

# H $\alpha$ Images of Ultra-Flat Edge-On Spiral Galaxies

S. S. Kaisin,<sup>1,\*</sup> I. D. Karachentsev,<sup>1</sup> H. Hernandez-Toledo,<sup>2</sup>

L. Gutierrez,<sup>3</sup> and V. E. Karachentseva<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Special Astrophysical Observatory, Russian Academy of Sciences, Nizhnii Arkhyz, 369167 Russia*

<sup>2</sup>*Institute of Astronomy (IA) of the UNAM, Mexico City, 04510 Mexico*

<sup>3</sup>*National Astronomical Observatory, Ensenada, 22800 Mexico*

<sup>4</sup>*Main Astronomical Observatory NAS of Ukraine, Kyiv, 03143 Ukraine*

(Received September 24, 2019; Revised November 14, 2019; Accepted November 14, 2019)

We present the H $\alpha$  images of ultra-flat (UF) spiral galaxies seen practically edge-on. The galaxies have the angular diameter in the  $B$  band  $a > 1'.9$  and the apparent axial ratio  $(a/b) > 10$ . We found that their H $\alpha$  images look, on average, almost two times thinner than those in the red continuum. The star-formation rate in the studied objects, determined from the H $\alpha$  flux, is in good agreement with that calculated from the  $FUV$  flux from the GALEX survey if we use the modified Verheijen and Sancisi formula taking into account the internal extinction in the UF galaxies. The logarithm of the specific star-formation rate in the UF galaxies shows a small scatter, 0.19, with a smooth decrease from  $-10.4$  for dwarf spirals to  $-10.7$  for massive ones. The relative amount of the hydrogen mass in UF disks varies from about 50% in dwarf disks to about 8% in massive ones. Structural distortions are less common in the UF galaxies (about 16%) than those in thick (less isolated) disks of edge-on spiral galaxies. On the cosmic time scale, 13.7 Gyr, large spiral disks are more efficient “engines” for gas processing into stars than dwarf spirals.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The revised catalog of flat galaxies RFGC contains 4236 objects distributed over the whole sky (Karachentsev et al. 1999). For the RFGC catalog, we selected the galaxies with the angular diameter  $a \geq 0'.6$  in the  $B$  band and the apparent axial ratio  $a/b \geq 7$  measured in the First Palomar Sky Survey (POSS-1) and in the ESO/SERC survey. The RFGC catalog includes spiral galaxies of various morphological types: from S0, Sa to Sd, Sm. The sample containing 817 ultra-flat galaxies was compiled from this array (UFgg) (Karachentseva et al. 2016) with the “blue” and “red” axial ratios:  $(a/b)_B \geq 10$  and  $(a/b)_R \geq 8.5$ . A substantial proportion in the UF sample is made up of spiral galaxies of the Sc, Scd, and Sd types, in which the spheroidal stellar subsystem makes insignificant contribution to the total mass/luminosity of a galaxy. Such disk-shaped galaxies with negligibly small bulges are attractive objects for various studies of their kinematics, dynamics, and star formation due to the simple structure of these galaxies.

---

\* Electronic address: skai@sao.ru

According to the data from Karachentsev et al. (2016), Melnyk et al. (2017), the UF galaxies are located in regions of low density avoiding close proximity to other galaxies. Obviously, the absence of close neighbors is an important condition for a thin stellar disk to persist. The presence of very few small satellites in the UF galaxies makes it possible to estimate the total mass from measurements of the difference in radial velocities and projected separations of the satellites. In spite of some expectations of Banerjee and Jog (2013), dark halos of the UF galaxies did not show any excess of dark matter compared to other spiral galaxies (Karachentsev et al. 2016).

Obtaining images of ultra-flat galaxies in the  $H\alpha$  emission line is of great interest, since it allows one to distinguish H II regions with young stellar populations. Unfortunately, the data on the  $H\alpha$  images of thin disks of edge-on galaxies are extremely rare in the literature. However, the first  $H\alpha$  image of the UF galaxy RFGC 2246 = UGC 7321 has already shown (Karachentsev et al. 2015) that the subsystem of the young population of the galaxy has the axial ratio  $(a/b)_{H\alpha} = 38$  which is much greater than that of the old disk population,  $(a/b) = 14$ . The relationship between disk flatness and its population age could be traced from images of the UF galaxies in the *FUV* and *NUV* ultraviolet bands, although, the low angular resolution of the GALEX survey (Gil de Paz et al. 2007) impedes the success of this approach.

To observe in the  $H\alpha$  line, we selected the largest UF galaxies with the “blue” angular diameter  $a_B > 1'.9$  located in the region of declinations of  $DEC > -30^\circ$ .

## 2. OBSERVATIONS AND DATA REDUCTION

Observations of the UF galaxies in the  $H\alpha$  emission line were carried out at the 2.12-m f/7.5 Cassegrain telescope of the San Pedro Mártir National Astronomical Observatory in Mexico for several sets since February 2016 till September 2017. The telescope was equipped with the 2K×2K CCD camera having a pixel size of  $13.5 \times 13.5 \mu\text{m}$ . With a binning of  $2 \times 2$ , the camera provided a field of view of  $6' \times 6'$  and a resolution of 0.352 arcsec/pixel. The observations were carried out with a set of narrow interference filters with equivalent widths of 80 Å centered at different wavelengths: 6603, 6643, 6683, and 6723 Å according to the radial velocity of the galaxy. Figure 1 shows the curves of the spectral transmission of filters.

To subtract the continuum, the images of galaxies were taken in the r-Gunn broadband filter. The image calibration was carried out every night using spectrophotometric standards.

