

A Submillimeter Survey of Faint Galaxies Behind Ten Strong Lensing Clusters

L. L. COWIE,¹ A. J. BARGER,^{1,2,3} F. E. BAUER,^{4,5,6} C.-C. CHEN,⁷ L. H. JONES,^{2,8} C. ORQUERA,^{4,5} M. J. ROSENTHAL,²
AND A. J. TAYLOR²

¹*Institute for Astronomy, University of Hawaii, 2680 Woodlawn Drive, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA*

²*Department of Astronomy, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 475 N. Charter Street, Madison, WI 53706, USA*

³*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Hawaii, 2505 Correa Road, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA*

⁴*Instituto de Astrofísica and Centro de Astroingeniería, Facultad de Física, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Casilla 306, Santiago 22, Chile*

⁵*Millennium Institute of Astrophysics (MAS), Nuncio Monseñor Sótero Sanz 100, Providencia, Santiago, Chile*

⁶*Space Science Institute, 4750 Walnut Street, Suite 205, Boulder, Colorado 80301, USA*

⁷*Academia Sinica Institute of Astronomy and Astrophysics, P.O. Box 23-141, Taipei 10617, Taiwan*

⁸*Space Telescope Science Institute, 3700 San Martin Drive, Baltimore, MD 21218*

ABSTRACT

We present deep SCUBA-2 450 μm and 850 μm imaging of ten strong lensing clusters. We provide a $> 4\sigma$ SCUBA-2 850 μm catalog of the 404 sources lying within a radius of $4'.5$ from the cluster centers. We also provide catalogs of the $> 4.5\sigma$ ALMA 850 μm detections in the clusters A370, MACSJ1149.5+2223, and MACSJ0717.5+3745 from our targeted ALMA observations, along with catalogs of all other $> 4.5\sigma$ ALMA (mostly 1.2 mm) detections in any of our cluster fields from archival ALMA observations. For the ALMA detections, we give spectroscopic or photometric redshifts, where available, from our own Keck observations or from the literature. We confirm the use of the 450 μm to 850 μm flux ratio for estimating redshifts. We use lens models to determine magnifications, most of which are in the 1.5–4 range. After supplementing the ALMA cluster sample with Chandra Deep Field (CDF) ALMA and SMA samples, we find no evidence for evolution in the redshift distribution of submillimeter galaxies down to demagnified 850 μm fluxes of 0.5 mJy. Given this result, we conclude that our observed trend of increasing F160W to 850 μm flux ratio from brighter to fainter demagnified 850 μm flux results from the fainter submillimeter galaxies having less extinction. However, there is wide spread in this relation, including the presence of some optical/NIR dark galaxies down to fluxes below 1 mJy. Finally, with insights from our ALMA analysis, we analyze our SCUBA-2 sample and present 55 850 μm -bright $z > 4$ candidates.

Keywords: cosmology: observations — galaxies: distances and redshifts — galaxies: evolution — galaxies: starburst

1. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of the far-infrared (FIR) Extragalactic Background Light (EBL) demonstrated that about half of the universe’s starlight at UV/optical wavelengths is absorbed by dust and re-radiated into the FIR (Puget et al. 1996; Fixsen et al. 1998; Dole et al. 2006). At high redshifts, observations with single-dish submillimeter telescopes, such as the 15 m James Clerk Maxwell Telescope (JCMT), can provide direct detections of the most luminous, dusty, star-forming galaxies (Smail, Ivison, & Blain 1997; Barger et al. 1998; Hughes et al. 1998; Eales et al. 1999). However, at 850 μm , such surveys become confusion limited at ~ 1.6 mJy (4σ ; Cowie et al. 2018), preventing the detection of fainter submillimeter galaxies (SMGs) with infrared luminosities $\lesssim 10^{12} L_{\odot}$, or star formation rates (SFRs) $\lesssim 200 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for a Kroupa (2001) initial mass function (IMF). SMGs se-

lected from other ground-based single-dish surveys (e.g., LABOCA, the South Pole Telescope) are brighter and hence more extreme starbursts (see, e.g., Hodge et al. 2013), even after taking into account gravitational lensing when present (see, e.g., Spilker et al. 2016).

SMGs selected from blank field, confusion-limited surveys with SCUBA-2 (Holland et al. 2013) on the JCMT are found to be substantially distinct from the extinction-corrected UV-selected population (Barger et al. 2014; Cowie et al. 2017). However, these SMGs only contain about 20–30% of the submillimeter EBL. Fainter SMGs are more common objects that contribute the majority of the EBL, but interferometry of any field or single-dish observations of massive lensing cluster fields are required to detect them. Since many of these fainter SMGs may also be selected in UV samples, we need to obtain a census of faint SMGs and determine their

redshifts and properties to avoid double-counting and biasing the star formation history.

To this end, we have been observing massive lensing cluster fields with SCUBA-2 to study the population of faint SMGs with SFRs comparable to those of the brighter UV-selected population. Gravitational lensing by foreground massive galaxy clusters is an excellent way to detect intrinsically faint SMGs, but it also has the advantages that lensed sources are magnified at all wavelengths and lensed images benefit from enhanced spatial resolution. Number counts in lensed fields are now well established at both $450\ \mu\text{m}$ and $850\ \mu\text{m}$ (e.g., Chen et al. 2013; Hsu et al. 2016), allowing us to determine the flux levels above which we see 50% of the submillimeter light. These flux levels are $\sim 3\ \text{mJy}$ at $450\ \mu\text{m}$ and $\sim 1\ \text{mJy}$ at $850\ \mu\text{m}$ for the Fixsen et al. (1998) EBL measurements, with the primary uncertainty being the submillimeter EBL.

Our goal is to generate a uniformly selected sample of many hundreds of galaxies in cluster lensing fields that have been intensively studied at other wavelengths. We can then optimize the extremely valuable interferometric time on the Atacama Large Millimeter/submillimeter Array (ALMA), the Northern Extended Millimeter Array (NOEMA), and the Submillimeter Array (SMA) to measure accurate positions and redshifts for the detected sample. In combination with the high-quality lensing models, the interferometry also allows us to determine the amplifications at the galaxy positions and to measure the de-lensed fluxes. We note that fainter SMGs can also be directly detected with ALMA, but the field-of-view is so small—even at millimeter wavelengths—as to make developing large samples through ALMA mosaicking inefficient (see, e.g., Zavala et al. 2021, who found 13 sources ($> 5\sigma$) at $2\ \text{mm}$ over $184\ \text{arcmin}^2$).

Our SCUBA-2 program targets 10 massive lensing cluster fields (see Table 1). We chose these fields to have good lensing models and a wealth of optical, near-infrared (NIR), mid-infrared (MIR), FIR, radio, and X-ray data from the Hubble Space Telescope (HST), the Spitzer Space Telescope, the Herschel Space Observatory, the Karl G. Jansky Very Large Array, the Chandra X-ray Observatory, and ground-based observatories.

Where possible, we chose clusters from the HST Frontier Fields (HFF; Lotz et al. 2017) program with its extraordinarily deep data and well-defined lensing models from 10 independent teams. Five of the six HFFs are in our sample, while the sixth, Abell S1063, is too far south to be observed with the JCMT. The HFF images have now been enlarged under the Beyond Ultra-deep Frontier Fields And Legacy Observations (BUFFALO) HST Treasury program (Steinhardt et al. 2020), providing a better match in area to the submillimeter observations, though with shallower images than the HFF regions. We take the BUFFALO images from the Mikulski Archive for Space Telescopes (MAST). We mark the

clusters with HFF/BUFFALO data in Table 1. Three other clusters in our survey come from the Cluster Lensing And Supernova Survey with Hubble (CLASH) HST Treasury program (Postman et al. 2012).

The Herschel data listed in Table 1 come from Oliver et al. (2012; Herschel Multi-tiered Extragalactic Survey, or HerMES), Smith et al. (2010; Local Cluster Substructure Survey or LoCuSS), Egami et al. (2010; Herschel Lensing Survey or HLS), and Eales et al. (2010, Herschel ATLAS or HATLAS). We will use the Herschel data in a subsequent paper when constructing spectral energy distributions for the sources. Here we only show some of the Herschel/PACS $100\ \mu\text{m}$ images for illustrative purposes.

In Section 2, we provide a description of our SCUBA-2 observations, data reduction, and sample construction, together with the final catalog of 404 $850\ \mu\text{m}$ ($> 4\sigma$) sources. In Section 3, we discuss our follow-up with ALMA for the A370, MACJ0717, and MACSJ1149 clusters, and we catalog the ALMA detected ($> 4.5\sigma$) sources from our work and from the ALMA archive for all the clusters. In Section 4, we interpret the ALMA cluster sample, supplemented with a CDF-S ALMA sample and a CDF-N SMA sample. In Section 5, we interpret our SCUBA-2 cluster sample with insights from our ALMA analysis. Finally, in Section 6, we summarize our results.

2. THE SCUBA-2 SURVEY

For our SCUBA-2 observations, we use two scan patterns: CV DAISY, which has a field size of $5.5'$ radius, and PONG-900, which has a field size of $10.5'$ radius. Detailed information about the SCUBA-2 scan patterns can be found in Holland et al. (2013). In our reductions, we use all available $450\ \mu\text{m}$ and $850\ \mu\text{m}$ data from SCUBA-2 in the CADC archive, together with more recent observations from our own programs. In Table 1 and Figure 1, we summarize the current status of the SCUBA-2 data.

Chen et al. (2013) and Cowie et al. (2017) provide a detailed description of the data reduction, which uses the Dynamic Iterative Map Maker (DIMM) in the SMURF package from the STARLINK software developed by the Joint Astronomy Centre (Jenness et al. 2011; Chapin et al. 2013). We expect nearly all of the galaxies to appear as unresolved sources. Thus, we apply a matched-filter to our maps, which provides a maximum-likelihood estimate of the source strength for unresolved sources (e.g., Serjeant et al. 2003). Each matched-filter image has a PSF with a Mexican hat shape and a FWHM corresponding to the telescope resolution. The FWHM values for the JCMT are $\sim 7.5''$ at $450\ \mu\text{m}$ and $\sim 14''$ at $850\ \mu\text{m}$.

We next generate the $850\ \mu\text{m}$ source catalog by identifying the peak signal-to-noise (S/N) pixel, subtracting this peak pixel and its surrounding areas using the PSF scaled to the source flux and centered on the value and

Table 1. Massive Cluster Lensing Fields Observed with SCUBA-2

Field	R.A.	Decl.	Central RMS [450, 850 μ m] (mJy)	HFF/ BUFFALO	Herschel	870 μ m Interferometric
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
A370	02 39 53.1	-01 34 35.0	[2.31, 0.29]	y	HerMES	ALMA
A1689	13 11 29.0	-01 20 17.0	[2.27, 0.32]	n	LoCuSS	
A2390	21 53 36.8	17 41 44.2	[2.38, 0.28]	n	LoCuSS	
A2744	00 14 21.2	-30 23 50.1	[3.03, 0.30]	y	HLS	
MACSJ0416.1-2403	04 16 08.9	-24 04 28.7	[2.16, 0.31]	y	HLS	
MACSJ0717.5+3745	07 17 34.0	37 44 49.0	[1.55, 0.22]	y	HLS	ALMA
MACSJ1149.5+2223	11 49 36.3	22 23 58.1	[1.34, 0.23]	y	HLS	ALMA
MACSJ1423.8+2404	14 23 48.3	24 04 47.0	[1.61, 0.23]	n	HLS	
MACSJ2129.4-0741	21 29 26.2	-07 41 26.0	[3.21, 0.40]	n	HLS	
RXJ1347	13 47 31.5	-11 44 19.0	[1.90, 0.32]	n	HATLAS	

NOTE— The central rms noise quoted in Column (4) is white noise and does not include confusion noise.

We list ALMA in Column (7) for the fields where we have obtained near-complete ALMA 870 μ m targeted follow-up of the SCUBA-2 sources.




Figure 1. Azimuthally averaged 450 μ m rms noise for the 10 clusters vs. radius. Note that the two clusters A2744 (green curve) and MACSJ2129 (gray curve) have shallower observations than the remaining eight clusters (see Table 1).

position of that pixel, and then searching for the next S/N peak. We iterate this process until we reach a S/N of 3.5. The reason for this iterative process is to remove contamination by brighter sources before we identify fainter sources and measure their fluxes. We then limit the catalog to the sources with a S/N above 4, where we include a confusion noise of 0.33 mJy (Cowie et al. 2017) added in quadrature. This choice of S/N provides a robust sample. For example, after analyzing the negatives of the images in exactly the same way as the actual images, we find a 4% false positive rate, which is consistent with historical estimates of $\leq 5\%$ (e.g., see

Figure 7 of Casey et al. 2013 for the field environment and Section 5.1 of Chen et al. 2013a for the cluster environment).

