicating whether the source is detected with a false probability lower than the threshold of  $\log(P_{\text{false}}) = -6$ , for the soft (3 – 8 keV), hard (8 – 24 keV), and full (3 – 24 keV) bands. These three bands are abbreviated as SB, HB, and FB, respectively, throughout the source catalogue.

**Columns 13–15:** The same as columns 10–12, after deblending has been performed to account for contamination of the source counts from very nearby sources (Section 2.3.2 of Mullaney et al. 2015). Deblending only affects a very small fraction of the overall sample (e.g., see Section 2.4 in L17).

**Columns 16–18:** The logarithm of the false probabilities ( $P_{\text{false}}$ ) of the *NuSTAR* detected source, for the three standard energy bands.

**Columns 19:** The *NuSTAR* detection likelihood ( $P_{\text{false,min}}$ ).

**Columns 20–22:** The same as columns 16–18, after deblending has been performed.

**Columns 23:** The same as column 19, after deblending has been performed.

**Column 24:** A binary flag indicating whether the *NuSTAR* detected source remains significant after deblending, in at least one of the three standard energy bands.

**Columns 25–39:** Photometric quantities, calculated at the *NuSTAR* source coordinates, and using a source aperture of 30'' radius (see Section 2.2). The values are non-aperture-corrected; i.e., they correspond to the 30'' values, and have not been corrected to the full PSF values. We provide the total counts (i.e., all counts within the source aperture) and associated errors (84% CL), the background counts scaled to the source aperture, and the net source counts (i.e., total minus background) and associated errors. For the net source counts, we give 90% CL upper limits for sources not detected in a given band. Throughout the table, upper limits are flagged with a -99 value in the error column.

**Columns 40–51:** The same as columns 25–39, after deblending has been performed.

**Columns 52–54:** The average net, vignetting-corrected exposure time at the source coordinates (columns 3 and 4), for each energy band. These correspond to the A+B data, so should be divided by two to obtain the average exposure per FPM. *Units:* s.

**Columns 55–69:** The non-aperture-corrected total, background, and net count rates (and associated errors; 84% CL) determined from the photometric values in columns 25–39, and the exposure times in columns 52–54. *Units:* s<sup>-1</sup>.

**Columns 70–75:** The deblended net count rates, and associated errors, determined from the photometric values in columns 40–51, and the exposure times in columns 52–54. *Units:* s<sup>-1</sup>.

**Columns 76–78:** The *NuSTAR* band ratio (BR<sub>Nu</sub>) and associated errors. Upper limits, lower limits, and sources with no constraints are flagged with -99, -88, and -77 values, respectively, in the error columns.

**Columns 79–81:** The effective photon index ( $\Gamma_{\text{eff}}$ ), and associated errors, estimated from the band ratio values in columns 76–78.

**Columns 82–87:** The observed-frame fluxes and associated errors (84% CL) for the three standard energy bands, after deblending has been performed. These are aperture corrected values (i.e., they correspond to the full *NuSTAR* PSF), and are calculated from the count rates in columns 70–75 using the conversion factors listed in L17. *Units:* erg s<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-2</sup>.

**Column 88:** An abbreviated code indicating the lower-energy (< 10 keV) X-ray coverage. “C”, “X”, and “S” indicate sources which have *Chandra*, *XMM-Newton* and *Swift-XRT* coverage, respectively.

**Column 89:** An abbreviated code indicating the origin of the adopted lower-energy X-ray counterpart: CSC2 indicates counterparts from the *Chandra* Source Catalog Release 2.0 (Evans et al. 2019), 4XMMDR10 and 4XMMDR10s indicate the Fourth *XMM-Newton* Serendipitous Source Catalog, Tenth Data Release (Webb et al. 2020) and its stacked version (Traulsen et al. 2020), and 2SXPS indicates the *Swift* XRT Point Source Catalogue (Evans et al. 2020), respectively. CXO\_MAN, XMM\_MAN, and XRT\_MAN indicate sources manually identified using archival *Chandra*, *XMM-Newton*, and *Swift*-XRT data, respectively. Sources that lack a soft X-ray counterpart are indicated with the code NULL; Section 3.1 details the counterpart matching.

**Columns 90,91:** The R.A. and decl. coordinates (J2000) of the adopted lower-energy X-ray counterpart. Sources that lack a lower-energy X-ray counterpart have R.A. and decl. values of (-999,-999). *Units:* degr.

**Column 92:** Positional uncertainty for lower-energy (where available) or *NuSTAR* coordinates used for NWAY matching. *Units:* degree.

**Column 93:** The angular offset between the *NuSTAR* position (columns 6 and 7) and the lower-energy X-ray counterpart position (columns 90 and 91). Sources lacking a soft X-ray counterpart are flagged with a value of -77. *Units:* arcsec.

**Column 94:** Reference for the lower-energy X-ray flux used to compute the 3–8 keV fluxes in columns 95-97: 2–7 keV, 0.5 – 7 keV or 0.1 – 10 keV for CSC2 fluxes, 4.5 – 12 keV for 4XMMDR10/s fluxes, and 2 – 10 keV for 2SXPS fluxes.

**Columns 95-97:** The observed-frame 3 – 8 keV flux of the lower-energy X-ray counterpart (with associated lower and upper errors) for sources with counterparts in the CSC2, 4XMMDR10/s and 2SXPS catalogues. For CSC2 sources we convert to the 3 – 8 keV flux from the 2 – 7 keV flux using a conversion factor of 0.83, for the 4XMMDR10/s sources we convert from the 4.5 – 12 keV flux using a conversion factor of 0.92, and for the 2SXPS sources we convert from the 2 – 10 keV flux using a conversion factor of 0.62. Sources lacking a soft X-ray counterpart have values of 0. *Units:*  $\text{erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}$ .

**Columns 98-100:** The total combined 3 – 8 keV flux of all (CSC2, 4XMMDR10/s, or 2SXPS) sources within 30'' of the *NuSTAR* position, with associated lower and upper errors. Sources lacking soft X-ray counterparts have values of 0. *Units:*  $\text{erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}$ .

**Column 101:** Galactic extinction,  $A_V$ ; i.e., the total absorption in magnitudes at  $V$ .

**Columns 102-104:** Galactic line-of-sight absorption in  $g$ ,  $r$ , and  $i$  magnitudes.

**Columns 105,106:** The NWAY calculated probability that each CatWISE20 (Marocco et al. 2021) source is the correct counterpart to the (adopted lower-energy or *NuSTAR*) X-ray source ( $\rho_{\text{Cat,best}}$  for CatWISE20, and the probability that any of the CatWISE20 sources is the right counterpart ( $\rho_{\text{Cat,any}}$  for CatWISE20; a higher probability indicates a lower false association likelihood). Sources lacking a CatWISE20 counterpart are flagged with a value of -77.

**Columns 107,108:** The CatWISE20 R.A. and decl. coordinates (J2000) for the most probable NWAY match *WISE* counterpart. Sources that lack a CatWISE20 counterpart have R.A. and decl. values of (-999,-999). *Units:* degr.

**Column 109:** The angular offset between the best NWAY-matched CatWISE20 position and the *NuSTAR* position. Sources lacking a CatWISE20 match are flagged with a -77 value. *Units:* arcsec.

**Column 110:** The angular offset between the best NWAY-matched CatWISE20 position and the adopted lower-energy X-ray counterpart position. Sources that lack a CatWISE20 counterpart are flagged with values of -77. *Units:* arcsec.

**Columns 111-114:** The CatWISE20 *WISE* profile-fit magnitudes and associated errors, for the two standard *WISE* bands available in CatWISE20:  $W1$  ( $\lambda \approx 3.4\mu\text{m}$ ) and  $W2$  ( $\lambda \approx 4.6\mu\text{m}$ ). Sources with no constraints are flagged with a -77 value, and upper limits are flagged with a -99 value in the error column. *Units:* Vega mag. Columns 115,116: The AllWISE R.A. and decl. coordinates (J2000) for crossmatches with CatWISE20 coordinates. Sources that lack an AllWISE counterpart have R.A. and decl. values of (-999,-999). *Units:* degr.

**Columns 117-120:** The AllWISE *WISE* profile-fit magnitudes and associated errors, for the two remaining standard *WISE* bands:  $W3$  ( $\lambda \approx 12\mu\text{m}$ ) and  $W4$  ( $\lambda \approx 22\mu\text{m}$ ). Sources with no constraints are flagged with a -77 value, and upper limits are flagged with a -99 value in the error column. *Units:* Vega mag.

**Columns 121,122:** The NWAY calculated probability that each PS1-DR2 (Flewelling 2018) source is the correct counterpart to the (adopted lower-energy or *NuSTAR*) X-ray source ( $\rho_{\text{PS1,best}}$ , and the probability that any of the PS1-DR2 sources is the right counterpart ( $\rho_{\text{PS1,any}}$ ). A higher probability indicates a lower false association likelihood. Sources lacking a PS1-DR2 counterpart are flagged with a value of -77.

**Columns 123,124:** The PS1-DR2 R.A. and decl. coordinates (J2000) for the best NWAY-matched Pan-STARRS counterpart. Sources that lack a PS1-DR2 NWAY match have R.A. and decl. values of (-999,-999). *Units:* degr.

**Column 125:** The angular offset between the best NWAY-matched PS1-DR2 position and the *NuSTAR* position.

Sources lacking a PS1-DR2 match are flagged with a -77 value. *Units:* arcsec.

**Column 126:** The angular offset between the best NWAY-matched PS1-DR2 position and the adopted lower-energy X-ray position. Sources lacking a PS1-DR2 match are flagged with a -77 value. *Units:* arcsec.

**Column 127:** The angular offset between the best NWAY-matched PS1-DR2 and CatWISE20 positions. Sources lacking a PS1-DR2/CatWISE20 match are flagged with a -77 value. *Units:* arcsec.

**Column 128-134:** The  $g$ -,  $r$ - and  $i$ -band magnitudes (with associated errors) of the best NWAY-matched PS1-DR2 counterpart. Magnitudes are not corrected for Galactic extinction. All PanSTARRS magnitudes quoted in the NSS80 catalog are, in order of preference, Kron, PSF, or the default aperture magnitudes, with the selected type for each band indicated in column 132. Sources with unconstrained magnitudes are denoted with -77, and limits with -99 values in the error columns. *Units:* AB mag.

**Columns 135:** A binary flag indicating the subsample of higher probability CatWISE20 or PS1-DR2 matches (i.e., NWAY reliable sample) with thresholds of  $\rho_{\text{Cat/PS1,best}} > 0.4$  and  $\rho_{\text{Cat/PS1,any}} > 0.5$ . Section 3.2 details the IR/optical counterpart matching using NWAY.

**Column 136:** Reference indicating the origin of the adopted principal optical counterpart to the *NuSTAR* source. The code PS1-NWAY indicates sources with lower-energy X-ray counterparts and successful NWAY matches in the PS1-DR2 catalog (Flewelling 2018). The codes PS1-MAN, SDSS, NSC2, DES2 and USNOB1 indicate sources with lower-energy X-ray counterparts and successful matches in the PS1-DR2 catalog (where  $\text{OOff\_PS1\_CatWISE} > 2.7''$  and therefore rematched to search for nominally closer PS1 matches), the SDSS photometric catalogue DR12 (Alam et al. 2015), the second data release of the NOIRLab Source Catalog (Nidever et al. 2021), the Dark Energy Survey DR2 (Abbott et al. 2016), and the USNOB1 catalogue (Monet et al. 2003), respectively. PS1-CatWISE, SDSS-CatWISE, NSC2-CatWISE, DES2-CatWISE, and USNOB1-CatWISE20 indicate the cases where there is no lower-energy X-ray counterpart to the *NuSTAR* position, but a CatWISE20 AGN candidate is identified within the *NuSTAR* error circle and successfully matched to the PS1-DR2, SDSS-DR12, NSC2, DES-DR2 or USNOB1 catalogue. PS1-softX, SDSS-softX, NSC2-softX, DES2-softX, and USNO1-softX indicate the cases where there is a lower-energy X-ray counterpart to the *NuSTAR* position, but no CatWISE20 candidate is identified within the *NuSTAR* error circle. NULL indicates sources that lack an optical identification. We give a detailed description of the procedure used to identify optical counterparts in Section 3.2.

**Column 137,138:** The R.A. and decl. coordinates (J2000) of the adopted optical counterpart, for sources with PS1-DR2, SDSS-DR12, NSC2, DES-DR2 and USNOB1 matches. Sources that lack an identified optical counterpart have R.A. and decl. values of (-999,-999). *Units:* degr.

**Column 139-145:** The  $g$ -,  $r$ - and  $i$ -band magnitudes (and associated errors) of the adopted optical counterpart. If the counterpart is sourced from PS1-DR2 the selected magnitude type for each band is indicated in column 143. Sources with no constraints are flagged with a -77 value, and limits are flagged with -99, respectively, in the error column. *Units:* AB mag.

**Column 146:** The angular offset between the adopted optical position and the *NuSTAR* position. Sources lacking an optical identification are flagged with a -77 value. *Units:* arcsec.

**Column 147:** The angular offset between the adopted optical position and the adopted lower-energy X-ray position. Sources lacking a PS1-DR2 match are flagged with a -77 value. *Units:* arcsec.

**Column 148:** The angular offset between the adopted optical position and the best NWAY-identified CatWISE20 position. Sources lacking a PS1-DR2/CatWISE20 match are flagged with a -77 value. *Units:* arcsec.

**Column 149:** A flag indicating whether the source is in the main spectroscopic catalog presented in Table 15: a value of 1 indicates the unique source entries for the spectroscopic catalog; a value of -1 flags sources with photometric redshifts; and sources which have not been targeted during our spectroscopic campaign are flagged with a value of 0.

**Column 150,151:** The R.A. and decl. coordinates (J2000) of the spectroscopic target observed during the ground-based follow-up program; see Section 3.3. Untargeted sources have R.A. and decl. values of (-999,-999). *Units:* degr.

**Column 152:** The angular offset between the spectroscopic target position and the adopted optical position. Sources lacking spectroscopic follow-up or an optical identification are flagged with a -77 value. *Units:* arcsec.

