The coevolution of supermassive black holes and galaxies in luminous AGN over a wide range of redshift

George Mountrichas¹

Instituto de Fisica de Cantabria (CSIC-Universidad de Cantabria), Avenida de los Castros, 39005 Santander, Spain e-mail: gmountrichas@gmail.com

February 23, 2023

ABSTRACT

It is well known that supermassive black holes (SMBHs) and their host galaxies co-evolve. A manifestation of this co-evolution is the correlation that has been found between the SMBH mass, M_{BH} , and the galaxy bulge or stellar mass, M_* . The cosmic evolution of this relation, though, is still a matter of debate. In this work, we examine the $M_{BH}-M_*$ relation, using 687 X-ray luminous (median $\log [L_{X,2-10keV}(ergs^{-1})] = 44.3$, broad line AGN, at 0.2 < z < 4.0 (median $z \approx 1.4$) that lie in the XMM-XXL field. Their M_{BH} and M_* range from 7.5 < log [M_{BH} (M_{\odot})] < 9.5 and 10 < log [$M_*(M_{\odot})$] < 12, respectively. Most of the AGN live in star-forming galaxies and their Eddington ratios range from 0.01 to 1, with a median value of 0.06. Our results show that M_{RH} and M_* are correlated (r = 0.47 ± 0.21 , averaged over different redshift intervals). Our analysis also shows that the mean ratio of the M_{BH} and M_{*} does not evolve with redshift, at least up to z = 2 and has a value of $\log(M_{BH}/M_*) = -2.44$. The majority of the AGN (75%) are in a SMBH mass growth dominant phase. In these systems, the $M_{BH}-M_*$ correlation is weaker and their M_* tends to be lower (for the same M_{BH}) compared to systems that are in a galaxy mass growth phase. Our findings suggest that the growth of black hole mass occurs first,

February 23, 2023
ABST
It is well known that supermassive black holes (SMBHs) and their correlation that has been found between the SMBH mass, M_{BH}, a this relation, though, is still a matter of debate. In this work, we e log [L_{X,2-10ke}v(ergs⁻¹)] = 44.3), broad line AGN, at 0.2 < 2 < 4.0 M, range from 7.5 < log [M_{BH}(M_☉)) < 9.5 and 10 < log [M.(M_☉)) and their Eddington ratios range from 0.01 to 1, with a median (r = 0.47 ± 0.21, averaged over different redshift intervals). Our ar evolve with redshift, at least up to z = 2 and has a value of log(M mass growth dominant phase. In these systems, the M_{BH} –M, corre compared to systems that are in a galaxy mass growth phase. Our while the early stellar mass assembly may not be so efficient. **1. Introduction**In the last two decades, several studies have shown that there is a co-evolution between the supermassive black holes (SMBHs) and their host galaxies (e.g., Kormendy & Ho 2013). In the local universe, this co-evolution has been demonstrated by tight correlations that have been found between the SMBH mass, M_{BH}, and various properties of the host galaxy. For instance, there is a correlation between the M_{BH} and the velocity dispersion, the bulge luminosity and the bulge mass, M_{bulge} (e.g., Magorrian et al. 1998; Ferrarese & Merritt 2000; Gebhardt et al. 2000; Tremaine et al. 2002; Häring & Rix 2004). Among them, the correlation between the M_{BH} and the velocity dispersion of the galaxy bulge (σ) appears to be the tightest. A possible explanation could be that σ is a good predictor of M_{bulge}. Another, perhaps more plausible, scenario is that σ measures the depth of the potential well in which the SMBH is formed (Ferrarese & Merritt 2000).
Although these correlations are well established at low redshift, is rost straightforward. Shankar et al. (2016) used Monte Carlo simulations and found evidence that local galaxy samples with dynamically measured M_{BH} and galaxy properties. Huserer the isolation refered for

angular resolution related selection effect that could bias the observed scaling relations between the M_{BH} and galaxy properties. However, this selection effect does not affect local samples of active galactic nuclei (AGN; Shankar et al. 2019).

