

The Fundamental Planes of Black Hole Activity for Radio-Loud and Radio-Quiet Quasars

Luis Gabriel C. Bariuan,^{1,2}★ Bradford Snios,² Małgosia Sobolewska,²

Aneta Siemiginowska,² Daniel A. Schwartz²

¹*Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA*

²*Center for Astrophysics | Harvard & Smithsonian, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA*

Accepted 2022 April 21. Received 2022 April 1; in original form 2021 November 4

ABSTRACT

We examine the fundamental plane of black hole activity for correlations with redshift and radio loudness in both radio-loud and radio-quiet quasar populations. Sources are compiled from archival data of both radio-loud and radio-quiet quasars over redshifts $0.1 < z < 5.0$ to produce a sample of 353 sources with known X-ray, radio, and black hole mass measurements. A fundamental plane of accretion activity is fit to a sample of radio-loud and radio-quiet quasars, and we find a dichotomy between radio-loud and radio-quiet sources. The set of best-fit equations that best describe the two samples are $\log L_R = (1.12 \pm 0.06) \log L_X - (0.20 \pm 0.07) \log M - (5.64 \pm 2.99)$ for our radio-loud sample and $\log L_R = (0.48 \pm 0.06) \log L_X + (0.50 \pm 0.08) \log M + (15.26 \pm 2.66)$ for our radio-quiet sample. Our results suggest that the average radio-quiet quasar emission is consistent with advection dominated accretion, while a combination of jet and disc emission dominates in radio-loud quasars. We additionally examine redshift trends amongst the radio-loud and radio-quiet samples, and we observe a redshift dependence for the fundamental plane of radio-loud quasars. Lastly, we utilize the fundamental plane as a black hole mass estimation method and determine it useful in studying systems where standard spectral modeling techniques are not viable.

Key words: Accretion – Active Galaxies – Black Hole Physics – Galaxy Nuclei – High-Redshift Galaxies

1 INTRODUCTION

Black holes are exotic astrophysical objects with masses ranging from stellar mass up to $10^{10} M_\odot$, whose influence can be observed due to accretion processes that produce emissions across a broad range of different wavelengths. In particular, relativistic jets generated from the black hole will produce synchrotron radiation which is detectable at radio wavelengths (Begelman et al. 1984), while adiabatic compression within the inner accretion disc heats the surrounding material and produces X-ray emission (Heinz et al. 1998; Stawarz et al. 2008). Black hole luminosities can be as low as $10^{30} - 10^{33} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ in quiescent stellar mass black holes (e.g., Gallo et al. 2003), and as high as $10^{47} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ in the most luminous quasars. By deriving correlations between the observables, black hole properties such as accretion rate \dot{M} , disc-jet coupling, and jet models can be extrapolated (e.g., Corbel et al. 2003; Gallo et al. 2003). Thus, multiwavelength observations of black holes are critical for studies of their unique physical properties.

The observational study by Merloni et al. (2003) examined physical properties of low-redshift black holes ($z < 0.3$) over broad mass and luminosity ranges in X-ray and radio wavelengths for any evidence of correlations between those parameters. By studying 116 black holes with known masses and luminosities, a “fundamental plane of black hole accretion activity” characterized by $\log L_R = \xi_{RX} \log L_X +$

$\xi_{RM} \log M + b_R$ was discovered. The result demonstrated that the radio luminosity of a black hole has a direct dependence on its mass and X-ray luminosity, regardless of local environmental effects. Furthermore, the fundamental plane provides an empirical method of characterizing black hole behavior and properties that is scale invariant (Heinz & Sunyaev 2003; Merloni et al. 2003). More recent works refined the fundamental plane parameters through the use of more precise radio and X-ray luminosities together with known masses obtained from direct dynamical measurements (Körding et al. 2006; Gültekin et al. 2009). The tighter constraints led to a relation between the luminosities and mass that was consistent with previous fundamental plane measurements but with 33% less scatter, further reinforcing the presence of a fundamental accretion process that is consistent across black holes in our nearby Universe.

Despite the merit of previous results, the majority of fundamental plane studies prioritized black holes at low redshifts ($z < 0.5$) since mass measurements and luminosities are well-constrained for those sources (e.g., Merloni et al. 2003; Falcke et al. 2004; Körding et al. 2006; Gültekin et al. 2009). Increased cosmic densities within the early Universe may have driven periods of rapid formation due to increased merger rates and gas consumption, giving rise to different accretion physics than what is presently observed (Volonteri 2012). In more recent timescales, the Universe has since undergone cosmological expansion which has also affected black hole formation and possibly accretion physics (Merloni et al. 2003; Merloni 2004; Micic et al. 2007). Thus, the validity of the fundamental plane is

★ E-mail: lbariuan@mit.edu

currently not well understood across a broad redshift range, resulting in a limited understanding of how black hole accretion evolved over large timescale.

In addition to an unknown redshift dependence, several fundamental plane studies utilized a combination of radio-loud and radio-quiet sources in order to increase sample sizes and improve statistical errors (e.g., Merloni et al. 2003; Falcke et al. 2004). However, radio loudness has been shown to correlate with jet outflows and accretion activity in a black hole system (Sikora et al. 2007; Baloković et al. 2012). Thus, it is probable that the initial sample of black hole sources utilized in a fundamental plane study will significantly impact the best-fit results. Examination of a sample with a broad range of radio loudness is therefore important in understanding if a singular fundamental plane can be derived for all black holes, or if there is evidence that the fundamental plane evolves with radio loudness.

