

Subaru High- z Exploration of Low-Luminosity Quasars (SHELLQs). XI. Proximity Zone Analysis for Faint Quasar Spectra at $z \sim 6$

RIKAKO ISHIMOTO,¹ NOBUNARI KASHIKAWA,¹ MASAFUSA ONOUE,² YOSHIKI MATSUOKA,³ TAKUMA IZUMI,^{4,5}
MICHAEL A. STRAUSS,⁶ SEIJI FUJIMOTO,^{7,8} MASATOSHI IMANISHI,^{4,5} KEI ITO,^{4,5} KAZUSHI IWASAWA,⁹
TOSHIHIRO KAWAGUCHI,¹⁰ CHIEN-HSIU LEE,¹¹ YONGMING LIANG,^{4,5} TING-YI LU,¹² RIEKO MOMOSE,¹ YOSHIKI TOBA,^{13,14,3}
AND HISAKAZU UCHIYAMA⁴

¹*Department of Astronomy, Graduate School of Science, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan*

²*Max Planck Institut für Astronomie, Königstuhl 17, D-69117 Heidelberg, Germany*

³*Research Center for Space and Cosmic Evolution, Ehime University, Matsuyama, Ehime 790-8577, Japan.*

⁴*National Astronomical Observatory of Japan, 2-21-1 Osawa, Mitaka, Tokyo 181-8588, Japan*

⁵*Department of Astronomical Science, Graduate University for Advanced Studies (SOKENDAI), Mitaka, Tokyo 181-8588, Japan.*

⁶*Princeton University Observatory, Peyton Hall, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA.*

⁷*Cosmic DAWN Center, Copenhagen, Denmark*

⁸*Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Lyngbyvej 2, DK-2100, Copenhagen, Denmark*

⁹*ICREA and Institut de Ciències del Cosmos, Universitat de Barcelona, IEEC-UB, Martí i Franquès, 1, 08028 Barcelona, Spain.*

¹⁰*Department of Economics, Management and Information Science, Onomichi City University, Onomichi, Hiroshima 722-8506, Japan.*

¹¹*National Optical Astronomy Observatory, 950 North Cherry Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85719, USA.*

¹²*Institute of Astronomy and Department of Physics, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu 30013, Taiwan.*

¹³*Department of Astronomy, Kyoto University, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan.*

¹⁴*Institute of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, 10617, Taiwan.*

ABSTRACT

We present measurements of the size of the quasar proximity zone (R_p) for eleven low-luminosity ($-26.16 \leq M_{1450} \leq -22.83$) quasars at $z \sim 6$, discovered by the Subaru High- z Exploration of Low-Luminosity Quasars project (SHELLQs). Our faint quasar sample expands the R_p measurement down to $M_{1450} = -22.83$ mag, where more common quasar populations dominate at the epoch. We restrict the sample to quasars whose systemic redshifts have been precisely measured by [C II] 158 μ m or Mg II $\lambda 2798$ emission lines. We also update the R_p measurements for 26 luminous quasars presented in Eilers et al. (2017) by using the latest systemic redshift results. The luminosity dependence on R_p is found to be consistent with the theoretical prediction assuming highly ionized intergalactic medium. We find a shallow redshift evolution of the luminosity-corrected R_p , $R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25}$ ($R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25} \propto (1+z)^{-3.79 \pm 1.72}$) over $5.8 \lesssim z \lesssim 6.6$. This trend is steeper than that of Eilers et al. (2017), but significantly shallower than those of the earlier studies. Our results suggest that $R_{p,\text{corr}}$ is insensitive to the neutral fraction of the universe at $z \sim 6$. Four quasars show exceptionally small $R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25}$ ($\lesssim 0.90$ proper Mpc), which could be the result of their young age ($< 10^4$ yr) in the reionization epoch, though statistics is still small.

Keywords: dark ages, reionization, first stars — quasars: absorption lines

1. INTRODUCTION

Cosmic reionization was a key event in the early universe. After recombination at $z \sim 1100$, the neutral intergalactic medium (IGM) was ionized by ultraviolet radiation from the first generations of stars and galaxies. Recent observations of the polarization of the cosmic

microwave background (CMB) imply a reionization redshift $z_{\text{reion}} = 7.7 \pm 0.7$ (Planck Collaboration et al. 2018) assuming instantaneous reionization, but when and how reionization proceeded is still under debate.

In recent years, the number of known quasars in the early universe at $z > 6$ has increased dramatically (Reed et al. 2017; Bañados et al. 2018; Matsuoka et al. 2019a; Wang et al. 2019). High- z ($z \gtrsim 6$) quasar spectra are used as a powerful probe of the state of the IGM in the reionization era. Absorption by neutral hydrogen in the

Ly α forest in the IGM yields some characteristic features in quasar spectra. The observation of Ly α optical depth, has revealed a steep increase in the IGM neutral fraction, f_{HI} , and its scatter at $z > 5.5$ (Fan et al. 2006; Becker et al. 2015; Eilers et al. 2018a). However, the Ly α forest cannot be used to measure f_{HI} at $z \gtrsim 6$ because it saturates when the IGM neutral fraction is high ($f_{\text{HI}} > 10^{-4}$) (Gunn & Peterson 1965).

There is another approach to measure f_{HI} , the size of the proximity zone around quasars. The proximity zone is an ionized region around a quasar generated by intense quasar radiation (e.g., Cen & Haiman 2000). It has been argued that proximity zone radius, R_p , evolves with redshift as a good proxy of neutral fraction. If the IGM is uniform and the quasar lifetime is much less than both the hydrogen recombination time and the age of the universe at that redshift, R_p is given by

$$R_p = f_{\text{HI}}^{-1/3} \left(\frac{\dot{N}_Q}{6.5 \times 10^{57} \text{ s}^{-1}} \right)^{1/3} \times \left(\frac{t_Q}{2 \times 10^7 \text{ yr}} \right)^{1/3} \frac{7}{1+z_Q} \text{ proper Mpc}, \quad (1)$$

where \dot{N}_Q is the rate of ionizing photons emitted by the quasar and t_Q is the quasar age (Haiman 2002). Early observational studies found a steep evolution with redshift of proximity zone sizes. For example, Fan et al. (2006) measured proximity zone sizes of 19 quasars at $5.74 < z < 6.42$ and found that R_p decreases rapidly toward higher redshifts. Carilli et al. (2010) analyzed the proximity zone sizes of 27 quasars with more accurate redshifts and came to the same conclusion. Mortlock et al. (2011), Venemans et al. (2015), and Bañados et al. (2018) extended the measurements to $z \sim 7$ quasars and confirmed this trend.