The reduction of the observed data was carried out using the set of standard procedures which included: bias subtraction, flat-field division, cosmic-ray removal, and sky-background subtraction. The images in the continuum were normalized to the image in the  $H\alpha$  filter using several dozen stars and then were subtracted. The  $H\alpha$  flux of the galaxy was determined from the  $H\alpha$  image with the subtracted continuum. The typical measurement error of the  $H\alpha$  flux was determined, as a rule, by weather conditions and it was equal to about 0.1 dex. With this accuracy, we ignored the contribution of the [N II] doublet to the emission flux neighboring  $H\alpha$ .

### 3. RESULTS

Figure 2 gives the first page of the mosaic comprising 45 pairs of the UF-galaxy images that we obtained. The left-hand images in each pair correspond to the total exposure in the  $H\alpha$  line and in the continuum, and the right-hand ones show the image difference in  $H\alpha$  and in the continuum. The name of each object, the scale of the image, and the “north-east” orientation are indicated in the right-hand images. Some images show residual traces from bright stars and objects of an anomalous color.

Table 1 summarises the main parameters of the observed UF galaxies. The table columns contain: (1) the number of the galaxy in the RFGC catalog; (2) the equatorial coordinates; (3,4) the “blue” angular diameter in arcmin and apparent “blue” axial ratio from RFGC; (5) the heliocentric radial velocity of the galaxy in  $\text{km s}^{-1}$ ; (6) the effective wavelength of the filter ( $\text{\AA}$ ) in which the galaxy was exposed; (7) the exposure time in the  $H\alpha$  filter in sec; (8) the flux logarithm in the  $H\alpha + [\text{N II}]$  lines in  $\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ .

Besides the  $H\alpha$  line, the  $[\text{N II}]$  nitrogen lines fall into the filters we used: 6548  $\text{\AA}$  and 6584  $\text{\AA}$ . According to Kennicutt et al. (2008), the relation of the intensities of the  $[\text{N II}]$  and  $H\alpha$  lines for spiral galaxies depends on the absolute magnitude of the galaxy and is expressed by the relation

$$\log(F[\text{N II}]/F(H\alpha)) = -0.173M_B - 3.90 \quad (1)$$

with  $M_B > -21.^m0$  and  $-0.27$ , when  $M_B < -21.^m0$ , having a standard deviation of 0.26 dex. For a typical galaxy of our sample with  $M_B \simeq -19.^m4$ , the correction to the flux  $F(H\alpha)$  due to the contribution of the  $[\text{N II}]$  doublet is  $-0.14$  dex, which is smaller than the standard deviation in relation (1). That is why, we did not correct the measured flux  $F(H\alpha + [\text{N II}])$  for the contribution of the nitrogen doublet.

We used the measured integrated flux of the galaxy  $F_c(H\alpha)$  corrected for Galactic and internal extinction to determine the star-formation integral rate,  $SFR(H\alpha)$ , in units  $M_\odot/\text{yr}$ . According to Kennicutt et al. (1998),

$$\log(SFR(H\alpha)) = \log F_c(H\alpha) + 2 \log D + 8.98, \quad (2)$$

where the distance  $D$  is given in Mpc.

Most galaxies in our sample have the estimated apparent magnitudes  $m_{FUV}$  in the  $FUV$  band of the far ultraviolet ( $\lambda_{\text{ef}} = 1539 \text{ \AA}$ ,  $\text{FWHM} = 269 \text{ \AA}$ ) measured at the GALEX<sup>1</sup> satellite. Following Lee et al. (2011), we determined the integral star-formation rate of the galaxy as

$$\log(SFR(FUV)) = 2.78 - 0.4m_{FUV}^c + 2 \log D, \quad (3)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://galex.stsci.edu/GalexView/>

where the apparent  $FUV$  magnitude is corrected for the Galactic and internal extinction. Comparison between  $SFR(H\alpha)$  and  $SFR(FUV)$  makes it possible to refine the value of internal extinction in galaxies, which appears to be significant in the case of edge-on galaxies.

Table 2 presents the extended summary of the main parameters of the UF galaxies. Besides those 45 galaxies that we observed, we also included the data on 10 UF galaxies with the  $F(H\alpha)$  flux measurements conducted in Karachentsev et al. (2015), Gavazzi et al. (2015), Spector and Brosch (2017) at the end of the table. The columns of Table 2 contain: (1) the RFGC galaxy number; (2) the morphological type according to the de Vaucouleurs classification: 4—Sbc, 5—Sc, 6—Scd, 7—Sd that we determined from the galaxy images in the PanSTARRS survey (Chambers et al. 2016); (3) the logarithm of the apparent axial ratio reduced to the standard isophote from HyperLEDA (Makarov et al. 2014); (4, 5) the apparent  $B$  magnitude and the Galactic extinction in the  $B$  band from Makarov et al. (2014), Schlegel et al. (1998); (6) the distance to the galaxy (Mpc) determined from the radial velocity relative to the Local Group centroid with the Hubble parameter  $H_0 = 73 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ ; for closer galaxies with  $V_{LG} < 2500 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ , the estimation of  $D$  is made using the Shaya et al. (2017) model which takes into account the infall of galaxies to the Virgo cluster and expansion of the Local cosmic void; (7) the amplitude of the galaxy rotation (in  $\text{km s}^{-1}$ ) from Makarov et al. (2014); (8) the apparent magnitude  $m_{21}$  from Makarov et al. (2014) characterizing the flux from the galaxy in the 21-cm line of neutral hydrogen; (9) the flux logarithm in the  $H\alpha$  line; (10) the apparent magnitude of the galaxy in the  $FUV$  band from the GALEX data; (11) the logarithm of the hydrogen mass of the galaxy