Within a radius of $4\frac{1}{5}$ from the cluster centers, we have an 850 μ m catalog of 404 sources. This radius corresponds to the position where the 450 μ m noise is roughly twice the central noise (see Figure 1). At larger radii, the noise rises rapidly. We measure the 450 μ m fluxes (whether positive or negative) and statistical uncertainties by searching for the brightest pixel in a $4''$ radius around each 850 μ m source position in the 450 μ m map. We chose this search radius based on the positional uncertainties in the 850 μ m sample (see, e.g., Cowie et al. 2017). We detect 341 of the 850 μ m sources above the 2σ level at 450 μ m, and 261 above the 3σ level. This procedure produces an upward bias. Based on randomized samples, we estimate a false positive rate of 14% at 2σ and 6% at 3σ .

In Figure 2, we show representative SCUBA-2 images (of the cluster MACSJ1149) based on just under 60 hours of exposure in weather band 1 conditions ($\tau_{225 \text{ GHz}} < 0.05$). We indicate where strongly magnified sources are expected to be by overplotting green contours on the 450 μ m image that show the Zitrin (2021) lens model for $z = 2$ at magnifications of 1.4, 2, and 4. In general, higher redshifts will have similar but somewhat more compact contours.

We show the rest of the 850 μ m and 450 μ m SCUBA-2 images for the cluster fields in the Appendix. In Table 2, we summarize our 850 μ m source catalog. We do not apply any corrections from peak fluxes to total fluxes




Figure 2. Representative SCUBA-2 (*left*) 850 μm and (*right*) 450 μm images of the cluster MACSJ1149 showing the central $4.5'$ radius region. (The images for all 10 clusters are shown in the Appendix.) The white circles show the $> 4\sigma$ 850 μm selected sample, including a confusion noise of 0.33 mJy. The green contours on the 450 μm image show the Zitrin (2021) lens model for $z = 2$ at magnifications (moving inwards) of 1.4, 2, and 4.

or any de-boosting correction. For the 850 μm noise, we use the measured white noise and a confusion noise of 0.33 mJy (Cowie et al. 2017) added in quadrature. We retain the brightest cluster galaxy (BCG) sources in Table 2 [labeled as “BCG” in Column (10)], even though they are associated with cluster cooling flows and are not produced by star formation (e.g., Edge et al. 2010).

In the next section, we describe the ALMA observations of the various cluster fields. Table 2 provides the target list for this follow up.

3. ALMA IMAGING

Our SCUBA-2 sample provides a large number of sources for interferometric follow-up. The primary goals of the interferometric work are to obtain accurate positions, to determine the optical/NIR counterparts (if any) to the SMGs, from which we can then derive photometric redshifts (hereafter, photzs).

The follow-up interferometric continuum imaging is most efficiently carried out with ALMA. In Table 1, we mark the fields where we have done targeted ALMA observations. This is a nearly complete 870 μm interferometric follow-up of the SCUBA-2 sources in the central areas of these fields. With ALMA’s subarcsecond resolution, we can obtain accurate positions for the SCUBA-2 sources and detect any multiple counterparts that are blended into a single source at the single-dish resolution. Based on our follow-up observations of SCUBA-2 sources with SMA and ALMA (e.g., Chen et al. 2013a;

Cowie et al. 2017, 2018), we expect $\sim 10\%$ of our sample to be blended multiples, but there are still few studies of the SCUBA-2 multiplicity fraction for our flux range. In order to separate multiples, we aim for an rms sensitivity of ~ 0.2 mJy at 850 μm , which allows for the detection of the brighter component of any $\sim 2 : 1$ ratio blends that combine to form a single 2 mJy source, which is the typical flux of our targets. (Note that this is the observed flux; the corresponding de-lensed fluxes probe the desired 1 mJy range.)

3.1. A370, MACSJ1149, and MACSJ0717

In our program “An ALMA Survey of Lensed SMGs in the Hubble Frontier Fields” (ALMA program #2017.1.00341.S, #2018.1.00003.S; PI: F. Bauer), we observed fields in A370, MACSJ1149, and MACSJ0717. For each cluster, we observed all objects with SCUBA-2 fluxes above 1.6 mJy lying within a $2'$ radius from the cluster center, together with a small number of fainter objects. The observations were made in band 7 (870 μm) using the C43-3 array configuration. We centered the observations on the targeted source positions and used a spectral set-up configured with four 1.875 GHz spectral windows (using time division mode) placed around a central frequency of 343.5 GHz in order to match the SCUBA-2 850 μm observations. This returned a representative spectral resolution of ~ 28 km s $^{-1}$.

Nominal natural-weighted beams of $\approx 0''.9 \times 0''.5$, $0''.6 \times 0''.5$, and $0''.9 \times 0''.4$ were achieved for our observations of

A370, MACSJ1149 and MACSJ0717, respectively. We made images of the targets using the task CLEAN. We made dirty images using natural weighting and a mild uv -taper to achieve a synthesized beam of $1''.0$ for the major axis; the minor axis was still $\sim 0.6-0''.7$. Based on the size estimates from Simpson et al. (2015), this offers the best trade-off between retaining a relatively low rms and increasing the sensitivity to extended sources in our data; tapering the data to larger beams means weighting toward shorter baselines, and hence fewer antennas and lower sensitivity.

We performed an initial source search on the dirty images prior to primary beam correction, with the dual purpose of assessing the rms sensitivity and finding all secure detections. We produced cleaned images by placing $2'' \times 2''$ clean boxes around all secure sources detected with $S/N \geq 5$ in the dirty images. We stopped the final cleaning process after 1000 iterations, such that most of the emission associated with the sources was recovered. We note that this choice does not strongly affect the resulting fluxes or rms; for example, opting for only 100 iterations and/or setting the clean threshold to 1σ results in drops of 1–4% in peak flux and 5–8% in rms.

We searched each of the $1''.0$ cleaned images for significant sources. We restricted our search to the area contained within an $8''.75$ radius, which corresponds to the ALMA half power. This also is well matched to the SCUBA-2 FWHM and should contain all sources contributing to the corresponding SCUBA-2 flux.

We selected all sources with a peak flux $S/N > 4.5$ (see below). We determined the peak flux noise using the dispersion in 100 independent beam positions surrounding the source. We measured a median central rms noise of 0.24 mJy for the sources in A370, 0.21 mJy in MACSJ1149, and 0.4 mJy in MACSJ0717.

The total searched area corresponds to 15,000 independent beams. For a Gaussian distribution in the noise, we expect 0.5 false sources above a S/N cut of 4, and 0.05 false sources above a S/N cut of 4.5. We restrict our final sample to sources with $S/N > 4.5$, which we expect to be highly robust. We have tested this selection by searching for sources in the negative of the images. At $S/N = 4.5$, we find no negative image detections, which confirms the robustness of the detected sample.

We find that the ALMA peak fluxes, even in the $1''.0$ tapered images, slightly underestimate the total fluxes. The reason for this is that the sources are resolved. However, $2''$ aperture fluxes well approximate the total ALMA fluxes. We list these aperture fluxes in Tables 3 and 5 for A370 and MACSJ1149, respectively. For the blended sources in A370 (numbers 1 and 2), we give the peak flux times 1.3 to approximate the total ALMA flux. We note that the $2''$ aperture fluxes closely match the SCUBA-2 fluxes, with a median ratio of SCUBA-2/ALMA of 1.12. This shows that ALMA is recovering most of the SCUBA-2 flux.

We now describe the ALMA observations for each cluster individually:

A370: In band 7 ($870 \mu\text{m}$), we observed 15 ALMA fields within a $2'$ radius from the cluster center. These covered all 13 SCUBA-2 sources with measured $850 \mu\text{m}$ fluxes in excess of 1.6 mJy in the region and two additional fields. We show the ALMA images in the upper left panel of Figure 3. We detect 10 sources ($> 4.5\sigma$) in the ALMA images. We summarize the properties of these sources in Table 3, and we mark their positions with white circles in all panels of Figure 3. This includes one double source in the ALMA observations (a well-known pair at $z = 2.8$ studied by Ivison et al. 1998), which blends into a single SCUBA-2 source. Eight of the ALMA detections are single sources (one of which is at $z = 1.056$ and was studied by Barger et al. 1999). In total, 9 of the 13 SCUBA-2 sources are detected with ALMA.

One of the four SCUBA-2 sources that was not detected by ALMA corresponds to the giant arc at $z = 0.724$ (Soucail et al. 1988). This source is extended even in the SCUBA-2 image (Figure 4) and is seen as an elongated source in the $100 \mu\text{m}$ Herschel/PACS image (Rawle et al. 2016). Although the source is over-resolved and undetected in the ALMA image, the SCUBA-2 identification is clear.

The three undetected sources are the faintest in the SCUBA-2 sample with $850 \mu\text{m}$ fluxes between 1.6 mJy and 1.8 mJy. These sources may be missed if they are extended or multiple, but they are also the most likely to be spurious in the $850 \mu\text{m}$ sample.

We also searched the ALMA archive for additional data. Mosaics of the field in band 6 (1.2 mm) have been obtained by González-López et al. (2017) and by ALMA program #2018.1.00035.L (PI: K. Kohno). We show these in the upper center and upper right panels of Figure 3, respectively, using images taken from the Japanese Virtual Observatory (JVO) archive. We summarize the three band 6 detected sources (two from González-López et al. and one from ALMA program #2018.1.00035.L) in Table 4, but they all overlap with our band 7 sample. The giant arc is not detected in either of the mosaicked images.

In the lower panels of Figure 3, we show the SCUBA-2 $450 \mu\text{m}$, HerMES $100 \mu\text{m}$, and BUFFALO F160W images, respectively. In Figure 5, we show BUFFALO/HFF three-color images with the ALMA emission overlaid.

MACSJ1149.5+2223: In band 7 ($870 \mu\text{m}$), we observed 22 ALMA fields within a $2'$ radius from the cluster center. These included 19 of the 20 SCUBA-2 sources with $850 \mu\text{m}$ fluxes above 1.6 mJy, together with 3 fainter sources. One SCUBA-2 source with a flux of 1.7 mJy, which was marginally below our S/N selec-




Figure 3. (*Upper three panels*) ALMA observations in A370. The left panel shows the targeted fields at $870\ \mu\text{m}$, each with a radius of $9''$. The white circles in all panels show our detected sources from these targeted observations. The circles are of arbitrary size but roughly match this ALMA field-of-view. The center panel shows the mosaicked $1.2\ \text{mm}$ image from ALMA programs #2013.1.00999.S and #2015.1.01425.S (PI: F. Bauer; González-López et al. 2017), while the right panel shows that from ALMA program #2018.1.00035.L (PI: K. Kohno). The mosaicked images are taken from the JVO archive. There are no additional detected sources in the mosaics. (*Lower three panels*) The SCUBA-2 $450\ \mu\text{m}$ image (left), the HerMES $100\ \mu\text{m}$ image (center), and the BUFFALO F160W image.

tion threshold at the time of setting up the observations, was omitted. We show these targeted ALMA observations in the upper left panel of Figure 6. We detect 12 sources ($> 4.5\sigma$) in the ALMA images. We summarize the properties of these sources in Table 5, and we mark their positions with white circles in all panels of Figure 6. This includes one double source, where the separation of the two ALMA sources is $6''.7$. This is small enough to produce a blended SCUBA-2 source.

ALMA mosaics of the field in band 6 ($1.2\ \text{mm}$) were obtained by González-López et al. (2017) and by ALMA program #2018.1.00035.L (PI: K. Kohno). We show these images, which we took from the JVO archive, in the upper center and upper right panels of Figure 6, re-

spectively. There is one unique $> 4.5\sigma$ detected source in each image, and they both overlap with our band 7 sample. Targeted band 6 observations based on an AzTEC image were also made as part of ALMA program #2016.1.00293.S (PI: A. Pope), and we summarize these eight detections in Table 6. Only two lie within our $2'$ selection radius, both of which we detected in band 7.

In the lower panels of Figure 6, we show the SCUBA-2 $450\ \mu\text{m}$, HLS $100\ \mu\text{m}$, and BUFFALO F160W images, respectively.

MACS J0717.5+37450: The SCUBA-2 data show that the central region of this cluster contains a surprisingly low number of sources (three) with $850\ \mu\text{m}$ fluxes




Figure 4. HFF F160W image of the giant arc in A370. The red contour shows our 850 μm SCUBA-2 observation of the arc, and the green contour shows the Herschel/PACS 100 μm image (Rawle et al. 2016). The image is 40'' on a side.

greater than 2 mJy within a 2' radius from the cluster center. Two of these sources are a close pair and correspond to lensed source 5 from Zitrin et al. (2009).