Motivated by these facts, we explored the observable properties of black holes across a broad redshift range in order to develop a fundamental plane of black hole activity. This derived relationship may then be compared with the relationship found amongst low-redshift sources to determine the presence, if any, of a redshift dependence in the fundamental plane. We additionally assemble a sample of radio-loud and radio-quiet quasars and examine differences between their respective fundamental plane models. This work complements recent studies of quasar structure and spectra performed across different wavelengths (e.g., Just et al. 2007; Lusso & Risaliti 2016; Vito et al. 2019; Snios et al. 2020), by providing insights into the properties of black holes that formed at the early epochs of the Universe as well as the evolution of their accretion properties.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In § 2, we describe the sources we obtained from independent surveys. In § 3, we describe the fitting method for our fundamental plane analysis and present our best-fit results. § 4 discusses observed trends in both redshift and radio loudness in our fundamental plane results as well as comment on utilizing the fundamental plane as method of estimating black hole mass. Our concluding remarks are discussed in § 5.

For this paper, we adopted the cosmological parameters $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$, and $\Omega_M = 0.3$ (Hinshaw et al. 2013). Estimated uncertainties are reported at a 1σ confidence level, unless otherwise specified.

2 QUASAR SAMPLE

Previous investigations of quasars have indicated that radio loudness is inversely dependent to the accretion rate of the black hole system (Sikora et al. 2007; Baloković et al. 2012). It is therefore plausible that the derived fundamental plane of black hole activity for a sample will be impacted by the radio loudness distribution of its sources. We therefore require samples of both radio-loud and radio-quiet quasars with comparable physical properties in order to investigate dependencies on radio loudness in our fundamental plane analysis.

For our study, we define radio-loudness according to the criterion described by Kellermann et al. (1989) where radio-loud objects are defined as any source with a radio loudness¹ parameter $R > 30$. Furthermore, we require that each sample must have a comparable sample size to previous works on the fundamental plane (> 100 sources, Merloni et al. 2003; Falcke et al. 2004) to ensure comparable statistical precision. We therefore searched the literature for archival

datasets that would supply us with a sufficient number of quasars spanning our desired physical parameter space.

2.1 Radio-Loud Quasars

For our radio-loud sample of quasars, we gathered data across several different works that contained complete descriptions of radio and X-ray luminosities. Since a primary goal of our analysis is to also investigate redshift dependence in accretion activity, we included samples spanning a broad redshift range. Sources with X-ray and radio luminosity measurements were selected from the radio-loud quasar catalogs of Zhu et al. (2019), Snios et al. (2020), Snios et al. (2021), and Zhu et al. (2021), where the luminosity derivation methods utilized in those works are briefly summarized below.

Radio fluxes were taken from the VLA-FIRST radio survey (Becker et al. 1995), or from independent VLA observations when FIRST data of the source was not available. A region was defined to isolate the AGN core in the radio observation, and the radio flux was measured from the region. The rest-frame 5 GHz radio luminosity of each source was extrapolated from the flux measurements assuming a spectral index of $\alpha_R = -0.5$. Radio loudness parameters for the quasars from Zhu et al. (2019), Snios et al. (2020), and Zhu et al. (2021) were provided from the original sources of the data. For the Snios et al. (2021) sample, radio loudness values were derived by extrapolating the provided $f_{2500 \text{ Å}}$ values to 4400 Å assuming a spectral index of $\alpha_o = -0.5$.

At the $5''$ resolution of FIRST, the survey resolved radio features up to a separation distance of 31 kpc at $z = 5$, the maximum redshift of our quasar sample. We note that radio emission in nearby sources studied in the context of the fundamental plane reflects activity of the nucleus and generally does not include the extended radio emission from large scale jets (e.g., Merloni et al. 2003; Falcke et al. 2004). Since a priority of our sample is to investigate high-redshift sources, we anticipate a possible bias in our sample due to the inclusion of extended radio emission in our measurements. We explore such possible bias in the discussion of our redshift analysis (§ 4.2).

X-ray luminosities were derived using observations from Chandra, XMM-Newton, and Swift. A region was defined around the AGN core, and an emission spectrum was extracted from the source. Extended X-ray features potentially present in the regions may be ignored as they generally provide a negligible contribution to the total quasar luminosity (e.g., Marshall et al. 2018; Worrall et al. 2020). Furthermore, the majority of quasars in our sample were observed in short exposures, which reduces the signal-to-noise of diffuse X-ray features and subsequently limits their impact on the extracted spectral profile of the AGN. The observed X-ray flux was measured from a spectral model of the 0.5–7.0 keV energy band, and the rest-frame 2–10 keV luminosity was extrapolated from the best-fit model. We specifically selected quasars with radio and X-ray flux measurements and omitted any sources with upper limit estimates. Our quasar catalog was cross-referenced with the SDSS-DR14 catalog (Rakshit et al. 2020), where sources with confirmed spectroscopic mass measurements via SDSS spectra were included in our fundamental plane analysis.

Ultimately, our radio-loud quasar sample included 11 sources from Zhu et al. (2019), 6 sources from Snios et al. (2020), 12 sources from Snios et al. (2021), and 196 sources from Zhu et al. (2021). Radio luminosities for the sample ranged between $10^{40} - 10^{46} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, while X-ray luminosities ranged between $10^{43} - 10^{47} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. The masses of the sources ranged between $10^6 - 10^{11} M_\odot$ with an average uncertainty of 0.342 M . Consistent with Merloni et al. (2003), we also calculated for each source the ratio of the X-ray luminos-

¹ Radio loudness is defined as $R = f_{5 \text{ GHz}} / f_{4400 \text{ Å}}$, where $f_{5 \text{ GHz}}$ and $f_{4400 \text{ Å}}$ correspond to the rest-frame flux density at 5 GHz and 4400 Å, respectively.