On the other hand, Bolton & Haehnelt (2007) used hydrodynamical simulations showing that the observed R_p differs from the true radii of the ionized region. In a highly ionized IGM, the observed R_p approximates the classical proximity zone, which is determined solely by the quasar luminosity, and does not correspond to the extent of an H II region expanding into a neutral IGM. This leads to substantial underestimate of the distance to the ionizing front around quasars in the highly ionized regime.

Eilers et al. (2017) systematically measured R_p for 34 luminous quasars, and found shallower redshift evolution of luminosity corrected R_p ($\propto (1+z)^{-1.44}$) than those of previous studies. The result is consistent with the prediction from hydrodynamical simulations by Bolton & Haehnelt (2007), suggesting that R_p is insensitive to the neutral fraction of the IGM. Mazzucchelli

et al. (2017) also found the same shallow evolution for $z > 6.5$ quasars. They also discovered quasars having R_p as small as < 1 proper Mpc (pMpc) after correcting by luminosity. This result implies that such quasars are young ($< 10^5$ yr) (Eilers et al. 2017, 2018b, 2020). Davies et al. (2019) used their radiative transfer simulation to predict the time evolution of quasar proximity zone size and showed that these small proximity zone size could be reproduced when the IGM gas has not yet reached photoionization equilibrium around young quasars.

However, all these studies are based only on luminous quasars, which might reside in unusually overdense regions at the epoch. Fainter quasars are more common in the universe and test the luminosity dependence in Equation (1) (e.g., Matsuoka et al. 2019b; Kulkarni et al. 2019). Therefore, it is important to expand the dynamic range of luminosity to the faint end. Moreover, since Equation (1) assumes a radiative equilibrium between the IGM and the quasar luminosity at all redshifts including $z \sim 6$, observational measurements over a wide luminosity range will give insights into the physics of the proximity zone. This study, for the first time, measures proximity zone sizes for faint ($-26.16 \leq M_{1450} \leq -22.83$) quasars at $z \sim 6$ to explore the luminosity dependence and robustness of Equation (1).

In Section 2, we describe the quasar sample we use in this work. We describe our method to predict intrinsic quasar spectra and to measure R_p in Section 3. We present the dependence of R_p on quasar luminosity and redshift and discuss the results in Section 4. We summarize our results in Section 5.

Throughout this paper, we adopt a flat Λ CDM cosmology with $\Omega_m = 0.307$ and $H_0 = 67.8 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ pMpc}^{-1}$ (Planck Collaboration et al. 2014).

2. QUASAR SAMPLE

2.1. Faint Quasars

Our faint sample consists of eleven quasars at $5.93 \leq z \leq 6.56$ (Table 1). All these quasars were discovered by the Subaru High- z Exploration of Low-Luminosity Quasars project (SHELLQs) using Hyper Suprime-Cam (HSC; Miyazaki et al. 2018; Komiyama et al. 2018; Kawanomoto et al. 2018; Furusawa et al. 2018) on the Subaru Telescope (e.g., Matsuoka et al. 2016, 2018a,b). The spectroscopic identification was carried out with the Faint Object Camera and Spectrograph (FOCAS; Kashikawa et al. 2002) mounted on the Subaru Telescope, for J0859+0022, J1153+0055, J1202-0057, J1208-0200, J2216-0116, and J2304+0045 and the Optical System for Imaging and low-intermediate-

Resolution Integrated Spectroscopy (OSIRIS; Cepa et al. 2000) mounted on the Gran Telescopio Canarias, for J0921+0007, J1406–0116, J1545+4232, J2216–0116, J2228+0152, and J2239+0207. FOCAS provides spectral coverage from $\lambda_{\text{obs}} = 0.75 \mu\text{m}$ to $1.05 \mu\text{m}$ with a resolution $R \sim 1200$, and OSIRIS provides spectral coverage from $\lambda_{\text{obs}} = 0.74 \mu\text{m}$ to $1.0 \mu\text{m}$ with a resolution $R \sim 1500$. The exposure times are 170 minutes for J1202–0057, and 15 or 30 minutes for the other quasars.

Accurate redshift measurements needed for an accurate prediction of the intrinsic spectra, are important in measuring R_p . The redshifts of eight of these quasars are from Izumi et al. (2018, 2019, in prep.) and have been accurately measured by [C II] $158 \mu\text{m}$ emission line. The three quasars, J0921+0007, J1406–0116, and J1545+4232 have Mg II $\lambda 2798$ redshifts, as well as black hole mass (M_{BH}) and Eddington ratio ($L_{\text{bol}}/L_{\text{Edd}}$) measured from K-band spectra taken by Subaru/MOIRCS (ID: S19A-015, PI: M.Onoue). The Mg II redshifts were derived from the peaks of the best-fit single Gaussian profiles of the emission lines, for which the power-law continuum and the rest-frame UV iron pseudo-continuum were subtracted beforehand with the empirical iron template of Vestergaard & Wilkes (2001). More details of the observations and the spectral analysis will be described in a forthcoming paper (Onoue et al. in prep.). One broad absorption line (BAL) quasar, J1205–0000, is excluded from our sample because it is difficult to determine its intrinsic spectrum. The absolute magnitude M_{1450} of each quasar is taken from Mat-suoka et al. (2018a,b) and Onoue et al. (2019). They were obtained by converting UV magnitudes, assuming the power-law continuum slope of $\alpha_\lambda = -1.5$ ($F_\lambda \propto \lambda^{\alpha_\lambda}$) for J1202–0057, J2228+0152, and J2304+0045 (Mat-suoka et al. 2018a,b), and by fitting α_λ for the other quasars (Onoue et al. 2019).

2.2. Bright Quasars

In addition to our new quasar spectra, we use the sample of luminous quasars analyzed in Eilers et al. (2017). These spectra are taken from *igmspec*¹ database. We exclude those quasars whose redshifts were measured based on the Ly α emission line alone, as this line usually gives a redshift uncertainty as large as $\sim 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, in order to unify the redshift accuracy with our faint quasar sample. We also update some redshifts which have newly measured [C II] or Mg II lines (Willott et al. 2017; Decarli et al. 2018; Shen et al. 2019). We also exclude J0100+2802, because Fujimoto et al. (2020) sug-

gested this extremely bright quasar could be amplified by gravitational lensing, while there is still debate for the interpretation.² In the end, we use 26 quasar spectra from Eilers et al. (2017), the systemic redshifts of which are determined with [C II], Mg II, or CO emission lines, as summarized in Table 2.

Figure 1 compares magnitudes and redshifts between our new sample and that of Eilers et al. (2017). Our new sample is 2-3 mag fainter than that of Eilers et al. (2017). The combined sample gives us a dynamic range of 5 magnitudes in luminosity.