Only half of the ALMA exposure time for our band 7 (870 μm) observations in this cluster were completed, and hence our sensitivity is considerably poorer than for the other two clusters, with a typical central rms of 0.4 mJy. Only the southern source of the close pair (corresponding to component 5.2 of the lensed source) is detected when our data are combined with deeper archival band 7 data from ALMA program #2017.1.00091.S (PI: A. Pope). Pope et al. (2017) also detected the source at 1.1 mm with the AzTEC camera on the Large Millimeter Telescope. We summarize the source's properties in Table 7, and we show the system in more detail in Figure 8.

This field was only partially observed in the ALMA band 6 program of González-López et al. (2017). These observations are less sensitive than the other mosaics on the HFFs and yielded no detections. Targeted band 6 observations based on an AzTEC image were made as part of ALMA program #2016.1.00293 (PI: A. Pope), and we summarize these four bright detections, which lie outside our 2' selection radius, in Table 8.

In the upper left panel of Figure 7, we show both the band 6 (square fields) and band 7 (circular fields) targeted ALMA observations. In the upper right panel, we show the González-López et al. (2017) band 6 mosaic. In the lower panels, we show the SCUBA-2 450 μm , HLS 100 μm , and BUFFALO F160W images, respectively. In all panels, we mark with white circles the positions of either a band 6 or a band 7 detection from the targeted observations.

3.2. Remaining Clusters

We searched the ALMA archives for detected sources lying within a radius of 5' from the cluster centers. These observations are primarily at millimeter wavelengths, but having accurate positions for SMGs is useful for our analysis in Section 4. We summarize the ALMA positions of the detected sources in Table 9. In some cases, the ALMA source lies below the SCUBA-2 detection threshold, but we give the measured SCUBA-2 850 μm and 450 μm fluxes at the ALMA position for all the ALMA sources. For the SCUBA-2 errors, we list the white noise, since we are pre-selecting from ALMA.

Breakdown by cluster:

- A2390 and MACSJ1423: Only the BCGs have ALMA archival observations.
 - A1689: There are 4 detected sources in the ALMA archive. One is the complex, heavily studied $z = 7.13$ source A1689-zd1 (Watson et al. 2015; Wong et al. 2022). Two others appear to be cluster members based on the photzs. Only the final source is bright enough to be detected in the SCUBA-2 sample.
 - A2744: There are 9 detected sources in the ALMA archive, seven of which come from González-López et al. (2017) and the remaining 2 from ALMA program #2017.1.01219.S (PI: F. Bauer). Seven of the nine sources are detected in the SCUBA-2 images.
 - MACSJ0416: There are 5 detected sources in the ALMA archive, four of which come from González-López et al. (2017); two of these four have SCUBA-2 detections. One source is near coincident with the strong lens component 12.3 in Hoag et al. (2016), but we cannot obtain a consistent solution for the submillimeter fluxes at all three positions. Thus, we do not believe this SMG is associated with the lensed system.
- The fifth source is MACS0416_Y1, which lies at a redshift of $z = 8.311$ based on ALMA fine structure line measurements (Tamura et al. 2019; Bakx et al. 2020). Consistent with the ALMA measured 870 μm flux of 0.14 mJy (Bakx et al. 2020), this source is not detected in the SCUBA-2 imaging.
- RXJ1347: Apart from the BCG, the only other ALMA detections from ALMA program #2018.1.00035.L (PI: K. Kohno) are two components of a lensed system (5.1, 5.2, 5.3 of Zitrin et al. 2015). We give their positions in Table 9. Zitrin et al. measured a photz of 1.28 for the lensed system, which we give in the table, but note that Bradač et al. (2008) placed it at a redshift of $z = 4$




Figure 5. HST three-color (red: BUFFALO/HFF F160W; green: HFF F814W; blue: HFF F606W) images of the A370 sources with ALMA emission overlaid (green contours: 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 σ ; beam size is also shown in the lower left corner of each image).

based on their gravitational lens modeling. We show the system in more detail in Figure 9.

4. INTERPRETING THE ALMA SAMPLE

In this section, we analyze the redshift distributions, demagnified flux distributions, and flux ratios of the ALMA cluster sample (we exclude the BCGs) with either specz or photz. This includes nearly all our band 7 A370, MACSJ1149, and MACSJ0717 sources (Tables 3, 5, and 7) and nearly all the (mostly band 6) remaining cluster sources in our Table 9.

4.1. Redshifts

Measuring the redshifts of SMGs is key to determining their physical sizes, luminosities, and stellar masses, along with accurate magnifications for the lensed sources. Where possible, we use the optical/NIR

spectroscopic redshifts (hereafter, specz) that we either obtained with the DEIMOS, LRIS, and MOSFIRE instruments on the Keck telescopes or pulled from the literature. However, a number of the SMGs are faint at optical/NIR wavelengths and hence do not have specz. For these objects, we use photz. We give all the redshifts and their sources in the tables.

We plot redshift versus observed HST F160W magnitude for the sample in Figure 10. We also include unlensed sources from the CDF-N and CDF-S fields (Cowie et al. 2017, 2018) for comparison. We note that there is a strong correlation of the redshift with the observed F160W magnitude, with fainter sources being systematically at higher redshift. This means, in turn, that the spectroscopically identified sources are strongly biased to lower redshifts, and that the highest redshift sources may be hard to obtain even photz for.




Figure 6. (*Upper three panels*) ALMA observations in MACSJ1149. The left panel shows our targeted fields at $870\ \mu\text{m}$, each with a radius of $9''$. The white circles in all panels show our detected sources from these targeted observations. The circles are of arbitrary size but roughly match this ALMA field-of-view. The center panel shows the mosaicked $1.2\ \text{mm}$ image from ALMA programs #2013.1.00999.S and #2015.1.01425.S (PI: F. Bauer; González-López et al. 2017), while the right panel shows that from ALMA program #2018.1.00035.L (PI: K. Kohno). The mosaicked images are taken from the JVO archive. There are no additional detected sources in the mosaics. (*Lower three panels*) The SCUBA-2 $450\ \mu\text{m}$ image (left), the HLS $100\ \mu\text{m}$ image (center), and the BUFFALO HST F160W image.

Different lensing cluster fields appear to have different redshift distributions. In Figure 11, we show the redshift distributions for the 5 HFFs contained in the sample. Some fields, such as MACSJ1149, are dominated by low-redshift ($z < 2$) sources, while other fields, such as A2744, have a significant number of high-redshift ($z > 4$) sources. This variance, which is a consequence of the small field sizes, emphasizes the need for multiple fields to obtain properly averaged redshift distributions.

The $450\ \mu\text{m}$ to $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux ratio may be used to make a rough estimate of the redshift, with lower ratios corresponding to higher redshift sources (e.g., Barger et al. 2022). We show the $450\ \mu\text{m}$ to $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux ratio versus redshift in Figure 12 compared with the power

law fit from Barger et al. for the CDF-N and CDF-S. High redshifts ($z > 4$) generally correspond to sources where the flux ratio is less than 2.

4.2. Magnifications

In order to compute the magnifications and intrinsic flux densities of our faint SMGs, lens models of the clusters are required. Lens models are available for the HFFs from 10 teams. We use the online tool provided by Dan Coe (<https://archive.stsci.edu/prepds/frontier/lensmodels/webtool/magnif.html>) to obtain median magnifications and standard deviations for the ALMA sources with redshifts in A370, MACSJ1149, and MACSJ0717 (Tables 3–7) to illustrate the range of magnifications. Most of the sources in the cluster samples




Figure 7. (*Upper two panels*) ALMA observations in MACSJ0717. The left panel shows the targeted fields at $870\ \mu\text{m}$ from our program and from ALMA program #2017.1.00091.S (PI: A. Pope) as circular fields with a radius of $9''$, as well as the targeted fields at $1.2\ \text{mm}$ from ALMA program #2016.1.00293 (PI: A. Pope) as square fields. The white circles in all panels show the detected sources in either band from these targeted observations. The circles are of arbitrary size but roughly match this ALMA field-of-view. The right panel shows the mosaicked $1.2\ \text{mm}$ observations from ALMA programs #2013.1.00999.S and #2015.1.01425.S (PI: F. Bauer; González-López et al. 2017). There are no additional detected sources in the mosaics. (*Lower three panels*) The SCUBA-2 $450\ \mu\text{m}$ image (left), the HLS $100\ \mu\text{m}$ image (center), and the BUFFALO HST F160W image.




Figure 8. Lensed source 5 in MACSJ0717 from Zitrin et al. (2009). The overlaid blue contours in three of the four panels show the predicted shape of the lensed source based on the positions of images 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 and their magnifications of 6.8, 7.5, 3.0, respectively. (*Upper left panel*) The SCUBA-2 850 μm image with the predicted SCUBA-2 850 μm shape overlaid. In order to match the observed 850 μm flux, we need a demagnified flux of 0.42 mJy for the source. The positions of the lensed components are shown with red squares. The 5.1 and 5.2 images are marginally blended at the SCUBA-2 850 μm FWHM. (*Upper right panel*) The 450 μm image with the predicted SCUBA-2 450 μm shape overlaid. The 5.1 and 5.2 images are resolved, but neither is detected. (*Lower left panel*) The ALMA 870 μm field containing the 5.2 image with the predicted SCUBA-2 850 μm shape overlaid. The 5.1 image is off the top of the ALMA field. (*Lower right panel*) A blow-up of the central region of the ALMA field, with the overlaid white contours showing the HFF F160W image. The large white square shows the position of the 5.2 image. The ALMA image shows two peaks, one associated with the brightest position of 5.2 and a second associated with a fainter region to the south.




Figure 9. Lensed source 5 in RXJ1347 from Zitrin et al. (2015). The overlaid blue contours in the top two panels show the predicted shape of the lensed source based on the positions of the lensed components 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 and their magnifications of 17.7, 2.2, and 18.2, respectively. The positions of the lensed components are shown with red squares in all four panels. Note that we applied a $0''.4$ astrometric correction in R.A. to the Zitrin et al. (2015) coordinates to match them to the HST image. This correction was used in all four panels. (*Upper left panel*) The SCUBA-2 850 μm image with the predicted SCUBA-2 850 μm shape overlaid. In order to match the observed 850 μm flux, we need a demagnified value of 0.4 mJy for the source. All three lensed components are blended at the SCUBA-2 850 μm FWHM. (*Upper right panel*) The SCUBA-2 450 μm image with the predicted SCUBA-2 450 μm shape overlaid. In order to match the observed 450 μm flux, we need a demagnified value of 0.66 mJy for the source. All three lensed components are still blended at the SCUBA-2 450 μm FWHM. Note that the dark region around the source in the SCUBA-2 images is a result of the Mexican hat-shape filter matching. (*Lower left panel*) The ALMA 1.2 mm image of the source from ALMA program 2018.1.00035.L (PI: K. Kohno). (*Lower right panel*) The CLASH F160W image of the source.




Figure 10. Redshift vs. observed F160W magnitude. The red squares show A370, blue MACSJ1149, green MACSJ0717, and black the remaining cluster fields. The AGN in A370 is marked with a larger open square. The black diamonds and triangles show the CDF-S and CDF-N fields, respectively. In all fields, solid symbols show speczs and open symbols show photzs. The horizontal lines show the redshifts of two of the clusters (A370 in red and MACSJ1149 in blue).

have modest magnifications in the 1.5–4 range and errors of ~ 10 –20%. However, for the very small number of high amplification sources lying close to the critical lines at $z=1$ –6, the errors can be larger. Meneghetti et al. (2017) quote an uncertainty of 10% at magnifications of 3, with a degradation to 30% at magnifications of 10. Meanwhile, based on A2744, Priewe et al. (2017) quote a larger uncertainty of 30% at magnifications of 2, with a degradation to 70% at rare high magnifications of 40.

For uniformity, we choose to use the Zitrin et al. (2009, 2013, 2014, 2015) and Zitrin (2021) models for the HFFs and the CLASH clusters MACSJ1423, MACSJ2129, and RXJ1347 (though note that we only have the one BCG in MACSJ1423, so we do not consider that cluster further). Thus, due to the lack of Zitrin models, we do not consider A2390 (for which we only have the one BCG, anyway) or A1689 further in our ALMA analysis.

We compute the source magnifications from the appropriate Zitrin models using the median in a $1''$ box surrounding the source positions; however, we note that these values are very similar to the values computed at the central positions of the sources. For the few sources that lie outside the Zitrin fields in the HFFs (no sources lie outside the Zitrin fields in the CLASH clusters), we adopt the median magnifications from the other models in the HFFs.

In Figure 13, we show the effects of demagnification. In the lower histogram, we show the distribution of observed $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux for the ALMA sources with SCUBA-2 $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux > 1.6 mJy, while in the upper histogram,




Figure 11. Redshift distributions for the five HFFs contained in the ALMA cluster sample with either speczs or photzs. Sources with $z > 6$ are shown in the $z = 5.5$ –6 bin.

we show the distribution of demagnified $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux. The median observed flux is 3.6 mJy, and the median demagnified flux is 1.5 mJy. Only three sources have magnifications > 4 . The highest magnification of 88 (in MACSJ0416; coordinate R.A. = $4^{\text{h}}16^{\text{m}}10.80^{\text{s}}$, decl.