**Column 153:** The spectroscopic redshift of the *NuSTAR* source. The large majority of the redshifts were obtained through our own campaign of ground-based spectroscopic follow-up of *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey sources (see Section 3.3). Sources which have been followed-up, but lack redshift measurements due to low signal-to-noise spectra are flagged with -99 values, while unobserved sources have entries of -77.

**Column 154:** Quality flag of the spectroscopic redshift measurement. Single-line measurements are flagged as “quality

B” redshift measurements, photometric redshifts obtained from literature are flagged as “quality C”, and sources with a faint continuum detected (but lack a redshift measurement) are flagged as “quality F”.

**Column 155:** Spectroscopic classification of the *NuSTAR* source: BL  $\equiv$  Broad Line object (i.e., quasar); NL  $\equiv$  Narrow Line object (AGN or galaxy); Gxy  $\equiv$  Galaxy (absorption lines); Galactic  $\equiv$  Galactic sources at  $z = 0$ . See Section 3.3.3.

**Column 156:** Additional classification information for the duplicate source entries, e.g., AGN pairs (BL\_pair & NL\_pair), dual AGN (Dual\_AGN), galaxy pairs (Gxy\_pair), and more than one counterpart candidate (2cpart\_candidates).

**Columns 157,158:** Binary flags indicating whether the spectroscopic target position matches to the best NWAY-identified counterpart for CatWISE20 and PS1-DR2.

**Column 159:** A flag indicating the reliability of the spectroscopic target as the correct counterpart: 1  $\equiv$  correct counterpart; 0  $\equiv$  counterpart uncertainty; -1  $\equiv$  unobserved.

**Column 160:** Reference indicating the catalog origin of the spectroscopic counterpart.

**Columns 161-166:** The  $g$ -,  $r$ - and  $i$ -band magnitudes (with associated errors) of the spectroscopic target. Magnitudes are not corrected for Galactic extinction. Sources with unconstrained magnitudes are denoted with -77, and limits with -99 values in the error column. *Units:* AB mag.

**Column 167:** The rest-frame 10 – 40 keV luminosity, estimated from the fluxes in columns 82-87. The luminosities are observed values, uncorrected for any absorption along the line of sight. The intrinsic luminosities may therefore be higher, for highly absorbed AGN. Sources with no constraints are flagged with a -77 value. *Units:* ergs<sup>-1</sup>.

**Column 168:** A binary flag indicating the few sources that show evidence for being associated with the primary science target of their respective *NuSTAR* observations, according to the definition in Section 3.3.3 [ $\Delta(cz) < 0.05 cz$ ]. 1  $\equiv$  associated with primary target; 0  $\equiv$  not associated; -1  $\equiv$  no spectroscopy.

**Column 169:** A binary flag indicating the *NuSTAR* sources which are Compton-thick candidates (CT;  $N_{\text{H}} \gtrsim 1.5 \times 10^{24} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ ). These sources can be (crudely) identified from their extreme band ratios as demonstrated in Section 4.1.2.

**Table 11.** Column descriptions for the primary NSS80 catalogue.

Column number	Column name	Description
1	ID	The unique source identification number, in order of increasing right ascension (R.A.).
2	NSS80_Name	The unique <i>NuSTAR</i> source name, following the IAU-approved format: <i>NuSTAR</i> JHHMMSS $\pm$ DDMM.m, where m is the truncated fraction of one arcminute for the arcseconds component of the declination (decl.).
3	Serendip	The unique <i>NuSTAR</i> field and source index.
4	IDL17	The unique L17 source identification number.
5	Serendip_L17	The unique L17 <i>NuSTAR</i> field and source index.
6,7	RAJ2000,DECJ2000	The <i>NuSTAR</i> R.A. and decl. coordinates (J2000), as described in Section 2.3.
8,9	Gal_lat,Gal_Long	IAU 1958 Galactic latitude and longitude.
10,11,12	SFlag,HFlag,HFlag	A binary flag indicating the energy bands for which the source is detected for the three standard <i>NuSTAR</i> energy bands.
13,14,15	SdbFlag,HdbFlag,FdbFlag	Same as columns 10–12, post-deblending.
16,17,18	logSP,logHP,logFP	The logarithm of the false probabilities for the three standard <i>NuSTAR</i> energy bands.
19	logMinP	The <i>NuSTAR</i> detection likelihood.
20,21,22	logSdbP,logHdbP,logFdbP	The same as columns 16–18, post-deblending.
23	logMindbP	The same as column 19, post-deblending.
24	dbFlag	A binary flag indicating whether the source is significant post-deblending, for at least one energy band.
25,26	Scts,e_Scts	Total source count for the soft energy band, and associated errors.
27	SBck	Background count for the soft energy band.
28,29	SNet,e_SNet	Net source count for the soft energy band, and associated errors.
30,31	Hcts,e_Hcts	Total source count for the hard energy band, and associated errors.
32	HBck	Background count for the hard energy band.
33,34	HNet,e_HNet	Net source count for the hard energy band, and associated errors.

**Table 11** continued on next page

Table 11 (continued)

Column number	Column name	Description
35,36	Fcts, e_Fcts	Total source count for the full energy band, and associated errors.
37	FBck	Background count for the full energy band.
38,39	FNet,e_FNet	Net source count for the full energy band, and associated errors.
40	Sdbcts	Total source count for the soft energy band, post-deblending.
41	SdbBck	Background count for the soft energy band, post-deblending.
42,43	SdbNet,e_SdbNet	Net source count for the soft energy band, post-deblending, and associated errors.
44	Hdbcts	Total source count for the hard energy band, post-deblending.
45	HdbBck	Background count for the hard energy band, post-deblending.
46,47	HdbNet,e_HdbNet	Net source count for the hard energy band, post-deblending, and associated errors.
48	Fdbcts	Total source count for the full energy band, post-deblending.
49	FdbBck	Background count for the full energy band, post-deblending.
50,51	FdbNet,e_FdbNet	Net source count for the full energy band, post-deblending, and associated errors.
52,53,54	Sexp,Hexp,Fexp	Net vignetting-corrected exposure times at the source position, for the combined A+B data.
55,56	SCR,e_SCR	Total source count rate for the soft energy band, and associated errors.
57	SCRBck	Background count rate for the soft energy band.
58,59	SNetCR,e_SNetCR	Net source count rate for the soft energy band, and associated errors.
60,61	HCR,e_HCR	Total source count rate for the hard energy band, and associated errors.
62	HCRBck	Background count rate for the hard energy band.
63,64	HNetCR,e_HNetCR	Net source count rate for the hard energy band, and associated errors.
65,66	FCR,e_FCR	Total source count rate for the full energy band, and associated errors.
67	FCRBck	Background count rate for the full energy band.
68,69	FNetCR,e_FNetCR	Net source count rate for the full energy band, and associated errors.
70,71	SdbNetCR,e_SdbNetCR	Deblended net source count rate for the soft energy band, and associated errors.
72,73	HdbNetCR,e_HdbNetCR	Deblended net source count rate for the hard energy band, and associated errors.
74,75	FdbNetCR,e_FdbNetCR	Deblended net source count rate for the full energy band, and associated errors.
76	H/S	Band ratio computed from using the <i>NuSTAR</i> hard and soft energy bands.
77	upH/S	Band ratio upper error.
78	lowH/S	Band ratio lower error.
79	gamma	Effective photon index.
80	upgamma	Effective photon index upper error.
81	lowgamma	Effective photon index lower error.
82,83	SdbFlux,e_SdbFlux	Deblended fluxes in the soft energy band, and associated errors.
84,85	HdbFlux,e_HdbFlux	Deblended fluxes in the hard energy band, and associated errors.
86,87	FdbFlux,e_FdbFlux	Deblended fluxes in the full energy band, and associated errors.
88	FLAG_softX_cov	Abbreviated code indicating the lower-energy X-ray coverage with <i>Chandra</i> , <i>XMM-Newton</i> and/or <i>Swift-XRT</i> .
89	XOrig	Reference for the adopted lower-energy X-ray ( <i>Chandra</i> , <i>XMM-Newton</i> or <i>Swift-XRT</i> ) counterpart.
90,91	XRAdeg,XDEdeg	R.A. and decl. of the lower-energy X-ray counterpart.
92	e_Xdeg	Positional uncertainty the lower-energy X-ray counterpart (where available, otherwise of the <i>NuSTAR</i> source) used for NWAY.
93	XOff_NuSTAR	Angular separation between the <i>NuSTAR</i> and lower-energy X-ray counterpart positions.
94	E_SoftX_keV	Reference for the lower-energy X-ray flux used to compute the 3 – 8 keV fluxes (i.e., XFlux).
95,96,97	XFlux,XFlux_Lerr,XFlux_Uerr	3 – 8 keV (CSC2, 4XMM-DR10/s, or 2SXPS) flux of the lower-energy X-ray counterpart, with associated lower and upper errors.
98,99,100	TXFlux,TXFlux_Lerr,TXFlux_Uerr	Total 3–8 keV flux of all (CSC2, 4XMM-DR10/s, or 2SXPS) sources within 30'' of the <i>NuSTAR</i> position, with associated lower and upper errors.
101	gal_ext_Av	Galactic extinction, $A_v$ .
102,103,104	gal_ext_g,gal_ext_r,gal_ext_i	Galactic line-of-sight absorption in the $g$ -, $r$ -, and $i$ -bands.
105,106	Pbest_CatWISE,Pany_CatWISE	The NWAY best match probability and probability that any of the CatWISE20 sources is the right counterpart.
107,108	RA_CatWISE,DEC_CatWISE	R.A. and decl. of the “best” NWAY-identified CatWISE20 counterpart.

Table 11 continued on next page

Table 11 (*continued*)

Column number	Column name	Description
109	IROff_NuSTAR	Angular separation between the NWAY-matched <i>WISE</i> counterpart position and the <i>NuSTAR</i> position.
110	IROff_SoftX	Angular separation between the NWAY-matched <i>WISE</i> counterpart position and the adopted lower-energy X-ray counterpart.
111,112	W1_CatWISE,e_W1_CatWISE	<i>WISE</i> W1 magnitude (3.4 $\mu\text{m}$ ), with associated errors.
113,114	W2_CatWISE,e_W2_CatWISE	<i>WISE</i> W2 magnitude (4.6 $\mu\text{m}$ ), with associated errors.
115,116	RA_AllWISE,DEC_AllWISE	R.A. and decl. of the closest AllWISE counterpart.
117,118	W3_AllWISE,e_W3_AllWISE	<i>WISE</i> W3 magnitude (12 $\mu\text{m}$ ), with associated errors.
119,120	W4_AllWISE,e_W4_AllWISE	<i>WISE</i> W4 magnitude (22 $\mu\text{m}$ ), with associated errors.
121,122	Pbest_PS1,Pany_PS1	The NWAY best match probability and probability that any of the PS1-DR2 sources is the right counterpart.
123,124	RA_PS1,DEC_PS1	R.A. and decl. of the “best” NWAY-identified PS1-DR2 counterpart.
125	OOff_PS1_NuSTAR	Angular separation between the NWAY-matched PS1-DR2 counterpart position and the <i>NuSTAR</i> position.
126	OOff_PS1_SoftX	Angular separation between the NWAY-matched PS1-DR2 counterpart position and the adopted lower-energy X-ray position.
127	OOff_PS1_CatWISE	Angular separation between the NWAY-matched PS1-DR2 and CatWISE20 counterpart positions.
128,129	gmag_PS1,e_gmag_PS1	<i>g</i> -band magnitude for the NWAY-identified PS1-DR2 counterpart, with associated errors.
130,131	rmag_PS1,e_rmag_PS1	<i>r</i> -band magnitude for the NWAY-identified PS1-DR2 counterpart, with associated errors.
132,133	imag_PS1,e_imag_PS1	<i>i</i> -band magnitude for the NWAY-identified PS1-DR2 counterpart, with associated errors.
134	mag_type_PS1	Three letter code indicating the type of PS1 magnitude in each band: ‘K’ (Kron), ‘P’ (PSF), ‘A’ (aperture), ‘-’ (unavailable).
135	NWAY_RFlag	A binary flag indicating the NWAY reliable sample following $p_{\text{Cat/PS,best}} > 0.4$ and $p_{\text{Cat/PS,any}} > 0.5$ .
136	OOrig_cpart	Reference for the adopted optical counterpart, in order of preference: PS1-DR2, SDSS, NSC2, DES-DR2 or USNOB1.
137,138	ORAdeg_cpart,ODEdeg_cpart	R.A. and decl. of the adopted optical counterpart.
139,140	gmag_cpart,e_gmag_cpart	<i>g</i> -band magnitude for the adopted optical counterpart, with associated errors.
141,142	rmag_cpart,e_rmag_cpart	<i>r</i> -band magnitude for the adopted optical counterpart, with associated errors.
143,144	imag_cpart,e_imag_cpart	<i>i</i> -band magnitude for the adopted optical counterpart, with associated errors.
145	mag_type_cpart	Three letter code indicating the type of PS1 magnitude in each band (if used for counterpart): ‘K’ (Kron), ‘P’ (PSF), ‘A’ (aperture), ‘-’ (unavailable).
146	OOff_NuSTAR	Angular separation between the adopted optical counterpart position and the <i>NuSTAR</i> position.
147	OOff_SoftX	Angular separation between the adopted optical counterpart position and the best soft X-ray position.
148	OOff_CatWISE	Angular separation between the adopted optical counterpart position and the best CatWISE20 position.
149	SpecCAT	Flag indicating sources which are included in the spectroscopic catalog.
150,151	RAdeg_spec,DEdeg_spec	R.A. and decl. of the spectroscopic target.
152	OOff_Spec_Cpart	Angular separation between the spectroscopic target and the adopted optical counterpart.
153	zspec	Spectroscopic redshift.
154	zQuality	Quality flag of the spectroscopic redshift measurement.
155,156	Classification,Class_extra	Spectroscopic classification and additional source class information.
157,158	NWAY_CatWISE,NWAY_PS1	A binary flag indicating a NWAY CatWISE20/PS1-DR2 match to the spectroscopic target.
159	Cpart_RFlag	A flag indicating the reliability of the spectroscopic target as the correct counterpart.
160	SpecRef	Reference for the information used for the spectroscopic target.
161,162	gmag_spec,e_gmag_spec	<i>r</i> -band magnitude for the spectroscopic target, with associated errors.
163,164	rmag_spec,e_rmag_spec	<i>r</i> -band magnitude for the spectroscopic target, with associated errors.
165,166	imag_spec,e_imag_spec	<i>r</i> -band magnitude for the spectroscopic target, with associated errors.
167	L10_40keV	Non-absorption-corrected, rest-frame 10-40 keV luminosity.
168	PFlag	A binary flag indicating sources that show evidence for being associated with the primary science targets of their respective <i>NuSTAR</i> observations.
169	CTFlag	A binary flag indicating Compton-thick candidates.