The M_{BH} and M_{bulge} or stellar mass, M_* is one of the most extensively studied relations, both from a theoretical as from an observational point of view (e.g. Marconi & Hunt 2003; Gültekin et al. 2009; Sani et al. 2011; Reines & Volonteri 2015). Since, at high redshift, it is difficult to separate the bulge from the total stellar mass, many observational works at $z \ge 1$ have studied the M_{BH} -M_{*} relation (e.g., Jahnke et al. 2009; Merloni et al. 2010; Schramm & Silverman 2013; Sun et al. 2015; Suh et al. 2020; Setoguchi et al. 2021; Poitevineau et al. 2023) as opposed to the $M_{BH}-M_{bulge}$ that is often studied at z < 1 (e.g. Park et al. 2015).

For the majority of the aforementioned observational studies, the M_{BH} - M_* relation has been examined for broad-line AGN whose M_{BH} were measured using continuum luminosities and broad-line widths. Jahnke et al. (2009) used 10 AGN in the COS-MOS field, at 1 < z < 2 and found no difference between their M_{BH} - M_* relation and that in the local universe. Merloni et al. (2010) used 89 broad line AGN in the zCOSMOS survey at 1 < 1 < 2.2 and found that the M_{BH}/M_* ratio evolves with redshift. Schramm & Silverman (2013) used 18 X-ray selected, broad-line AGN at 0.5 < z < 1.2 and found that bulgedominated host galaxies are more aligned with the local relation than those with prominent disks. Sun et al. (2015) used 69 *Herschel* detected, broad line AGN at $0.2 \le z < 2.1$ and found that galaxies with overmassive (undermassive) black holes, BHs, tend to have a low (high) ratio of the specific accretion rate to the specific star formation rate. Suh et al. (2020) used a sample of 100 X-ray selected, broad-line and moderate luminosity AGN in the Chandra-COSMOS Legacy survey up to z ~ 2.5 and found no significant evolution of the M_{BH}/M_* ratio. Setoguchi et al. (2021) used 117, moderate luminosity, broad loine AGN in the Subaru/XMM-Newton Deep Field (SXDF) and found that the M_{BH}/M_* ratio is similar to that in the local Universe. According to the authors, if their galaxies are bulge dominant, then they have already established the local M_{BH} -M_{*} relation. If they are disk dominant, then their SMBHs are overmassive relative to their M_{*}.

In most of the above works a limiting factor is the relative small number of AGN (≤ 100) used in the analysis. Furthermore, the examination of the evolution of the $M_{BH}-M_*$ relation with redshift is done my comparing and combining results from different studies. This approach, though, may hint at systematic effects. Although, the calculation of M_{BH} at different redshifts

and therefore using widths of different broad lines (H β , Mg II, C IV) gives consistent results (e.g., Shen et al. 2013; Liu et al. 2016), this is not true for the measurement of the galaxy properties, such as the M_{*} and the star-formation rate (SFR). In this case, utilizing different methods and/or different templates and parameter space (e.g., when fitting their spectral energy distribution, SED) may introduce a number of systematics that could affect the comparison and thus the overall conclusions (Mountrichas et al. 2021b).

In this work, we use 687 X-ray selected, broad-line and luminous (median log $[L_{X,2-10keV}(ergs^{-1})] = 44.3$) AGN, that span a redshift range of 0.2 < z < 4.0 to study the correlation between the AGN and their host galaxy properties, at different redshift intervals. In Sect. 2 we describe the parent sample and the strict criteria we apply to compile a final dataset with accurate and consistent AGN and galaxy measurements. The results are presented in Sect. 3 and we summarize our main conclusions in Sect. 4.

Throughout this work, we assume a flat Λ CDM cosmology with $H_0 = 70.4 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ and $\Omega_M = 0.272$ (Komatsu et al. 2011).

2. Data

In this section, we describe the XMM-XXL survey and how we obtained measurements for important AGN and host galaxy properties that are used throughout this work.

2.1. The sample

The X-ray AGN used in this study were observed in the North field of the XMM-Newton-XXL survey (XMM-*XXL*; Pierre et al. 2016). XMM-*XXL* is a medium-depth X-ray survey that covers a total area of 50 deg² split into two fields equal in size, the XMM-*XXL* North (XXL-N) and the XMM-*XXL* South (XXL-S). The *XXL*-N sample consists of 8445 X-ray sources. Of these X-ray sources, 5294 have SDSS counterparts and 2512 have reliable spectroscopy (Menzel et al. 2016; Liu et al. 2016). Mid-IR and near-IR was obtained following the likelihood ratio method (Sutherland & Saunders 1992) as implemented in Georgakakis & Nandra (2011). For more details on the reduction of the *XMM* observations and the IR identifications of the X-ray sources, see Georgakakis et al. (2017).