Figure 12. SCUBA-2 450 μm to 850 μm flux ratio vs. redshift for A370 (red), MACSJ1149 (blue), MACSJ0717 (green), and the remaining cluster fields (black). Solid symbols show speczs, and open symbols show photzs. The AGN in A370 is marked with a large open square. Only sources detected above the 2σ level in the 850 μm images are shown. The power law fit (solid line) is taken from Barger et al. (2022) and is based on the CDF-N and CDF-S.




Figure 13. (*Lower histogram*) Distribution of observed 850 μm flux for the ALMA sources with SCUBA-2 850 μm flux > 1.6 mJy (black). (*Upper histogram*) Distribution of demagnified 850 μm flux (red).

$= -24^{\circ}4'47.6''$) produces the one very faint source in the demagnified histogram.

4.3. Optical/NIR Counterparts to the Faint SMGs

The detailed matching of individual faint SMGs with their UV/optical counterparts is still poorly understood and will only be resolved with large, well-studied samples, such as those presented here.

Studies of low-redshift starburst galaxies (e.g., Chary & Elbaz 2001; Le Floc'h et al. 2005; Reddy et al. 2010) have shown that fainter sources are generally less dusty. However, some recent work has suggested that fainter

SMGs are, on average, at lower redshifts (e.g., Mobasher et al. 2009; Magliocchetti et al. 2011; Hsu et al. 2016; Aravena et al. 2016, 2020; Cowie et al. 2018). In this section, we will argue that the primary evolution is in the extinction rather than in the redshift distribution.

In Figure 14, we plot for the ALMA cluster sample with redshifts the F160W to 850 μm flux ratio versus demagnified SCUBA-2 850 μm flux (left panel), and redshift versus demagnified SCUBA-2 850 μm flux (right panel). We supplement this with blank-field observations of the CDF-N and CDF-S.

There are 23 CDF-N SMGs in the footprint of the HST F160W image with $> 5\sigma$ SMA detections from Cowie et al. (2017). All of these are also detected in the SCUBA-2 850 μm image, with the lowest S/N being 7.5.

Targeted ALMA imaging in the CDF-S by Cowie et al. (2018) yields 74 ALMA detected sources in the footprint of the HST F160W image. Contiguous millimeter mosaics have also been used to generate ALMA samples in the CDF-S, but the most recent analysis of these data (Gómez-Guijarro et al. 2022) only adds 10 directly detected sources to those given in Cowie et al. (2018), reflecting the inefficiency of this procedure. 83 of the 84 sources in this combined ALMA CDF-S sample are detected above a 2σ threshold (79 above 3σ , and 76 above 4σ) in the SCUBA-2 850 μm image. Seven of the 10 additional ALMA sources are detected above the 4σ level in the SCUBA-2 image.

We add these two samples (84 CDF-S and 23 CDF-N SMGs) to Figure 14 using the measured SCUBA-2 fluxes. We measured the 1.6 μm fluxes using corrected $1''$ diameter apertures on the Hubble Legacy Fields¹ combined F160W images (G. Illingworth et al., in preparation).

In Figure 14(a), we see a trend of increasing F160W to 850 μm flux ratio from brighter to fainter SMGs. However, there is a wide spread in this ratio. Hereafter, we will refer to the sources that are extremely faint in this ratio (i.e., $< 10^{-4}$) as optical/NIR dark SMGs (horizontal line). For a source with a 2 mJy 850 μm flux, this would correspond to an F160W magnitude of 25.6. Based on the figure, such sources are more common at brighter 850 μm fluxes but continue to exist down to 850 μm fluxes fainter than 1 mJy.

In Figure 14(b), some of the lowest flux sources at are very high redshifts due to ALMA targeting of known high-redshift sources (the $z = 8.311$ source in MACSJ0416 from Tamura et al. 2019 and Bakx et al. 2020) or to possibly uncertain photzs (the $z = 5.56$ source in A2744 and the $z = 4.52$ source in MACSJ0717). For sources around 1 mJy, redshifts range from cluster redshifts to redshifts just above $z = 4$.

The median redshifts for the combined sample are $z = 2.29$, 2.00, and 2.20, and 2.49 in the 0.5–1, 1–2,

¹ <http://archive.stsci.edu/hlsps/hlf>




Figure 14. Ratio of F160W flux to SCUBA-2 850 μm flux (left) and redshift (right) vs. demagnified SCUBA-2 850 μm flux for the ALMA clusters listed in the legend with either speczs or photzs. We also show SMA sources in the CDF-N from Cowie et al. (2017) (black triangles) and ALMA sources in the CDF-S from Cowie et al. (2018) (black diamonds). In the left panel, we include two SMA-selected sources in MACSJ0717 from Hsu et al. (2017; green circles). We also show our definition of optical/NIR dark SMGs (horizontal line). Finally, we show a power law fit to the points above 0.5 mJy, $\log(\text{flux ratio}) = (-3.00 \pm 0.11) - (0.96 \pm 0.23) \log(\text{demagnified } 850 \mu\text{m flux})$, where the errors on the parameters are 1σ . In the right panel, we show the ALMA cluster sources that are not detected in the SCUBA-2 850 μm image at a nominal flux of 0.03 mJy.

2–4, and 4–8 mJy flux ranges. These median redshifts are slightly lower than the strongly-lensed galaxy sample 850 μm curve over this flux range given in Béthermin et al. (2015; Figure 3), which is based on their phenomenological model of galaxy evolution. Their curve shows a decline from about $z = 2.9$ to $z = 2.6$, with the lower fluxes being at lower redshifts. Meanwhile, their full galaxy sample 850 μm curve declines from about $z = 2.7$ to $z = 1.9$.

For the present sample above 0.5 mJy, the field galaxies have a median redshift of $z = 2.27$, while the lensed galaxies have a median redshift of $z = 2.20$. For the sources that are not in our primary ALMA band 7 sample, there may be biases due to selection effects. However, in our highly complete band 7 sample in A370, MACSJ1149, and MACSJ1707 (only two of these sources do not have redshifts, one of which lies off the F160W field), above 0.5 mJy we find a median redshift of $z = 2.00$, which is quite similar to our overall lensed galaxy median redshift of $z = 2.20$, as quoted above.

Thus, we see no strong evidence for evolution in the redshift distribution versus demagnified 850 μm flux over this flux range. This implies that the trend of increasing F160W to 850 μm flux ratio from brighter to fainter SMGs that we observe results from decreasing extinction as we move to fainter SMGs.

However, we emphasize that there is a wide range of measured F160W to 850 μm flux ratios in the faint SMG samples, including sources that are extremely dark in the optical/NIR, as was first noted by Chen et al. (2014) and Hsu et al. (2017). In Figure 15, we show an example of an optical/NIR dark, faint SMG in the A2744 field with $z_{\text{phot}} = 4.16$ (see Table 9). The source, which has a delensed 850 μm flux of 0.9 mJy, is extremely faint in

the NIR with a F160W magnitude of 27.0. This suggests that there is a population of faint SMGs that are also extremely optical/NIR faint, either because they are very dusty and/or because they are at very high redshifts (see also, e.g., Wang et al. 2019).

4.4. Estimating Redshifts from the F160W Flux

Given the observed distribution for the combined sample in Figure 10, where we plot redshift versus observed F160W magnitude, sources with F160W magnitudes $\gtrsim 25$ tend to be at $z > 4$. We can further refine the use of F160W magnitude for estimating redshifts by plotting the F160W to 850 μm flux ratio versus demagnified flux with the sources color-coded by redshift (see Figure 16). We see that, as an ensemble, the sources in the various redshift ranges are reasonably well separated and can be fit by a power law of the form (gold curve in Figure 10)

$$1 + z = 0.624(f_{160})^{-0.258}, \quad (1)$$

where f_{160} is in mJy. There does not appear to be a strong dependence on the 850 μm flux.

In Figure 17, we show the distribution of redshifts determined from Equation 1, though we caution that redshifts for individual sources may have substantial uncertainty. We find that for sources above 0.5 mJy, $20 \pm 4\%$ are at $z > 4$. For sources in the range 0.5 to 2 mJy, 16 (10, 24)% are at $z > 4$, where the numbers in parentheses are the 68% confidence range.

5. INTERPRETING THE SCUBA-2 SAMPLE

Now that we are informed by the ALMA data from the previous section, we turn to analyzing the SCUBA-2 sample. After developing the SCUBA-2 sample, one of our main goals is to determine candidate high-redshift




Figure 15. Centered in the image is an example of an optical/NIR dark, faint SMG at R.A. = $0^h14^m19.50^s$, decl. = $-30^\circ22'48.7''$ in A2744 with $z_{\text{phot}} = 4.16$ (see Table 9). It has an F160W magnitude of 27.0 and a demagnified SCUBA-2 850 μm flux of 0.9 mJy. The color image ($18''$ on a side) shows the HFF data for F105W (blue), F125W (green), and F160W (red). The white contours show the ALMA 1.2 mm image (ALMA program #2017.1.01219.S; PI: F. Bauer) offset by $1''.2$ in the horizontal direction so its optical/NIR counterpart may be more clearly seen (i.e., the ALMA source is coincident with the faint red galaxy at the center of the image). Note that the SMG in the upper right (R.A. = $0^h14^m19.12^s$, decl. = $-30^\circ22'42.2''$) has an F160W magnitude of 23.5 and a similar demagnified SCUBA-2 flux to the example source.

SMGs. This is important, because the space density at $z > 4$ remains relatively poorly constrained.

5.1. Positional Uncertainty

We first measured the accuracy of the 450 μm source positions using the SCUBA-2 cluster sample together with the CDF-N and CDF-S samples (Cowie et al. 2017, 2018). We measured the offset between the $> 4\sigma$ 450 μm source position and the nearest ALMA/SMA counterpart, if one exists within $5''$. In the well-studied A370 and MACS1149 fields, there are 18 ALMA sources detected above 4σ in the 450 μm band. Of these, there are two pairs that correspond to a single 450 μm source, one in each field. The remainder are single matches. This corresponds to a multiplicity of $11^{+26}_{-4}\%$, where the upper and lower values give the 68% confidence range.

In Figure 18, we show the distribution of offsets between the 450 μm SCUBA-2 and ALMA positions. For 80% of the sources with a counterpart, the offsets are $< 2''.5$. The mean and median offsets are both $1''.7$. This




Figure 16. Ratio of 1.6 μm flux to SCUBA-2 850 μm flux vs. demagnified SCUBA-2 850 μm flux, color-coded by redshift (gold— $z < 1$; blue— $z = 1-2$; green— $z = 2-3.5$; red— $z = 3.5-4.5$). The color-coded lines show the fitted relationship given in Equation 1 computed at the labeled redshifts.




Figure 17. Distribution of fitted redshifts (calculated using Equation 1). We use shading to denote which sources already have speczs (red), photzs (black), and neither (open).

is very similar to the offsets measured in Barger et al. (2022) between the $> 4\sigma$ 450 μm source position and the nearest 20 cm counterpart.

Since many of the SCUBA-2 cluster sample do not have $> 4\sigma$ 450 μm detections, we also need the uncertainties for the 850 μm positions. These scale roughly with the PSF, and Cowie et al. (2017) found that 96% of the $> 4\sigma$ 850 μm source positions are within $4''$ of the nearest 20 cm counterpart in the CDF-N. We take this as the uncertainty in the 850 μm positions.

5.2. Central Sample

Only the central members of the SCUBA-2 cluster sample lie in regions where lensing magnifications are




Figure 18. Distribution of offsets between $450\ \mu\text{m}$ source position and nearest ALMA/SMA counterpart, if there is one within $5''$, for sources with $> 4\sigma$ $450\ \mu\text{m}$ detections in either the SCUBA-2 cluster sample or the CDF-N and CDF-S samples. Only sources with $450\ \mu\text{m}$ rms errors $< 3\ \text{mJy}$ are included.

significant. In studying the fainter SMGs, we therefore restrict to sources within a $1'.75$ radius from the cluster center, where amplifications may be > 2 . Excluding $850\ \mu\text{m}$ sources corresponding to BCGs and pairs (see Table 2), this provides a sample of 111 SMGs.

In Figure 19, we plot the observed $450\ \mu\text{m}$ flux versus the observed $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux for this sample. 16 (14%) have measured ALMA counterparts (red squares), and 39 have $> 4\sigma$ detections at $450\ \mu\text{m}$. The ALMA detected sources appear to be well representative of this sample, so we can assume that information derived in Section 4 can be applied here.