**Table 12.** Individual sources in order of R.A. for the first 25 NSS80 catalogue entries. The column numbers corresponds to the descriptions given in Table 11. The full NSS80 catalogue is available on the NSS80 webpage.

ID	<i>NuSTAR</i> name	R.A.	decl.	XOrig	NWAY	NWAY <sub>clean</sub>	<i>z</i>	$L_{10-40\text{ keV}}$ ( $\text{erg s}^{-1}$ )
(1)	(2)	(6)	(7)	(85)	(91)	(112)	(113)	(114)
1	NuSTARJ000011-7652.5	0.04947511	-76.8755213	2SXPS	...	0	0.05	$2.26 \times 10^{42}$
2	NuSTARJ000303+7017.7	0.76529404	70.29623148	...	...	0	...	...
3	NuSTARJ000333+7013.7	0.89107631	70.22940726	4XMMDR10	CatWISE20	1	0.39	$4.75 \times 10^{43}$
4	NuSTARJ000423+7017.2	1.09736601	70.28740531	4XMMDR10	CatWISE20	1	0.77	$1.73 \times 10^{44}$
5	NuSTARJ000549+2013.0	1.45692910	20.21813114	4XMMDR10s	CatWISE20	1	1.97	$7.79 \times 10^{44}$
6	NuSTARJ000613+2018.3	1.55586492	20.30626396	4XMMDR10s	CatWISE20	1	...	...
7	NuSTARJ000634+2013.0	1.64247764	20.21818081	4XMMDR10s	CatWISE20	1	...	...
8	NuSTARJ001003+1057.5	2.51268295	10.95874867	4XMMDR10s	CatWISE20	1	...	...
9	NuSTARJ001026+1054.5	2.60935872	10.90892409	...	...	0	...	...
10	NuSTARJ001443+8131.9	3.68230459	81.53320406	4XMMDR10	CatWISE20	1	0.37	$6.63 \times 10^{43}$
11	NuSTARJ001542+8134.4	3.92760279	81.57499432	4XMMDR10	CatWISE20	1	...	...
12	NuSTARJ001852-1026.1	4.71867576	-10.4352099	CSC2	CatWISE20	1	0.33	$2.61 \times 10^{43}$
13	NuSTARJ001858-1022.7	4.74574713	-10.3799008	CSC2	CatWISE20	1	1.17	$7.32 \times 10^{44}$
14	NuSTARJ001908-1020.7	4.78738895	-10.3457535	...	CatWISE20	1	...	...
15	NuSTARJ001952-7057.0	4.96672553	-70.9511159	CSC2	CatWISE20	1	0.81	$1.48 \times 10^{44}$
16	NuSTARJ002028+5910.3	5.12058379	59.17219231	...	...	0	...	...
17	NuSTARJ002046-7057.6	5.19269674	-70.9614382	CSC2	CatWISE20	1	0.27	$9.81 \times 10^{42}$
18	NuSTARJ002102+5546.2	5.26237238	55.77061297	2SXPS	CatWISE20	1	...	...
19	NuSTARJ002112+5542.5	5.30106223	55.70913570	2SXPS	CatWISE20	1	0.41	$4.38 \times 10^{43}$
20	NuSTARJ002113-7053.5	5.30725801	-70.8924101	4XMMDR10s	...	0	...	...
21	NuSTARJ002151-1859.7	5.46388437	-18.9957774	...	PSDR2	1	...	...
22	NuSTARJ002214-1851.0	5.56207390	-18.8503530	4XMMDR10	CatWISE20	1	...	...
23	NuSTARJ002227-1854.7	5.61405050	-18.9131576	4XMMDR10	CatWISE20	1	0.29	$1.99 \times 10^{43}$
24	NuSTARJ002544+6818.8	6.43592415	68.31345208	CSC2	CatWISE20	1	...	...
25	NuSTARJ002624+6819.9	6.60239773	68.33175607	2SXPS	...	0	...	...

## B. DESCRIPTION OF THE SECONDARY NSS80 SOURCE CATALOGUE

The secondary *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey source catalogue, contains 214 sources in total, and is available as an electronic table on the NSS80 webpage. Here we describe the columns of the catalogue, which are summarized in Table 13.

## C. COMPARISON TO THE NSS40


Overall, we find a 91% match between the primary NSS80 catalog and NSS40 for a search radius of  $25''$  (which is the positional accuracy of *NuSTAR* for faint sources), with 36 primary NSS40 sources reported in L17 undetected in the NSS80. For the majority of these sources the deeper data has improved the false probability estimates and, consequently, eliminates false detections. This is particularly noticeable for L17 sources with detections in a single energy band only. We summarise potential reasons to explain the undetected L17 sources in Table 14: 32 sources have improved false probabilities, 1 source lies in an excess background region, and 3 sources are on the peripheries of coadded fields.

## D. COMPARISON OF CATWISE20 COUNTERPARTS TO SPECTROSCOPIC TARGETS

Our assessment of the reliability of the followed-up spectroscopic sources takes into account the positional offset between the best CatWISE20 counterpart and the spectroscopic counterpart in combination with the CatWISE20 probability. In Figure D we plot the offset between the best CatWISE20 counterpart and the followed-up spectroscopic target as a function of the NWAY best match probability, color-coded by the different spectral classifications. Each

**Table 13.** Column descriptions for the secondary NSS80 catalogue.

Column number	Description
1	Unique source identification number (ID).
2	Unique <i>NuSTAR</i> source name.
3	Unique <i>NuSTAR</i> field and source ID.
4,5	Unique L17 <i>NuSTAR</i> source ID and field; the secondary L17 catalog is appended with a “S”.
6,7	Right ascension (R.A.) and declination (decl.).
8,9	Flags indicating optical mask and optical source name.
10-12	Flags indicating the energy bands for which the source is detected.
13-15	Same as columns 10–12, post-deblending.
16-18	The logarithm of the false probabilities for the three standard <i>NuSTAR</i> energy bands.
19	The <i>NuSTAR</i> detection likelihood.
20-22	Same as columns 16–18, post-deblending.
23	The same as column 19, post-deblending.
24	Flag indicating whether the source is significant post-deblending, for at least one energy band.
25-39	Total, background, and net source counts for the three standard energy bands, and associated errors.
40-51	Same as columns 25–39, post-deblending.
52-54	Net vignetting-corrected exposure times at the source position, for the combined A+B data.
55-69	Total, background, and net source count rates for the three standard energy bands, and associated errors.
70-75	Deblended net source count rates for the three standard energy bands, and associated errors.
76-78	Band ratio and upper and lower errors.
79-81	Effective photon index and upper and lower errors.
82-87	Deblended fluxes in the three standard bands and associated errors.



**Figure D1.** Separation in arcsec between the NWay-identified CatWISE20 counterpart and the spectroscopic target versus the best CatWISE20 match probability, color-coded by spectral classifications: BL (blue circle), NL (green circle), galaxy (Gxy; peach ‘X’), Galactic sources (grey circle), AGN/Gxy pairs (peach star), dual AGN (purple star), and a BL Lac candidate (white, black-edged ‘X’). Solid symbols indicate NSS80 sources with lower-energy (i.e., soft) X-ray counterparts and white filled symbols mark NSS80 sources which lack lower-energy X-ray counterparts and, therefore, have a lower match probability given the large uncertainty in the *NuSTAR* position (i.e.,  $\sim 25''$ ). The vertical black dash-dotted line indicates the probability cut we applied in Section 3.2 to obtain reliable counterpart associations to the X-ray source.

**Table 14.** A list of the NSS40 serendipitous sources reported in L17 which are undetected in the NSS80 catalogue.

ID	<i>NuSTAR</i> name	Science target name	R.A.	decl.	Type	$z_{\text{spec}}$	Explanation
(1)	(2)	(3)	( $^{\circ}$ ) (4)	( $^{\circ}$ ) (5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
2	NuSTARJ001130 + 0057.8	SDSSJ001111d97p005626d3	2.88	0.96	BL	1.492	$P_{\text{false}}$ condition not met in NSS80 reductions
5	NuSTARJ001717 + 8127.3	S50014p81	4.32	81.46	-	-	Undetected in HB+FB; logSdbP $\approx$ -6
9	NuSTARJ001953 + 5911.8	IC10_X1	4.97	59.2	-	-	$P_{\text{false}}$ condition not met in NSS80 reductions
78	NuSTARJ040730 + 0344.2	3C105	61.88	3.74	-	-	Undetected in SB+FB; logHdbP $\approx$ -6
79	NuSTARJ042349 + 0410.9	2MASXJ04234080p0408017	65.96	4.18	-	-	$P_{\text{false}}$ condition not met in NSS80 reductions
81	NuSTARJ042509 - 5709.5	1H_0419m577	66.29	-57.16	-	-	Undetected in SB+HB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6
89	NuSTARJ043724 - 4722.2	PSRJ0437m4715	69.35	-47.37	-	-	Undetected in SB+HB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6
99	NuSTARJ052100 - 2528.8	IRAS05189m2524	80.25	-25.48	BL	1.666	Possible false detection on the edge of an exposure
121	NuSTARJ065922 - 5558.6	Bullet_Bullet_shock	104.84	-55.98	-	-	Undetected in SB+HB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6
179	NuSTARJ095440 + 6942.6	SN2014J	148.67	69.71	-	-	Undetected in SB+HB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6
192	NuSTARJ095801 + 6859.4	M81_X9	149.51	68.99	-	-	Undetected in SB+HB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6
193	NuSTARJ095806 + 6910.3	M81_X9	149.53	69.17	-	-	Undetected in HB+FB; logSdbP $\approx$ -6
196	NuSTARJ095853 + 6901.3	M81_X9	149.72	69.02	-	-	Undetected in SB+HB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6
211	NuSTARJ102318 + 0036.5	PSRJ1023p0038	155.83	0.61	Gal	0.0	Undetected in SB+HB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6
212	NuSTARJ102328 + 0043.9	PSRJ1023p0038	155.87	0.73	-	-	Undetected in SB+HB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6
219	NuSTARJ102802 - 4351.0	NGC3256	157.01	-43.85	BL	1.784	$P_{\text{false}}$ condition not met in NSS80 reductions
227	NuSTARJ105931 + 2429.8	IRAS_10565p2448	164.88	24.5	BL	0.908	$P_{\text{false}}$ condition not met in NSS80 reductions
233	NuSTARJ110632 + 7225.9	NGC3516	166.64	72.43	-	-	Undetected in SB+FB; logHdbP $\approx$ -6
236	NuSTARJ110752 + 7230.7	NGC3516	166.97	72.51	BL	0.901	Undetected in SB+HB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6
256	NuSTARJ120242 + 4437.2	NGC4051	180.68	44.62	NL?	0.296	Possible false detection on the edge of an exposure
261	NuSTARJ120613 + 4957.2	2MASXJ12055599p4959561	181.56	49.95	BL	0.784	Undetected in SB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6
302	NuSTARJ125657 + 5644.6	Mrk231	194.24	56.74	NL	2.073	Undetected in SB+HB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6
303	NuSTARJ130108 - 6356.2	2RXPJ130159d6m635806	195.28	-63.94	-	-	Undetected in SB+FB; logHdbP $\approx$ -6
313	NuSTARJ133311 - 3406.8	ESO383_18	203.3	-34.11	NL?	0.091	Possible false detection on the edge of an exposure
330	NuSTARJ141215 - 6519.6	Circinus_XMM2	213.07	-65.33	-	-	Undetected in SB+HB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6
375	NuSTARJ165346 + 3953.7	Mkn501	253.44	39.9	NL	0.354	Undetected in SB+FB; logHdbP $\approx$ -6
376	NuSTARJ165351 + 3938.5	Mkn501	253.46	39.64	Gal	0.0	Undetected in SB+HB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6
384	NuSTARJ171718 - 6239.1	NGC6300	259.33	-62.65	-	-	Undetected in SB+HB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6
389	NuSTARJ172755 - 1417.4	PDS_456	261.98	-14.29	-	-	Undetected in HB+FB; logSdbP $\approx$ -6
390	NuSTARJ172803 - 1423.0	PDS_456	262.02	-14.38	BL	1.555	Contaminated by stray light
395	NuSTARJ172843 - 1419.0	PDS_456	262.18	-14.32	-	-	Undetected in HB+FB; logSdbP $\approx$ -6
407	NuSTARJ182447 - 2444.5	PSR_B1821m24	276.2	-24.74	-	-	$P_{\text{false}}$ condition not met in NSS80 reductions
414	NuSTARJ183422 - 0840.6	HESSJ1834m087_TeV	278.59	-8.68	-	-	$P_{\text{false}}$ condition not met in NSS80 reductions
413	NuSTARJ183422 - 0841.4	HESSJ1834m087_TeV	278.59	-8.69	-	-	$P_{\text{false}}$ condition not met in NSS80 reductions
485	NuSTARJ224302 + 2942.1	Ark_564	340.76	29.7	-	-	Undetected in SB+FB; logHdbP $\approx$ -6
491	NuSTARJ231811 - 4228.8	NGC7582	349.55	-42.48	-	-	Undetected in SB+HB; logFdbP $\approx$ -6

NOTE— COLUMNS: (1) Unique source identification number in L17. (2) Unique *NuSTAR* source name in L17. (3) Object name for the primary science target of the *NuSTAR* observation in L17. (4) Right ascension as recorded in L17. (5) Declination as recorded in L17. (6) Spectroscopic classification of the optical counterpart. (7) Spectroscopic redshift. (8) Explanation for non-detection of the NSS40 serendipitous source in the NSS80 catalogue.

spectroscopic class is further divided into NSS80 sources with lower-energy X-ray (solid symbols) and without lower-energy X-ray (white filled, color-edged symbols) counterparts. Overall, there is a good match to NWAY for the majority of the spectroscopically classified sources, indicating that the correct spectroscopic counterpart has been identified: the positional offset for the majority of the sources is  $< 5''$ ; we consider  $5''$  as a reasonable threshold since it broadly corresponds to the CatWISE20 positional uncertainty. The reliability of the targets with larger positional offsets is less certain. The NWAY probability for the best CatWISE20 counterpart is strongly dependent on the availability of a lower-energy X-ray counterpart. For example, the dual AGN system in the NSS80 catalog (NuSTARJ054231+6054.4; open, purple-edged star) is the correct counterpart based on its AGN-like *WISE* colours, but it has a low NWAY probability due to the lack of lower-energy X-ray information (*Swift*-XRT coverage, but undetected). Most of the large-offset NSS80 sources without lower-energy X-ray counterparts have low-to-intermediate NWAY probabilities and sensitive lower-energy X-ray observations are required to improve the counterpart identification. By comparison, most of the large-offset NSS80 sources with lower-energy X-ray counterparts have high NWAY probabilities, but NWAY has selected

a different source as the best match, typically a brighter lower-energy X-ray counterpart to that spectroscopically followed-up (see e.g., Figure 20). To better determine the reliability between the best CatWISE20 counterpart and the followed-up counterpart of these more uncertain sources requires further investigation including, for example, spectroscopic follow-up of the best CatWISE20 counterpart.