Table 1. Properties of the Quasar Sample

Name	z	$\log(R)$	$\log(L_R)$	$\Delta\log(L_R)$	Ref	$\log(L_X)$	$\Delta\log(L_X)$	Ref	$\log(M)$	$\Delta\log(M)$	Ref	$\log(L_X/L_{\text{Edd}})$
150436–024404	0.200	1.024	39.169	0.065	5	42.16	0.09	4	7.44	0.86	6	–3.39
140051+025905	0.256	1.023	39.407	0.065	5	42.12	0.09	4	8.37	0.42	6	–4.36
162901+400759	0.272	1.430	40.777	0.065	4	44.44	0.09	4	7.36	0.23	6	–1.03
172255+320307	0.275	1.031	39.484	0.065	5	43.77	0.09	4	6.75	1.48	6	–1.09
103336+573106	0.295	0.981	39.538	0.065	5	42.30	0.09	4	8.82	0.30	6	–4.63

The first five sources from our compiled catalog of quasars are shown. The complete table is available online in machine-readable format.




Figure 1. Distributions of the radio-loud quasar (blue) and radio-quiet quasar (orange) samples used in our study of the fundamental plane for black hole activity. The histograms illustrate distributions across several different physical properties, including: (a) redshift z , (b) 2–10 keV rest-frame X-ray luminosity $\log(L_X)$, (c) spectroscopically measured black hole mass $\log(M)$, (d) 5 GHz rest-frame radio luminosity $\log(L_R)$, (e) the ratio of X-ray luminosity to Eddington luminosity $\log(L_X/L_{\text{Edd}})$, and (f) radio loudness $\log(R)$.

ity to the Eddington luminosity, which may be used as a proxy for the Eddington ratio. We defined the ratio as L_X/L_{Edd} where $L_{\text{Edd}} = 1.3 \times 10^{38} M/M_{\odot}$. The range of $\log(L_X/L_{\text{Edd}})$ for our radio-loud sample is $[-3.31, -0.31]$ with a mean of -1.92 . In total, we obtained 225 unique radio-loud quasars at $0.1 < z < 5.0$ with complete measurements over a broad range of observables, which is sufficient for our modeling analysis. We note that our sample includes quasars with known X-ray luminosity, radio luminosity, and mass. We found that inclusion of sources with luminosity upper limits added only 3 sources to our total, so we discarded upper limit sources from our sample for consistency with previous studies. Details on our radio-loud catalog are provided in Table 1, and Figure 1 shows the source distribution of our radio-loud sample across several different physical properties.

2.2 Radio-Quiet Quasars

Radio-quiet quasars comprise the majority of the known quasar population and are therefore commonly utilized in fundamental plane analyses (e.g., Merloni et al. 2003; Falcke et al. 2004; K rding et al.

2006; G ltekin et al. 2009; Plotkin et al. 2012). To obtain our radio-quiet quasar sample, we cross-referenced the radio-quiet quasar catalog from Timlin et al. (2020) with the X-ray fluxes of Zhu et al. (2021). Consistent with our sample selection method for the radio-loud catalog, we selected radio-quiet quasars with known radio and X-ray flux measurements. Radio and X-ray luminosities were provided from Timlin et al. (2020) and Zhu et al. (2021), where the derivation methods are the same as those described in § 2.1. Our quasar catalog was cross-referenced with the SDSS-DR14 catalog for spectroscopic mass measurements (Rakshit et al. 2020). The radio loudness parameters for our sample were provided from Timlin et al. (2020).

In total, we found 128 radio-quiet quasars with complete measurements which we included in our fundamental plane analysis. Similar to the radio-loud sample, inclusion of radio-quiet quasars with luminosity upper limits added a negligible amount of sources to the catalog, 9 sources in total. Our radio-quiet sample of 128 sources therefore omits sources with luminosity upper limits. We note that although radio-quiet quasars comprise the majority of the known quasar population, our radio-loud sample is larger than our radio-

Table 2. Best-fit Parameters of the Fundamental Plane of Black Hole Activity Analysis

	Number of Sources	ξ_X	ξ_M	b	σ_{res}^2	R_{adj}^2	σ_R
Total Dataset	353	1.44 ± 0.08	0.16 ± 0.10	-23.85 ± 3.49	54.97	0.5207	0.85
<i>Radio Loudness Dependence</i>							
Radio-Loud Quasars	225	1.12 ± 0.06	-0.20 ± 0.07	-5.64 ± 2.99	20.09	0.4629	0.62
Radio-Quiet Quasars	128	0.48 ± 0.06	0.50 ± 0.08	15.26 ± 2.66	17.77	0.5866	0.39
<i>Redshift-dependence (Radio-Loud Quasars)</i>							
$z < 1.5$	87	1.32 ± 0.15	-0.06 ± 0.13	-16.20 ± 6.59	18.58	0.3390	0.55
$1.5 < z < 3$	94	1.06 ± 0.13	-0.17 ± 0.10	-3.27 ± 6.00	21.66	0.3564	0.52
$z > 3$	44	0.63 ± 0.15	-0.27 ± 0.15	17.55 ± 6.64	22.63	0.2779	0.48
<i>Redshift-dependence (Radio-Quiet Quasars)</i>							
$z < 1.5$	66	0.38 ± 0.08	0.40 ± 0.11	20.20 ± 3.32	22.68	0.5035	0.42
$z > 1.5$	62	0.18 ± 0.09	0.22 ± 0.08	31.49 ± 4.12	11.17	0.4460	0.26

NOTE: The reported parameters for the fundamental plane best-fits correspond to the X-ray luminosity slope ξ_X , the black hole mass slope ξ_M , the y-intercept b , the best-fit residual variance σ_{res}^2 , the adjusted R-squared of the best-fit model R_{adj}^2 , and the scatter of the $\log(L_R)$ parameter relative to the predicted value from the fundamental plane model σ_R .

quiet sample because relatively few radio-quiet sources have radio fluxes above current detector sensitivity limits. The sources span a redshift range of $0.1 < z < 4.0$, X-ray luminosities that ranged between $10^{42} - 10^{46} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, radio luminosities that ranged between $10^{39} - 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, and masses that ranged between $10^6 - 10^{10} M_{\odot}$ with an average uncertainty of $0.341 M$. The ratio $\log(L_X/L_{\text{Edd}})$ was also calculated for our radio-quiet sample, finding a range of $[-4.87, -1.03]$ with a mean of -2.43 . The radio-quiet sources possess similar physical parameters as our radio-loud sources, and both samples are comparable in size. This ensures that radio loudness is the primary difference between our two samples. Details on our radio-quiet catalog are provided in Table 1, Figure 1 shows the source distribution of our radio-quiet sample across different physical properties.