We now again exclude A1689 and A2390 and refer to the remaining sample as *our central $850\ \mu\text{m}$ sample*. Sources with modest magnifications (we take this to mean < 4.2) are relatively insensitive to $4''$ positional changes, but sources with higher magnifications can be much more uncertain. In both cases, the redshift is the primary source of uncertainty, but this uncertainty is again less for the sources with modest magnifications. For the sources in these fields, we computed the magnification at the SCUBA-2 $850\ \mu\text{m}$ position for $z = 2$ and estimated the uncertainty by considering a range from $z = 1-4$. To illustrate how well this works, we show in Figure 20 for A370 and MACSJ1149 these magnifications versus magnifications computed at the ALMA positions and accurate redshifts. Within the magnification uncertainties corresponding to the adopted $z = 1-4$ range, there is broad agreement.

5.3. 450 to 850 Micron Ranges




Figure 19. Observed $450\ \mu\text{m}$ flux vs. observed $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux for SMGs in the central regions ($< 1'.75$ radius) of the SCUBA-2 $850\ \mu\text{m}$ cluster sample, after excluding BCGs and pairs. The measured $450\ \mu\text{m}$ fluxes are shown with 1σ errors. If the $450\ \mu\text{m}$ flux is negative, then the source is shown at a nominal $450\ \mu\text{m}$ flux of $2.2\ \text{mJy}$. SMGs with ALMA counterparts are shown with red large squares.




Figure 20. Magnification computed at the SCUBA-2 $850\ \mu\text{m}$ position for $z = 2$ (squares) and for a range from $z = 1$ to $z = 4$ (error bars) vs. magnification computed at the ALMA position and accurate redshift for sources from A370 and MACSJ1149 with high enough $850\ \mu\text{m}$ fluxes to appear in Table 2.




Figure 21. $450\ \mu\text{m}$ to $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux ratio vs. $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux. (Top two panels) Central sample divided by magnification: > 4.2 for $z = 2$ (top) and < 4.2 for $z = 2$ (middle). The uncertainties show a range from $z = 1$ – 4 . (Bottom panel) Full sample outside a $2\frac{1}{2}$ radius from the cluster center, where we do not apply a magnification correction. In all panels, sources with ALMA identifications are shown in red.

In the top two panels of Figure 21, we show the $450\ \mu\text{m}$ to $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux ratio for the central sample versus the demagnified $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux, with the magnification uncertainties corresponding to the adopted $z = 1$ – 4 range. We use two panels to split the SMGs into those with high magnifications (here > 4.2 for $z = 2$), where the




Figure 22. Histogram of the $450\ \mu\text{m}$ to $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux ratio for the outer sample (black), the central sample with moderate magnifications (red), and the central sample with high magnifications (green).

uncertainties are large, and those with modest magnifications, where the uncertainties are smaller.

In the bottom panel, we show the sample outside a $2\frac{1}{2}$ radius from the cluster center (again excluding BCGs and close pairs, but using all of the clusters), where we expect the magnification to be near one. Here we use the observed $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux.

These three samples have very similar distributions of $450\ \mu\text{m}$ to $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux ratios, as we show in Figure 22. A Mann-Whitney test does not show a significant difference between the three samples. If, as we have argued, this flux ratio is a good redshift indicator, then the redshift distribution of this large $850\ \mu\text{m}$ sample is invariant as a function of the $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux over the 0.5 – 10 mJy flux range. This is consistent with the smaller ALMA sample with direct redshift measurements (see Figure 14).

5.4. Candidate High-Redshift SMGs

We restrict to the $> 5\sigma$ $850\ \mu\text{m}$ full cluster sample, after including confusion noise, to improve the fidelity of our candidate high-redshift SMG selection. We determine the sources in this sample that have $450\ \mu\text{m}$ to $850\ \mu\text{m}$ flux ratios < 2 , which Barger et al. (2022) give as a criterion to select candidate high-redshift SMGs with $z > 4$. We list these candidates, which make up 21% of the $> 5\sigma$ $850\ \mu\text{m}$ full cluster sample, in Table 10. At present, only one has a measured ALMA counterpart (source 2 in MACSJ1149; see Table 5). This source does not have a specz or a photz.

The 55 SMGs in Table 10 are quite bright, with $850\ \mu\text{m}$ fluxes from 2.3 mJy to 12.1 mJy and a median flux of 4.3 mJy. They should be straightforward targets for future interferometric observations. Seven lie within

the central high-magnification regions (< 1.75 radius) of clusters observable with ALMA, and these represent the most interesting targets.

6. SUMMARY

In this paper, we presented deep SCUBA-2 450 μm and 850 μm imaging of ten strong lensing clusters. We constructed a catalog of 404 sources with 850 μm fluxes detected above 4σ that lie within a radius of 4.5 from the cluster centers. We also presented catalogs of $> 4.5\sigma$ ALMA band 6 (1.2 mm) and band 7 (870 μm) detections from our observations and from the archive, for which we gave, where available, spectroscopic or photometric redshifts from new Keck observations or from the literature. We supplemented our cluster lensed ALMA sample with a CDF-S ALMA sample and a CDF-N SMA sample from previous work to aid with interpretation. Our main results based on these samples are as follows:

- We noted a correlation between redshift and observed F160W magnitude, with fainter sources being at higher redshifts. Higher redshift sources may therefore be hard to get even photometric redshifts for.
- We found that different cluster fields have different redshift distributions, emphasizing the need for observations of multiple fields to obtain properly averaged redshift distributions.
- We confirmed the use of the 450 μm to 850 μm flux ratio for estimating redshifts, with $z > 4$ generally corresponding to a flux ratio < 2 .
- We used publicly available lens models for the clusters to determine magnifications, most of which are in the 1.5–4 range with modest errors of 10–20%, though there are a very small number of high amplification sources where the errors can be large.
- Utilizing both our cluster lensed sample and the CDF samples, we found a trend of increasing F160W to 850 μm flux ratio from brighter to fainter SMGs.
- We found no evidence that the fainter SMGs, which we probe primarily through our cluster lensed sample, have a different redshift distribution than the brighter SMGs, which we probe primarily through the CDF samples.
- Since we did not find a change in the redshift distribution as a function of the demagnified 850 μm flux, we concluded that the observed trend in the F160W to 850 μm flux ratio as a function of the demagnified 850 μm flux results from decreasing extinction in the fainter SMGs.
- We caution, however, that there is wide spread in the F160W to 850 μm flux ratio relation. For example, although optical/NIR dark SMGs, which we defined as being extremely faint in the F160W to 850 μm flux ratio (i.e., $< 10^{-4}$), are more common at brighter 850 μm fluxes, we found that they continue to exist down to 850 μm fluxes fainter than 1 mJy.

- We argued that roughly 20% of the SMGs are at $z > 4$, independent of submillimeter flux.

Finally, informed by the ALMA results, we separately analyzed the SCUBA-2 cluster sample and identified 55 $z > 4$ candidates selected on the basis of the 450 μm to 850 μm flux ratio. These are bright at 850 μm and hence good targets for future interferometric observations, including seven that lie in the central high magnification regions of clusters that are observable with ALMA.

We thank the anonymous referee for constructive comments that helped us to improve the manuscript. We gratefully acknowledge support for this research from NASA grants NNX17AF45G and 80NSSC22K0483 (L. L. C.), the William F. Vilas Estate (A. J. B.), a Kellett Mid-Career Award and a WARF Named Professorship from the University of Wisconsin-Madison Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education with funding from the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (A. J. B.), the Millennium Science Initiative Program – ICN12_009 (F. E. B.), CATA-Basal – FB210003 (F. E. B.), and FONDECYT Regular – 1190818 (F. E. B.) and 1200495 (F. E. B., C. O.), the Ministry of Science and Technology of Taiwan (MOST 1092112-M-001-016-MY3) (C.-C. C.), WSGC Graduate and Professional Research Fellowships (L. H. J., A. J. T.), and a Sigma Xi Grant in Aid of Research (A. J. T.).

This work utilizes gravitational lensing models produced by PIs Bradač, Natarajan & Kneib (CATS), Merten & Zitrin, Sharon, Williams, Keeton, Bernstein and Diego, and the GLAFIC group. This lens modeling was partially funded by the HST Frontier Fields program conducted by STScI. STScI is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc. under NASA contract NAS 5-26555. The lens models were obtained from the Mikulski Archive for Space Telescopes (MAST).

The National Radio Astronomy Observatory is a facility of the National Science Foundation operated under cooperative agreement by Associated Universities, Inc. This paper makes use of the following ALMA data: ADS/JAO.ALMA #2013.1.00999.S, ADS/JAO.ALMA #2015.1.01425.S, ADS/JAO.ALMA #2016.1.00293.S, ADS/JAO.ALMA #2017.1.00091.S, ADS/JAO.ALMA #2017.1.00341.S, ADS/JAO.ALMA #2017.1.01219.S, ADS/JAO.ALMA #2018.1.00003.S, and ADS/JAO.ALMA #2018.1.00035.L. ALMA is a partnership of ESO (representing its member states), NSF (USA), and NINS (Japan), together with NRC (Canada), MOST and ASIAA (Taiwan), and KASI (Republic of Korea), in cooperation with the Republic of

Chile. The Joint ALMA Observatory is operated by ESO, AUI/NRAO, and NAOJ.

The James Clerk Maxwell Telescope is operated by the East Asian Observatory on behalf of The National Astronomical Observatory of Japan, Academia Sinica Institute of Astronomy and Astrophysics, the Korea Astronomy and Space Science Institute, the National Astronomical Observatories of China and the Chinese Academy of Sciences (grant No. XDB09000000), with additional funding support from the Science and Technology Facilities Council of the United Kingdom and

participating universities in the United Kingdom and Canada.

The W. M. Keck Observatory is operated as a scientific partnership among the California Institute of Technology, the University of California, and NASA, and was made possible by the generous financial support of the W. M. Keck Foundation.

We wish to recognize and acknowledge the very significant cultural role and reverence that the summit of Maunakea has always had within the indigenous Hawaiian community. We are most fortunate to have the opportunity to conduct observations from this mountain.