$$\log M_{\text{HI}} = 12.33 - 0.4m_{21} + 2 \log D \quad (4)$$

expressed in units  $M_\odot$ ; (12) the magnitude of the accepted internal extinction in the galaxy in the  $B$  band (see Section 4); (13) the apparent magnitude of the galaxy in the  $K$  band determined from the integral  $B$  value and from the morphological type  $T$  as

$$K = B + T/4 - 4.60 \quad (5)$$

corrected for the Galactic and internal extinction; such a recipe suggested in Jarrett et al. (2003) eliminates systematic underestimation of the flux from peripheral regions under photometry of blue edge-on galaxies in the 2MASS survey (Jarrett et al. 2000); (14) the integral luminosity of the galaxy in the  $K$  band (in  $L_\odot$ ) which with  $M_*/L_K = 1M_\odot/L_\odot$  (Bell et al. 2003) corresponds to the stellar mass of the galaxy; (15,16) the integral star-formation rate determined from the  $H\alpha$  and  $FUV$  fluxes, respectively; (17) the specific star-formation rate  $sSFR(H\alpha)/M_*$  in units ( $\text{yr}^{-1}$ ) under the assumption that  $M_*/L_K = 1$  in solar units.

#### 4. ACCOUNTING FOR THE INTERNAL EXTINCTION IN THE UF GALAXIES

The example of our Galaxy shows that dust, HII regions, and blue stars are distributed in a spiral disk extremely unevenly. The picture of the shredded distribution of dust is far from a simple

model of flat-parallel layers. For this reason, a reliable scheme for accounting for internal extinction has not yet been proposed. Usually, the extinction in the  $B$  band is expressed as

$$A_B^i = \gamma \log(a/b), \quad (6)$$

where the coefficient  $\gamma$  depends on the luminosity or morphological type of the galaxy. The HyperLEDA accounting scheme for the internal extinction implies a dependence of  $\gamma$  on a morphological type. Its imperfection is the monotonic increase of  $\gamma$  with the increase of  $T$  which leads to strong overestimation of the extinction in late-type dwarf galaxies.

Other authors (Bothwell et al. 2009, Devour and Bell 2016, Lee et al. 2009) used the schemes, where the parameter  $\gamma$  depended on the absolute magnitude of the galaxy, and the character of this dependence was significantly different for different authors. Obviously, the absolute magnitude of the galaxy itself depends on the accepted internal extinction, so, the  $A_B^i$  estimation scheme for edge-on galaxies requires a series of sequential iterations.

Verheijen and Sancisi (2001) proposed to express the parameter  $\gamma$  via the amplitude of the galaxy rotation:

$$\gamma(V_m) = 1.54 + 2.5(\log V_m - 2.2) \quad (7)$$

with  $V_m > 43 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ , otherwise  $\gamma = 0$ , when  $V_m < 43 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . This approach is free from iterations, however, it is applicable only to galaxies with a known rotation amplitude. Considering the statistics of the relation  $SFR(H\alpha)/SFR(FUV)$  for the Local Volume galaxies, Karachentsev et al. (2018) concluded that expression (6) somewhat overestimates the extinction in massive galaxies and underestimates it for dwarf galaxies. In our estimation, the appropriate correction for the internal extinction in late-type spiral disks has the form

$$A_B^i = (1.3 + 2.0(\log V_m - 2.2)) \log r_{25} \quad (8)$$

with  $V_m > 36 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ , otherwise  $A_B^i = 0$ , when  $V_m < 36 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ , where  $r_{25} = (a/b)_{25}$  is the apparent axial ratio reduced to the standard isophote (Makarov et al. 2014). Table 2 presents  $A_B^i$  calculated according to this recipe. For two galaxies with unknown  $V_m$ , we estimated the extinction with the empirical relation:

$$A_B^i(T) = \begin{cases} (3.0 - 0.3T) \log r_{25}, & T > 4; \\ 0.3(1 + T) \log r_{25}, & T < 5, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

which describes extinction in late-type galaxies more adequately than the schemes from Bothwell et al. (2009), Devour and Bell (2016), Lee et al. (2009), or the algorithm used in HyperLEDA. Following Lee et al. (2009), we accepted the transition coefficients for the Galactic extinction in the  $H\alpha$  and  $FUV$  bands:

$$A_{H\alpha}^G = 0.61 A_B^G, \quad A_{FUV}^G = 1.93 A_B^G. \quad (10)$$

For the internal extinction, according to Lee et al. (2009), these relations were accepted:

$$A_{H\alpha}^i = 1.07 A_B^i, \quad A_{FUV}^i = 1.93 A_B^i. \quad (11)$$

Here, a higher value of the transition coefficient for the  $H\alpha$  line compared to relation (10) is due to the close correlation between the distribution of dust and HII regions in the galaxy disks, and its value was estimated from spectrophotometric measurements of the Balmer decrement (see the details in Lee et al. 2009).

Determining the hydrogen mass of galaxies  $M_{HI}$ , we ignored the correction for the internal self-extinction of the emission in the 21-cm line. For the edge-on galaxies, HyperLEDA introduces a correction to  $m_{21}$  for the self-extinction effect, equal to  $\Delta m_{21} = -0^m.82$ . However, such a correction seems overstated to us. Jones et al. (2018) investigated the self-extinction effect in the 21-cm line for the sample of 2022 galaxies from the ALFALFA survey and concluded that galaxy disks are almost transparent in the 21-cm line, and the required correction is only

$$\Delta \log M_{HI} = (0.13 \pm 0.03) \log(a/b). \quad (12)$$

The comparison between the UF and Sc, Sd face-on galaxy samples (Karachentsev and Karachentseva 2019) shows that the self-extinction effect is actually even smaller being lost in measurement errors of the HI flux of galaxies and errors in the morphological classification of galaxies.