3 MODELING THE FUNDAMENTAL ACTIVITY PLANE

With our accumulated dataset from § 2, we constructed a fundamental plane of black hole activity. Uncertainties for sources from [Snios et al. \(2020\)](#); [Snios et al. \(2021\)](#) were provided in their work. Since sources found within [Zhu et al. \(2019\)](#); [Timlin et al. \(2020\)](#); [Zhu et al. \(2021\)](#) did not include quoted errors, we adopted a 20% uncertainty for their X-ray luminosities. For all of our radio luminosities, we adopted a 15% uncertainty. We note that our adopted errors exceed those from similar studies (e.g., [Gültekin et al. 2009](#); [Gültekin et al. 2019](#)), which reassures us that our error estimates are conservative. For the mass measurements obtained from [Rakshit et al. \(2020\)](#), we utilized the quoted uncertainties. Due to our model fitting method (described below), we adopted conservative symmetric uncertainties for all measurements.

Consistent with [Merloni et al. \(2003\)](#), we defined the fundamental plane of activity as

$$\log L_R = \xi_X \log L_X + \xi_M \log M + b, \quad (1)$$

where L_R is the rest-frame 5 GHz luminosity, L_X is the rest-frame 2–10 keV luminosity, and M is the black hole mass. The dataset was fit using the multivariate orthogonal distance regression (ODR) method to estimate the best-fit regression coefficients ([Boggs & Rogers 1990](#)). ODR is a fitting scheme that modifies the ordinary

least squares by accounting for uncertainties within both the dependent and independent variables, and the data is minimized by the sum of squared perpendicular distances from the data points to the best-fit line weighted by the uncertainty. Given the presence of measurement uncertainties for our three input parameters, ODR provided a more accurate best-fit than the commonly used ordinary least square regression method.

Despite the robustness of the ODR method, a single run is not guaranteed to produce well-constrained best-fit coefficients with our data set as the maximally strict convergence conditions of the sums of squares and relative changes in the estimated parameters yield fits that are not necessarily located at the global minimum. We therefore ran ODR with 10^4 iterations, which produced a symmetric distribution of fitting coefficients. We used the mean of the resultant parameters as our best-fit coefficients, while their errors were calculated from the mean covariance matrices. We additionally implemented randomized initial conditions for each run to reduce input bias on the best-fit parameters.

For our analysis, we utilized our accumulated samples to construct a fundamental plane of black hole activity. Performing the ODR fit on our radio-loud and radio-quiet sources, we found a fundamental plane best-fit of $\log L_R = (1.12 \pm 0.06) \log L_X + (-0.20 \pm 0.07) \log M - (5.64 \pm 2.99)$ for our radio-loud sample and $\log L_R = (0.48 \pm 0.06) \log L_X + (0.50 \pm 0.08) \log M + (15.26 \pm 2.66)$ for our radio-quiet sample. Figure 2 shows the result of fitting across the two samples, and Table 2 displays the best-fit coefficients. For completeness, a best-fit was obtained for the entire dataset of radio-loud and radio-quiet quasars, which is also provided in Table 2. The residual variance σ_{res}^2 and the adjusted coefficient of determination² R_{adj}^2 were measured for each best-fit model, and the results are shown in Table 2. A positive correlation is observed for each best-fit, while

² We define the coefficient of determination as $R^2 = \frac{r_{xz}^2 + r_{yz}^2 - 2r_{xy}r_{xz}r_{yz}}{1 - r_{xy}^2}$, where r_{xy} , r_{xz} , and r_{yz} are the correlation coefficients. Here x and y are the independent variables of the fit, while z is the dependent variable. To account for the number of model parameters in the fit, we calculate the adjusted coefficient of determination $R_{\text{adj}}^2 = 1 - \frac{(1 - R^2)(N - 1)}{N - p - 1}$, where N is the total sample size and p is the number of independent variables.




Figure 2. An edge-on view of the fundamental planes of black hole activity, where the sample is separated into radio-loud and radio-quiet quasars. The x-axis is defined in accordance with the best-fit parameters to the total quasar dataset. Best-fit lines for the radio-quiet (blue) and radio-loud (red) are shown. The data demonstrates a clear dichotomy between the fundamental plane best-fit for the two populations.

the fit statistics demonstrate a preference towards utilizing separate models for the radio-loud and radio-quiet samples.

We compared our best-fit parameters of each sample to the result from Merloni et al. (2003). The measured scatters of the fit in the $\log(L_R)$ parameter relative for radio-loud and radio-quiet quasar samples are $\sigma_R = 0.62$ and $\sigma_R = 0.39$, which is at least 68% less than the scatter found by Merloni et al. (2003) and at least 75% less than the scatter found by Gültekin et al. (2009), though this difference may be attributable to our larger adopted uncertainties than those from similar studies. Overall, we found that the radio-quiet and Merloni et al. (2003) best-fit parameters agree with one another within 1σ despite different data selection criteria (e.g., redshift and mass). This agreement is unsurprising given that the sample from Merloni et al. (2003) was primarily comprised of radio-quiet sources. In comparison, the radio-loud best-fit parameters each diverge from the Merloni et al. (2003) result by $> 3\sigma$. Our results suggest that the dichotomy between radio-loud and radio-quiet quasars is also found within the fundamental plane, hence, two fundamental planes are better descriptors of quasar populations. In § 4, we discuss the physical impacts of trends observed within the fundamental planes.