## E. OPTICAL SPECTROSCOPIC PROPERTIES OF INDIVIDUAL POST-NSS40 OBJECTS

### E.1. *Optical spectroscopic properties of individual post-NSS40 objects*

Here we provide details of the optical spectroscopic properties of individual sources from the *NuSTAR* serendipitous survey. As described in Section 3.3.1, these largely result from our dedicated follow-up campaign using the Keck, Palomar, VLT, and SALT facilities, and also from existing publicly available spectroscopy (primarily SDSS spectroscopy).

Details for individual sources are tabulated in Table 15, the columns of which are as follows:

- (1) Unique *NuSTAR* source identification number, in order of increasing right ascension;
- (2) Unique *NuSTAR* source name as listed in source catalogue;
- (3) The unique observing run identification number, as defined in Table 6 (“S” and “Lit” mark spectra obtained from the SDSS and from elsewhere in the literature, respectively);
- (4) Source redshift (mainly from spectroscopic data);
- (5) Source classification as described in Section 3.3.3 (sources with photometric redshift measurements are appended with a “C” symbol and sources with a level of ambiguity in the optical classification are appended with a “?” symbol);
- (6) Quality flag of spectroscopic redshift. Single line measurements are annotated with “B” and photometric redshift measurements with “C”; “F” annotates sources which lack a reliable redshift measurement (usually faint, red continuum spectra);
- (7) NWAY association flag: 0 = mismatch between spectroscopic target and NWAY source; 1 = match between spectroscopic target and NWAY source; -99 = Secondary post-NSS40 objects.
- (8) A binary flag indicating sources that show evidence for being associated with the primary science target of their respective *NuSTAR* observations, according to the definition  $\Delta(cz) < 0.05 cz$ .
- (9) An abbreviated flag indicating a NWAY CatWISE20 (C) and/or PS1-DR2 (P) counterpart match to the spectroscopic target.
- (10) Notes based on our visual assessment of the spectra.

Individual source spectra are available online and example spectra of the first four sources for the different spectral classes are shown in Figures E1–E5: BL AGN, NL AGN, galaxies, Galactic sources, and unclassified objects with a faint continuum detected, respectively. The spectra for each class are given in order of increasing right ascension. Shown on the top are the unique *NuSTAR* ID and source name, in the upper left corner the observing telescope and run identification number (corresponding to Table 6), and in the upper right corner the source classification and redshift. All *CatWISE* detections are shown with ‘X’ marks, colored green. The *NuSTAR* 25” and 30” error circles are plotted in a dash-dotted and solid black line, respectively. All PS1-DR2 detections are shown with ‘plus’ marks, colored pink. The X-ray position is marked with the respective error circle, the CatWISE20 position is indicated with a green 2.7” error circle, the PS1-DR2 position is shown with a purple 2” error circle, and the spectroscopic target is marked with a red crosshair corresponding to the black spectrum in the left panel. Where a second spectrum is available, the spectrum, observation details, and target position are shown in peach.

### E.2. *Optical finding charts for the spectroscopic NSS40 sources*

Figure E6 shows optical finding charts for the first 12 spectroscopically followed-up NSS40 sources reported in L17; the finding charts for the full sample are available online. Following the colour scheme of Section E.1, all *WISE* detections are shown with ‘X’ marks, and PS1-DR2 detections with ‘plus’ marks. The *NuSTAR* 25” and 30” error circles are plotted in a dash-dotted and solid black line, respectively. The X-ray position is marked with the respective

error circle, the CatWISE20 position is indicated with a green  $2.7''$  error circle, the PS1-DR2 position is shown with a purple  $2''$  error circle, and the spectroscopic target is marked with a red crosshair.

**Table 15.** Summary of the optical spectroscopy for the post-NSS40 serendipitous survey sources. The columns are described in Section E.1. Details for NSS40 sources are tabulated in Table 6 in L17.

ID	<i>NuSTAR</i> name	Run	$z$	Type	Quality	PFlag	NWAY	F <sub>Cpart</sub>	Notes
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
2	NuSTARJ000303+7017.7	24	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	2	Possibly incorrect counterpart due to high source density
3	NuSTARJ000333+7013.7	20	0.391	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
4	NuSTARJ000423+7017.2	20	0.775	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
5	NuSTARJ000549+2013.0	S	1.974	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Mg II BALQSO
6	NuSTARJ000613+2018.3	23	...	...	F	0	C+P	1	Continuum detected
10	NuSTARJ001443+8131.9	24	0.365	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
15	NuSTARJ001952-7057.0	25	0.813	BL	...	0	C	1	...
17	NuSTARJ002046-7057.6	30	0.271	NL	...	0	C	1	...
19	NuSTARJ002112+5542.5	7	0.409	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
20	NuSTARJ002113-7053.5	28	0	Galactic	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty; two potential candidates within XMM error circle
27	NuSTARJ004220-1254.0	7	0.803	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
28	NuSTARJ004230-1255.3	1	0.521	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
31	NuSTARJ005219+1725.3	22	0.102	NL	...	0	C+P	1	[O III] affected by chip gap
40	NuSTARJ005538+4613.1	23	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	1	...
41	NuSTARJ005543+4605.6	23	0.452	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
42	NuSTARJ005730-2220.5	28	...	...	F	0	C	1	Low S/N spectrum; potentially H $\alpha$ at $z = 0.195$
43	NuSTARJ005748-2218.8	27	1.260	BL	B	0	C+P	1	...
45	NuSTARJ010710-1732.4	32	0.369	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
46	NuSTARJ010718-1130.9	13	1.146	BL?	B	0	C	1	Extremely faint; potential Mg II detected
48	NuSTARJ010736-1732.3	L	0.0217	NL	...	1	C+P	1	Emission-line galaxy (da Costa et al. 1998) associated with the <i>NuSTAR</i> science target (Strauss et al. 1992; Arp 1966, IC 1623)
49	NuSTARJ010739-1139.1	5	0.048	NL	...	0	C+P	1	UKST/6dF spectrum also available (Jones et al. 2009); reported in <i>Swift</i> -BAT BASS DR2 (Koss et al. 2022)
56	NuSTARJ011429-3241.9	27	0.693	NL	...	0	C	1	...
60	NuSTARJ012227+0056.2	S	1.698	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
62	NuSTARJ012618+2559.2	16	0.410	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
63	NuSTARJ012633+2556.2	S	0.427	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
64	NuSTARJ012642+2554.9	18	0.208	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
68	NuSTARJ012947-6036.9	28	...	...	F	0	C	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information; continuum detected
69	NuSTARJ013003-4600.4	29	0.159	NL	...	0	C	1	H $\alpha$ lost to A-band telluric feature
72	NuSTARJ013859+2920.0	7	0	Galactic	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty; target is bright in <i>W3</i>
73	NuSTARJ014316+1337.7	1	0.844	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
74	NuSTARJ014333+1342.2	13	0.343	Gxy	...	0	P	1	Possibly an obscured AGN in an early-type galaxy; weak H $\alpha$ detection
75	NuSTARJ014904+2143.5	5	0.614	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
78	NuSTARJ015548+0227.2	22	0.481	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
79	NuSTARJ020344+1137.3	5	0.167	NL	...	0	C	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information; H $\alpha$ affected by A-band telluric feature
82	NuSTARJ020601-0011.7	S	1.337	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Strong [O II] Emission-line

Table 15 continued on next page

Table 15 (continued)

ID	<i>NuSTAR</i> name	Run	$z$	Type	Quality	PFlag	NWAY	F <sub>Cpart</sub>	Notes
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
83	NuSTARJ020614+6449.3	24	...	...	F	0	C+P	2	Possibly two sources contributing to <i>NuSTAR</i> detection; continuum detected for both targets
84	NuSTARJ020622-0023.5	23	2.793	NL	B	0	C+P	1	Tentative Ly $\alpha$ and C III] Emission-lines detected
87	NuSTARJ021435-0042.7	S	0.437	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
88	NuSTARJ021449-0045.2	7	0.940	NL	...	0	C	1	Oxygen lines offset from a continuum source
89	NuSTARJ021454-6425.9	30	0.068	Gxy/pair	...	1	...	2	Galaxy companion at $z = 0.075$ which is associated with the <i>NuSTAR</i> science target (RBS 0295; Schwobe et al. 2000); H $\alpha$ affected by chip gap
90	NuSTARJ021810+4236.0	12	0.967	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
91	NuSTARJ021902+7348.5	20	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	1	Unusual <i>WISE</i> (bright in W3) optical colours for Galactic source
92	NuSTARJ021934-0508.8	S	1.324	BL	...	0	C+P	2	Counterpart uncertainty; the nominally closer (but fainter) CXO source is a SDSS BL at $z = 2.305$
93	NuSTARJ022023-0403.2	20	3.190	BL	...	0	C+P	1	C IV affected by telluric feature
94	NuSTARJ022032-0403.3	S	0.822	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
95	NuSTARJ022222+2505.9	20	0.342	NL	...	0	C	1	...
97	NuSTARJ022742+3331.5	20	0.090	NL/pair	...	0	C+P	1	Borderline AGN from BPT diagnostics; NL companion (star-forming from BPT) north of <i>NuSTAR</i> position at the same redshift
99	NuSTARJ022746+3334.6	23	0.387	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
101	NuSTARJ022943-0857.8	24	1.182	BL	B	0	C+P	1	...
102	NuSTARJ022951-0856.4	24	0.300	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
104	NuSTARJ023013-0853.2	24	0.180	NL	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty based on XMM position and <i>WISE</i> AGN candidate; target is an emission-line galaxy
105	NuSTARJ023023-0857.7	22	0.449	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
106	NuSTARJ023030-0856.9	24	0.631	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
110	NuSTARJ024111+0711.1	28	2.983	BL	...	0	C	1	C III] affected by A-band telluric feature
111	NuSTARJ024143+0708.4	30	0.403	NL	...	0	C+P	1	[O III] affected by chip gap
112	NuSTARJ024144+0512.3	22	0.070	NL	...	1	C+P	1	2MASX J02414414+0512203 (Bilicki et al. 2014); associated with the <i>NuSTAR</i> science target (2MASX J02420381+0510061; Gu et al. 1997)
113	NuSTARJ024213+0516.1	23	0.441	NL	...	0	C+P	1	Narrow Mg II
114	NuSTARJ024213-0001.5	S	0.687	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
116	NuSTARJ024243-0006.4	23	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	1	...
117	NuSTARJ024254-0004.6	S	1.850	BL	B	0	C+P	1	...
119	NuSTARJ024304+0000.1	S	1.995	BL	...	0	C+P	1	C IV BALQSO; C III] affected by telluric feature
125	NuSTARJ025932+3642.3	13	...	...	F	0	C	1	Continuum detected
126	NuSTARJ030008+4415.0	8	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	2	Counterpart uncertainty; difficult to assess due to deficient soft X-ray information
131	NuSTARJ031015-7651.5	L	1.187	BL	...	0	C	1	Fiore et al. (fig.1 2000)
147	NuSTARJ032419+3413.8	24	...	...	F	0	...	2	NWAY disagreement; faint red continuum source next to bright star
149	NuSTARJ032439+3415.1	24	1.412	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
156	NuSTARJ033331-0506.9	31	0.458	BL	...	0	C+P	1	H $\beta$ affected by chip gap
160	NuSTARJ033835+0110.4	19	0.171	NL	...	0	C	1	H $\alpha$ affected by A-band telluric feature

Table 15 continued on next page

Table 15 (continued)