## 5. STAR-FORMATION RATES IN ULTRA-FLAT GALAXIES

The upper panel of Figure 3 shows the dependence between the star-formation rate determined from the  $H\alpha$  flux and the  $K$  luminosity of the UF galaxies. Our measurements are shown with the solid circles and data from the literature—with the open circles. The dashed line corresponds to the case  $\log(SFR) = \log L_K - 10.14$ , when the galaxy manages to reproduce its observed stellar mass with the observed  $SFR$  for the cosmological time  $T_0 = 13.7$  Gyr. The linear regression (the solid line) has a slope of  $0.87 \pm 0.04$  indicating that more massive galaxies required higher star-formation rates in the past to provide the accumulated stellar mass. The similar diagram in the case of  $SFR$  calculated from the  $FUV$  flux is shown in the lower panel of Fig. 3. In general, the diagram has a similar shape, although, the dispersion of the  $SFR$  estimates is larger in Fig. 3b.

Figure 4 gives the comparison of the obtained  $SFR(H\alpha)$  and  $SFR(FUV)$  values. The data is well grouped along diagonal, having average  $\langle SFR(H\alpha) \rangle = -0.11 \pm 0.08$  and  $\langle SFR(FUV) \rangle = -0.03 \pm 0.09$ . This circumstance indirectly confirms that the difference in calibrations of empirical relations (1) and (2) is small, and the scheme we have adopted for taking into account the internal extinction in galaxies is close to reality.

Figure 5 reproduces the relationship between the specific star-formation rate  $sSFR(H\alpha)$  and the total  $K$  luminosity or stellar mass of the UF galaxies with  $M_*/L_K = 1$  in solar units. The dashed horizontal line corresponds to the Hubble parameter  $H_0 = 73 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ . The scatter of galaxies relative to the quadratic regression line is small, 0.19 dex, which indicates a fairly uniform pattern of the star formation in thin disks of late-type spiral galaxies. Moreover, in massive disks, the gas-to-star conversion occurred in the past at about two times higher rates than in dwarf spirals.

It should be noted that this difference is leveled if  $SFR$  is normalized not to the stellar mass but to the total baryon mass of the galaxy.

## 6. SOME MAIN PROPERTIES OF ULTRA-FLAT SPIRAL DISKS

The ultra-flat category represents the galaxies with a large range of linear sizes. The nearby Sd dwarf, RFGC 1700 = UGCA 193 has the minimum linear diameter in our sample, 13 kpc. Among the giant disks, the Sbc galaxy RFGC 1339 = UGC 4704 has the largest diameter, 105 kpc. The median linear diameter of the UF galaxies is 44 kpc. The correction for inclination adopted in HyperLEDA about one and a half times decreases the isophotal diameter of the UF galaxy.

Figure 6 shows the dependence between the hydrogen mass and the  $K$  luminosity of the UF galaxies. As follows from these data, the ratio  $M_{\text{HI}}/L_K$  systematically decreases from dwarf galaxies to high-luminosity objects. This pattern indicates that the process of converting gas into stars was the most intense in the most massive galaxies. The noticed effect obviously is not related to the presence of bulges in galaxies, since their contribution to the luminosity of the UF galaxies is quite small.

Comparing the logarithm of the hydrogen mass for the face-on (Karachentsev and Karachentseva 2019) and edge-on galaxies within equal intervals of the  $L_K$  luminosities, we got the average difference  $\langle \log M_{\text{HI}} \rangle_{\text{faceon}} - \langle \log M_{\text{HI}} \rangle_{\text{edgeon}} = -0.08 \pm 0.06$ . The negative value of this difference under the typical ratio  $\log(a/b) \simeq 1$  for the UF galaxies indicates that the disks of ultra-flat galaxies are almost transparent in the 21-cm line, and correction (12) for them is excessive.

The upper and lower panels of Fig. 7 show the dependence of the star-formation rate determined from the  $H\alpha$  and  $FUV$  fluxes on the hydrogen mass of the UF galaxies. The regression lines on them have an inclination of  $1.27 \pm 0.12$  and  $1.16 \pm 0.08$ , noticeably smaller than the expected  $1.4 \pm 0.1$  from the Schmidt–Kennicutt relation (Kennicutt 1998) for individual star-formation sites. It should also be noted that the dispersion of the observed data on the  $SFR$ – $M_{\text{HI}}$  diagrams obtained from the  $FUV$  fluxes is noticeably smaller than that obtained from the  $H\alpha$  fluxes unlike the  $SFR$ – $L_K$  diagrams (Fig. 3). We did not find an explanation for this feature.

Comparison of the images given in Fig. 2 shows that all the UF galaxies without exception appear thinner in the  $H\alpha$  filter than in the red continuum. This difference is the stronger, the closer the inclination angle of the galaxy to  $i = 90^\circ$  is. Figure 8 reproduces the ratio  $a/b$  in the  $H\alpha$  line and in the red continuum for 45 galaxies under study. Average values of  $\langle \log(a/b)_{H\alpha} \rangle = 1.23 \pm 0.03$

and  $\langle \log(a/b)_r \rangle = 0.97 \pm 0.02$  show that the thickness of the emission disk is on average almost two times smaller than that in the red continuum. As is known, the complexes of hot blue stars that regulate the glow of H II regions are approximately  $10^7$  yrs old. Consequently, the formation of a young stellar population occurs in a thinner layer of the disk compared to the thickness of the disk of an old stellar population. This conclusion is quite expected in the picture of the formation of young H II complexes with gravitational instability of molecular gaseous clouds.