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Radio-Loud Dependence on Fundamental Plane

The fundamental plane comparisons performed in § 3 reveal several key properties within our quasar samples. First, the fundamental

plane from Merloni et al. (2003) with their predominantly radio-quiet heterogeneous sample is consistent with our more homogeneous radio-quiet quasar sample. Second, the Merloni et al. (2003) fundamental plane underpredicts the radio luminosity of the radio-loud quasar sample, resulting in a divergence between the two best-fits over our examined physical parameter space. Radio loudness has previously been shown to impact accretion rates (Sikora et al. 2007; Baloković et al. 2012), so it follows that it should also impact the fundamental plane of black hole activity. Furthermore, studies of radio loudness could help constrain jet formation, acceleration, and collimation (Sikora et al. 2007). Motivated by our observation and its physical significance, we explored the fundamental plane within the context of radio loudness.

The fundamental plane best-fit parameters for the two radio loudness samples are shown in Table 2, and Figure 2 displays our results. Comparing the two best-fits, we find that their difference exceeds the measured scatter σ_R of 0.62 and 0.39 for the radio-loud and radio-quiet fits, respectively. Thus, we observe a dichotomy between the black hole activity of radio-loud and radio-quiet sources. The observed separation between the radio-loud and radio-quiet samples is consistent with previous studies that have demonstrated a bimodal distribution of radio loudness amongst the quasar population (e.g., Kellermann et al. 1989; Miller et al. 1990; Ivezić et al. 2004; White et al. 2007; Zamfir et al. 2008; Baloković et al. 2012).

The measured correlation coefficients from our fundamental plane best-fits provide insight into the different emission mechanisms within the quasar samples, where the ratio of these observables can




Figure 3. A comparison of the correlation coefficients ξ_X and ξ_M for the fundamental plane best-fits of the radio-loud and radio-quiet samples (left) as well as for redshift subsamples (right). Each figure also shows the theoretically predicted correlation coefficients from Merloni et al. (2003), where circles, diamonds, and squares correspond to Advection Dominated Accretion Flows (ADAF), jet, and disc models respectively. Empty symbols are for a radio spectral index $\alpha_R = 0$ and filled symbols for $\alpha_R = 0.5$. The dotted lines represent different possible correlation coefficients due to variations in radio emission.

correspond to predicted values from different emission models (Merloni et al. 2003; Plotkin et al. 2012). We therefore plotted the correlation coefficients from our radio-loud and radio-quiet best-fits, which is shown in Figure 3, left. Joint errors for the ξ_X – ξ_M parameters of each best-fit function were calculated from their respective mean covariance matrix, and found to be consistent with their marginalized uncertainties for both the radio-loud and radio-quiet best-fits. The resulting figure further illustrates the dichotomy between our radio-loud and radio-quiet quasar samples as the two best-fits are separated by $> 3\sigma$ for both ξ_X and ξ_M parameters. Furthermore, these results indicate that the dominant emission mechanism differs between the two samples.

To assess the probable emission mechanism for our quasar samples, we compared our correlation coefficients to those predicted by different emission models from Merloni et al. (2003). The predicted coefficients are also overlaid on Figure 3. We stress that the plotted model parameters represent a small subsample of the possible quasar emission models, so any emission mechanism predictions and subsequent comparisons should be regarded as approximate. Based on the different model parameterizations from Merloni et al. (2003) that were tested, we found that the radio-quiet sample, on average, favors the advection dominated accretion flows (ADAF) instead of the standard jet or disc models, which agrees with previous fundamental plane studies for radio-quiet black holes (e.g., Merloni et al. 2003; Gültekin et al. 2009; Plotkin et al. 2012). The distribution of L_X/L_{Edd} values for the radio-quiet sample, shown in Figure 1, is also broadly consistent with radiatively inefficient emission based on the model results of Merloni et al. (2003). In comparison, the radio-loud quasar sample is, on average, more consistent with the standard jet emission model, or a disc model, or a combination of the two. Our finding agrees with previous quasar studies where jet contributions are invoked to explain the radio-loud phenomenon (Worrall et al. 1987; Kellermann et al. 1989; Urry & Padovani 1995).

Overall, our results demonstrate that two fundamental planes are necessary to accurately reflect the different physical mechanisms that govern radio-loud and radio-quiet quasars. These two separate models will help better constrain and predict physical properties of

quasar populations such as the nature of jets, accretion processes, and their local environments.

4.2 Redshift Dependence on Fundamental Plane

Previous works, due to observational constraints, focused on the fundamental plane within the context of low-redshift sources $z < 0.5$ (e.g., Merloni et al. 2003; Falcke et al. 2004; Körding et al. 2006; Gültekin et al. 2009). As a result, the fundamental plane at high-redshifts is not well-understood. Furthermore, whether the fundamental plane model is constant over the age of the Universe is not well-constrained. We therefore investigated the fundamental plane model across varying redshift.

Due to the observed differences between the population of our radio-loud and radio-quiet sample, we analyzed redshift dependencies of each sample separately. We binned the radio-loud sources across three redshift ranges ($z < 1.5$, $1.5 < z < 3.0$, and $z > 3$), where each redshift bin was selected to ensure similar sample statistics for our analysis. In contrast, we binned the radio-quiet sources across two redshift ranges ($z < 1.5$, $z > 1.5$), due to its smaller sample size. The best-fit results from these additional tests are shown in Table 2. We note that the measured scatter σ_R demonstrates consistency between the different models over the parameter space investigated with our sample (Table 2). Figure 4, left displays the fundamental plane best-fit for the radio-loud quasars, while Figure 4, right displays the best-fit for the radio-quiet quasars.