2.2. Black hole mass measurements

As mentioned above, there are 2512 AGN in the XXL-N catalogue that have reliable spectroscopy from SDSS-III/BOSS. 1786 out of these 2512 sources, have been classified as broad line AGN (BLAGN1), by Menzel et al. (2016). A source was classified as BLAGN1 using the full width at half-maximum (FWHM) threshold of 1000 Km s⁻¹. Liu et al. (2016) performed spectral fits to the BOSS spectroscopy of these 1786 BLAGN1 to estimate single-epoch virial M_{BH} from continuum luminosities and broad line widths (e.g., Shen et al. 2013). The details of the spectral fitting procedure are given in Sect. 3.3 of Liu et al. (2016) and in Shen et al. (2013). In brief, they first measured the continuum luminosities and broad line FWHMs. Then, they used several single-epoch virial mass estimators to calculate M_{BH} . Specifically, they applied the following fiducial mass recipes, depending on the redshift of the source: $H\beta$ at z < 0.9, Mg II at 0.9 < z < 2.2 and C IV at z > 2.2.



Fig. 1: SMBH and galaxy properties as a function of redshift. Top panel: M_{BH} vs. redshift. Bottom panel: M_* vs. redshift. The dashed horizontal lines show the M_{BH} (top panel) and M_* (bottom panel) limits that our sample is complete up to redshift 2 (vertical lines). For more details, see Sect. 3.3.

Previous studies have shown that single-epoch M_{BH} estimates that use different emission lines, when adopting the fiducial single-epoch mass formula, are generally consistent with each other with negligible systematic offsets and scatter (e.g., Shen et al. 2008, 2011; Shen & Liu 2012; Shen et al. 2013). Liu et al. (2016) confirmed these previous findings. Finally, their M_{BH} measurements have, on average, errors of ~ 0.5 dex, whereas sources with higher SNR have uncertainties of the measured M_{BH} that are less than 0.15 dex.

2.3. Host galaxy measurements

In our analysis, we use the host galaxy measurements presented in Mountrichas & Shankar (2023). These have been derived by applying spectral energy distribution (SED) fitting, using the CIGALE code (Boquien et al. 2019; Yang et al. 2020, 2022). The available photometry has been compiled and presented in Masoura et al. (2018, 2021). The templates and parameter space used is the same as that presented in Mountrichas et al. (2021b, 2022c,a). In brief, a delayed star formation history (SFH) model with a function form SFR $\propto t \times exp(-t/\tau)$ is used to fit the galaxy component. A star formation burst is included (Ciesla et al. 2017; Małek et al. 2018; Buat et al. 2019) as a constant ongoing period of star formation of 50 Myr. The Bruzual & Charlot (2003) single stellar population template is used to model the stellar emission. Stellar emission is attenuated following Charlot & Fall (2000). The dust heated by stars is modelled following Dale et al. (2014). The SKIRTOR template (Stalevski et al. 2012, 2016) is used for the AGN emission. Accounting for the AGN emission significantly reduces the biases on the estimate of the M_* and SFR of their host galaxy (Ciesla et al. 2015). The values for the various parameters are similar to those presented in Tables 1 in Mountrichas et al. (2021b, 2022c,a).

To examine if our SFR and M_* measurements are sensitive to the adopted SFH model, we repeat the SED fitting process using a different SFH module. Specifically, we adopt an expansion of the delayed SFH model mentioned above, that allows for a recent quenching of the SFR (Ciesla et al. 2017). This module is provided as sfhdelayedbq in CIGALE. We confirm that CIGALE measurements for the host galaxy properties of interest are robust and do not depend on the selection of the SFH model (see also Appendix B in Mountrichas et al. 2022a).

2.4. Final sample

To ensure that only sources with reliable galaxy measurements are included in our analysis, we follow the criteria used in Mountrichas et al. (2021b, 2022c,a); Mountrichas & Shankar (2023). Specifically, we include only sources that have measurements in the following photometric bands: u, g, r, i, z, J, H, K, W1, W2 and W4, where W1, W2 and W4 are the WISE photometric bands at 3.4, 4.6 and 22 μ m. Approximately, 50% of our sources have far-IR measurements by Herschel (HELP collaboration; Shirley et al. 2019, 2021). However, previous studies have shown that lack of far-IR photometry does not affect the SFR calculations of CIGALE (Mountrichas et al. 2021a,b, 2022a,c). Therefore, we do not require our sources to have available far-IR photometry.