Reshetnikov and Combes (1998) investigated the statistics of S-like distortions in optical images of flat galaxies. According to the data by Reshetnikov and Combes (1998), such distortions are visible in 40% of edge-on galaxies, and their frequency increases with the increase of the flat galaxy environment. The latter circumstance indicates the external, tidal nature of the distortions visible on the outskirts of the disks. In our sample of 45 UF galaxies, we found distinct distortions of the emission disk only in one galaxy, RFGC 1133 = UGC 3539<sup>2</sup>, and weak distortions for other 6 galaxies: RFGC 504, 531, 722, 1434, 3935, and 4039. Thus, the occurrence of distortions of the H $\alpha$  disk of ultra-flat galaxies, no greater than  $(16 \pm 5)\%$ , turns out to be noticeably smaller than that of the objects of the RFGC catalog. A small percentage of peripheral distortions in ultra-flat galaxy disks is in agreement with the fact that they are preferred in the very low density regions.

## 7. FINAL REMARKS

The presented results of observations in the H $\alpha$  line of ultra-flat galaxies resulted in a multiple increase in the number of the studied objects of this category. The UF edge-on galaxies have angles of rotational axis inclination to the line of sight in the range of  $i \simeq (85\text{--}90)^\circ$  which, with the absence of significant bulges, corresponds to the apparent axial ratio  $a/b > 10$  in the blue region of the spectrum. In the emission H $\alpha$  line, the UF galaxies look even thinner having the characteristic axial ratio  $\langle a/b \rangle_{\text{H}\alpha} \simeq 17$ . This shows that the young stellar population of galaxy disks is formed in a narrow layer, the thickness of which increases with the transition to an older population.

The internal extinction in the UF galaxies appears to be significant. With a characteristic linear diameter of about 44 kpc, the extinction in the H $\alpha$  line reaches  $1\text{--}2^{\text{m}}$ , and in the *FUV* band—even  $3\text{--}4^{\text{m}}$ . The considerable extinction results in the faint appearance of the UF galaxies in the GALEX ultraviolet sky survey. The method of accounting for the internal extinction used by us leads to good agreement between the estimates of the star-formation rate obtained from the H $\alpha$  and *FUV* fluxes. In the 21-cm emission line, the ultra-flat galaxies of our sample are almost transparent.

The specific star-formation rate in the UF galaxies, referred to the unit of the *K* luminosity or stellar mass, shows a systematic decrease from  $sSFR \sim -10.4$  dex with  $L_K \sim 9$  dex to about  $-10.7$  dex with  $L_K \sim 11$  dex. The low dispersion on the  $sSFR$  vs  $L_K$  diagram relative to the

---

<sup>2</sup> This integral-shaped galaxy is highly isolated. Its nearest neighbor, the galaxy CGCG 308-039, has a radial velocity difference of  $228 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  and a projected separation of 410 kpc.



regression line indicates the uniformity of the star formation in thin disks of spiral galaxies.

To reproduce the observed stellar mass, the average star-formation rate of dwarf and massive UF galaxies had to be two and four times higher in the past, respectively, than their current value of  $sSFR$ .

The relative abundance of hydrogen mass in the UF galaxy disks is on average about 20%, varying from 50% in dwarf disks to about 8% in massive galaxies. Consequently, the UF galaxies have gas reserves to maintain the observed star-formation rates for over several billion years.


Disk shape distortions are noticeably less common in the UF galaxies than those in other edge-on galaxies of the RFGC catalog. The presence of the UF galaxies in the regions of low cosmic density is consistent with the assumption that many distortions of the periphery of spiral galaxies are due to the tidal force of close neighbors.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS


In this paper, we used the data of the GALEX and PanSTARRS sky surveys as well as the HyperLEDA extragalactic database. This work was partially supported by the RSF grant 19-12-00145.

- 
1. I. D. Karachentsev, V. E. Karachentseva, Yu. N. Kudrya, et al., Bulletin of the Special Astrophysical Observatory **47**, 1 (1999).
  2. V. E. Karachentseva, Yu. N. Kudrya, I. D. Karachentsev, et al., Astrophysical Bulletin **71**, 1 (2016).
  3. I. D. Karachentsev, V. E. Karachentseva, and Yu. N. Kudrya, Astrophysical Bulletin **71**, 129 (2016).
  4. O. V. Melnyk, V. E. Karachentseva, and I. D. Karachentsev, Astrophysical Bulletin **72**, 1 (2017).
  5. A. Banerjee & C. J. Jog, Monthly Notices Royal Astron. Soc. **431**, 582 (2013).
  6. I. D. Karachentsev, S. S. Kaisin, and E. I. Kaisina, Astrofizika **58**, 453 (2015).
  7. A. Gil de Paz, S. Boissier, B. F. Madore, et al., Astrophys. J. Suppl. **173**, 185 (2007).
  8. R. C. Kennicutt, J. C. Lee, J. G. Funes, et al., Astrophys. J. Suppl. **178**, 247 (2008).
  9. R. C. Kennicutt, Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys., **36**, 189 (1998).
  10. J. C. Lee, A. Gil de Paz, R. C. Kennicutt, et al., Astrophys. J. Suppl. **192**, 6 (2011).
  11. G. Gavazzi, G. Consolandi, E. Viscardi, et al., Astron. and Astrophys. **576**, 16 (2015).
  12. O. Spector & N. Brosch, Monthly Notices Royal Astron. Soc. **469**, 347 (2017).
  13. K. C. Chambers, E. A. Magnier, N. Metcalfe, et al., arXiv:1612.05560 (2016).
  14. D. Makarov, P. Prugniel, N. Terekhova, et al., Astron. and Astrophys. **570**, 13 (2014).
  15. D. J. Schlegel, D. P. Finkbeiner, and M. Davis, Astrophys. J. **500**, 525 (1998).
  16. E. J. Shaya, R. B. Tully, Y. Hoffman, and D. Pomarede, Astron. J. **850**, 207 (2017).
  17. N. H. Jarrett, T. Chester, R. Cutri, et al., Astron. J. **125**, 525 (2003).
  18. N. H. Jarrett, T. Chester, R. Cutri, et al., Astron. J. **119**, 2498 (2000).
  19. E. F. Bell, D. H. McIntosh, N. Katz, and M. D. Weinberg, Astrophys. J. Suppl. **149**, 289 (2003).
  20. J. C. Lee, A. Gil de Paz, C. Tremonti, et al., Astrophys. J. **706**, 599 (2009).