ID	<i>NuSTAR</i> name	Run	$z$	Type	Quality	PFlag	NWAY	F <sub>Cpart</sub>	Notes
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
170	NuSTARJ035542-6252.8	26	0.408	NL	...	0	C	1	...
175	NuSTARJ035902-3011.7	25	0.093	NL	...	1	C	1	Associated with the <i>NuSTAR</i> science target (SARS 059.33488-30.34397; Katgert et al. 1998)
177	NuSTARJ035918-3009.6	26	0.549	NL?	...	0	C	1	Low S/N spectrum; H $\beta$ + [O III] affected by A-band telluric feature
178	NuSTARJ035951-3009.9	28	0.685	NL	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information; [O III] affected by telluric feature
179	NuSTARJ040702+0346.8	24	0.088	NL	B	1	C	1	Associated with the <i>NuSTAR</i> science target (3C 105 Nilsson 1998)
183	NuSTARJ041426+2805.9	24	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	2	Known T-Tauri star (Luhman et al. 2010); the brighter companion is also a known T-Tauri star; counterpart uncertainty
184	NuSTARJ041656+0058.0	7	0.438	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
194	NuSTARJ042914-2110.2	27	0.818	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
206	NuSTARJ044901+1123.2	2	0.872	NL	...	0	C+P	1	Type-2 quasar
212	NuSTARJ045348+0408.6	2	1.357	NL	...	0	C	1	Likely Type-2 quasar
213	NuSTARJ050449-1016.6	19	0.342	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
214	NuSTARJ050501-1010.4	19	0	Galactic	B	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information
218	NuSTARJ050559-2349.9	2	0.137	NL	...	1	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty; NL at $z = 0.036$ is associated with the <i>NuSTAR</i> science target (LEDA178130; Jones et al. 2004, 2009; Lansbury et al. 2017b)
222	NuSTARJ050919+0544.1	20	1.492	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
227	NuSTARJ050941+0541.7	20	0.796	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
232	NuSTARJ051926-4546.0	26	0	Galactic	B	0	C	1	Continuum detected
233	NuSTARJ051926-3242.8	25	0.915	BL	...	0	C	1	...
234	NuSTARJ051935-3235.9	26	0	Galactic	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty
235	NuSTARJ051937-3233.3	25	0.640	BL	...	0	C	1	...
236	NuSTARJ051945-3235.2	25	1.174	BL	...	0	C	1	...
237	NuSTARJ052056-2524.1	25	0.111	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
241	NuSTARJ052116-2514.1	30	...	...	F	0	C+P	1	Continuum detected with red configuration
243	NuSTARJ052438-2341.7	27	0.322	Gxy	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information; require deeper optical/IR imaging
245	NuSTARJ052613-2118.7	31	0.214	NL	...	0	C+P	1	H $\beta$ and H $\alpha$ affected by chip gaps
249	NuSTARJ053120+2132.9	24	0.379	NL?	...	0	...	2	Faint, red Type-2 AGN (no blue extraction); Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information
261	NuSTARJ053823+2225.7	24	0.153	NL?	...	0	C	1	Targeted <i>W3</i> -detected <i>WISE</i> source; deficient soft X-ray information; H $\alpha$ affected by A-band telluric feature
264	NuSTARJ054231+6054.4	20	0.257	NL/Dual	...	0	C+P	1	Dual AGN; pair of merging, obscured AGN
267	NuSTARJ054349-5536.7	29	0.272	BL	...	1	C	1	Associated with the <i>NuSTAR</i> science target (2FGL J0543.9-5532; Chang et al. 2019)
281	NuSTARJ061820+2234.2	24	0.776	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
295	NuSTARJ063325+0549.3	20	0.347	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
304	NuSTARJ064331+5530.4	24	0.167	NL?	...	0	P	1	H $\alpha$ affected by A-band telluric feature
335	NuSTARJ073530-6936.7	31	1.055	BL?	B	0	C	1	Low S/N spectrum; C II] + Mg II affected by chip gaps
337	NuSTARJ073651-6935.9	30	0	Galactic	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information

Table 15 continued on next page

Table 15 (continued)

ID	<i>NuSTAR</i> name	Run	$z$	Type	Quality	PFlag	NWAY	F <sub>Cpart</sub>	Notes
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
343	NuSTARJ074113-5442.6	26	0	Galactic	...	0	C	1	...
345	NuSTARJ074317+6509.5	24	0.760	BL	...	0	C	1	...
360	NuSTARJ081003-7527.2	30	...	BL Lac?	F	0	C	1	Continuum detected; bright X-ray source with featureless power-law spectrum
363	NuSTARJ081323+2541.1	9	0.899	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Also observed in SDSS-DR16 but with lower S/N; WISEA J081322.80+254119.0
382	NuSTARJ084149+0101.0	20	0.560	NL	...	0	C+P	1	H $\beta$ affected by A-band telluric line
384	NuSTARJ084337+3555.1	3	0.699	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
385	NuSTARJ084407+3552.8	S	0.467	BL	...	0	C	1	...
387	NuSTARJ084725-2337.5	26	0.216	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
390	NuSTARJ085429+6424.3	9	0.806	Gxy	...	0	P	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information; likely spurious <i>NuSTAR</i> detection
395	NuSTARJ090529+6930.1	20	0.418	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
396	NuSTARJ090602+6933.1	20	0.777	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
404	NuSTARJ091519+2931.9	S	1.099	BL	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty; the fainter <i>WISE-XMM</i> source is a SDSS BL at $z = 1.099$ citet-richards2009
405	NuSTARJ091534+4054.6	S	1.298	BL/pair	...	0	C+P	1	BL AGN pair; SDSS quasar companion at same redshift matches to Nway
408	NuSTARJ091912+5527.8	S	0.049	NL	...	0	C+P	1	Possibly Sy2 (Véron-Cetty & Véron 2006; Ahn et al. 2012)
418	NuSTARJ094133+3441.5	S	1.779	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
422	NuSTARJ094847+0023.6	9	0.262	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
423	NuSTARJ094907+0026.2	S	2.461	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
424	NuSTARJ094910+0022.9	14	0.093	NL	...	0	C+P	1	Nearby extended source is an emission-line galaxy at $z = 0.11$ ; possibly both sources contributing to <i>NuSTAR</i> detection
441	NuSTARJ095709+2511.6	S	0.902	BL	...	0	C	1	...
457	NuSTARJ100620-3350.1	27	0	Galactic	...	0	C	1	...
458	NuSTARJ100642-3355.1	27	0.069	NL	...	0	C	2	Counterpart uncertainty; <i>WISE</i> AGN candidate on edge of CXO error circle
459	NuSTARJ100648+6535.4	3	0.983	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Mg II affected by chip gap
460	NuSTARJ100700+6530.1	3	0.117	NL	...	0	...	2	Emission-line galaxy; counterpart uncertainty
474	NuSTARJ102313+1956.7	S	1.087	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
489	NuSTARJ103135-4206.0	L	0.0615	NL	...	0	C	1	Paturel et al. (2005)
492	NuSTARJ103456+3939.6	S	0.151	NL	...	0	C+P	1	Ahn et al. (2012)
493	NuSTARJ103514+3939.0	S	0.107	NL	...	0	C+P	1	Abazajian et al. (2009)
501	NuSTARJ104950+2301.6	S	0.143	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
503	NuSTARJ110021+6458.4	S	0.882	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
505	NuSTARJ110333-2333.8	26	1.372	BL	B	0	C+P	1	...
506	NuSTARJ110349-2326.2	26	0.173	NL	...	0	C	1	H $\alpha$ affected by A-band telluric feature
507	NuSTARJ110354-2324.8	28	...	...	F	0	C+P	1	Continuum detected
510	NuSTARJ110415-2328.6	26	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	1	...
513	NuSTARJ110526+7238.1	L	1.399	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Chu et al. (1998)
528	NuSTARJ111518+7935.7	9	0.693	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
529	NuSTARJ111822-6127.0	25	0	Galactic	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty; two potential soft X-ray counterparts associated with non-AGN <i>WISE</i> sources
537	NuSTARJ112026+1340.4	S	0.984	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
540	NuSTARJ112745-2911.0	29	0.190	BL	...	0	C+P	1	H $\beta$ + [O III] affected by chip gap

Table 15 continued on next page

Table 15 (continued)

ID	<i>NuSTAR</i> name	Run	$z$	Type	Quality	PFlag	NWAY	F <sub>Cpart</sub>	Notes
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
547	NuSTARJ113253+5303.6	S	0.509	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
563	NuSTARJ114934-0413.6	30	0.341	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
564	NuSTARJ114948+5323.1	3	0.499	NL	...	0	C	1	...
566	NuSTARJ114957+5320.1	3	0.233	NL	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information
568	NuSTARJ115658+5508.2	S	0.080	NL	...	0	C+P	1	Albareti et al. (2017)
570	NuSTARJ115809+5532.4	S	1.607	BL	...	0	C+P	1	C <sub>IV</sub> BALQSO AGN pair; WISEA J120530.63+164941.4 (Ahn et al. 2012; Toba et al. 2014); NL companion is on the edge of BPT composite region; associated with the <i>NuSTAR</i> science target (2MASX J12054771+1651085; Darling & Giovanelli 2006)
586	NuSTARJ120530+1649.9	3	0.216	BL/pair	...	1	C+P	1	H $\beta$ + [O III] affected by A-band telluric feature
587	NuSTARJ120539+1657.0	3	0.548	NL	...	0	C	1	Emission-line galaxy
588	NuSTARJ120551+1657.9	3	0.416	NL	...	0	C	1	...
593	NuSTARJ121249+0659.7	S	0.210	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
612	NuSTARJ121932+4717.8	3	1.233	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Counterpart uncertainty; the closer CXO source to the <i>NuSTAR</i> detection is a SDSS BL at $z = 0.531$
613	NuSTARJ122119+3015.8	S	0.646	BL	...	0	C	2	...
615	NuSTARJ122222+0416.4	S	1.190	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Continuum detected
624	NuSTARJ123755+1147.0	10	...	...	F	0	C+P	1	Possibly incorrect counterpart based on <i>WISE</i> colours deficient soft X-ray information; continuum detected
625	NuSTARJ123849-1614.4	30	...	...	F	0	P	2	Paturel et al. (2005); associated with the <i>NuSTAR</i> science target (2MASX J12545637-2657021 Parisi et al. 2014)
633	NuSTARJ125442-2657.1	L	0.0586	Gxy	...	1	C+P	1	...
634	NuSTARJ125524+5656.2	S	1.189	BL	...	0	C	1	Albareti et al. (2017)
641	NuSTARJ125631+5649.5	S	1.188	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
651	NuSTARJ130432-1024.5	9	1.059	BL	...	0	C	1	...
653	NuSTARJ130519-4934.2	31	0	Galactic	...	0	C	1	Flux calibration failure
654	NuSTARJ130617-4021.5	26	1.052	BL	...	0	C	1	...
672	NuSTARJ132139+0023.9	S	1.621	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
673	NuSTARJ132231-1647.4	25	0.349	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
674	NuSTARJ132240-1642.7	3	2.386	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
675	NuSTARJ132250-1645.1	3	0.656	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Possibly spurious feature at 4800Å due to cosmic ray
676	NuSTARJ132253-1636.7	25	1.631	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
678	NuSTARJ132455-3822.4	28	0	Galactic	...	0	...	1	Bright in <i>WISE</i> W3-band
680	NuSTARJ132525-3821.0	28	0	Galactic	...	0	C	1	...
681	NuSTARJ132533-3828.7	28	0	Galactic	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty; <i>WISE-XMM</i> candidate identified with <i>NWAY</i> matches to a faint optical source
682	NuSTARJ132535-3830.7	28	0	Galactic	...	0	C	1	...
683	NuSTARJ132535-3825.6	L	0.445	GClstr	...	0	C	2	Counterpart uncertainty; Cluster of Galaxies; Burke et al. (2003)
689	NuSTARJ132939+4719.2	S	1.028	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
690	NuSTARJ133213-0511.7	10	0.481	BL	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty; <i>XRT-WISE</i> AGN candidate identified with <i>NWAY</i> ; [O III]/H $\beta$ agrees with Type-2 AGN relation, but broad Mg II evident

Table 15 continued on next page

Table 15 (continued)

ID	<i>NuSTAR</i> name	Run	$z$	Type	Quality	PFlag	NWAY	F <sub>Cpart</sub>	Notes
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
692	NuSTARJ133343-3400.1	27	2.715	BL	...	0	C	1	BALQSO; C IV absorption
694	NuSTARJ133401-3403.6	27	0.145	NL	...	0	C	1	H $\alpha$ affected by A-band telluric feature
699	NuSTARJ133843+4818.1	S	1.732	BL	...	0	P	1	Albaret et al. (2017)
700	NuSTARJ134547+7317.0	9	0.579	NL	...	0	C	2	Counterpart uncertainty; H $\beta$ affected by A-band telluric feature
710	NuSTARJ135345-0209.2	10	0.627	NL	...	0	C	1	...
711	NuSTARJ135351-0204.2	28	...	...	F	0	C	1	Continuum detected; counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information
713	NuSTARJ140459+2552.2	10	1.363	BL	...	0	C+P	1	NALQSO; C IV and Mg II doublet absorption lines
717	NuSTARJ140536+2551.7	S	0.943	BL	...	0	C	1	...
729	NuSTARJ141842+2100.1	S	1.122	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
730	NuSTARJ141857+2105.1	4	0.895	NL	...	0	C+P	1	Emission-line galaxy
731	NuSTARJ141914+2104.2	S	0.109	NL	...	0	C+P	1	Galaxy spectrum with narrow H $\alpha$ Emission-line; Albaret et al. (2017)
736	NuSTARJ142510+3320.4	S	0.258	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Ahn et al. (2012)
738	NuSTARJ142904+0120.4	S	0.101	NL	...	0	C+P	1	Star-forming galaxy (Driver et al. 2011)
745	NuSTARJ143442-0144.6	3	0.285	NL	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information
746	NuSTARJ143517-0146.5	4	0.690	NL	...	0	C+P	1	<i>WISE</i> AGN candidates
750	NuSTARJ143707+3639.5	S	0.861	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Early-type galaxy with strong oxygen lines
759	NuSTARJ144932-4012.3	L	0.057	NL	...	0	C	1	...
762	NuSTARJ145034+0508.3	S	1.635	BL	...	0	C	1	Jones et al. (2009)
769	NuSTARJ145452+0331.2	21	2.606	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
772	NuSTARJ145513+0322.7	S	0.423	BL	...	0	C+P	1	C IV affected by chip gap; potentially C IV BALQSO from SALT spectrum
774	NuSTARJ145528+0324.4	21	...	...	F	0	C+P	1	...
775	NuSTARJ145812-3133.4	31	...	...	F	0	...	1	Continuum detected
785	NuSTARJ150225-4208.3	L	0.054	Gxy	...	0	C	1	Continuum detected
787	NuSTARJ150334-4152.5	L	0.335	BL	...	0	C	1	Jones et al. (2009)
788	NuSTARJ150516+0324.0	11	0.533	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Winkler & Long (1997)
789	NuSTARJ150529+0322.6	S	2.358	BL	...	0	C+P	1	[O III] affected by A-band telluric feature
792	NuSTARJ150915+5702.2	15	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	2	...
794	NuSTARJ150937+5703.6	S	0.308	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Counterpart uncertainty; require deeper optical/IR imaging
796	NuSTARJ151008+5705.8	S	0.548	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
798	NuSTARJ151148-1050.3	3	0.947	NL	...	0	C+P	1	The nominally closer W3-detected X-ray source is a galaxy at $z = 0.272$ ; Eckart et al. (2006)
803	NuSTARJ151519+5615.6	9	0.490	NL	...	0	C+P	2	Counterpart uncertainty; <i>XMM</i> source is undetected with Keck; spectrum is a $z = 0.490$ emission-line galaxy at 3.4 arcsec offset
807	NuSTARJ151626+5620.7	S	1.349	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
813	NuSTARJ152548+4139.3	S	0.679	BL	...	0	C	1	...
815	NuSTARJ152722+3600.2	S	0.269	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
819	NuSTARJ153601+5435.1	3	1.150	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
820	NuSTARJ153602-5749.0	28	0	Galactic	...	0	C	1	...
821	NuSTARJ153632-5751.2	25	0	Galactic	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information and high source density at low Galactic latitude