Facilities: ALMA, JCMT, KeckI, KeckII

REFERENCES

- Aravena, M., Boogaard, L., González-López, J., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 901, 79
- Aravena, M., Decarli, R., Walter, F., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 833, 68
- Bakx, T. J. L. C., Tamura, Y., Hashimoto, T., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 493, 4294
- Barger, A. J., Cowie, L. L., Blair, A. H., & Jones, L. H.. 2022, *ApJ*, 934, 56
- Barger, A. J., Cowie, L. L., Chen, C.-C., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 784, 9
- Barger, A. J., Cowie, L. L., Sanders, D. B., et al. 1998, *Nature*, 394, 248
- Barger, A. J., Cowie, L. L., Smail, I., et al. 1999, 117, 2656
- Barger, A. J., Wang, W.-H., Cowie, L. L., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 761, 89
- Béthermin, M., De Breuck, C., Sargent, M., & Daddi, E. 2015, *A&A*, 576, L9
- Bradač, M., Huang, K.-H., Fontana, A., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 489, 99
- Bradač, M., Schrabback, T., Erben, T., et al. 2008, *ApJ*, 681, 187
- Casey, C. M., Chen, C.-C., Cowie, L. L., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 436, 1919
- Casey, C. M., Narayanan, D., & Cooray, A., 2014, *PhR*, 541, 45
- Castellano, M., Amorín, R., Merlin, E., et al. 2016, *A&A*, 590, 31
- Chapin, E. L., Berry, D. S., Gibb, A. G., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 430, 2545
- Chary, R., & Elbaz, D. 2001, *ApJ*, 556, 562
- Chen, C.-C., Cowie, L. L., Barger, A. J., et al. 2013a, *ApJ*, 762, 81
- Chen, C.-C., Cowie, L. L., Barger, A. J., et al. 2013b, *ApJ*, 776, 131
- Chen, C.-C., Cowie, L. L., Barger, A. J., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 789, 12
- Colless, M., Peterson, B. A., Jackson, C., et al. 2003, *arXiv:astro-ph/0306581*
- Cowie, L. L., Barger, A. J., Hsu, L.-Y., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 837, 139
- Cowie, L. L., González-López, J., Barger, A. J., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 865, 106
- Di Criscienzo, M., Merlin, E., Castellano, M., et al. 2017, *A&A*, 607, A30
- Dole, H., Lagache, G., Puget, J.-L., et al. 2006, *A&A*, 451, 417
- Eales, S., Dunne, L., Clements, D., et al. 2010, *PASP*, 122, 499
- Eales, S., Lilly, S., Gear, W., et al. 1999, *ApJ*, 515, 518
- Edge, A. C., Oonk, J. B. R., Mittal, R., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 518, L47
- Egami, E., Rex, M., Rawle, T. D., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 518, L12
- Fixsen, D. J., Dwek, E., Mather, J. C., et al. 1998, *ApJ*, 508, 123
- Gómez-Guijarro, C., Elbaz, D., Xiao, M., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 658, 43
- González-López, J., Bauer, F. E., Romero-Cañizales, C., et al. 2017, 597, A41
- Hoag, A., Huang, K.-H., Treu, T., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 831, 182
- Hodge, J. A., Karim, A., Smail, I., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 768, 91
- Holland, W. S., Bintley, D., Chapin, E. L., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 430, 2513
- Holland, W. S., Robson, E. I., Gear, W. K., et al. 1999, *MNRAS*, 303, 659
- Hsu, L.-Y., Cowie, L. L., Barger, A. J., & Wang, W.-H. 2017, *ApJ*, 850, 189
- Hsu, L.-Y., Cowie, L. L., Chen, C.-C., Barger, A. J., & Wang, W.-H. 2016, *ApJ*, 829, 25
- Hughes, D. H., Serjeant, S., Dunlop, J., et al. 1998, *Nature*, 394, 241
- Ivison, R. J., Smail, I., Le Borgne, J.-F., et al. 1998, *MNRAS*, 298, 583
- Jenness, T., Berry, D., Chapin, E., et al. 2011, in *ASP Conf. Ser.* 442, *Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XX*, ed. I. N. Evans, A. Accomazzi, D. J. Mink, & A. H. Rots (San Francisco, CA: ASP), 281
- Kroupa, P. 2001, *MNRAS*, 322, 231
- Laporte, N., Bauer, F. E., Troncoso-Iribarren, P., et al. 2017, *A&A*, 604, A132
- Le Floc'h, E., Papovich, C., Dole, H., et al. 2005, *ApJ*, 632, 169
- Lim, C.-F., Wang, W.-H., Smail, I., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 889, 80
- Lin, Y.-T., Huang, H.-J., & Chen, Y.-C. 2018, *AJ*, 155, 188
- Lotz, J. M., Koekemoer, A., Coe, D., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 837, 97
- Magliocchetti, M., Santini, P., Rodighiero, G., et al. 2011, *MNRAS*, 416, 1105
- Meneghetti, M., Natarajan, P., Coe, D., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 472, 3177
- Merlin, E., Amorín, R., Castellano, M., et al. 2016, *A&A*, 590, 30
- Mobasher, B., Dahlen, T., Hopkins, A. et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 690, 1074
- Molino, A., Benítez, N., Ascaso, B., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 470, 95
- Muñoz Arancibia, A. M., González-López, J., Ibar, E., et al. 2022, *A&A*, submitted (arXiv:2203.06195)
- Oliver, S. J., Bock, J., Altieri, B., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 424, 1614
- Pope, A., Montaña, A., Battisti, A., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 838, 137
- Postman, M., Coe, D., Benítez, N., et al. 2012, *ApJS*, 199, 25
- Priewe, J., Williams, L. L. R., Lisenborgs, J., Coe, D., & Rodney, S. A. 2017, *MNRAS*, 465, 1030
- Puget, J.-L., Abergel, A., Bernard, J.-P., et al. 1996, *A&A*, 308, L5
- Rawle, T. D., Altieri, B., Egami, E., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 459, 1626
- Reddy, N. A., Erb, D. K., Pettini, M., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 712, 1070
- Serjeant, S., et al. 2003, *MNRAS*, 344, 887
- Simpson, J. M., Smail, I., Swinbank, A. M., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 799, 81
- Smail, I., Ivison, R. J., Blain, A. W. 1997, *ApJL*, 490, L5
- Smith, G. P., Haines, C. P., Pereira, M. J., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 518, L18
- Soucail, G., Mellier, Y., Fort, B., Mathez, G., & Cailloux, M. 1988, *A&A*, 191, L19
- Soucail, G., Kneib, J. P., Bézecourt, J., et al. 1999, *A&A*, 343, L70
- Spilker, J. S., Marrone, D. P., Aravena, M., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 826, 112
- Steinhardt, C. L., Jauzac, M., Acebron, A., et al. 2020, *ApJS*, 247, 64
- Tamura, Y., Mawatari, K., Hashimoto, T., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 874, 27

- Treu, T., Schmidt, K. B., Brammer, G. B., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 812, 114
- Umetsu, K., Medezinski, E., Nonino, M., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 795, 1634
- Wang, T., Schreiber, C., Elbaz, D., et al. 2019, *Natur*, 572, 211
- Wang, W.-H., Lin, W.-C., Lim, C.-F., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 850, 37
- Watson, D., Christensen, L., Knudsen, K. K., et al. 2015, *Natur*, 519, 327
- Wong, Y. H. V., Wang, P., Hasimoto, T., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 929, 161
- Zavala, J. A., Casey, C. M., Manning, S. M., et al. 2021, *ApJ*, 909, 165
- Zitrin, A. 2021, *ApJ*, 919, 54
- Zitrin, A., Broadhurst, T., Rephaeli, Y., & Sadeh, S. 2009, *ApJL*, 707, L102
- Zitrin, A., Fabris, A., Merten, J., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 801, 44
- Zitrin, A., Meneghetti, M., Umetsu, K. et al. 2013, *ApJL*, 762, L30
- Zitrin, A., Zheng, W., Broadhurst, T., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 793, L12

Table 2. SCUBA-2 850 μm Sample ($> 4\sigma$)

No. and Name	R.A.	Decl.	f_{850}	Error	S/N	f_{450}	Error	S/N	f_{450}/f_{850}	Error	Offset
	J2000.0	J2000.0	(mJy)			(mJy)					(arcmin)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
1 SMM131126-11906	13 11 26.3	-1 19 06.3	12.0	0.5	24.0	33.9	2.6	12.0	2.73	0.23	1.2
2 SMM131121-11951	13 11 21.8	-1 19 51.3	11.0	0.5	21.0	14.7	2.7	5.3	1.31	0.25	1.7
3 SMM131131-11804	13 11 31.8	-1 18 04.3	9.5	0.6	17.0	38.3	2.8	13.0	3.99	0.37	2.2
4 SMM131117-12239	13 11 17.5	-1 22 39.3	7.6	0.6	12.0	18.3	3.7	4.8	2.39	0.52	3.7
5 SMM131121-12108	13 11 21.8	-1 21 08.3	6.2	0.5	11.0	18.2	2.8	6.4	2.92	0.52	1.9
6 SMM131118-12213	13 11 18.6	-1 22 13.3	5.4	0.6	8.9	15.3	3.6	4.2	2.80	0.73	3.2
7 SMM131119-12151	13 11 19.2	-1 21 51.3	5.4	0.6	9.1	9.5	3.4	2.7	1.75	0.66	2.9
8 SMM131129-12048	13 11 29.2	-1 20 48.4	5.1	0.5	10.0	14.5	2.3	6.2	2.84	0.52	0.6
9 SMM131138-11636	13 11 38.0	-1 16 36.3	4.8	0.7	7.2	8.1	3.3	2.4	1.68	0.73	4.3
10 SMM131128-12224	13 11 28.4	-1 22 24.3	4.7	0.5	8.8	21.5	2.9	7.3	4.50	0.79	2.2
11 SMM131113-11858	13 11 13.2	-1 18 58.3	4.7	0.6	7.9	14.0	3.6	3.8	2.95	0.85	4.0
12 SMM131134-12017	13 11 34.8	-1 20 17.3	4.7	0.5	9.0	11.2	2.5	4.4	2.38	0.59	1.5
13 SMM131114-12229	13 11 14.7	-1 22 29.4	4.4	0.6	7.4	15.1	3.6	4.1	3.43	0.95	4.1
14 SMM131126-12317	13 11 26.0	-1 23 17.4	4.3	0.6	7.7	23.6	3.1	7.4	5.48	1.02	3.1
15 SMM131127-11847	13 11 27.1	-1 18 47.3	4.2	0.5	8.2	11.3	2.7	4.1	2.67	0.71	1.4
16 SMM131119-12257	13 11 19.8	-1 22 57.3	4.2	0.6	7.0	13.1	3.6	3.5	3.10	0.97	3.5
17 SMM131123-12046	13 11 23.9	-1 20 46.3	4.1	0.5	8.1	9.8	2.5	3.8	2.37	0.67	1.3
18 SMM131133-11712	13 11 33.3	-1 17 12.3	3.8	0.6	6.3	18.0	3.0	5.9	4.70	1.08	3.1
19 SMM131116-12307	13 11 16.2	-1 23 07.3	3.8	0.6	6.3	11.6	3.7	3.1	3.06	1.09	4.2
20 SMM131141-11824	13 11 41.1	-1 18 24.3	3.7	0.7	5.3	9.3	3.8	2.4	2.50	1.12	3.6
21 SMM131130-11911	13 11 30.8	-1 19 11.3	3.6	0.5	7.1	14.6	2.4	5.9	4.04	0.88	1.1
22 SMM131128-11816	13 11 28.1	-1 18 16.4	3.5	0.5	6.6	13.6	2.9	4.6	3.79	0.99	1.9
23 SMM131133-12023	13 11 33.8	-1 20 23.3	3.5	0.5	6.9	9.6	2.4	3.9	2.71	0.78	1.3
24 SMM131132-11952	13 11 32.2	-1 19 52.3	3.5	0.5	6.9	3.6	2.3	1.5	1.02	0.69	1.0
25 SMM131121-11946	13 11 21.0	-1 19 46.3	3.3	0.5	6.3	15.0	2.7	5.3	4.50 PAIR	1.09	1.9
26 SMM131113-12115	13 11 13.2	-1 21 15.3	3.3	0.8	5.7	6.8	3.4	1.9	2.02	1.09	4.0
27 SMM131124-12212	13 11 24.1	-1 22 12.4	3.2	0.6	5.7	8.0	3.0	2.6	2.50	1.04	2.3
28 SMM131131-12409	13 11 31.9	-1 24 09.4	3.1	0.6	5.3	15.3	3.4	4.4	4.83	1.41	4.0
29 SMM131118-12326	13 11 18.8	-1 23 26.3	3.0	0.6	5.1	24.6	3.6	6.6	8.06	1.98	4.0
30 SMM131132-11821	13 11 32.7	-1 18 21.4	2.8	0.6	5.0	5.4	2.7	1.9	1.88	1.03	2.0
31 SMM131139-12034	13 11 39.0	-1 20 34.3	2.8	0.6	4.9	9.5	2.8	3.3	3.38	1.23	2.5
32 SMM131133-12424	13 11 33.5	-1 24 24.3	2.7	0.6	4.4	11.9	3.7	3.2	4.29	1.64	4.3
33 SMM131134-11804	13 11 34.4	-1 18 04.3	2.7	0.6	4.5	10.0	2.9	3.3	3.60	1.34	2.6
34 SMM131134-11904	13 11 34.0	-1 19 04.3	2.7	0.5	5.0	11.3	2.6	4.2	4.10	1.27	1.7
35 SMM131121-11634	13 11 21.8	-1 16 34.4	2.7	0.7	4.0	0.4	4.2	0.1	0.13	1.57	4.0
36 SMM131128-11907	13 11 28.0	-1 19 07.4	2.6	0.5	5.3	0.9	2.5	0.4	0.34	0.95	1.1
37 SMM131129-11818	13 11 29.3	-1 18 18.3	2.6	0.5	4.8	5.2	2.7	1.8	2.00	1.14	1.8
38 SMM131134-11721	13 11 34.5	-1 17 21.4	2.5	0.6	4.1	8.7	3.0	2.8	3.39	1.45	3.1
39 SMM131122-11746	13 11 22.8	-1 17 46.4	2.5	0.6	4.0	5.2	3.7	1.3	2.05	1.55	2.7
40 SMM131117-12234	13 11 17.8	-1 22 34.4	2.4	0.6	4.0	17.3	3.7	4.6	6.97 PAIR	2.28	3.6
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

NOTE— The columns are (1) number and name, (2) and (3) SCUBA-2 850 μm R.A. and decl., (4), (5), and (6) SCUBA-2 850 μm flux, error (we have included a confusion noise of 0.33 mJy added in quadrature to the white noise here), and S/N, (7), (8), and (9) SCUBA-2 450 μm flux, error, and S/N, (10) and (11) SCUBA-2 450 μm to 850 μm flux ratio and error, and (12) offset from the cluster center in arcmin. In Column (10), we also indicate whether the source is part of a close pair (labeled “PAIR”) or corresponds to the brightest cluster galaxy (labeled “BCG”). (This table is available in its entirety in machine-readable form.)