21. M. S. Bothwell, R. C. Kennicutt, and J. C. Lee, Monthly Notices Royal Astron. Soc. **400**, 154 (2009).
22. B. M. Devour & E. F. Bell, Monthly Notices Royal Astron. Soc. **459**, 2054 (2016).
23. M. A. W. Verheijen and R. Sancisi, Astron. and Astrophys. **370**, 765 (2001).
24. I. D. Karachentsev, E. I. Kaisina, and D. I. Makarov, Monthly Notices Royal Astron. Soc. **479**, 4136 (2018).
25. M. C. Jones, M. P. Haynes, & R. Giovanelli, Monthly Notices Royal Astron. Soc. **477**, 2 (2018).
26. I. D. Karachentsev and V. E. Karachentseva, Monthly Notices Royal Astron. Soc. **485**, 1477 (2019).
27. V. Reshetnikov and F. Combes F., Astron. and Astrophys. **337**, 9 (1998).




**Figure 1.** Curves of the spectral transmission of filters used in observations.




**Figure 2.** Mosaic image of ultra-flat galaxies. The left-hand images in each pair present the sum of the exposures in the H $\alpha$  line and in the continuum, and the right-hand images correspond to the difference “H $\alpha$ –continuum”. The right-hand images show: the name of the galaxy, 1' scale, and “North–East” direction.

The full consolidated data on the H $\alpha$  images of the UF galaxies are available at


<http://lv.sao.ru/EDGE-ON/>.




**Figure 3.** Dependence of the star-formation rate determined from a) the  $\text{H}\alpha$  flux, b) the flux in the  $FUV$  band on the  $K$  luminosity of the galaxies. The data of the  $\text{H}\alpha$  fluxes from the literature are denoted by the open circles. The dashed line corresponds to a cosmic time of 13.7 Gyr, for which the observed stellar mass of the galaxy is reproduced at the observed  $SFR$  rate. The linear regressions have an inclination of  $0.87 \pm 0.04$  and  $0.71 \pm 0.06$  for the  $\text{H}\alpha$  and  $FUV$  fluxes, respectively.




**Figure 4.** Relation between the  $SFR$  estimates obtained from the  $H\alpha$  and  $FUV$  fluxes for the UF galaxies.



**Figure 5.** Dependence of the specific star-formation rate on the  $K$  luminosity for the galaxies observed in the  $H\alpha$  line. The dashed horizontal line corresponds to the Hubble parameter  $H_0 = 73 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ . The solid line indicates the quadratic regression.




**Figure 6.** Distribution of ultra-flat galaxies with the hydrogen integral mass and the  $K$  luminosity.



**Figure 7.** Dependence of the star-formation rate determined from a) the  $\text{H}\alpha$  flux, b) the flux in the  $FUV$  band on the hydrogen mass. The linear regressions have inclinations of  $1.27 \pm 0.12$  and  $1.16 \pm 0.08$  for the  $\text{H}\alpha$  and  $FUV$  fluxes, respectively.