Table 15 continued on next page

Table 15 (continued)

ID	<i>NuSTAR</i> name	Run	$z$	Type	Quality	PFlag	NWAY	F <sub>Cpart</sub>	Notes
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
824	NuSTARJ153640+5435.1	S	0.447	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
825	NuSTARJ153700+5434.2	4	1.315	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
829	NuSTARJ154407+2827.1	S	0.303	BL	...	0	C	1	...
830	NuSTARJ154430+2828.1	S	0.231	BL	...	0	C	1	...
849	NuSTARJ160817+1221.4	10	0.181	NL	...	0	P	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information; <i>W3</i> -detected target seems correct
850	NuSTARJ160832+1222.4	10	0.944	NL	...	0	C+P	1	Mg II affected by chip gap; WISEA J160833.89+122216.7
852	NuSTARJ161404+4702.8	S	0.551	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Albaret et al. (2017)
853	NuSTARJ161417+4701.8	23	0.151	NL	...	0	C+P	1	H $\alpha$ affected by A-band telluric feature
854	NuSTARJ161424+4709.3	S	1.502	BL	...	0	C+P	1	C IV BALQSO
855	NuSTARJ161445+4659.3	23	0.153	NL	...	0	C+P	1	H $\alpha$ affected by A-band telluric feature
857	NuSTARJ161548+2210.9	S	1.698	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
860	NuSTARJ161723+3225.2	4	1.028	NL	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty; <i>NWAY</i> disagreement; a post-starburst galaxy
867	NuSTARJ162035+8530.3	10	0.258	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
881	NuSTARJ163108+2350.1	11	0.038	NL	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty; associated with a known local starburst; difficult to assess due to deficient soft X-ray information
882	NuSTARJ163114+2358.1	S	0.038	Gxy	...	0	C	1	Albaret et al. (2017)
883	NuSTARJ163126+2357.0	10	0.751	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
886	NuSTARJ164323+3948.4	S	0.0306	NL	...	0	C+P	1	Galaxy spectrum with narrow H $\alpha$ Emission-line
890	NuSTARJ164503+2624.9	S	0.127	NL	...	0	P	1	Broad + narrow H $\alpha$ Emission-line; galaxy shining through
892	NuSTARJ164511+2620.4	S	1.168	BL	...	0	C	1	...
894	NuSTARJ164718+2103.5	4	0.882	BL	...	0	C+P	1	NALQSO; Mg II $\lambda, \lambda$ 2796,2803 absorption doublets
895	NuSTARJ164724+2105.5	4	0.788	NL	...	0	C	1	...
897	NuSTARJ165059+0440.5	10	0.299	BL	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty; two AGN-like <i>WISE</i> candidates within XRT error circle
913	NuSTARJ165315-0158.3	9	0.189	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
915	NuSTARJ165349-0154.8	11	0.627	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
916	NuSTARJ165414+3949.9	S	1.636	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
917	NuSTARJ165417+3946.8	S	0.354	NL?	...	0	C	1	Adelman-McCarthy et al. (2008)
924	NuSTARJ165825+5855.8	23	0.105	NL	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty; CXO source ( <i>NWAY</i> ) is the more probable counterpart
929	NuSTARJ170632-6138.4	26	0	Galactic	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty based on <i>WISE</i> colours and multiple candidates within XRT error circle
947	NuSTARJ172405+5058.4	23	0.298	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
968	NuSTARJ175307-0123.7	28	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	1	...
974	NuSTARJ180958-4552.6	L	0.070	BL	...	0	C	1	Flat-Spectrum Radio Source; blazar (Healey et al. 2007; Jones et al. 2009); reported in <i>Swift</i> -BAT BASS DR2 (Koss et al. 2022)
978	NuSTARJ181313-1240.0	17	...	...	F	0	C+P	1	Continuum detected; heavily reddened source
997	NuSTARJ182622-1446.6	15	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	2	Counterpart uncertainty; all three bright objects are Galactic sources
1001	NuSTARJ183042+0931.1	6	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	1	...
1002	NuSTARJ183052+0925.3	6	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	1	...

Table 15 continued on next page

Table 15 (continued)

ID	<i>NuSTAR</i> name	Run	$z$	Type	Quality	PFlag	NWAY	F <sub>Cpart</sub>	Notes
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
1005	NuSTARJ183250-0913.9	13	0	Galactic	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to high source density at low Galactic latitude problematic <i>WISE</i> imaging
1009	NuSTARJ183428+3239.4	4	0.292	Gxy	...	0	C+P	1	Possibly two sources contributing to <i>NuSTAR</i> detection; early-type galaxy with hints of [NII] emission
1018	NuSTARJ183511+4357.9	23	0	Galactic	...	0	C	1	Unusual <i>WISE</i> (bright in <i>W3</i> ) optical colours for Galactic source
1043	NuSTARJ184449+7212.1	23	1.298	BL	...	0	C	1	...
1045	NuSTARJ184552+8428.2	23	0.233	NL/pair	...	1	...	1	NL AGN with an early-type galaxy companion at the same redshift (NWAY position); associated with the <i>NuSTAR</i> science target (1RXS J184642.2+842506; Bauer et al. 2000; Koss et al. 2022)
1047	NuSTARJ184628+7214.2	23	0.750	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1048	NuSTARJ185528+0123.7	21	...	...	F	0	P	1	Red continuum
1049	NuSTARJ185544+0124.7	32	0	Galactic	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty and NWAY disagreement; require deeper optical/IR data
1055	NuSTARJ190642+0917.5	15	0	Galactic	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to high source density at low Galactic latitude
1057	NuSTARJ190813-3925.7	31	0.075	Gxy	...	1	C	1	H $\alpha$ lost to chip gap; associated with the <i>NuSTAR</i> science target (2MASX J19075035-3923315 Jones et al. 2009; Malizia et al. 2012)
1061	NuSTARJ192215-5844.9	30	0.231	BL	...	0	C	1	...
1069	NuSTARJ192607+4134.1	23	0.777	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1092	NuSTARJ194226-1016.0	5	0.449	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1093	NuSTARJ194234-1011.9	13	0.849	NL?	B	0	C+P	1	e Emission-line galaxy; possible obscured AGN; tentative C III], [Ne V] and [O III] detections at $z = 0.849$
1098	NuSTARJ195204+0234.6	23	1.168	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1100	NuSTARJ195221+2930.2	7	...	...	F	0	P	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information; red continuum
1108	NuSTARJ200727-4431.6	26	...	...	F	0	C	1	Continuum detected
1109	NuSTARJ200735-4436.6	31	0.405	NL	...	0	C	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information; [O III] affected by chip gap
1110	NuSTARJ200755-4439.7	25	0.456	BL	...	0	C	1	...
1111	NuSTARJ200821-4437.9	25	0.524	NL	...	0	C	1	...
1113	NuSTARJ201501+3710.8	4	0	Galactic	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to high source density; possibly incorrect based on XRT- <i>WISE</i> NWAY candidate
1115	NuSTARJ201536+3704.9	4	0	Galactic	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty given the high source density at low Galactic latitude
1116	NuSTARJ201545+3714.3	4	0	Galactic	...	0	...	1	Ultra-red source; heavily embedded
1118	NuSTARJ201645+5810.7	24	0	Galactic	...	0	P	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information
1119	NuSTARJ201727+5815.5	24	0.278	NL?	...	0	C+P	1	Red continuum detected for the second source in the <i>WISE</i> error circle
1124	NuSTARJ202029+4356.8	24	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	2	Counterpart uncertainty; two stars, possibly not the X-ray emitter

Table 15 continued on next page

Table 15 (continued)

ID	<i>NuSTAR</i> name	Run	$z$	Type	Quality	PFlag	NWAY	F <sub>Cpart</sub>	Notes
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
1128	NuSTARJ202108+6136.5	23	1.553	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1129	NuSTARJ202226+6141.3	23	0.259	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1140	NuSTARJ203353+6010.9	7	1.863	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1147	NuSTARJ204256+7503.1	13	...	Hotspot	F	0	...	2	Hotspot of 4C 74.26 (science target), a radio quasar at $z = 0.104$ (Erlund et al. 2010)
1154	NuSTARJ210737-0512.1	21	0.841	BL?	...	0	C+P	1	Strong [O III] lines, but broad Mg II detected; Akiyama et al. (2003)
1156	NuSTARJ211152+8210.4	11	0.421	NL	...	0	C+P	1	H $\alpha$ affected by telluric feature
1157	NuSTARJ211421+0605.5	24	0.216	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1168	NuSTARJ212807+5649.5	12	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	1	...
1171	NuSTARJ212931-0431.4	4	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	1	...
1172	NuSTARJ212954-0425.4	4	2.065	BL	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to multiple <i>XMM/WISE</i> AGN candidates; NALQSO; C III] affected by telluric feature
1173	NuSTARJ212956-0435.5	31	0	Galactic	B	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information; potentially spurious <i>NuSTAR</i> detection
1174	NuSTARJ213005-0427.4	4	0.277	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Quasar with host galaxy showing through
1175	NuSTARJ213309+5106.5	22	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	1	...
1176	NuSTARJ213347+5112.1	23	0.168	BL	...	0	C+P	1	H $\alpha$ affected by A-band telluric feature
1178	NuSTARJ213900-2640.4	28	0.551	BL	...	0	C+P	1	H $\beta$ affected by telluric feature
1180	NuSTARJ214239+4330.9	5	0.0174	BL	...	0	C+P	1	NED counterpart with same spec- $z$ but quality B estimated; WISEA J214238.71+433057.9
1181	NuSTARJ214320+4334.8	5	0.0131	NL	...	0	P	1	NED counterpart; UGC11797 (Seeberger et al. 1994)
1185	NuSTARJ214755+0651.8	24	0.182	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1186	NuSTARJ214758-3502.4	29	0.439	NL	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information; H $\beta$ affected by chip gap
1194	NuSTARJ220039+1039.7	24	1.389	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1204	NuSTARJ221133+1841.5	S	0.578	BL	...	0	C	1	...
1205	NuSTARJ221457-3842.5	28	0.800	BL	...	0	C	1	...
1206	NuSTARJ221716+0051.1	19	1.934	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Also observed in SDSS-DR16 but with lower S/N; C III] affected by chip gap
1207	NuSTARJ221735-0820.7	S	0.085	NL	...	0	C+P	1	Galaxy shining through Adelman-McCarthy et al. (2008)
1208	NuSTARJ222348-0201.4	4	0.274	NL	...	0	P	2	Counterpart uncertainty; NWAY disagreement; lack soft X-ray detection; emission-line galaxy
1212	NuSTARJ223536+3359.0	21	0.485	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1213	NuSTARJ223538-2554.9	27	0.429	NL	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty; require spectrum of NWAY candidate for further assessment
1214	NuSTARJ223547-2558.7	L	0.304	NL	...	0	C+P	1	Sy I galaxy (Caccianiga et al. 2008; Lin et al. 2012)
1215	NuSTARJ223630+3425.9	24	1.767	BL	...	0	C	1	Mg II affected by A-band telluric feature
1216	NuSTARJ223653+3423.6	24	0.149	NL	...	0	C+P	1	H $\beta$ affected by chip gap
1220	NuSTARJ223728+3425.6	24	1.571	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1224	NuSTARJ224200-4539.3	28	...	...	F	0	C	2	Counterpart uncertainty; difficult to assess due to deficient soft X-ray information
1228	NuSTARJ224230+2939.4	23	0.120	NL	...	0	C+P	1	H $\beta$ + [O III] lost to chip gap
1230	NuSTARJ224239-3707.9	28	0.222	BL	...	0	C	1	...
1232	NuSTARJ224252+2941.5	24	0	Galactic	...	0	C+P	1	...

Table 15 continued on next page

Table 15 (continued)

ID	<i>NuSTAR</i> name	Run	$z$	Type	Quality	PFlag	NWAY	F <sub>Cpart</sub>	Notes
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
1233	NuSTARJ224252+2937.0	S	...	...	F	0	C	1	Continuum detected
1236	NuSTARJ224306+2941.4	23	0.158	Gxy	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information; H $\beta$ lost to chip gap; H $\alpha$ lost to A-band telluric feature
1237	NuSTARJ224536+3947.1	8	0.081	NL	...	1	C+P	1	2MASX J22453396+3946591 (Bilicki et al. 2014); associated with the <i>NuSTAR</i> science target (3C 452 Véron-Cetty & Véron 2006)
1238	NuSTARJ224618+3941.6	7	0.341	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1240	NuSTARJ224925-1917.5	1	0.444	NL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1242	NuSTARJ225513-0302.4	19	0.797	BL	...	0	C+P	1	...
1245	NuSTARJ230147-5920.8	32	0.366	BL?	...	0	C	1	...
1246	NuSTARJ230443+1216.4	4	1.410	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Véron-Cetty & Véron (2010)
1255	NuSTARJ232728-0047.1	19	0.217	NL?	...	0	C+P	1	...
1257	NuSTARJ233200+0016.0	S	0.352	BL	...	0	C+P	1	Ahn et al. (2012)
1258	NuSTARJ233221+0020.8	19	1.853	NL	...	0	C+P	1	High-redshift Type-2 quasar
1261	NuSTARJ233917-0537.2	7	...	...	F	0	C	1	Continuum detected
1262	NuSTARJ233948-0536.6	5	0	Galactic	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty; other non-AGN <i>WISE</i> source in field is a galaxy at $z = 0.413$
1263	NuSTARJ235538+3008.2	23	0.556	NL	...	0	...	2	Counterpart uncertainty due to deficient soft X-ray information; H $\beta$ affected by A-band telluric feature
1264	NuSTARJ235553+3015.0	24	0.874	BL?	...	0	C+P	1	Faint continuum detected with tentatively broad Mg II and weak oxygen lines
1272	NuSTARJ235806-3237.9	25	0.795	BL	B	0	C	1	...