Table 3. A370 Band 7 (870 μm) ALMA $> 4.5\sigma$

No. and Name	R.A.	Decl.	Pk Flux	Error	S/N	Tot Flux	SCUBA-2 $f_{850} : f_{450}$	m160	z	Median Magnif.	σ	Zitrin Magnif.
	J2000.0	J2000.0	(mJy)			(mJy)	(mJy)					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1 ALMA023951–13559	2 39 51.94	-1 35 59.0	11.00	0.35	30.8	14.3	19.0 : 37.0	22.7	2.808	3.93	0.52	...
2 ALMA023951–13558	2 39 51.80	-1 35 58.5	6.16	0.37	16.4	8.0	18.0 : 40.0	20.7	2.806 ^a	3.61	0.46	...
3 ALMA023957–13453	2 39 57.58	-1 34 53.7	4.05	0.24	16.6	4.2	4.1 : 10.0	23.5	2.04	2.10	0.41	2.44
4 ALMA023956–13426	2 39 56.57	-1 34 26.3	5.25	0.25	20.4	6.2	6.8 : 37.0	19.5	1.062 ^a	2.87	1.10	2.78
5 ALMA023949–13551	2 39 49.12	-1 35 51.8	1.55	0.24	6.3	1.9	1.8 : 4.6	22.8	2.507	1.87	0.46	3.09
6 ALMA023950–13542	2 39 50.19	-1 35 42.1	2.49	0.24	10.0	2.6	1.2 : 9.4	23.5	2.01	2.48	2.96	2.12
7 ALMA023947–13517	2 39 47.11	-1 35 17.7	2.20	0.39	5.5	2.1	2.4 : 7.0	23.2	3.472	1.56	0.38	1.65
8 ALMA023958–13424	2 39 58.16	-1 34 24.7	1.58	0.25	6.1	2.1	0.6 : 11.0	20.7	1.256	1.33	0.27	...
9 ALMA023946–13332	2 39 46.88	-1 33 32.8	2.43	0.27	8.7	2.6	2.2 : 13.0	21.8	2.487	1.55	0.29	1.00
10 ALMA023954–13320	2 39 54.24	-1 33 20.7	2.04	0.24	8.3	3.5	2.4 : 13.0	21.1	1.523	3.17	0.97	...

NOTE— The columns are (1) number and name, (2) and (3) ALMA R.A. and decl., (4), (5), and (6) ALMA peak flux, error, and S/N, (7) ALMA 2'' aperture flux (except for blended source numbers 1 and 2, which are peak flux times 1.3), (8) SCUBA-2 850 μm and 450 μm fluxes, (9) m160 magnitude, (10) redshift (speczs have three digits after the decimal point, and photzs have two), (11) and (12) median magnification and standard deviation for all the models submitted by the HFF teams, as obtained from the online tool provided by Dan Coe (<https://archive.stsci.edu/prepds/frontier/lensmodels/webtool/magnif.html>), and (13) adopted Zitrin magnification. Note that all speczs are from our Keck observations. Sources 1 and 2 also had previous speczs from Ivison et al. (1998), and source 4 had a previous specz from Barger et al. (1999) and Soucail et al. (1999). The m160 magnitudes and photzs are from Bradač et al. (2019). ^aType 2 AGN.

Table 4. A370 Band 6 (1.2 mm) ALMA $> 4.5\sigma$

No. and Name	R.A.	Decl.	Pk Flux	Error	S/N	SCUBA-2 $f_{850} : f_{450}$	m160	z	Median Magnif.	σ	Zitrin Magnif.
	J2000.0	J2000.0	(mJy)			(mJy)					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
1 ALMA023956–13426 ^b	2 39 56.57	-1 34 26.3	1.50	0.06	23.4	6.8 : 37.0	19.5	1.062 ^a	2.87	1.10	2.78
2 ALMA023950–13542 ^b	2 39 50.19	-1 35 42.1	0.92	0.18	5.2	1.2 : 9.4	23.5	2.01	2.48	2.96	2.12
3 ALMA023958–13424 ^b	2 39 58.14	-1 34 24.6	0.55	0.12	4.5	0.6 : 11.0	20.7	1.256	1.33	0.27	...

NOTE— The columns are (1) number and name, (2) and (3) ALMA R.A. and decl., (4), (5), and (6) ALMA peak flux, error, and S/N, (7) SCUBA-2 850 μm and 450 μm fluxes, (8) m160 magnitude, (9) redshift (speczs have three digits after the decimal point, and photzs have two), (10) and (11) median magnification and standard deviation for all the models submitted by the HFF teams, as obtained from the online tool provided by Dan Coe (<https://archive.stsci.edu/prepds/frontier/lensmodels/webtool/magnif.html>), and (12) adopted Zitrin magnification. Note that both speczs are from our Keck observations. The m160 magnitudes and photz are from Bradač et al. (2019). ^aType 2 AGN. ^bThis source is also in the band 7 sample (see Table 3).

Table 5. MACSJ1149.5+2223 Band 7 (870 μm) ALMA $> 4.5\sigma$

No. and Name	R.A.	Decl.	Pk Flux	Error	S/N	Tot Flux	SCUBA-2 $f_{850} : f_{450}$	m160	z	Median Magnif.	σ	Zitrin Magnif.
	J2000.0	J2000.0	(mJy)			(mJy)	(mJy)					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1 ALMA014941-222316	11 49 41.48	22 23 16.1	0.94	0.14	6.8	1.3	1.4 : 5.0	24.2	2.52	1.97	0.48	2.04
2 ALMA014943-222400	11 49 43.64	22 24 0.39	1.08	0.19	5.7	1.0	2.2 : 1.9	...	...	...	...	...
3 ALMA014933-222226	11 49 33.87	22 22 26.9	0.85	0.15	5.5	1.0	1.4 : 6.1	17.4	0.554	1.00	0.02	...
4 ALMA014942-222339	11 49 42.37	22 23 39.5	0.60	0.13	4.6	0.6	1.3 : 6.4	21.1	1.632	1.43	0.21	...
5 ALMA014941-222436	11 49 41.46	22 24 36.1	1.49	0.17	9.0	2.0	1.5 : 8.5	22.9	1.720	1.20	0.14	1.29
6 ALMA014930-222427	11 49 30.67	22 24 27.7	2.57	0.15	17.0	4.3	4.6 : 15.0	20.4	1.489	1.68	0.29	2.03
7 ALMA014937-222430	11 49 37.28	22 24 30.3	0.67	0.14	4.7	0.2	2.4 : 6.0	20.1	1.020	1.53	0.16	1.60
8 ALMA014936-222424	11 49 36.09	22 24 24.2	0.91	0.11	8.3	1.6	1.5 : 5.4	20.5	1.603	3.07	0.72	3.42
9 ALMA014934-222445	11 49 34.42	22 24 45.3	0.81	0.16	5.1	1.3	1.8 : 5.3	20.1	0.976	3.89	2.11	2.72
10 ALMA014935-222231	11 49 35.46	22 22 31.9	1.02	0.11	9.2	1.2	1.8 : 5.5	22.0	...	...	...	...
11 ALMA014930-222253	11 49 30.82	22 22 53.7	1.26	0.15	8.5	1.2	1.4 : 8.3	18.6	0.31	1.05	0.11	1.11
12 ALMA014931-222252	11 49 31.30	22 22 52.2	0.62	0.13	4.9	1.2	1.3 : 8.8	19.0	0.540	1.01	0.06	1.16

NOTE— The columns are as in Table 3. Note that all of the specz are from our Keck observations, except for sources 7 and 12, which are from the HST grism reductions of Rawle et al. (2016). The m160 magnitudes and photz are from the ASTRODEEP catalog of Di Criscienzo et al. (2017), except for sources 4 and 5, where we measured corrected 2'' diameter m160 magnitudes from the BUFFALO F160W image. Source 2 lies outside the BUFFALO image, but it is extremely faint in the Subaru/Suprime-Cam z' image (Umetsu et al. 2014).

Table 6. MACSJ1149.5+2223 Band 6 (1.2 mm) ALMA $> 4.5\sigma$

No. and Name	R.A.	Decl.	Pk Flux	Error	S/N	SCUBA-2 $f_{850} : f_{450}$	m160	z	Median Magnif.	σ	Zitrin Magnif.
	J2000.0	J2000.0	(mJy)			(mJy)					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
1 ALMA014941-222436 ^a	11 49 41.46	22 24 36.2	0.51	0.06	7.8	1.4 : 7.5	22.9	1.720	1.20	0.14	1.29
2 ALMA014926-222455	11 49 26.57	22 24 55.7	3.05	0.07	42.6	6.8 : 12.0	...	...	...	...	...
3 ALMA014930-222427 ^a	11 49 30.69	22 24 27.7	0.55	0.07	7.5	4.7 : 15.0	20.4	1.489	1.68	0.29	2.03
4 ALMA014933-222552	11 49 33.33	22 25 52.2	1.89	0.07	26.7	3.7 : 8.9	...	...	...	...	...
5 ALMA014946-222542	11 49 46.82	22 25 42.1	1.25	0.08	16.1	6.0 : 20.0	...	...	...	...	...
6 ALMA014945-222232	11 49 45.01	22 22 32.6	0.87	0.09	9.2	2.9 : 8.2	...	...	...	...	...
7 ALMA014927-222402	11 49 27.52	22 24 2.80	0.53	0.07	7.8	2.3 : 7.5	21.1	...	...	...	...
8 ALMA014928-222300	11 49 28.07	22 23 0.69	0.82	0.08	10.5	3.0 : 8.4	25.2	...	...	...	...

NOTE— The columns are as in Table 4. Note that both specz are from our Keck observations. The m160 magnitudes are from the ASTRODEEP catalog of Di Criscienzo et al. (2017), except for source 1, where we measured the corrected 2'' diameter m160 magnitude from the BUFFALO F160W image. ^aThis source is also in the band 7 sample (see Table 5).

Table 7. MACSJ0717.5+3745 Band 7 (870 μm) ALMA $> 4.5\sigma$

No. and Name	R.A.	Decl.	Pk Flux	Error	S/N	SCUBA-2 $f_{850} : f_{450}$	m160	z	Median Magnif.	σ	Zitrin Magnif.
	J2000.0	J2000.0	(mJy)			(mJy)					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
1 ALMA071730-374433	7 17 30.69	37 44 33.0	0.52	0.09	6.0	2.8 : 2.7	23.7	4.52	6.94	2.02	8.71

NOTE— The columns are as in Table 4. The m160 magnitude and photz are from the ASTRODEEP catalog of Di Criscienzo et al. (2017). We do not include the Bradač models in the median, as they give a very high magnification.

Table 8. MACSJ0717.5+3745 Band 6 (1.2 mm) ALMA $> 4.5\sigma$

No. and Name	R.A.	Decl.	Pk Flux	Error	S/N	SCUBA-2 $f_{850} : f_{450}$	m160	z	Median Magnif.	σ	Zitrin Magnif.
	J2000.0	J2000.0	(mJy)			(mJy)					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
1 ALMA071724-374329	7 17 24.55	37 43 29.5	2.62	0.18	13.8	4.9 : 18.0	...	...	...	...	...
2 ALMA071742-374225	7 17 42.86	37 42 25.7	3.02	0.20	14.6	2.8 : 5.0	...	...	...	...	...
3 ALMA071742-374231	7 17 42.55	37 42 31.0	2.26	0.22	10.1	2.4 : 6.5	...	...	...	...	...
4 ALMA071726-374247	7 17 26.01	37 42 47.5	1.03	0.17	6.0	3.8 : 11.0	...	...	...	...	...

NOTE— The columns are as in Table 4.