**Figure 8.** Apparent axial ratio in the H $\alpha$  line and in the continuum for the UF galaxies.

**Table 1.** List of the UF galaxies observed in H $\alpha$  line

Galaxy	RA (2000.0)	DEC	a'	log(a/b)	V <sub>h</sub>	Filter	T <sub>exp</sub>	log F <sub>H<math>\alpha</math></sub>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
RFGC 001	000056.0	+202016	2.02	1.07	6804	6723	1440	-13.45
RFGC 099	002547.7	-021705	2.46	1.05	5339	6643	2160	-12.97
RFGC 124	003149.4	-264312	2.80	1.00	7235	6723	2160	-12.72
RFGC 161	004214.7	-180942	3.36	1.05	1553	6603	2700	-12.80
RFGC 176	004708.2	+302027	2.50	1.08	5248	6643	2160	-12.98
RFGC 255	010836.9	+013830	4.65	1.19	1982	6603	2700	-12.77
RFGC 438	020302.0	-093922	2.80	1.19	3864	6643	1800	-12.73
RFGC 463	020926.4	+371529	2.13	1.29	4586	6643	2160	-13.46
RFGC 504	022131.0	+141155	2.52	1.06	3744	6643	2160	-12.85
RFGC 511	022356.1	-064216	1.97	1.22	9560	6723	2160	-13.61
RFGC 517	022515.5	+452704	2.02	1.00	5195	6643	2160	-13.21
RFGC 531	022827.3	+153625	1.90	1.16	4080	6643	2160	-13.39
RFGC 560	023631.6	+071834	2.89	1.12	6122	6723	2160	-12.91
RFGC 603	025017.5	-083550	2.55	1.01	5326	6643	2160	-13.42
RFGC 620	025426.2	+423900	2.43	1.21	2162	6603	1800	-13.11
RFGC 722	032524.8	-161405	3.23	1.06	1873	6603	2400	-12.81
RFGC 798	040048.9	+350049	2.55	1.06	4157	6643	2160	-12.93
RFGC 855	042921.8	-044535	2.12	1.03	4353	6643	3600	-13.03
RFGC 911	045146.0	+034005	2.02	1.00	4578	6643	2160	-13.41
RFGC 944	050732.0	-113905	2.26	1.12	2358	6603	2400	-13.39
RFGC 1133	064854.0	+661540	2.24	1.01	3304	6643	3600	-12.76
RFGC 1339	081357.6	+523853	4.87	1.09	5459	6683	3600	-13.31
RFGC 1434	084850.8	+295212	2.13	1.05	5964	6683	3600	-13.57
RFGC 1462	085901.0	+391233	4.14	1.00	595	6603	2400	-12.98
RFGC 1504	091154.6	-200700	4.76	1.19	2177	6603	2400	-12.95
RFGC 1700	100236.0	-060049	4.31	1.16	661	6603	3600	-12.90
RFGC 3359	182402.4	+651822	2.52	1.22	7124	6723	2160	-13.20
RFGC 3378	183339.5	+320822	1.95	1.25	5456	6683	2400	-13.62
RFGC 3385	183754.4	+173201	2.63	1.14	4500	6683	1800	-13.05
RFGC 3608	203523.7	-061440	2.11	1.07	5798	6643	2400	-13.39
RFGC 3645	204838.4	-171430	2.08	1.32	8336	6723	2160	-13.50
RFGC 3651	204952.2	-070119	3.47	1.05	6047	6723	2160	-12.94
RFGC 3803	214439.4	-064121	2.06	1.27	3090	6643	2400	-13.39
RFGC 3824	215235.8	+281823	2.08	1.09	3476	6643	2160	-12.88
RFGC 3827	215245.5	+385611	3.09	1.11	5989	6723	2160	-12.95
RFGC 3846	215807.4	+010032	3.47	1.13	3011	6643	2160	-13.17
RFGC 3880	220804.8	-101959	2.16	1.33	2866	6643	2400	-13.63
RFGC 3935	222316.6	-285851	3.64	1.03	1808	6603	2700	-12.68
RFGC 4039	225912.8	+133624	3.44	1.24	2568	6643	2160	-12.84
RFGC 4072	230754.9	+050940	1.90	1.02	3523	6643	2160	-13.26
RFGC 4078	231203.6	+484859	1.93	1.29	8657	6723	2160	-13.25
RFGC 4081	231313.1	+062548	4.70	1.02	4839	6683	1800	-13.23
RFGC 4091	231502.6	+012608	2.11	1.05	4961	6643	2160	-13.41
RFGC 4106	231930.4	+160429	3.25	1.06	7238	6723	2160	-12.97
RFGC 4149	233543.6	+322306	2.37	1.12	4957	6683	2100	-12.95

**Table 2.** General parameters of the UF galaxies

RFGC	T	$\log r_{25}$	$B_t$	$A_G$	$D$	$V_m$	$m_{21}$	$\log F_{H\alpha}$	$m_{FUV}$	$\log M_{HI}$	$A_B$	$m_K$	$\log L_K$	$\log SFR\alpha$	$\log SFRu$	$\log sSFR\alpha$
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
1	5	0.85	15.65	0.34	97	204	15.53	-13.45	19.18	10.09	1.29	10.67	11.01	0.14	0.34	-10.87
99	5	0.88	15.69	0.11	75	190	15.02	-12.97	17.26	10.07	1.28	10.95	10.68	0.34	0.70	-10.34
124	5	0.82	14.61	0.09	101	294	16.54	-12.72	19.92	9.72	1.51	9.66	11.45	0.94	0.06	-10.51
161	7	0.82	14.33	0.09	22	86	14.33	-12.80		9.28	0.63	10.76	9.69	-0.84		-10.53
176	6	0.89	14.77	0.29	75	165	14.93	-12.98	17.67	10.11	1.19	10.19	10.98	0.33	0.60	-10.65
255	7	0.73	14.67	0.11	24	89	14.48	-12.77	16.41	9.30	0.58	11.13	9.62	-0.75	-0.49	-10.37
438	7	1.04	14.61	0.11	53	117	14.88	-12.73	16.71	9.83	1.08	10.57	10.53	0.19	0.46	-10.34
463	6	0.73	16.08	0.21	66	104	15.77	-13.46		9.66	0.68	12.09	10.11	-0.50		-10.61
504	6	0.86	14.73	0.66	53	180	15.03	-12.85	18.28	9.77	1.21	9.76	10.85	0.26	0.36	-10.59
511	5	1.00	15.88	0.13	131			-13.61	18.90		1.50	10.98	11.12	0.28	0.71	-10.84
517	5	0.86	15.41	0.40	74	128	16.15	-13.21	19.66	9.61	1.07	10.59	10.81	0.07	-0.21	-10.74
531	6	0.75	16.0	1.00	58	93	15.67	-13.39	20.06	9.59	0.63	11.27	10.33	-0.37	-0.46	-10.70
560	5	0.90	15.44	0.54	85	202	14.74	-12.91	18.71	10.29	1.36	10.19	11.09	0.64	0.62	-10.45
603	5	0.95	15.02	0.13	73	130	16.08	-13.42	18.52	9.62	1.07	10.47	10.85	-0.22	0.02	-11.07
620	7	0.69	15.63	0.40	32	86	15.53	-13.11	18.47	9.13	0.53	11.85	9.58	-0.79	-0.88	-10.37
722	7	0.83	15.33	0.18	25	101	14.12	-12.81	16.61	9.48	0.75	11.55	9.48	-0.67	-0.35	-10.15
798	5	0.89	15.19	0.92	59	166	15.20	-12.93		9.79	1.19	9.73	10.96	0.33		-10.63
855	6	0.92	15.38	0.23	59	136	15.40	-13.03	18.09	9.71	1.07	10.98	10.46	0.01	0.09	-10.45
911	6	0.94	16.0	0.27	62	111	14.68	-13.41		10.04	0.93	11.70	10.21	-0.38		-10.59
944	7	0.75	15.40	0.69	31	99	15.48	-13.39		9.12	0.67	11.19	9.82	-0.97		-10.79
1133	4	0.98	15.28	0.35	47	142	15.34	-12.76		9.54	1.18	10.15	10.59	0.16		-10.43
1339	5	0.89	15.23	0.19	74	277	14.52	-13.31	19.27	10.26	1.59	10.10	11.01	0.14	0.18	-10.87
1434	5	0.69	15.52	0.17	81	186	15.66	-13.57	19.00	9.88	0.99	11.01	10.72	-0.31	-0.11	-11.03
1462	7	0.98	15.18	0.13	15	48	14.39	-12.98	16.21	8.93	0.26	11.94	8.89	-1.50	-1.05	-10.39
1504	5	1.14	14.74	0.66	26	156	13.82	-12.95	18.18	9.63	1.47	9.26	10.44	-0.35	-0.02	-10.79
1700	7	1.15	14.70	0.17	10	53	14.40	-12.90	16.60	8.57	0.40	11.28	8.80	-1.71	-1.42	-10.51
3359	5	1.01	15.76	0.18	101	191	15.40	-13.20	18.96	10.18	1.48	10.75	11.02	0.47	0.49	-10.55
3378	5	1.15	16.50	0.38	78	184	16.11	-13.62	19.82	9.67	1.64	11.13	10.64	-0.06	0.19	-10.70