NOTE— COLUMNS: **(1)** Unique *NuSTAR* source ID. **(2)** Unique *NuSTAR* source name. **(3)** Spectroscopic follow-up observing code; see Table 6. **(4)** Spectroscopic redshift. **(5)** Spectroscopic classification: BL  $\equiv$  Broad Line object (i.e., quasar); NL  $\equiv$  Narrow Line object (AGN or galaxy); Gxy  $\equiv$  Galaxy (absorption lines); Galactic  $\equiv$  Galactic sources at  $z = 0$ . See Section 3.3.3. **(6)** Spectroscopic redshift quality: F  $\equiv$  Faint continuum detected; B  $\equiv$  single-line redshift measurement; C  $\equiv$  photometric redshift. **(7)** Binary flag to indicate association to the *NuSTAR* science target, i.e., sources with a velocity offset from the science target smaller than 5% of the total science target velocity. **(8)** Flag indicating whether the spectroscopic target matches to the CatWISE20 and/or PS1 *NWAY*-identified counterparts: C+P  $\equiv$  CatWISE20+PS1; C  $\equiv$  CatWISE20 only; P  $\equiv$  PS1 only. **(9)** Flag indicating reliability of identified spectroscopic counterpart: 0  $\equiv$  unreliable; 1  $\equiv$  reliable; 2  $\equiv$  counterpart uncertainty.




Figure E1. Optical spectra for the first four extragalactic post-NSS40 sources classified as BL AGN in order of *NuSTAR* ID. The symbol key is described in Appendix E.1.




Figure E2. Optical spectra for the first four extragalactic post-NSS40 sources classified as NL AGN. The symbol key is described in Appendix E.1.




Figure E3. Optical spectra for the first four extragalactic post-NSS40 sources classified as galaxies (i.e., absorption spectral features). The symbol key is described in Appendix E.1.







Figure E4. Optical spectra for the first four Galactic post-NSS40 sources ( $z=0$ ). The symbol key is described in Appendix E.1.



**Figure E5.** Optical spectra for the first four unclassified post-NSS40 sources which lacks a redshift measurement; in some cases a red faint continuum is detected. The symbol key is described in Appendix E.1.



**Figure E6.**  $30'' \times 30''$  Finding charts for the first 12 NSS80 sources with redshift measurements from literature. For sources with decl.  $> -30^\circ$  Pan-STARRS  $i$ -band imaging is used, and for sources with decl.  $< -30^\circ$  Astro Data Lab (Fitzpatrick et al. 2014; Nikutta et al. 2020)  $i$ -band imaging is retrieved. The symbol key is described in Appendix E.1. Optical classifications for sources with photometric redshifts are appended with a “C” (i.e., GxyC = Galaxy Candidate; BLC = BL Candidate). Also identified is a galaxy cluster (GClstr) at  $z = 0.445$ .



**Figure E7.** 30''  $\times$  30'' Finding charts for the first 12 optically followed-up NSS40 sources reported in L17. For sources with decl.  $> -30^\circ$  Pan-STARRS  $i$ -band imaging is used, and for sources with decl.  $< -30^\circ$  Astro Data Lab  $i$ -band imaging is retrieved. The symbol key is described in Appendix E.1.

## REFERENCES

- Abazajian, K. N., Adelman-McCarthy, J. K., Agüeros, M. A., Allam, S. S., & et al. 2009, *ApJS*, 182, 543, doi: [10.1088/0067-0049/182/2/543](https://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/182/2/543)
- Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., & et al. 2016, *Physical Review Letters*, 116, 061102, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.061102](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.061102)
- Abell, G. O. 1958, *ApJS*, 3, 211, doi: [10.1086/190036](https://doi.org/10.1086/190036)
- Abraham, R. G., Glazebrook, K., McCarthy, P. J., et al. 2004, *AJ*, 127, 2455, doi: [10.1086/383557](https://doi.org/10.1086/383557)
- Ackermann, M., Ajello, M., An, H., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 820, 72, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/820/1/72](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/820/1/72)
- Adelman-McCarthy, J. K., Agüeros, M. A., Allam, S. S., & et al. 2008, *ApJS*, 175, 297, doi: [10.1086/524984](https://doi.org/10.1086/524984)
- Ahn, C. P., Alexandroff, R., Allende Prieto, C., Anderson, S. F., & et al. 2012, *ApJS*, 203, 21, doi: [10.1088/0067-0049/203/2/21](https://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/203/2/21)
- Ahumada, R., Allende Prieto, C., Almeida, A., et al. 2020, *ApJS*, 249, 3, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/ab929e](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/ab929e)
- Aird, J., Alexander, D. M., Ballantyne, D. R., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 815, 66, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/815/1/66](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/815/1/66)
- Akiyama, M., Ueda, Y., Ohta, K., Takahashi, T., & Yamada, T. 2003, *ApJS*, 148, 275, doi: [10.1086/376441](https://doi.org/10.1086/376441)
- Alam, S., Albareti, F. D., Allende Prieto, C., et al. 2015, *ApJS*, 219, 12, doi: [10.1088/0067-0049/219/1/12](https://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/219/1/12)
- Albareti, F. D., Allende Prieto, C., Almeida, A., Anders, F., & et al. 2017, *ApJS*, 233, 25, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/aa8992](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/aa8992)
- Alexander, D. M., Bauer, F. E., Brandt, W. N., et al. 2003, *AJ*, 125, 383, doi: [10.1086/346088](https://doi.org/10.1086/346088)
- Alexander, D. M., Stern, D., Del Moro, A., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 773, 125, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/773/2/125](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/773/2/125)
- Ananna, T. T., Treister, E., Urry, C. M., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 889, 17, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab5aef](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab5aef)
- Arp, H. 1966, *ApJS*, 14, 1, doi: [10.1086/190147](https://doi.org/10.1086/190147)
- Assef, R. J., Stern, D., Noirot, G., et al. 2018, *ApJS*, 234, 23, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/aaa00a](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/aaa00a)
- Assef, R. J., Kochanek, C. S., Brodwin, M., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 713, 970, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/713/2/970](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/713/2/970)
- Assef, R. J., Stern, D., Kochanek, C. S., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 772, 26. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1209.6055>
- Astropy Collaboration, Robitaille, T. P., Tollerud, E. J., et al. 2013, *A&A*, 558, A33, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201322068](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201322068)
- Astropy Collaboration, Price-Whelan, A. M., Sipőcz, B. M., et al. 2018, *AJ*, 156, 123, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aabc4f](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aabc4f)
- Astropy Collaboration, Price-Whelan, A. M., Lim, P. L., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 935, 167, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac7c74](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac7c74)
- Baloković, M., Comastri, A., Harrison, F. A., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 794, 111, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/794/2/111](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/794/2/111)
- Banerji, M., McMahon, R. G., P. C., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 427, 2275. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1203.5530>
- Bauer, F. E., Condon, J. J., Thuan, T. X., & Broderick, J. J. 2000, *ApJS*, 129, 547, doi: [10.1086/313425](https://doi.org/10.1086/313425)
- Baumgartner, W. H., Tueller, J., Markwardt, C. B., et al. 2013, *ApJS*, 207, 19, doi: [10.1088/0067-0049/207/2/19](https://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/207/2/19)
- Bertin, E., & Arnouts, S. 1996, *A&AS*, 117, 393, doi: [10.1051/aas:1996164](https://doi.org/10.1051/aas:1996164)
- Bilicki, M., Jarrett, T. H., Peacock, J. A., Cluver, M. E., & Steward, L. 2014, *ApJS*, 210, 9, doi: [10.1088/0067-0049/210/1/9](https://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/210/1/9)
- Blaauw, A., Gum, C. S., Pawsey, J. L., & Westerhout, G. 1960, *MNRAS*, 121, 123, doi: [10.1093/mnras/121.2.123](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/121.2.123)
- Bolton, A. S., Schlegel, D. J., Aubourg, É., et al. 2012, *AJ*, 144, 144, doi: [10.1088/0004-6256/144/5/144](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-6256/144/5/144)
- Brandt, W. N., & Alexander, D. M. 2015, *A&ARv*, 23, 1, doi: [10.1007/s00159-014-0081-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00159-014-0081-z)
- Brandt, W. N., & Yang, G. 2021, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2111.01156. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.01156>
- Brunner, H., Liu, T., Lamer, G., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 661, A1, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202141266](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202141266)
- Burke, D. J., Collins, C. A., Sharples, R. M., Romer, A. K., & Nichol, R. C. 2003, *MNRAS*, 341, 1093, doi: [10.1046/j.1365-8711.2003.06378.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-8711.2003.06378.x)
- Burlon, D., Ajello, M., Greiner, J., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 728, 58, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/728/1/58](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/728/1/58)
- Caccianiga, A., Severgnini, P., Della Ceca, R., et al. 2008, *A&A*, 477, 735, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361:20078568](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361:20078568)
- Calistro Rivera, G., Alexander, D. M., Rosario, D. J., et al. 2021, *A&A*, 649, A102, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202040214](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202040214)
- Cappelluti, N., Li, Y., Ricarte, A., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 837, 19, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa5ea4](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa5ea4)
- Cardamone, C. N., Urry, C. M., Damen, M., et al. 2008, *ApJ*, 680, 130, doi: [10.1086/587800](https://doi.org/10.1086/587800)
- Chang, Y. L., Arsioli, B., Giommi, P., Padovani, P., & Brandt, C. H. 2019, *A&A*, 632, A77, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201834526](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201834526)
- Chu, Y., Wei, J., Hu, J., Zhu, X., & Arp, H. 1998, *ApJ*, 500, 596, doi: [10.1086/305779](https://doi.org/10.1086/305779)
- Civano, F., Hickox, R. C., Puccetti, S., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 808, 185, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/808/2/185](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/808/2/185)
- Colless, M., Dalton, G., Maddox, S., et al. 2001, *MNRAS*, 328, 1039, doi: [10.1046/j.1365-8711.2001.04902.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-8711.2001.04902.x)
- da Costa, L. N., Willmer, C. N. A., Pellegrini, P. S., et al. 1998, *AJ*, 116, 1, doi: [10.1086/300410](https://doi.org/10.1086/300410)
- Darling, J., & Giovanelli, R. 2006, *AJ*, 132, 2596, doi: [10.1086/508513](https://doi.org/10.1086/508513)

- De Luca, A., & Molendi, S. 2004, *A&A*, 419, 837, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361:20034421](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361:20034421)
- de Vaucouleurs, G., de Vaucouleurs, A., Corwin, H. G., et al. 1995, *VizieR Online Data Catalog*, VII/155
- Delaney, J. N., Aird, J., Evans, P. A., et al. 2023, *MNRAS*, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stac3703](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stac3703)
- Della Ceca, R., Castelli, G., Braitto, V., Cagnoni, I., & Maccacaro, T. 1999, *ApJ*, 524, 674, doi: [10.1086/307836](https://doi.org/10.1086/307836)
- Dicke, R. H., Peebles, P. J. E., Roll, P. G., & Wilkinson, D. T. 1965, *ApJ*, 142, 414, doi: [10.1086/148306](https://doi.org/10.1086/148306)
- Drinkwater, M. J., Jurek, R. J., Blake, C., et al. 2010, *MNRAS*, 401, 1429, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15754.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15754.x)
- Driver, S. P., Hill, D. T., Kelvin, L. S., et al. 2011, *MNRAS*, 413, 971, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.18188.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.18188.x)
- Eckart, M. E., Stern, D., Helfand, D. J., et al. 2006, *ApJS*, 165, 19, doi: [10.1086/504524](https://doi.org/10.1086/504524)
- Eisenhardt, P. R. M., Wu, J., Tsai, C.-W., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 755, 173, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/755/2/173](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/755/2/173)
- Erlund, M. C., Fabian, A. C., Blundell, K. M., Crawford, C. S., & Hirst, P. 2010, *MNRAS*, 404, 629, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.16304.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.16304.x)
- Erlund, M. C., Fabian, A. C., Blundell, K. M., Moss, C., & Ballantyne, D. R. 2007, *MNRAS*, 379, 498, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2007.11962.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2007.11962.x)
- Evans, I. N., Primini, F. A., Glotfelty, K. J., et al. 2010, *ApJS*, 189, 37, doi: [10.1088/0067-0049/189/1/37](https://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/189/1/37)
- Evans, I. N., Allen, C., Anderson, C. S., et al. 2019, in *AAS/High Energy Astrophysics Division*, Vol. 17, AAS/High Energy Astrophysics Division, 114.01
- Evans, P. A., Osborne, J. P., Beardmore, A. P., et al. 2014, *ApJS*, 210, 8, doi: [10.1088/0067-0049/210/1/8](https://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/210/1/8)
- Evans, P. A., Page, K. L., Osborne, J. P., et al. 2020, *ApJS*, 247, 54, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/ab7db9](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/ab7db9)
- Fawcett, V. A., Alexander, D. M., Rosario, D. J., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 494, 4802, doi: [10.1093/mnras/staa954](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa954)
- . 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2201.04139. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.04139>
- Fiore, F., La Franca, F., Vignali, C., et al. 2000, *New Astronomy*, 5, 143, doi: [10.1016/S1384-1076\(00\)00017-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1384-1076(00)00017-8)
- Fitzpatrick, E. L. 1999, *PASP*, 111, 63, doi: [10.1086/316293](https://doi.org/10.1086/316293)
- Fitzpatrick, M. J., Olsen, K., Economou, F., et al. 2014, in *Observatory Operations: Strategies, Processes, and Systems V*, ed. A. B. Peck, C. R. Benn, & R. L. Seaman, Vol. 9149, International Society for Optics and Photonics (SPIE), 91491T, doi: [10.1117/12.2057445](https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2057445)
- Flewelling, H. 2018, in *American Astronomical Society Meeting Abstracts*, Vol. 231, American Astronomical Society Meeting Abstracts #231, 436.01
- Fornasini, F. M., Tomsick, J. A., Hong, J., et al. 2017, *ApJS*, 229, 33, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/aa61fc](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/aa61fc)
- Gandhi, P., Lansbury, G. B., Alexander, D. M., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 792, 117, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/792/2/117](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/792/2/117)
- Giacconi, R., Gursky, H., Paolini, F. R., & Rossi, B. B. 1962, *PhRvL*, 9, 439, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.9.439](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.9.439)
- Glikman, E., Gregg, M. D., Lacy, M., et al. 2004, *ApJ*, 607, 60, doi: [10.1086/383305](https://doi.org/10.1086/383305)
- Goulding, A. D., Zakamska, N. L., Alexandroff, R. M., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 856, 4, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aab040](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aab040)
- Gu, Q. S., Huang, J. H., Su, H. J., & Shang, Z. H. 1997, *A&A*, 319, 92. <https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9810098>
- Hamann, F., Zakamska, N. L., Ross, N., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 464, 3431. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.07241>
- Harris, C. R., Millman, K. J., van der Walt, S. J., et al. 2020, *Nature*, 585, 357, doi: [10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2)
- Harris, W. E. 1996, *AJ*, 112, 1487, doi: [10.1086/118116](https://doi.org/10.1086/118116)
- Harrison, F. A., Craig, W. W., Christensen, F. E., & et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 770, 103, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/770/2/103](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/770/2/103)
- Harrison, F. A., Aird, J., Civano, F., et al. 2016a, *ApJ*, 831, 185, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/831/2/185](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/831/2/185)
- . 2016b, *ApJ*, 831, 185, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/831/2/185](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/831/2/185)
- Healey, S. E., Romani, R. W., Taylor, G. B., et al. 2007, *ApJS*, 171, 61, doi: [10.1086/513742](https://doi.org/10.1086/513742)
- Hickox, R. C., & Alexander, D. M. 2018, *ARA&A*, 56, 625, doi: [10.1146/annurev-astro-081817-051803](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-astro-081817-051803)
- Hickox, R. C., & Markevitch, M. 2007, *ApJ*, 671, 1523, doi: [10.1086/522918](https://doi.org/10.1086/522918)
- Hinton, S. R., Davis, T. M., Lidman, C., Glazebrook, K., & Lewis, G. F. 2016, *Astronomy and Computing*, 15, 61, doi: [10.1016/j.ascom.2016.03.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ascom.2016.03.001)
- Hong, J., Mori, K., Hailey, C. J., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 825, 132, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/825/2/132](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/825/2/132)
- Hunter, J. D. 2007, *Computing in Science and Engineering*, 9, 90, doi: [10.1109/MCSE.2007.55](https://doi.org/10.1109/MCSE.2007.55)
- Jarrett, T. H., Cohen, M., Masci, F., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 735, 112, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/735/2/112](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/735/2/112)
- Jones, D. H., Saunders, W., Colless, M., et al. 2004, *MNRAS*, 355, 747, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2004.08353.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2004.08353.x)
- Jones, D. H., Read, M. A., Saunders, W., et al. 2009, *MNRAS*, 399, 683, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15338.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15338.x)
- Katgert, P., Mazure, A., den Hartog, R., et al. 1998, *A&AS*, 129, 399, doi: [10.1051/aas:1998399](https://doi.org/10.1051/aas:1998399)
- Klindt, L. 2022, PhD thesis, Durham University. <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/14314/>
- Klindt, L., Alexander, D. M., Rosario, D. J., Lusso, E., & Fotopoulou, S. 2019, *MNRAS*, 488, 3109, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stz1771](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz1771)