From our analysis, the radio-quiet best-fits demonstrate broad consistency with one another across the examined redshift range, where the correlation coefficients are in agreement to within 2σ in all scenarios. Additionally, Figure 3, right illustrates the consistency between the two radio-quiet subsamples while also indicating that each subsample is most consistent with ADAF from the emission models tested. Our result agrees with optical–X-ray studies of quasars that have shown constant trends in power output and accretion rates within radio-quiet quasars up to redshifts $z \sim 6$ (Just et al. 2007; Nanni et al. 2017; Vito et al. 2019). Ultimately, our current data which spans a




Figure 4. An edge-on view of the fundamental planes of black hole activity across different redshift bins for the radio-loud quasars (left) and radio-quiet quasars (right). The best-fit lines for each redshift bin (colored) and the total sample (black) are plotted. The fundamental plane best-fit parameters are found to be broadly consistent across redshifts for both the radio-loud and radio-quiet samples.

redshift range of $0.1 < z < 5.0$ suggests that the radio-quiet fundamental plane model is independent of redshift. Hence, low-redshift fundamental plane models from previous works (e.g., Merloni et al. 2003; Falcke et al. 2004; Körding et al. 2006; Gültekin et al. 2009; Plotkin et al. 2012) may be valid for radio-quiet black holes extending all the way to 9% of the present age of the Universe.

In contrast to the radio-quiet sample, examination of the radio-loud quasar subsamples indicates a decreasing X-ray luminosity dependence for increasing redshift at a $> 3\sigma$ significance. This result is also illustrated in Figure 3, right, where the radio-loud samples clearly demonstrate a decreasing X-ray luminosity dependence versus redshift while mass dependence remains constant to within 1σ . As noted in § 2, the radio luminosity measurements of the high-redshift radio-loud quasar cores may include contributions from extended features due to instrument resolution limits, which would elevate L_R with increasing redshift. Comparatively, extended emission, on average, accounts for $< 2\%$ the total X-ray luminosity of a quasar (e.g., Marshall et al. 2018; Worrall et al. 2020; Snios et al. 2021), which is below other sources of measurement error. If extended emission contamination is present in our radio-loud sample, the L_R values of the high-redshift quasars should be regarded as upper limits on the true AGN core luminosity. Reducing L_R to account for such effects would also reduce the measured slope of the fundamental plane for sources at $z > 3$, increasing the statistical significance of the inverse relationship between X-ray luminosity and redshift for the fundamental plane. Thus, the presence of contamination would serve to enhance the observed redshift trend for the fundamental plane of the radio-loud quasar population.

Comparing the samples to different emission models from Merloni et al. (2003), we found that the low-redshift radio-loud sample agrees well with the disc model. However, the high-redshift sample is more consistent with a jet model, indicating a possible evolution of the primary emission mechanism for radio-loud quasars. Such an effect would be consistent with the recent theory that inverse Compton up-scattering of the cosmic microwave background radiation (IC/CMB) will increase the observed jet intensity for quasars at $z \gtrsim 3$ as the

energy density of the CMB exceeds the magnetic energy density for the quasar jets (Schwartz et al. 2020; Hodges-Kluck et al. 2021).

We stress that the observed redshift dependence in the radio-loud sample is indicative given the limited sample size and coarse redshift binning utilized in our analysis, and a greater sample size across all redshifts is necessary to accurately constrain the existence of a redshift dependence on the primary emission mechanism. Nonetheless, our analysis does suggest a redshift dependence for the fundamental plane of radio-loud quasars.

4.3 Using the Fundamental Plane as a Mass Estimator

Historically, fundamental plane studies have focused on investigating the accretion properties of black holes across broad mass and luminosity ranges. However, the fundamental plane may also be used as an estimator of black hole masses due to the scale-invariant nature of the model (e.g., Merloni et al. 2003; Gültekin et al. 2019). Motivated by this fact, we examined the fundamental plane in the context of mass prediction for our quasar sample.

Using the ODR fitting method described in § 3, we defined our model as the expression

$$\log M = \xi_{MX} \log L_X + \xi_{MR} \log L_R + b_M. \quad (2)$$

Due to the observed dichotomy between radio-loud and radio-quiet quasars described in § 4.1, we fit the model to each sub-sample separately. The results for all our fits are shown in Table 3, and Figure 5 displays the best-fit results of our analysis. The results indicate a dichotomy between the radio-loud and radio-quiet sample when fitting the fundamental plane defined in Equation 2, where the best-fit slope parameters ξ_{MX} and ξ_{MR} differed by $> 3\sigma$ between the two best-fits. The measured scatter of the $\log(M)$ parameter between the measured and predicted values σ_M are determined to be 0.43 and 0.45 for the radio-loud and radio-quiet samples, respectively. The scatters are consistent between the two datasets, and both samples cover a comparable physical parameter range. Altogether, we find that the fundamental plane model for mass measurements is dependent on radio loudness.

Table 3. Best-Fit Parameters of Black Hole Mass Fundamental Plane Analysis

	Number of Sources	ξ_{MX}	ξ_{MR}	b_M	σ_{res}^2	R_{adj}^2	σ_M
Radio-Loud Quasars	225	0.63 ± 0.05	-0.21 ± 0.04	-10.47 ± 2.09	15.56	0.1474	0.43
Radio-Quiet Quasars	128	0.08 ± 0.07	0.41 ± 0.06	-11.42 ± 3.61	32.00	0.3281	0.45

NOTE: The reported parameters for the fundamental plane best-fits correspond to the X-ray luminosity slope ξ_{MX} , the radio luminosity slope ξ_{MR} , the y-intercept b_M , the best-fit residual variance σ_{res}^2 , the adjusted R-squared of the best-fit model R_{adj}^2 , and the scatter of the $\log(L_R)$ parameter relative to the predicted value from the fundamental plane models σ_M .