Table 2. Contd.

RFGC	T	$\log r_{25}$	$B_t$	$A_G$	$D$	$V_m$	$m_{21}$	$\log F_{H\alpha}$	$m_{FUV}$	$\log M_{HI}$	$A_B$	$m_K$	$\log L_K$	$\log SFR\alpha$	$\log SFRu$	$\log sSFR\alpha$
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
3385	5	0.74	15.39	1.27	65	234	14.75	-13.05		10.06	1.21	9.56	11.11	0.38		-10.73
3608	5	0.96	15.38	0.22	82	278	15.44	-12.92	19.06	9.98	1.72	10.09	11.10	0.68	0.48	-10.42
3645	6	1.03	16.1	0.25	116			-13.50			1.40	11.39	10.86	0.27		-10.59
3651	5	0.90	15.15	0.27	85	253	14.80	-12.94	18.03	10.27	1.54	9.99	11.17	0.62	0.82	-10.55
3803	6	0.99	15.70	0.16	45	89	16.11	-13.39	17.58	9.19	0.79	11.65	9.96	-0.72	-0.21	-10.68
3824	6	0.94	15.28	0.36	52	113	15.22	-12.88		9.67	0.95	10.87	10.39	0.03		-10.36
3827	5	1.12	16.50	1.39	86	231	15.55	-13.25		9.98	1.82	9.94	11.20	0.72		-10.48
3846	4	0.79	15.48	0.23	44	143	14.69	-13.17	18.41	9.74	0.96	10.69	10.32	-0.43	-0.48	-10.75
3880	7	1.09	16.0	0.16	42	84	15.72	-13.63	18.03	9.29	0.82	12.17	9.69	-1.01	-0.43	-10.70
3935	7	0.93	14.36	0.08	19	60	14.24	-12.68	16.10	9.19	0.42	11.01	9.46	-0.94	-0.72	-10.40
4039	6	0.82	14.92	0.35	38	121	14.23	-12.84		9.80	0.87	10.60	10.23	-0.24		-10.47
4072	5	0.67	16.39	0.29	51	113	15.63	-13.26	19.03	9.49	0.67	12.08	9.89	-0.51	-0.68	-10.40
4078	5	1.22	16.50	1.00	123	269	15.83	-13.55		10.18	2.14	10.01	11.48	0.77		-10.71
4081	5	0.95	14.53	0.47	70	236	14.00	-13.23	17.90	10.42	1.56	9.15	11.34	0.22	0.88	-11.12
4091	5	0.94	15.57	0.24	71	137	15.36	-13.41	18.51	9.89	1.10	10.88	10.66	-0.20	0.11	-10.86
4106	5	0.67	15.51	0.24	102	217	15.12	-12.97	18.04	10.30	1.05	10.87	10.98	0.54	0.58	-10.44
4149	6	0.70	15.54	0.35	72	100	14.78	-12.95	17.31	10.13	0.63	11.46	10.44	0.10	0.33	-10.34
2246	7	1.22	14.10	0.12	17	98	13.70	-12.69	16.30	9.31	1.08	10.05	9.75	-0.76	-0.35	-10.51
626	7	0.85	16.93	0.60	91	101	16.23	-13.77		9.76	0.77	12.71	10.14	-0.40		-10.54
1446	5	0.85	16.40	0.19	82	126	16.32	-13.36	19.46	9.63	0.94	11.92	10.37	-0.10	-0.30	-10.47
251824	5	1.00	17.52	0.17	88	93	16.65	-13.80	19.43	9.56	0.84	13.16	9.93	-0.53	-0.32	-10.46
2026	5	0.90	15.75	0.08	104	218	16.10	-13.34	19.85	9.92	1.42	10.90	10.98	0.30	0.03	-10.68
2079	5	0.80	16.71	0.10	94	158	16.30	-13.34	19.77	9.76	1.04	12.22	10.37	0.06	-0.30	-10.31
2253	5	0.99	16.65	0.12	91	160	16.98	-13.43	20.73	9.46	1.30	11.88	10.48	0.06	-0.50	-10.42
2322	5	0.71	16.07	0.07	94	164	15.93	-13.33	18.31	9.90	0.94	11.71	10.57	0.02	0.18	-10.55
2339	5	0.82	15.87	0.09	100	180	15.28	-13.38	18.57	10.22	1.16	11.27	10.80	0.12	0.32	-10.68
2461	6	0.80	17.00	0.07	97	116	16.62	-13.51	19.63	9.66	0.82	13.01	10.08	-0.19	-0.41	-10.27