Figure 1. The redshift and M_{1450} distribution of our sample. The orange circles show the faint quasars, and the grey circles show the brighter quasars. The magnitude errors are not given in Eilers et al. (2017), but are likely to be small.

3. THE PROXIMITY ZONE SIZE MEASUREMENTS

3.1. Quasar Continuum Normalization

We estimate the quasar intrinsic spectra after normalizing at rest 1280 \AA with principal component spectra (PCS) from a principal component analysis (PCA) of low-redshift quasar spectra. This approach is justified

² Actually, if the lensing hypothesis is correct, the measured proximity zone size for J0100+2802 ($R_p = 7.12 \text{ pMpc}$; Eilers et al. 2017) is too large for the $M_{1450} = -22.51$ after correcting by the inferred magnification factor $\mu = 450$ (see Figure 6). On the other hand, it is also argued that the R_p measurement is exceptionally smaller than the prediction from its uniquely bright observed luminosity of $M_{1450} = -29.26$ (Eilers et al. 2017).

¹ <http://specdb.readthedocs.io/en/latest/igmspec.html>

Table 1. Overview of Our Faint Sample and Proximity Zone Sizes

Name	R.A.	Decl.	z	Redshift Line	References	M_{1450} (mag)	R_p (pMpc)	$R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25}$ (pMpc)
J0859+0022	08 ^h 59 ^m 07 ^s .19	+00°22′55″.9	6.3903 ^{+0.0005} _{-0.0005}	[C II]	1	−23.10 ± 0.27	1.14 ± 0.03	3.14 ± 0.09
J0921+0007	09 ^h 21 ^m 20 ^s .56	+00°07′22″.9	6.563 ^{+0.002} _{-0.001}	Mg II	3	−26.16 ± 0.29	3.05 ± 0.45	1.64 ± 0.24
J1152+0055	11 ^h 52 ^m 21 ^s .27	+00°55′36″.6	6.3637 ^{+0.0005} _{-0.0005}	[C II]	1	−25.08 ± 0.07	2.67 ± 0.03	2.56 ± 0.03
J1202−0057	12 ^h 02 ^m 46 ^s .37	−00°57′01″.7	5.9289 ^{+0.0002} _{-0.0002}	[C II]	1	−22.83 ± 0.08	0.74 ± 0.01	2.34 ± 0.04
J1208−0200	12 ^h 08 ^m 59 ^s .23	−02°00′34″.8	6.1165 ^{+0.0002} _{-0.0002}	[C II]	2	−24.36 ± 0.09	0.62 ± 0.01	0.87 ± 0.02
J1406−0116	14 ^h 06 ^m 29 ^s .12	−01°16′11″.2	6.292 ^{+0.002} _{-0.002}	Mg II	3	−24.76 ± 0.18	0.14 ± 0.05	0.16 ± 0.05
J1545+4232	15 ^h 45 ^m 05 ^s .62	+42°32′11″.6	6.511 ^{+0.003} _{-0.004}	Mg II	3	−24.76 ± 0.17	2.14 ± 0.18	2.43 ± 0.20
J2216−0016	22 ^h 16 ^m 44 ^s .47	−00°16′50″.1	6.0962 ^{+0.0003} _{-0.0003}	[C II]	1	−23.65 ± 0.20	0.66 ± 0.02	1.36 ± 0.04
J2228+0152	22 ^h 28 ^m 27 ^s .83	+01°28′09″.5	6.0805 ^{+0.0004} _{-0.0004}	[C II]	2	−24.00 ± 0.04	2.11 ± 0.02	3.60 ± 0.04
J2239+0207	22 ^h 39 ^m 47 ^s .47	+02°07′47″.5	6.2497 ^{+0.0004} _{-0.0004}	[C II]	2	−24.60 ± 0.15	1.65 ± 0.02	2.04 ± 0.03
J2304+0045	23 ^h 04 ^m 22 ^s .97	+00°45′05″.4	6.3504 ^{+0.0002} _{-0.0002}	[C II]	4	−24.28 ± 0.03	1.15 ± 0.01	1.68 ± 0.02

NOTE—The columns show the object name, coordinates, the redshift and its error, the lines used to measure redshift, absolute magnitude M_{1450} , proximity zone sizes R_p , and luminosity corrected proximity zone sizes $R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25}$.

References for redshifts: (1) Izumi et al. (2018), (2) Izumi et al. (2019), (3) Onoue et al. (in prep), (4) Izumi et al. (in prep)

by lack of spectral evolution of quasars (e.g., Jiang et al. 2009). In PCA, the quasar spectrum, $q_i(\lambda)$, is modeled as a mean quasar spectrum, $\mu(\lambda)$, and a linear combination of PCS:

$$q_i(\lambda) \sim \mu(\lambda) + \sum_{j=1}^m c_{ij} \xi_j(\lambda), \quad (2)$$

where i refers to a i th quasar, $\xi_j(\lambda)$ is the j th PCS, and c_{ij} is the weight. We use the PCS from Suzuki et al. (2005). First, c'_{ij} , the weights for the spectrum redward of 1216 Å, are derived by

$$c'_{ij} = \int_{1216\text{\AA}}^{\lambda_{\text{upper}}} [q_i(\lambda) - \mu(\lambda)] \xi_j(\lambda) d\lambda, \quad (3)$$

where λ_{upper} is the upper limit of available wavelength in each observed quasar spectrum. Suzuki et al. (2005) produced PCS for 1216 Å to 1600 Å, while our faint sample usually has coverages up to ~ 1350 Å.

Then we use the projection matrix \mathbf{X} to calculate c_{ij} , the weights for the whole intrinsic spectrum, covering the entire spectral region between 1020 Å and 1600 Å, using

$$c_{ij} = c'_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{X}. \quad (4)$$

The projection matrix \mathbf{X} is also taken from Suzuki et al. (2005). It is the matrix which satisfies the relation $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{X}$, where \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{D} are the weights of principal components of the whole and the redward of quasar spectrum derived in Suzuki et al. (2005), respectively.

Eilers et al. (2017) mainly used PCS from Pâris et al. (2011), but we use PCS and the projection matrix from Suzuki et al. (2005), who constructed the PCS using

fainter quasars at $z < 1$ than those of Pâris et al. (2011). However, we found no significant difference in the results between the two. We use five PCS for all quasar spectra. The spectra of our faint sample and the PCA fits are shown in Figure 2.