Figure 5. An edge-on view of the fundamental planes of black hole activity where $\log M_{BH}$ is the predicted variable, where the sample is separated into radio-loud (left) and radio-quiet quasars (right). Best-fit lines for the radio-quiet and radio-loud are shown. The derived mass measurements are found to be consistent with spectroscopic mass estimation techniques for black holes, where the accuracy of the fundamental plane mass estimates is comparable to those obtained from spectroscopic mass measurements of high-redshift quasars.

To assess the accuracy of the fundamental plane as a black hole mass predictor, we compared the predicted masses determined by our fundamental plane fits with the spectroscopically measured values from the SDSS-DR14 emission line analysis compiled by [Rakshit et al. \(2020\)](#). We therefore calculated the root mean square error³ (RMSE), also known as the standard deviation of the residuals, between the predicted black hole mass from the fundamental plane model and the spectrum-measured mass from [Rakshit et al. \(2020\)](#). We found that the radio-loud and radio-quiet quasars have an RMSE of $0.43 \log(M_\odot)$ (5.0%) and $0.45 \log(M_\odot)$ (5.5%), respectively. Our method of black hole mass estimation is broadly consistent with previous studies that utilized the fundamental plane as a mass estimator (e.g., [Gültekin et al. 2019](#)), despite our study focusing on high-mass quasars ranging between 10^6 – $10^{10} M_\odot$ while previous works prioritized low-mass, low-redshift sources.

The accuracy of black hole mass estimates from spectroscopic modeling is known to worsen with increasing redshift due to a reduction in the available emission lines in the optical band as well as a greater reliance on low signal-to-noise emission lines, such as Mg II and C IV ([Shen 2013](#)). We theorize that the mass estimates from the fundamental plane would not suffer from a similar degradation in accuracy with increasing redshift given the comparable radio and

X-ray flux errors across our sample. To test this theory, we divided our total quasar sample into low-redshift ($z < 3$) and high-redshift ($z > 3$) subsamples. For the fundamental plane mass measurements, we found an average RMSE of 5.1% for quasars at $z < 3$ and 5.4% for quasars at $z > 3$. In contrast, the spectroscopic mass measurements taken from [Rakshit et al. \(2020\)](#) have an average error percentage of 1.6% for quasars at $z < 3$ and 2.5% for quasars at $z > 3$.

Given our selection of conservative errors for the radio and X-ray fluxes (§ 3), the precision of the fundamental plane method could improve if more accurate uncertainties are utilized. Nonetheless, our results demonstrate that the accuracy of the fundamental plane mass model is predominantly redshift invariant, while the accuracy of spectrum-measured masses worsens with redshift. Thus, our derived fundamental plane for black hole mass may prove useful in studying high-redshift quasars as well as situations where more standard mass estimation techniques, such as spectral modeling, are not possible.

5 CONCLUSION

We examined the fundamental plane of black hole activity for correlations with redshift and radio loudness in both radio-loud and radio-quiet quasar populations. Utilizing archival observations, we compiled quasar data that varied across radio loudness, mass, and redshift to obtain a sample of 353 sources. We constructed a fundamental plane of black hole activity, and our best-fits are $\log L_R = (1.12 \pm 0.06) \log L_X - (0.20 \pm 0.07) \log M - (5.64 \pm 2.99)$

³ We define the root-mean square error as $[\sum_i^N (O_i - P_i)^2 / N]^{1/2}$, where O is the measured value from the fundamental mass plane, P is the mass value from [Rakshit et al. \(2020\)](#), and N is the sample size.

for our radio-loud sample and $\log L_R = (0.48 \pm 0.06) \log L_X + (0.50 \pm 0.08) \log M + (15.26 \pm 2.66)$ for our radio-quiet sample.

We examined the impact of radio loudness on the fundamental plane best-fit for within our quasar sample. Our results demonstrate that two different fundamental planes are required to accurately model the dichotomy of radio-loud and radio-quiet quasar populations. Thus, we concluded that the radio-loud and radio-quiet quasar populations are governed by different fundamental plane models. Comparing the best-fit correlation coefficients to values predicted from different emission models, we found that a possible emission mechanism for the radio-quiet sample is advection dominated accretion flows while the radio-loud sample is likely a combination of jet and disc emission.

We also explored the dependencies of redshift on the fundamental plane model for our samples of radio-loud and radio-quiet quasars. Our derived best-fit results show no redshift dependence for radio-quiet quasars $z \leq 5$, where all correlation coefficients agreed within 2σ . In contrast, the radio-loud quasars exhibit a decreasing X-ray luminosity dependence for increasing redshift at a $> 3\sigma$ level, which we theorize may be due to the primary emission mechanism of radio-loud quasars evolving over redshift. However, a greater sample size is necessary to conclusively verify the existence of, or lack thereof, an evolving emission mechanism for the radio-loud quasar population.

Leveraging our fundamental plane results, we derived a best-fit expression for black hole mass estimation that used only the radio and the X-ray luminosities. We found a best-fit of $\log M = (0.63 \pm 0.05) \log L_X - (0.21 \pm 0.04) \log L_R - (10.47 \pm 2.09)$ for the radio-loud quasars and $\log M = (0.08 \pm 0.07) \log L_X - (0.41 \pm 0.06) \log L_R - (11.42 \pm 3.61)$ for the radio-quiet quasars. The accuracy of our fundamental plane mass estimation method was assessed for each sample, and we found an average 4.0% difference between it and standard estimates from optical spectrum emission lines. Thus, this method may prove useful in studying the high-redshift quasar population as well as situations where high signal-to-noise emission lines utilized for spectral modeling are not present at standard observing wavelengths.