Table 9. ALMA Archive Sample

Cluster	R.A.	Decl.	f_{850}	Error	f_{450}	Error	Note	m160	Redshift
	J2000.0	J2000.0	(mJy)		(mJy)				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
A1689	13 11 30.80	-1 19 11.3	3.6	0.3	13.0	2.4		24.4	...
A1689	13 11 31.45	-1 19 32.4	-1.2	0.3	0.6	2.3		17.4	0.187
A1689	13 11 30.03	-1 20 28.4	-0.7	0.3	0.1	2.2		18.1	0.200
A1689	13 11 29.93	-1 19 18.7	0.8	0.3	0.4	2.4		25.3	7.130
A2390	21 53 36.78	17 41 42.3	7.2	0.3	4.9	2.4	BCG	...	...
A2744	0 14 19.80	-30 23 07.7	1.7	0.3	0.8	3.3		24.4	2.96
A2744	0 14 18.35	-30 24 47.3	6.7	0.3	10.0	3.4		25.2	2.482
A2744	0 14 20.40	-30 22 54.3	3.6	0.4	7.8	3.3		23.5	3.058
A2744	0 14 17.58	-30 23 00.5	3.3	0.3	18.0	3.4		21.9	1.498
A2744	0 14 19.12	-30 22 42.2	1.8	0.4	6.5	3.4		23.5	2.409
A2744	0 14 17.28	-30 22 58.5	4.1	0.3	18.0	3.4		22.0	1.55
A2744	0 14 22.10	-30 22 49.6	-0.4	0.4	5.2	3.4		25.4	2.644
A2744	0 14 19.50	-30 22 48.7	1.8	0.4	-6.0	3.4		27.0	4.16
A2744	0 14 19.79	-30 22 37.8	0.5	0.4	5.1	3.5		25.5	5.56
MACSJ0416	4 16 10.79	-24 04 47.4	3.7	0.3	11.0	2.2		21.4	2.086
MACSJ0416	4 16 06.96	-24 04 00.0	1.5	0.3	2.8	2.2		22.0	1.953
MACSJ0416	4 16 08.81	-24 05 22.5	0.5	0.3	2.0	2.4		23.6	1.50
MACSJ0416	4 16 11.66	-24 04 19.4	-0.8	0.3	5.4	2.2		23.2	2.13
MACSJ0416	4 16 09.44	-24 05 35.3	-0.1	0.4	-2.8	2.5		25.9	8.311
MACSJ1423	14 23 47.87	24 04 42.2	1.7	0.2	6.5	1.6	BCG	...	...
MACSJ2129	21 29 21.32	-7 41 15.4	8.8	0.4	28.0	3.3		...	...
MACSJ2129	21 29 22.35	-7 41 31.0	-0.6	0.4	-2.8	3.2		20.3	1.537
RXJ1347	13 47 30.62	-11 45 09.6	3.7	0.3	3.2	1.9	BCG	...	...
RXJ1347	13 47 27.82	-11 45 55.9	12.0	0.3	47.0	2.0	LENS	20.2	1.28
RXJ1347	13 47 27.64	-11 45 51.0	14.0	0.3	51.0	1.9	LENS	21.4	1.28

NOTE— The columns are (1) cluster, (2) and (3) ALMA R.A. and decl., (4) and (5) SCUBA-2 850 μm flux and error (we have included a confusion noise of 0.33 mJy added in quadrature to the white noise here), (6) and (7) SCUBA-2 450 μm flux and error, (8) note as to whether the source is a brightest cluster galaxy (labeled “BCG”) or a multiply-lensed source (labeled “LENS”; see Figure 9), (9) m160 magnitude, and (10) redshift (speczs have three or more digits after the decimal point, and photzs have two). Note that in A1689, the speczs for the second, third, and fourth sources are from Colless et al. (2003), Lin et al. (2018), and Wong et al. (2022), respectively. For A2744, the speczs are from Muñoz Arancibia et al. (2022), and the photzs for the remaining sources are from the ASTRODEEP catalogs of Merlin et al. (2016) and Castellano et al. (2016). For MACSJ0416, the first two sources have speczs from the Grism Lens-Amplified Survey from Space (GLASS) survey (Treu et al. 2015), as quoted in Laporte et al. (2017). The fifth source has a specz from Bakx et al. (2020). The third and fourth sources have photzs from the ASTRODEEP catalogs of Merlin et al. (2016) and Castellano et al. (2016). For MACSJ2129, the specz is from Molino et al. (2017). For RXJ1347, the photz for the multiply-lensed source is from Zitrin et al. (2015). However, Bradač et al. (2008) placed it at $z = 4$ based on their gravitational lens modeling.

Table 10. SCUBA-2 High-Redshift Candidates

No. and Name	R.A.	Decl.	f_{850}	Error	S/N	f_{450}	Error	S/N	f_{450}/f_{850}	Radius
	J2000.0	J2000.0	(mJy)			(mJy)				(arcmin)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
1 A1689	13 11 21.8	-1 19 51.3	11.0	0.5	21.0	14.7	2.7	5.3	1.31	1.7
2 A1689	13 11 19.2	-1 21 51.3	5.4	0.6	9.1	9.5	3.4	2.7	1.75	2.9
3 A1689	13 11 38.0	-1 16 36.3	4.8	0.7	7.2	8.1	3.3	2.4	1.68	4.3
4 A1689	13 11 32.2	-1 19 52.3	3.5	0.5	6.9	3.6	2.3	1.5	1.02	1.0
5 A1689	13 11 32.7	-1 18 21.4	2.8	0.6	5.0	5.4	2.7	1.9	1.88	2.0
6 A1689	13 11 28.0	-1 19 07.4	2.6	0.5	5.3	0.9	2.5	0.4	0.34	1.1
7 A2390	21 53 23.5	17 40 07.2	5.8	0.5	10.0	11.0	3.7	2.9	1.90	3.4
8 A2390	21 53 37.4	17 43 39.2	3.5	0.5	7.2	6.7	2.5	2.5	1.89	1.6
9 A2390	21 53 17.9	17 41 27.0	3.3	0.6	5.8	3.8	3.6	1.0	1.15	4.1
10 A2390	21 53 32.6	17 44 32.1	3.1	0.5	6.1	6.2	2.7	2.2	1.99	2.4
11 A2390	21 53 27.2	17 40 40.2	3.1	0.5	6.0	-1.0	3.4	-0.3	-0.31	2.4
12 A2390	21 53 26.1	17 44 21.1	2.8	0.5	5.3	5.5	3.5	1.5	1.90	3.1
13 A2744	0 14 19.4	-30 23 07.1	2.5	0.5	5.1	4.2	3.1	1.3	1.64	0.8
14 A370	2 39 57.0	-1 37 18.9	6.2	0.6	10.0	7.9	3.8	2.0	1.25	3.2
15 A370	2 40 3.03	-1 31 16.0	5.4	0.7	8.2	8.9	3.3	2.6	1.62	4.0
16 A370	2 39 51.6	-1 30 33.0	5.4	0.6	9.4	8.2	3.6	2.2	1.50	3.7
17 A370	2 39 45.3	-1 38 07.0	4.0	0.6	6.9	-0.7	3.5	-0.2	-0.18	4.1
18 A370	2 39 35.2	-1 34 55.0	3.6	0.6	6.3	5.8	4.1	1.4	1.60	4.3
19 A370	2 39 47.1	-1 32 20.0	2.8	0.6	5.0	0.5	3.5	0.1	0.16	2.3
20 MACSJ0416	4 16 5.61	-24 07 18.7	8.8	0.6	14.0	12.8	3.5	3.5	1.45	2.9
21 MACSJ0416	4 16 19.1	-24 03 59.7	4.4	0.6	7.5	8.0	2.8	2.7	1.82	2.6
22 MACSJ0717	7 17 54.2	37 42 53.9	12.0	0.5	23.0	12.6	2.6	4.8	1.04	4.1
23 MACSJ0717	7 17 43.0	37 40 35.9	8.8	0.5	16.0	16.4	2.4	6.8	1.86	4.4
24 MACSJ0717	7 17 34.3	37 48 01.0	6.2	0.5	12.0	12.0	2.3	5.0	1.93	3.2
25 MACSJ0717	7 17 51.3	37 44 50.9	5.9	0.5	12.0	10.8	2.3	4.5	1.82	3.2
26 MACSJ0717 ^a	7 17 30.8	37 44 37.9	4.3	0.4	9.8	5.1	1.6	3.1	1.18	0.8
27 MACSJ0717	7 17 40.6	37 47 10.0	2.8	0.5	5.9	4.8	2.2	2.1	1.69	2.6
28 MACSJ0717	7 17 38.7	37 40 27.0	2.7	0.5	5.1	-0.2	2.4	-0.1	-0.08	4.4
29 MACSJ0717	7 17 53.5	37 46 26.9	2.5	0.5	5.0	3.8	2.5	1.4	1.47	4.0
30 MACSJ1149	11 49 44.8	22 21 45.7	9.4	0.5	19.0	12.8	1.7	7.3	1.36	2.9
31 MACSJ1149	11 49 17.5	22 23 19.7	7.5	0.5	14.0	13.1	2.0	6.3	1.73	4.3
32 MACSJ1149	11 49 49.5	22 24 41.7	7.2	0.5	14.0	12.7	1.9	6.6	1.76	3.1
33 MACSJ1149	11 49 46.3	22 26 31.7	7.0	0.5	14.0	13.6	1.9	7.1	1.94	3.4
34 MACSJ1149	11 49 28.9	22 27 10.7	6.2	0.5	12.0	11.5	1.9	6.0	1.84	3.5

Table 10 *continued*

Table 10 (*continued*)

No. and Name	R.A.	Decl.	f_{850}	Error	S/N	f_{450}	Error	S/N	f_{450}/f_{850}	Radius
	J2000.0	J2000.0	(mJy)			(mJy)				(arcmin)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
35 MACSJ1149	11 49 27.6	22 26 02.8	5.5	0.5	11.0	9.5	1.8	5.1	1.69	2.8
36 MACSJ1149	11 49 38.8	22 27 54.7	5.2	0.6	9.0	7.0	2.6	2.6	1.33	3.9
37 MACSJ1149	11 49 50.3	22 22 02.8	4.6	0.5	9.3	8.0	2.1	3.7	1.70	3.8
38 MACSJ1149	11 49 49.2	22 27 06.8	4.1	0.5	8.1	7.6	2.1	3.4	1.80	4.3
39 MACSJ1149	11 49 55.3	22 23 52.7	2.6	0.5	5.0	-0.1	2.0	-0.1	-0.06	4.4
40 MACSJ1149	11 49 43.7	22 24 02.8	2.3	0.5	5.0	3.9	1.6	2.3	1.62	1.7
41 MACSJ1423	14 23 40.6	24 07 39.1	7.5	0.5	15.0	12.5	2.2	5.5	1.66	3.0
42 MACSJ1423	14 23 28.4	24 05 38.9	5.8	0.5	11.0	7.8	2.7	2.7	1.33	4.4
43 MACSJ1423	14 24 3.17	24 02 53.1	3.8	0.5	7.4	6.6	2.4	2.6	1.72	4.1
44 MACSJ1423	14 23 28.4	24 04 24.0	3.5	0.5	6.7	3.9	2.6	1.4	1.09	4.4
45 MACSJ1423	14 23 50.0	24 08 36.1	3.2	0.6	5.8	6.1	3.1	1.9	1.87	3.6
46 MACSJ1423	14 24 3.84	24 04 52.9	2.8	0.6	5.1	4.3	2.6	1.6	1.52	3.6
47 MACSJ1423	14 24 7.40	24 04 30.0	2.8	0.5	5.2	4.9	2.5	1.9	1.72	4.4
48 MACSJ1423	14 23 40.4	24 06 08.1	2.3	0.5	5.0	4.1	2.0	1.9	1.76	2.0
49 MACSJ2129	21 29 26.1	-7 45 29.8	8.7	0.7	12.0	12.9	4.9	2.6	1.47	3.9
50 RXJ1347	13 47 21.4	-11 48 59.9	9.6	0.6	15.0	17.9	3.1	5.6	1.84	4.4
51 RXJ1347	13 47 17.4	-11 45 50.0	7.0	0.6	12.0	12.0	2.7	4.4	1.71	3.0
52 RXJ1347	13 47 41.8	-11 47 20.0	6.8	0.7	10.0	12.5	3.2	3.8	1.82	3.7
53 RXJ1347	13 47 14.0	-11 44 34.9	4.4	0.6	7.2	6.7	2.9	2.2	1.52	3.8
54 RXJ1347	13 47 31.2	-11 48 12.9	3.6	0.6	6.3	5.6	2.8	1.9	1.53	3.1
55 RXJ1347	13 47 23.0	-11 48 59.0	3.4	0.6	5.4	5.4	3.1	1.7	1.58	4.2

NOTE— The columns are (1) number and name, (2) and (3) SCUBA-2 850 μm R.A. and decl., (4), (5), and (6) SCUBA-2 850 μm flux, error (we have included a confusion noise of 0.33 mJy added in quadrature to the white noise here), and S/N, (7), (8), and (9) SCUBA-2 450 μm flux, error, and S/N, (10) SCUBA-2 450 μm to 850 μm flux ratio, and (11) offset from the cluster center in arcmin. ^aThis is a multiply-lensed source that is blended at the SCUBA-2 resolution (see Figure 8).

APPENDIX

Here we show the 850 μm (left) and 450 μm (right) SCUBA-2 images for the remaining 9 clusters (MACSJ1149 is shown in Figure 2), with the detected ($> 4\sigma$) 850 μm sources marked (white circles).




Figure 23. Images of the (*left*) 850 μm and (*right*) 450 μm SCUBA-2 data for nine of the ten clusters (MACSJ1149 is shown in Figure 2). In each panel, we show the central $4'5$ radius region of the SCUBA-2 field. In both panels, the white circles show the $> 4\sigma$ 850 μm selected sample, including a confusion noise of 0.33 mJy. The sources are summarized in Table 2.




Figure 24. See caption for Figure 23.




Figure 25. See caption for Figure 23.




Figure 26. See caption for Figure 23.




Figure 27. See caption for Figure 23.