3.2. Measuring Proximity Zone Sizes

We adopt the same definition of proximity zone size as was used in Fan et al. (2006). It is the physical distance between the quasar host galaxy (z_Q) and the point where the transmitted flux ratio first drops below 0.1, using the observed quasar spectrum after smoothing to a resolution of 20 Å in the observed frame (z_{GP}). We regard the first of three consecutive pixels blueward of Ly α as the end of the proximity zone (Eilers et al. 2017), and calculate proximity zone sizes using

$$R_p = \frac{D_Q - D_{\text{GP}}}{1 + z_Q}, \quad (5)$$

where D_Q and D_{GP} are the comoving distances implied by z_Q and z_{GP} , respectively. Figure 3 shows the continuum-normalized spectra around the proximity zone of each quasar in our faint quasar sample, and the measured R_p are listed in Tables 1 and 2.

In general, the observed wavelength range of the rest-UV spectrum of $z \sim 6$ quasars is limited, which could cause a poor prediction of the intrinsic spectrum using PCA. The NIR spectra are available for five quasars, J0859+0022, J1152+0055, J1208−0200, J2216−0016, and J2239+0207 (Onoue et al. 2019), which extend a spectral coverage much further to $\sim 2.5 \mu\text{m}$. The NIR spectra of the former two, J0859+0022 and J1152+0055,




Figure 2. Predicted intrinsic spectra using principal component analysis (PCA). The black and red curves show the observed and the predicted spectrum of each quasar, respectively. The dashed vertical line indicates 1215.67\AA .

Table 2. Overview of Our Bright Sample and Proximity Zone Sizes

Name	R.A.	Decl.	z	Redshift Line	References	M_{1450} (mag)	R_p (pMpc)	$R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25}$ (pMpc)
J0002+2550	00 ^h 02 ^m 39 ^s .39	+25°50′34″.96	5.818 ± 0.007*	Mg II	15	−27.31	8.83 ± 0.46	2.58 ± 0.13
J0005−0006	00 ^h 05 ^m 52 ^s .34	−00°06′55″.80	5.844 ± 0.001	Mg II	6	−25.73	2.91 ± 0.06	1.97 ± 0.04
J0050+3445	00 ^h 55 ^m 02 ^s .91	+34°45′21″.65	6.253 ± 0.003	Mg II	5	−26.70	3.96 ± 0.17	1.60 ± 0.07
J0148+0600	01 ^h 48 ^m 37 ^s .64	+06°00′20″.06	5.98 ± 0.01	Mg II	10	−27.39	6.11 ± 0.64	1.71 ± 0.18
J0210−0456	02 ^h 10 ^m 13 ^s .19	−04°56′20″.90	6.4323 ± 0.0005	[C II]	8	−24.53	1.38 ± 0.03	1.77 ± 0.04
J0226+0302	02 ^h 26 ^m 01 ^s .87	+03°02′59″.42	6.5412 ± 0.0018	[C II]	9	−27.33	3.66 ± 0.09	1.06 ± 0.03
J0227−0605	02 ^h 27 ^m 43 ^s .29	−06°05′30″.20	6.212 ± 0.007*	Mg II	15	−25.28	2.27 ± 0.40	1.95 ± 0.35
J0303−0019	03 ^h 03 ^m 31 ^s .40	−00°19′12″.90	6.078 ± 0.007	Mg II	3	−25.56	2.28 ± 0.44	1.69 ± 0.33
J0836+0054	08 ^h 36 ^m 43 ^s .86	+00°54′53″.26	5.810 ± 0.003	Mg II	2	−27.75	5.16 ± 0.20	1.19 ± 0.05
J0842+1218	08 ^h 42 ^m 29 ^s .43	+12°18′50″.58	6.0763 ± 0.0005*	[C II]	14	−26.91	6.95 ± 0.04	2.52 ± 0.01
J0927+2001	09 ^h 27 ^m 21 ^s .82	+20°01′23″.64	5.7722 ± 0.0006	CO	4	−26.76	4.69 ± 0.05	1.84 ± 0.02
J1030+0524	10 ^h 30 ^m 27 ^s .11	+05°24′55″.06	6.309 ± 0.009	Mg II	1	−26.99	6.00 ± 0.51	2.08 ± 0.18
J1137+3549	11 ^h 37 ^m 17 ^s .73	+35°49′56″.85	6.009 ± 0.010*	Mg II	15	−27.36	5.81 ± 0.62	1.66 ± 0.18
J1148+5251	11 ^h 48 ^m 16 ^s .65	+52°51′50″.39	6.4189 ± 0.0006	[C II]	11	−27.62	4.70 ± 0.03	1.16 ± 0.01
J1250+3130	12 ^h 50 ^m 51 ^s .93	+31°30′21″.90	6.138 ± 0.005*	Mg II	15	−26.53	4.91 ± 0.29	2.17 ± 0.13
J1306+0356	13 ^h 06 ^m 08 ^s .27	+03°56′26″.36	6.0337 ± 0.0004*	[C II]	14	−26.81	6.51 ± 0.02	2.48 ± 0.01
J1319+0950	13 ^h 19 ^m 11 ^s .30	+09°50′51″.52	6.1330 ± 0.0007	[C II]	7	−27.05	4.99 ± 0.04	1.68 ± 0.01
J1335+3533	13 ^h 35 ^m 50 ^s .81	+35°33′15″.82	5.9012 ± 0.0019	CO	4	−26.67	0.70 ± 0.10	0.29 ± 0.04
J1411+1217	14 ^h 11 ^m 11 ^s .29	+12°17′37″.28	5.904 ± 0.002	Mg II	2	−26.69	4.61 ± 0.13	1.88 ± 0.05
J1602+4228	16 ^h 02 ^m 53 ^s .98	+42°28′24″.94	6.083 ± 0.005*	Mg II	15	−26.94	6.82 ± 0.29	2.43 ± 0.10
J1623+3112	16 ^h 23 ^m 31 ^s .81	+31°12′00″.53	6.2572 ± 0.0024	[C II]	12	−26.55	5.05 ± 0.14	2.21 ± 0.06
J1630+4012	16 ^h 30 ^m 33 ^s .90	+40°12′09″.69	6.065 ± 0.007	Mg II	3	−26.19	5.25 ± 1.03	2.79 ± 0.55
J1641+3755	16 ^h 41 ^m 21 ^s .73	+37°55′20″.15	6.047 ± 0.003	Mg II	5	−25.67	4.00 ± 0.18	2.80 ± 0.13
J2054−0005	20 ^h 54 ^m 06 ^s .49	−00°05′14″.80	6.0391 ± 0.0001	[C II]	7	−26.21	3.12 ± 0.01	1.64 ± 0.01
J2229+1457	22 ^h 29 ^m 01 ^s .65	+14°57′09″.00	6.1517 ± 0.0005	[C II]	11	−24.78	0.48 ± 0.04	0.54 ± 0.04
J2329−0301	23 ^h 29 ^m 08 ^s .28	−03°01′58″.80	6.4164 ± 0.0008*	[C II]	13	−25.25	2.73 ± 0.04	2.39 ± 0.04

*The redshifts updated from Eilers et al. (2017)(Willott et al. 2017; Decarli et al. 2018; Shen et al. 2019)

NOTE—Same as Table 1, but for the bright sample from Eilers et al. (2017). Absolute magnitudes M_{1450} are taken from Bañados et al. (2016).