Follow-up studies with more robust statistics may be used to better constrain model uncertainties. Furthermore, additional sources from future large-scale quasar surveys, such as the VLA and eROSITA all-sky surveys that are currently in progress, will increase the number of available targets and improve the the statistical significance of future fundamental plane studies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

L.B. was supported by the SAO REU program, which is funded in part by the National Science Foundation REU and Department of Defense ASSURE programs under NSF Grants no. AST 1852268 and 2050813, and by the Smithsonian Institution. B.S., M.S., A.S., and D.A.S. were supported by NASA contract NAS8-03060 (*Chandra* X-ray Center). B.S. was also supported in part by CXC grants GO8-19093X and GO0-21101X.

L.B. also thanks Matthew Ashby and Jonathan McDowell for their support and mentorship throughout the SAO REU program.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data used in this investigation are available with the article in a machine-readable format.

REFERENCES

- Baloković M., Smolčić V., Ivezić Ž., Zamorani G., Schinnerer E., Kelly B. C., 2012, *ApJ*, **759**, 30
- Becker R. H., White R. L., Helfand D. J., 1995, *ApJ*, **450**, 559
- Begelman M. C., Blandford R. D., Rees M. J., 1984, *RvMP*, **56**, 255
- Boggs P. T., Rogers J. E., 1990, in Statistical analysis of measurement error models and applications: proceedings of the AMS-IMS-SIAM joint summer research conference held June 10-16, 1989.
- Corbel S., Nowak M. A., Fender R. P., Tzioumis A. K., Markoff S., 2003, *A&A*, **400**, 1007
- Falcke H., Kording E., Markoff S., 2004, *A&A*, **414**, 895
- Gallo E., Fender R. P., Pooley G. G., 2003, *MNRAS*, **344**, 60
- Gültekin K., King A. L., Cackett E. M., Nyland K., Miller J. M., Di Matteo T., Markoff S., Rupen M. P., 2019, *ApJ*, **871**, 80
- Gültekin K., Cackett E. M., Miller J. M., Matteo T. D., Markoff S., Richstone D. O., 2009, *ApJ*, **706**, 404
- Heinz S., Sunyaev R. A., 2003, *MNRAS*, **343**, L59
- Heinz S., Reynolds C. S., Begelman M. C., 1998, *ApJ*, **501**, 126
- Hinshaw G., et al., 2013, *ApJS*, **208**, 19
- Hodges-Kluck E., Gallo E., Ghisellini G., Haardt F., Wu J., Ciardi B., 2021, *MNRAS*, **505**, 1543
- Ivezić v., et al., 2004, *Proc Int Astron Union*, 2004, 525–526
- Just D. W., Brandt W. N., Shemmer O., Steffen A. T., Schneider D. P., Chartas G., Garmire G. P., 2007, *ApJ*, **665**, 1004
- Kellermann K. I., Sramek R., Schmidt M., Shaffer D. B., Green R., 1989, *AJ*, **98**, 1195
- Kording E., Falcke H., Corbel S., 2006, *A&A*, **456**, 439
- Lusso E., Risaliti G., 2016, *ApJ*, **819**, 154
- Marshall H. L., et al., 2018, *ApJ*, **856**, 66
- Merloni A., 2004, *MNRAS*, **353**, 1035
- Merloni A., Heinz S., Di Matteo T., 2003, *MNRAS*, **345**, 1057
- Micic M., Holley-Bockelmann K., Sigurdsson S., Abel T., 2007, *MNRAS*, **380**, 1533
- Miller L., Peacock J. A., Mead A. R. G., 1990, *MNRAS*, **244**, 207
- Nanni R., Vignali C., Gilli R., Moretti A., Brandt W. N., 2017, *A&A*, **603**, A128
- Plotkin R. M., Markoff S., Kelly B. C., Kording E., Anderson S. F., 2012, *MNRAS*, **419**, 267
- Rakshit S., Stalin C. S., Kotilainen J., 2020, *ApJS*, **249**, 17
- Schwartz D. A., et al., 2020, *ApJ*, **904**, 57
- Shen Y., 2013, *BASI*, **41**, 61
- Sikora M., Stawarz L., Lasota J.-P., 2007, *ApJ*, **658**, 815
- Snios B., et al., 2020, *ApJ*, **899**, 127
- Snios B., et al., 2021, *ApJ*, **914**, 130
- Stawarz L., Ostorero L., Begelman M. C., Moderski R., Kataoka J., Wagner S., 2008, *ApJ*, **680**, 911
- Timlin J. D., Brandt W. N., Zhu S., Liu H., Luo B., Ni Q., 2020, *MNRAS*, **498**, 4033
- Urry C. M., Padovani P., 1995, *PASP*, **107**, 803
- Vito F., et al., 2019, *A&A*, **630**, A118
- Volonteri M., 2012, *Science*, **337**, 544
- White R. L., Helfand D. J., Becker R. H., Glikman E., de Vries W., 2007, *ApJ*, **654**, 99
- Worrall D. M., Giommi P., Tananbaum H., Zamorani G., 1987, *ApJ*, **313**, 596
- Worrall D. M., Birkinshaw M., Marshall H. L., Schwartz D. A., Siemiginowska A., Wardle J. F. C., 2020, *MNRAS*, **497**, 988
- Zamfir S., Sulentic J. W., Marziani P., 2008, *MNRAS*, **387**, 856
- Zhu S. F., Brandt W. N., Wu J., Garmire G. P., Miller B. P., 2019, *MNRAS*, **482**, 2016
- Zhu S. F., Timlin J. D., Brandt W. N., 2021, *MNRAS*, **505**, 1954

This paper has been typeset from a \LaTeX file prepared by the author.