- Koss, M. J., Glidden, A., Baloković, M., et al. 2016, *ApJL*, 824, L4, doi: [10.3847/2041-8205/824/1/L4](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8205/824/1/L4)
- Koss, M. J., Trakhtenbrot, B., Ricci, C., et al. 2022, *ApJS*, 261, 1, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/ac6c8f](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/ac6c8f)
- Kraft, R. P., Burrows, D. N., & Nousek, J. A. 1991, *ApJ*, 374, 344, doi: [10.1086/170124](https://doi.org/10.1086/170124)
- Lake, S. E., Wright, E. L., Petty, S., et al. 2012, *AJ*, 143, 7, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1111.0341>
- LaMassa, S. M., Georgakakis, A., Vivek, M., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 876, 50, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab108b](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab108b)
- Lansbury, G. B., Gandhi, P., Alexander, D. M., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 809, 115, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/809/2/115](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/809/2/115)
- Lansbury, G. B., Alexander, D. M., Aird, J., et al. 2017a, *ApJ*, 846, 20, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa8176](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa8176)
- Lansbury, G. B., Stern, D., Aird, J., et al. 2017b, *ApJ*, 836, 99, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/836/1/99](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/836/1/99)
- Lin, D., Webb, N. A., & Barret, D. 2012, *ApJ*, 756, 27, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/756/1/27](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/756/1/27)
- Luhman, K. L., Allen, P. R., Espaillat, C., Hartmann, L., & Calvet, N. 2010, *ApJS*, 186, 111, doi: [10.1088/0067-0049/186/1/111](https://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/186/1/111)
- Luo, B., Brandt, W. N., Alexander, D. M., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 794, 70, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/794/1/70](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/794/1/70)
- Luo, B., Brandt, W. N., Xue, Y. Q., et al. 2017, *ApJS*, 228, 2, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/228/1/2](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/228/1/2)
- Lynden-Bell, D. 1969, *Nature*, 223, 690
- Lyu, J., Alberts, S., Rieke, G. H., & Rujopakarn, W. 2022, *ApJ*, 941, 191, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac9e5d](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac9e5d)
- Mainzer, A., Bauer, J., Grav, T., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 731, 53, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/731/1/53](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/731/1/53)
- Malizia, A., Bassani, L., Bazzano, A., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 426, 1750, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2012.21755.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2012.21755.x)
- Marchesi, S., Ajello, M., Marcotulli, L., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 854, 49, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aaa410](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aaa410)
- Marchesi, S., Ajello, M., Zhao, X., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 872, 8, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aafbeb](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aafbeb)
- Marocco, F., Eisenhardt, P. R. M., Fowler, J. W., et al. 2021, *ApJS*, 253, 8, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/abd805](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/abd805)
- Masini, A., Civano, F., Comastri, A., et al. 2018, *ApJS*, 235, 17, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/aaa83d](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/aaa83d)
- Masini, A., Hickox, R. C., Carroll, C. M., et al. 2020, *ApJS*, 251, 2, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/abb607](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/abb607)
- Massaro, E., Giommi, P., Leto, C., et al. 2009, *VizieR Online Data Catalog*, J/A+A/495/691
- Massey, P., Valdes, F., & Barnes, J. 1992, *A User's Guide to Reducing Slit Spectra with IRAF* (available at: <https://www.mn.uio.no/astro/english/services/it/help/visualization/iraf/spect.pdf> accessed 14/01/2016)
- Mateos, S., Alonso-Herrero, A., Carrera, F. J., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 434, 941, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stt953](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stt953)
- . 2012, *MNRAS*, 426, 3271, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1208.2530>
- Merloni, A., Predehl, P., Becker, W., et al. 2012, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1209.3114, doi: [10.48550/arXiv.1209.3114](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1209.3114)
- Monet, D. G., Levine, S. E., Canzian, B., et al. 2003, *AJ*, 125, 984, doi: [10.1086/345888](https://doi.org/10.1086/345888)
- Moretti, A., Campana, S., Lazzati, D., & Tagliaferri, G. 2003, *ApJ*, 588, 696, doi: [10.1086/374335](https://doi.org/10.1086/374335)
- Mori, K., Hailey, C. J., Krivonos, R., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 814, 94, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/814/2/94](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/814/2/94)
- Mullaney, J. R., Del-Moro, A., Aird, J., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 808, 184, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/808/2/184](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/808/2/184)
- Mushotzky, R. F., Cowie, L. L., Barger, A. J., & Arnaud, K. A. 2000, *Nature*, 404, 459, doi: [10.1038/35006564](https://doi.org/10.1038/35006564)
- Nandra, K., Laird, E. S., Adelberger, K., et al. 2005, *MNRAS*, 356, 568, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2004.08475.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2004.08475.x)
- Netzer, H. 2015, *ARA&A*, 53, 365, doi: [10.1146/annurev-astro-082214-122302](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-astro-082214-122302)
- Nidever, D. L., Dey, A., Fasbender, K., et al. 2021, *AJ*, 161, 192, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/abd6e1](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/abd6e1)
- Nikutta, R., Fitzpatrick, M., Scott, A., & Weaver, B. 2020, *Astronomy and Computing*, 33, 100411, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ascom.2020.100411>
- Nilsson, K. 1998, *A&AS*, 132, 31, doi: [10.1051/aas:1998442](https://doi.org/10.1051/aas:1998442)
- Nishiyama, S., Nagata, T., Tamura, M., et al. 2008, *ApJ*, 680, 1174, doi: [10.1086/587791](https://doi.org/10.1086/587791)
- Oh, K., Koss, M., Markwardt, C. B., et al. 2018, *ApJS*, 235, 4, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/aaa7fd](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/aaa7fd)
- Parisi, P., Masetti, N., Rojas, A. F., et al. 2014, *A&A*, 561, A67, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201322409](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201322409)
- Paturel, G., Vauglin, I., Petit, C., et al. 2005, *A&A*, 430, 751, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361:20041162](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361:20041162)
- Penzias, A. A., & Wilson, R. W. 1965, *ApJ*, 142, 419, doi: [10.1086/148307](https://doi.org/10.1086/148307)
- Predehl, P., Andritschke, R., Arefiev, V., et al. 2021, *A&A*, 647, A1, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202039313](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202039313)
- Ricci, C., Trakhtenbrot, B., Koss, M. J., et al. 2017, *ApJS*, 233, 17, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/aa96ad](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/aa96ad)
- Richards, G. T., Hall, P. B., Vanden Berk, D. E., et al. 2003, *AJ*, 126, 1131
- Richards, G. T., Myers, A. D., Gray, A. G., et al. 2009, *ApJS*, 180, 67, doi: [10.1088/0067-0049/180/1/67](https://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/180/1/67)
- Ross, N. P., Hamann, F., Zakamska, N. L., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 453, 3932, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1405.1047>
- Salvato, M., Hasinger, G., Ilbert, O., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 690, 1250, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/690/2/1250](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/690/2/1250)
- Salvato, M., Buchner, J., Budavári, T., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 473, 4937, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stx2651](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx2651)
- Schlegel, D. J., Finkbeiner, D. P., & Davis, M. 1998, *ApJ*, 500, 525, doi: [10.1086/305772](https://doi.org/10.1086/305772)

- Schmidt, M., & Green, R. F. 1983, *ApJ*, 269, 352, doi: [10.1086/161048](https://doi.org/10.1086/161048)
- Schwöpe, A., Hasinger, G., Lehmann, I., et al. 2000, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, 321, 1. <https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0003039>
- Seeberger, R., Huchtmeier, W. K., & Weinberger, R. 1994, *A&A*, 286, 17
- Shen, Y., Richards, G. T., Strauss, M. A., et al. 2011, *ApJS*, 194, 45. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1006.5178>
- Stern, D., Eisenhardt, P., Gorjian, V., et al. 2005, *ApJ*, 631, 163, doi: [10.1086/432523](https://doi.org/10.1086/432523)
- Stern, D., Assef, R. J., Benford, D. J., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 753, 30. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1205.0811>
- Strauss, M. A., Huchra, J. P., Davis, M., et al. 1992, *ApJS*, 83, 29, doi: [10.1086/191730](https://doi.org/10.1086/191730)
- SubbaRao, M., Frieman, J., Bernardi, M., et al. 2002, in *Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series*, Vol. 4847, *Astronomical Data Analysis II*, ed. J.-L. Starck & F. D. Murtagh, 452–460, doi: [10.1117/12.461108](https://doi.org/10.1117/12.461108)
- Toba, Y., Oyabu, S., Matsuhara, H., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 788, 45, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/788/1/45](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/788/1/45)
- Tomsick, J. A., Lansbury, G. B., Rahoui, F., et al. 2017, *ApJS*, 230, 25, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/aa7517](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/aa7517)
- . 2018, *ApJ*, 869, 171, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aaf007](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aaf007)
- Torres-Albà, N., Marchesi, S., Zhao, X., et al. 2021a, *ApJ*, 922, 252, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac1c73](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac1c73)
- . 2021b, *ApJ*, 922, 252, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac1c73](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac1c73)
- Traulsen, I., Schwöpe, A. D., Lamer, G., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 641, A137, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202037706](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202037706)
- Véron-Cetty, M. P., & Véron, P. 2006, *A&A*, 455, 773, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361:20065177](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361:20065177)
- . 2010, *A&A*, 518, A10, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201014188](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201014188)
- Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T. E., et al. 2020, *Nature Methods*, 17, 261, doi: [10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2)
- Webb, N. A., Coriat, M., Traulsen, I., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 641, A136, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201937353](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201937353)
- Wik, D. R., Hornstrup, A., Molendi, S., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 792, 48, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/792/1/48](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/792/1/48)
- Winkler, P. F., & Long, K. S. 1997, *ApJ*, 486, L137, doi: [10.1086/310850](https://doi.org/10.1086/310850)
- Worsley, M. A., Fabian, A. C., Bauer, F. E., et al. 2005, *MNRAS*, 357, 1281, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2005.08731.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2005.08731.x)
- Wright, E. L., Eisenhardt, P. R. M., Mainzer, A. K., et al. 2010, *AJ*, 140, 1868. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1008.0031>
- Yan, W., Hickox, R. C., Hainline, K. N., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 870, 33, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aaeed4](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aaeed4)
- Yuan, F., Lidman, C., Davis, T. M., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 452, 3047, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stv1507](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv1507)
- Yuan, S., Strauss, M. A., & Zakamska, N. L. 2016, *MNRAS*, 462, 1603, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stw1747](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stw1747)
- Zhao, X., Marchesi, S., Ajello, M., et al. 2021a, *A&A*, 650, A57, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202140297](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202140297)
- Zhao, X., Civano, F., Fornasini, F. M., et al. 2021b, *MNRAS*, 508, 5176, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stab2885](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab2885)