References for redshifts. (1)Jiang et al. (2007), (2)Kurk et al. (2007), (3)Carilli et al. (2010), (4)Wang et al. (2010), (5)Willott et al. (2010), (6)De Rosa et al. (2011), (7)Wang et al. (2013), (8)Willott et al. (2013), (9)Bañados et al. (2015), (10)Becker et al. (2015), (11)Willott et al. (2015), (12)Eilers et al. (2017), (13)Willott et al. (2017),(14)Decarli et al. (2018), (15)Shen et al. (2019)

were taken by the Very Large Telescope/X-SHOOTER, and the latter three were taken by the Gemini Near-Infrared Spectrograph (GNIRS). In addition, for former two, the optical spectra taken by X-SHOOTER are available, which have higher resolutions and deeper integrations than the FOCAS/OSIRIS one (Onoue et al. 2019). We use their optical and NIR spectra to measure R_p of these five quasars. When we use only the optical spectra, the resultant R_p are 1.22 ± 0.06 pMpc, 2.60 ± 0.03 pMpc, 0.62 ± 0.01 pMpc, 0.66 ± 0.02 pMpc, and 1.31 ± 0.02 pMpc. Three of them, J0859+0022, J1208–0200, and J2216–0016 are consistent within the errors with those in Table 1, suggesting that our R_p measurements are not significantly affected by the limited wavelength coverage.

Several quasars show a weak or no Ly α emission line, i.e., J1208–0200 and J1406–0116, as is often seen in $z \sim 6$ quasars (e.g., Bañados et al. 2014). This could give rise to a poor PCA fit around the wavelength of Ly α showing apparent negative Ly α emission. As a test, we remeasured R_p for these two quasars using a simple power-law fit to the continuum (Fan et al. 2006; Carilli et al. 2010) over wavelength intervals devoid of emission lines at 1275–1295 and 1325–1335 Å in the rest frame. The resultant R_p are 0.55 ± 0.01 pMpc and 1.03 ± 0.41 pMpc for J1208–0200 and J1406–0116, respectively. The R_p of J1406–0116 is larger than the PCA measurement, which gives extremely small R_p , probably due to its relatively noisy spectrum. Although it is hard to determine which measurement is likely to be more accurate for J1406–0116 due to their relatively poor quality spectra, we decide to adopt PCA measurement to keep consistency with other sample. The R_p of J1406–0116 might have large uncertainty, but we find this discrepancy does not affect the final result of the luminosity (Sec.4.2) and redshift (Sec.4.3) dependences.

Figure 4 shows a comparison in R_p for the bright sample between our measurement and Eilers et al. (2017). They are in good agreement with each other except for those quasars whose redshifts have been updated using data from Willott et al. (2017), Decarli et al. (2018), and Shen et al. (2019). Consequently, this moderately change the PCA fit, supporting our previous statement that accurate redshift measurements are needed for the accurate R_p measurements.

It should be noted that the spectrum signal-to-noise ratios of the faint sample are generally lower than those of the bright sample. We check the R_p uncertainties due to the spectral noise by the following Monte Carlo simulation using the noise spectra. In this process, the flux of each spectral pixel was associated with a random error perturbed within the measured 1σ error. We gen-

erated 100 mock spectra and repeated the PCA analysis. The R_p uncertainty of the trials is found to be 0.33 ± 0.32 pMpc, which is comparable to the errors due to the redshift uncertainty, except for the two quasars, J0921+0007 (0.71 pMpc) and J1202–0057 (1.06 pMpc). We also found the error is almost negligible for the two quasar spectra, J0859+0022 and J1152+0055, taken by X-SHOOTER. The 16th and 84th percentiles of these uncertainties are 0.07 pMpc and 0.64 pMpc, respectively. We confirm this additional error do not significantly change the result. It is not clear how large the error for the bright sample from Eilers et al. (2017). To make a fair comparison with the bright sample, this error is not taken into account.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Proximity Zone Sizes Using Stacked Spectra

To illustrate the luminosity dependence, we create mean-stacked spectra of the faint and the bright samples, and measure R_p for both. These spectra were generated by normalizing each spectrum by the flux density at 1280 Å of PCA fit, converting to the rest frame, and then mean-stacking. When we measure R_p of these spectra, we assume the mean redshifts of each sample as the stacked quasar redshift. Figure 5 shows the two stacked spectra. The R_p of our faint and bright quasar sample are $R_p = 2.23 \pm 0.03$ pMpc and 5.45 ± 0.06 pMpc, respectively. Our faint sample shows significantly smaller R_p than that of the bright sample as Equation (1) predicts.

Matsuoka et al. (2019a) suggested the faint sample shows systematically narrower Ly α emission. The composite spectra shown in Figure 5 based on more accurate systemic redshift definitely shows that the faint quasar sample has narrower Ly α emission than the brighter sample. The reason for this is unclear, it may be partly due to contamination from narrow line quasars with exceptionally narrow Ly α emission lines (Kashikawa et al. 2015; Matsuoka et al. 2019a).

4.2. Luminosity Dependence

Figure 6 shows the relation between quasar proximity zone sizes R_p and quasar absolute magnitude M_{1450} . We define α as a power-law index of luminosity dependence of R_p ($R_p \propto 10^{-0.4M_{1450}/\alpha}$). A power-law fit to our measurements weighted by errors gives $\alpha = 1.80 \pm 0.29$; $R_p = (1.73 \pm 0.21) \times 10^{-0.4 \times (M_{1450} + 25)/(1.80 \pm 0.29)}$ pMpc. (6)

In the fit, we weight the measurement by the errors. The 1σ uncertainty of this fit is calculated by bootstrapping the fit 1000 times. The best fit described in Eilers et al. (2017) is

$$R_p = 4.71 \times 10^{-0.4 \times (M_{1450} + 27)/3.42} \text{ pMpc.} \quad (7)$$




Figure 3. Transmission spectra of the faint sample. The black and red curves show the quasar spectra smoothed with two pixels boxcar and a resolution of 20 Å, respectively. The horizontal dashed lines represent a flux level of 10%. The vertical dashed lines show the points where normalized flux first drops below the 10% (left) and the quasar redshift (right).




Figure 4. Comparison between R_p measured in this study and in Eilers et al. (2017). The quasars whose redshifts are updated from Eilers et al. (2017) are shown as red points.

We normalize the relation at $M_{1450} = -25$, which is the mid-point of our data, while Eilers et al. (2017) normalized at $M_{1450} = -27$. We obtain a steeper relation than the best fit in Eilers et al. (2017). The luminosity dependence of proximity zone sizes could, in principle, depend on the IGM ionization state. Equation (1) indicates that R_p is proportional to $\alpha = 3$ in the case of a neutral IGM, while Bolton & Haehnelt (2007) showed analytically that the proximity zone size scales as $\alpha = 2$, in the case of a highly ionized IGM. Our result on the luminosity dependence is close to the prediction for the ionized IGM, suggesting that most of the surrounding IGM is ionized at $z \sim 6$. As described in the introduction, the observed proximity zone sizes R_p are not strictly identical to the distances to the ionization front, and actual luminosity dependence could be affected by the detailed ionizing process; therefore, radiative transfer simulations would be required to make further comparison with our result. The simulation of Eilers et al. (2017), whose fit over the luminosity range of their sample, predicts a scaling of $\alpha = 2.35$ in a highly ionized IGM.

4.3. Redshift Evolution

In order to examine the redshift evolution of R_p , we use the luminosity scaling of our data from Equation

(6);

$$R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25}{}^3 = R_p \times 10^{0.4 \times (M_{1450} + 25) / 1.80} \quad (8)$$

to rescale the measured R_p , and the derived $R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25}$ are listed in Tables 1 and 2. Figure 7 shows the redshift evolution of proximity zone sizes corrected by absolute magnitude. We define β as a power-law index of a dependence on redshifts of $R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25}$ ($R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25} \propto (1+z)^\beta$). A power-law fit using both the faint and the bright quasar sample gives $\beta = -3.79 \pm 1.72$;

$$R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25} = (1.82 \pm 0.18) \times \left(\frac{1+z}{7} \right)^{-3.79 \pm 1.72} \text{ pMpc.} \quad (9)$$

The 1σ uncertainty is calculated by bootstrapping. The redshift dependency is steeper than the best fit by Eilers et al. (2017), $\beta = -1.44$. When we do not weight the measurement by the errors as Eilers et al. (2017) did not, a power-law fit gives $\beta = -1.43$, consistent with Eilers et al. (2017). It is substantially shallower than that found in earlier studies, which presented a linear fit to their corrected measurements for $z > 5.7$ quasars (Carilli et al. 2010; Venemans et al. 2015). When we correct R_p using Equation (8) for measurements of Carilli et al. (2010) and Venemans et al. (2015), the power-law fit gives $\beta = -8.40 \pm 0.91$, -7.83 ± 0.36 , respectively. Thus we conclude that our R_p shows a mild evolution at $z \sim 6$.

When using only the bright quasar sample, we obtain

$$R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25} = (1.78 \pm 0.19) \times \left(\frac{1+z}{7} \right)^{-4.86 \pm 1.94} \text{ pMpc,} \quad (10)$$

as the best fit, which is consistent with Equation (9) for the full sample. We note that Eilers et al. (2017) corrected the luminosity dependence of R_p with factor $\alpha = 2.35$ rather than their best fit result, $\alpha = 3.42$. On the other hand, the best fit using the faint sample only is,

$$R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25} = (1.68 \pm 0.44) \times \left(\frac{1+z}{7} \right)^{-0.00 \pm 2.00} \text{ pMpc.} \quad (11)$$

No redshift dependence is detected, and the $R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25}$ is slightly smaller than that of the bright sample only. All these three fits show shallow to no redshift evolution. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to access the statistical significance of the difference between the faint sample and the bright sample, yielded $p = 0.93$, suggesting that the difference between the two is statistically not significant;

³ We denote our luminosity-corrected R_p measurement as $R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25}$, normalized at $M_{1450} = -25$, while Eilers et al. (2017) normalized at $M_{1450} = -27$.




Figure 5. (top) Rest-frame composite spectra of the faint sample (red) and the bright sample (black). (bottom) Transmission spectra smoothed to a resolution of 20 Å in observed wavelengths. The grey dashed line shows a flux level of 10%.




Figure 6. Proximity zone sizes R_p as a function of the quasar magnitudes M_{1450} . The orange and grey circles indicate R_p for the faint and the bright sample, respectively. The blue solid line and the shaded region show the best power-law fit to the measurements and its 1σ uncertainty from bootstrapping errors, respectively. The grey dashed line shows the best fit in Eilers et al. (2017). The purple dotted and green dot-dashed curves show the theoretical predictions assuming a mostly neutral IGM (Eq.1) and a mostly ionized IGM (Bolton & Haehnelt 2007), respectively.

the two samples have almost the same distribution of corrected proximity zone sizes, albeit the faint sample has large errors. The size of our faint sample is still small, and we will be able to make firmer conclusions

as the sample of faint quasars with accurate redshifts grows.




Figure 7. Redshift evolution of rescaled proximity zone sizes $R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25}$. The orange and grey circles indicate $R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25}$ values for the faint and the bright sample, respectively. The blue solid line shows the best power-law fit to the measurement with 1σ uncertainty from bootstrapping errors. The orange dotted line and grey dashed line show the best fit to the measurement of the faint and the bright sample, respectively.

4.4. Young Quasar Candidates with Exceptionally Small Proximity Zones

Davies et al. (2019) presented radiative transfer simulation to investigate the behavior of R_p . They found that the only quasars with $R_{p,\text{corr}} \lesssim 2.5$ pMpc are young ($t_Q \lesssim 10^4$ yr), where R_p is normalized to an absolute magnitude of $M_{1450} = -27$. This corresponds to $R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25} \lesssim 0.90$ pMpc with our normalization at $M_{1450} = -25$ using Equation (8). There are two quasars that meet this criterion in the faint sample, J1208–0200 and J1406–0116, and two in the bright sample, J1335+3533 and J2229+1457, which Eilers et al. (2017) also suggested to have an exceptionally small proximity zone size. We should note that R_p measurement of J1406–0116 might be inaccurate due to poor PCA fit (see Sec. 3.2). These four quasars may be young, but it is also possible that neutral gas lying along the quasar sightline truncates the proximity zones. One piece of evidence for such a clump of high column density neutral gas, such as Damped Ly α Systems (DLAs) and Lyman Limit Systems (LLSs), would be the presence of associated metal-line absorbers (Eilers et al. 2017). Eilers et al. (2018b) conducted spec-

troscopic observations of J1335+3533 and ruled out the possibility that its small R_p is due to an associated absorption system. J1208–0200 shows significant absorption redward of Ly α emission line, implying the presence of a strong foreground absorption feature such as a proximate DLA, which could exhibit low-ionization metal absorption lines. We search corresponding low-ionization metal absorption lines in the spectrum of J1208–0200, Si II (1260.42 Å and 1304.37 Å), O I (1302.16 Å), and [C II] (1334.53 Å), and find no clear absorption features. However, the spectra of our faint quasar sample, in general, have insufficient S/N to identify very weak metal absorption features.

Eight objects in our faint sample have Mg II-based measurements of black hole mass M_{BH} and Eddington ratio (Onoue et al. 2019, Onoue et al. in prep.), and as do for 21 objects in the bright sample (Shen et al. 2019). We examine the correlation between black hole mass, Eddington ratio and proximity zone size in Figure 8. Young quasar candidates suggested by extremely small R_p tend to have smaller M_{BH} and lower Eddington ratio, though there is no clear correlation.




Figure 8. The correlation between $R_{p,\text{corr}}$ and black hole mass (left) and Eddington ratio (right). The Mg II-based mass measurements have systematic uncertainties of 0.5 dex (Shen 2013). The orange and grey dots show the faint and bright sample, respectively. The shaded region indicates $R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25} \leq 0.90$ pMpc.

Meyer et al. (2019) found that the average blueshift of the C IV emission line with respect to low-ionization lines in quasar spectra increases significantly at $z > 6$. The authors interpreted this trend as due to a strong outflows, likely related to the relative youth of high- z quasars. Five objects in our faint sample, J0859+0022, J1152+0055, J1208–0200, J2216–0016 and J2239+0207, were found to have significant C IV blueshift with respect to Mg II lines (Onoue et al. 2019, Table 3). Interestingly, the quasars with the most extreme blueshifted C IV is J1208–0200 (1830 km s^{-1}), and J2216–0016 (1170 km s^{-1}) is the second among these five quasars. J1208–0200 is suggested as young quasar candidate because of its extreme small proximity zone, and J2216–0016 also exhibits relatively small proximity zone, $R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25} = 1.36$ pMpc. Both observational quantities consistently indicate the young age of quasars. Farina et al. (2019) recently conducted a sensitive search for extended Ly α halos around $z \sim 6$ quasars with MUSE. While they detected significant extended Ly α emissions around 12 quasars, one of the young quasar candidates, J2229+1457 does not show an extended Ly α halo. Another young quasar candidate from our faint sample, J2216–0016 is also observed by Farina et al. (2019) and it has neither extended Ly α halo. As discussed in Farina et al. (2019), a young quasar with $t_Q < 10^4$ yr does not have enough time to light up an extended Ly α halo with more than 10 pkpc radius, large enough to be observed by their survey. Along with the proximity zone size and the C IV blueshift, the Ly α halo extension could be another promising observational diagnostic of young quasars; however, a larger sample is obviously required to make a clear conclusion.

Eilers et al. (2020) additionally found four young quasar candidates with extremely small proximity zone

sizes. They constrained the fraction of young quasars within the luminous ($M_{\text{UV}} \lesssim -25$) quasars as $5\% < f_{\text{young}} < 9\%$, while it is interesting to note that our faint sample exhibit a high fraction as $\sim 2/11 \sim 18\%$. Future observations of such first quasars will reveal nature of quasar activity, such as lifetime and duty cycle.

5. SUMMARY

In this paper, we measure the proximity zone sizes for a sample which consists of eleven faint $z \sim 6$ quasars discovered by the SHELLQs project, and 26 luminous $z \sim 6$ quasars which were analyzed in Eilers et al. (2017). Our faint sample significantly expands the dynamic range of quasar luminosity to examine more common and numerous quasar environments in the reionization era. It is essential to use precise redshifts for accurate R_p measurement. All redshifts of our quasar sample have been accurately measured from the [C II], Mg II, or CO emission lines.

We estimate the intrinsic quasar spectra by PCA, using PCS from Suzuki et al. (2005), and measure the size of the proximity zones. The major results in this study are summarized below.

1. We compare the mean-stacked spectra based on the accurate systemic redshifts of our faint and bright samples. The R_p of the faint sample is significantly smaller than that of the bright sample. The faint sample shows a narrower Ly α emission line than that of the bright sample.
2. The best fit of dependence of the proximity zone size on quasar luminosity is found to be $R_p \propto 10^{-0.4M_{1450}/1.80 \pm 0.29}$. This shallow relation is consistent with a theoretical model which assumes an

ionized IGM (Bolton & Haehnelt 2007). We use the best fit to rescale R_p by quasar luminosity.

3. Our results find a shallow redshift evolution, $R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25} \propto (1+z)^{-3.79 \pm 1.72}$. This relation is steeper than that of Eilers et al. (2017), and significantly shallower than those of Carilli et al. (2010); Venemans et al. (2015), all of which are based on the luminous quasar sample. The R_p of the faint sample tend to be smaller than that of the bright sample, though with small significance.
4. Two quasars in the faint sample and two in the bright sample show exceptionally small proximity zones ($R_{p,\text{corr}}^{-25} < 0.90$ pMpc), implying that such quasars are young ($< 10^4$ yr). Some of these quasars have significantly blueshifted C IV emission lines and show no Ly α extended halos, although statistical uncertainties still remain. Further observation is required to uncover the local environment of high- z quasars and the IGM state at the reionization epoch.

We appreciate the anonymous referee for helpful comments and suggestions that improved the manuscript.

The Hyper Suprime-Cam (HSC) collaboration includes the astronomical communities of Japan and Taiwan, and Princeton University. The HSC instrumentation and software were developed by NAOJ, the Kavli Institute for the Physics and Mathematics of the Universe (Kavli IPMU), the University of Tokyo, the High Energy Accelerator Research Organization (KEK), the Academia Sinica Institute for Astronomy and Astrophysics in Taiwan (ASIAA), and Princeton

University. Funding was contributed by the FIRST program from Japanese Cabinet Office, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS), Japan Science and Technology Agency (JST), the Toray Science Foundation, NAOJ, Kavli IPMU, KEK, ASIAA, and Princeton University.

This paper makes use of software developed for the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope (LSST). We thank the LSST Project for making their code available as free software at <http://dm.lsst.org>.

The Pan-STARRS1 Surveys (PS1) have been made possible through contributions of the Institute for Astronomy, the University of Hawaii, the Pan-STARRS Project Office, the Max-Planck Society and its participating institutes, the Max Planck Institute for Astronomy, Heidelberg and the Max Planck Institute for Extraterrestrial Physics, Garching, The Johns Hopkins University, Durham University, the University of Edinburgh, Queen's University Belfast, the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, the Las Cumbres Observatory Global Telescope Network Incorporated, the National Central University of Taiwan, the Space Telescope Science Institute, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under Grant No. NNX08AR22G issued through the Planetary Science Division of the NASA Science Mission Directorate, the National Science Foundation under Grant No. AST-1238877, the University of Maryland, and Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE).

Facilities: Subaru, GTC, VLT:Kueyen, Gemini:Gillett

Software: astropy (Astropy Collaboration et al. 2013, 2018), igmspec (<http://specdb.readthedocs.io/en/latest/igmspec.html>)

REFERENCES

- Astropy Collaboration, Robitaille, T. P., Tollerud, E. J., et al. 2013, *A&A*, 558, A33
- Astropy Collaboration, Price-Whelan, A. M., Sipcz, B. M., et al. 2018, *AJ*, 156, 123
- Bañados, E., Decarli, R., Walter, F., et al. 2015, *ApJL*, 805, 1
- Bañados, E., Venemans, B. P., Morganson, E., et al. 2014, *AJ*, 148, 14
- Bañados, E., Venemans, B. P., Decarli, R., et al. 2016, *ApJS*, 227, 11
- Bañados, E., Venemans, B. P., Mazzucchelli, C., et al. 2018, *Nature*, 553, 473
- Becker, G. D., Bolton, J. S., Madau, P., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 447, 3402
- Bolton, J. S., & Haehnelt, M. G. 2007, *MNRAS*, 374, 493
- Carilli, C. L., Wang, R., Fan, X., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 714, 834
- Cen, R., & Haiman, Z. 2000, *ApJ*, 542, L75
- Cepa, J., Aguiar, M., Escalera, V. G., et al. 2000, *Proc. SPIE*, 4008, 623
- Davies, F. B., Hennawi, J. F., & Eilers, A.-C. 2019, *MNRAS*, 493, 1330
- De Rosa, G., Decarli, R., Walter, F., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 739
- Decarli, R., Walter, F., Venemans, B. P., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 854, 97

- Eilers, A.-C., Davies, F. B., & Hennawi, J. F. 2018a, *ApJ*, 864, 53
- Eilers, A.-C., Davies, F. B., Hennawi, J. F., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 840, 24
- Eilers, A.-C., Hennawi, J. F., & Davies, F. B. 2018b, *ApJ*, 867, 30
- Eilers, A.-C., Hennawi, J. F., Decarli, R., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 900, 37
- Fan, X., Strauss, M. A., Becker, R. H., et al. 2006, *AJ*, 132, 117
- Farina, E. P., Arrigoni-Battaia, F., Costa, T., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 887, 196
- Fujimoto, S., Oguri, M., Nagao, T., Izumi, T., & Ouchi, M. 2020, *ApJ*, 891, 64
- Furusawa, H., Koike, M., Takata, T., et al. 2018, *PASJ*, 70, s3
- Gunn, J. E., & Peterson, B. A. 1965, *ApJ*, 142, 1633
- Haiman, Z. 2002, *ApJ*, 576, L1
- Izumi, T., Onoue, M., Shirakata, H., et al. 2018, *PASJ*, 70, 36
- Izumi, T., Onoue, M., Matsuoka, Y., et al. 2019, *PASJ*, 71, 111
- Jiang, L., Fan, X., Vestergaard, M., et al. 2007, *AJ*, 134, 1150
- Jiang, L., Fan, X., Bian, F., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 138, 305
- Kashikawa, N., Aoki, K., Asai, R., et al. 2002, *PASJ*, 54, 819
- Kashikawa, N., Ishizaki, Y., Willott, C. J., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 798, 28
- Kawanomoto, S., Uraguchi, F., Komiyama, Y., et al. 2018, *PASJ*, 70, 66
- Komiyama, Y., Obuchi, Y., Nakaya, H., et al. 2018, *PASJ*, 70, s2
- Kulkarni, G., Worsack, G., & Hennawi, J. F. 2019, *MNRAS*, 488, 1035
- Kurk, J. D., Walter, F., Fan, X., et al. 2007, *ApJ*, 669, 32
- Matsuoka, Y., Onoue, M., Kashikawa, N., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 828, 26
- . 2018a, *PASJ*, 70, s35
- Matsuoka, Y., Iwasawa, K., Onoue, M., et al. 2018b, *ApJS*, 237, 5
- . 2019a, *ApJ*, 883, 183
- Matsuoka, Y., Onoue, M., Kashikawa, N., et al. 2019b, *AJ*, 872, L2
- Mazzucchelli, C., Bañados, E., Venemans, B. P., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 849, 91
- Meyer, R. A., Bosman, S. E., & Ellis, R. S. 2019, *MNRAS*, 487, 3305
- Miyazaki, S., Komiyama, Y., Kawanomoto, S., et al. 2018, *PASJ*, 70, s1
- Mortlock, D. J., Warren, S. J., Venemans, B. P., et al. 2011, *Nature*, 474, 616
- Onoue, M., Kashikawa, N., Matsuoka, Y., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 880, 77
- Pâris, I., Petitjean, P., Rollinde, E., et al. 2011, *A&A*, 530, A50
- Planck Collaboration, Ade, P. A. R. and Aghanim, N., Armitage-Caplan, C., et al. 2014, *A&A*, 571, A16
- Planck Collaboration, Aghanim, N., Akrami, Y., et al. 2018, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1807.06209
- Reed, S. L., McMahon, R. G., Martini, P., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 468, 4702
- Shen, Y. 2013, *Bulletin of the Astronomical Society of India*, 41, 61
- Shen, Y., Wu, J., Jiang, L., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 873, 35
- Suzuki, N., Tytler, D., Kirkman, D., O’Meara, J. M., & Lubin, D. 2005, *ApJ*, 618, 592
- Venemans, B. P., Bañados, E., Decarli, R., et al. 2015, *ApJL*, 801, L11
- Vestergaard, M., & Wilkes, B. J. 2001, *ApJS*, 134, 1
- Wang, F., Yang, J., Fan, X., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 884, 30
- Wang, R., Carilli, C. L., Neri, R., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 714, 699
- Wang, R., Wagg, J., Carilli, C. L., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 773
- Willott, C. J., Bergeron, J., & Omont, A. 2015, *ApJ*, 801, 123
- . 2017, *ApJ*, 850, 108
- Willott, C. J., Omont, A., & Bergeron, J. 2013, *ApJ*, 770
- Willott, C. J., Albert, L., Arzoumanian, D., et al. 2010, *AJ*, 140, 546