Furthemore, we exclude sources with bad SED fits and unreliable host galaxy measurements. Towards this end, we impose a reduced χ^2 threshold of $\chi^2_r < 5$ (e.g. Masoura et al. 2018; Buat et al. 2021). We also exclude systems for which CIGALE could not constrain the parameters of interest (SFR, M_{*}). For that we apply the same criteria used in previous recent studies (e.g. Mountrichas et al. 2021b; Buat et al. 2021; Mountrichas et al. 2022c,b; Koutoulidis et al. 2022). The method uses the two values that CIGALE provides for each estimated galaxy property. One value corresponds to the best model and the other value (bayes) is the likelihood-weighted mean value. A large difference between the two calculations suggests a complex likelihood distribution and important uncertainties. We therefore only include in our analysis sources with $\frac{1}{5} \leq \frac{SFR_{hest}}{SFR_{hayes}} \leq 5$ and $\frac{1}{5} \le \frac{M_{*,best}}{M_{*,bayes}} \le 5$, where SFR_{best} and M_{*,best} are the best-fit values of SFR and $M_\ast,$ respectively and SFR_{bayes} and $M_{\ast,bayes}$ are the Bayesian values estimated by CIGALE. These criteria reduce the number of X-ray AGN to 1592. We note that this number includes sources with either spectroscopic or photometric redshifts (photoz). The photoz calculations have been presented in Masoura et al. (2018).

We then cross match these 1592 AGN with the spectroscopic sample of Liu et al. (2016). This results in 687 broadline, X-ray AGN with spectroscopic redshifts that have reliable measurements for M_{BH} and galaxy properties. The distribution of M_{BH} and M_* vs. redshift for our final AGN sample is presented in the top and bottom panels of Fig. 1, respectively. The X-ray luminosity of the sources spans a range of $42.5 < \log [L_{X,2-10keV}(ergs^{-1})] < 45.5$ with a median value of $\log [L_{X,2-10keV}(ergs^{-1})] = 44.3$. The median redshift is z = 1.4(0.2 < z < 4.0). To minimize selection effects in our analysis



Fig. 2: SFR vs. M_* of the X-ray AGN in our dataset. Different symbols indicate different redshift intervals, as shown in the legend. The results are colour-coded based on the M_{BH} value.

(see next sections), we split the dataset into four redshift intervals. There are 181 AGN at z < 0.9, 215 at 0.9 < z < 1.5, 188 at 1.5 < z < 2.2 and 103 AGN at z > 2.2.

There are two available measurements for the bolometric luminosities, L_{bol} , of our sources. The catalogue of Liu et al. (2016) includes L_{bol} calculations. For their estimation, they have integrated the radiation directly produced by the accretion process, that is the thermal emission from the accretion disc and the hard X-ray radiation produced by inverse-Compton scattering of the soft disc photons by a hot corona (for more details see their Sect. 4.2). We also combine CIGALE's measurements for the absorption corrected X-ray luminosity and the AGN disc luminosity. Comparison of the two L_{bol} estimates shows that the distribution of their (log) difference has a mean value of 0.08 dex and a standard deviation of 0.42 dex. In our analysis, we choose to use the L_{bol} calculations of CIGALE. However, we confirm that this choice does not affect our overall results and conclusions.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. SFR vs. M_{*}

The SFR-M_{*} relation of our sources is presented in Fig. 2. Different symbols correspond to different redshift intervals, as indicated in the legend. The results are colour-coded based on the M_{BH}. Sources located in the upper, right corner of the SFR-M_{*} space, with log [SFR(M_☉yr⁻¹)] > 3 and log [M_{*}(M_☉)] > 12 are high redshift sources (z > 2) with massive SMBHs (log [M_{BH} (M_☉)] > 9). Based on the sSFR (sSFR = SFR/M_{*}) measurements of CIGALE, there is only a handful of AGN in our dataset that are in quiescent systems (log sSFR(Gyr⁻¹) > 11). The vast majority of our AGN are either in star-forming or in starburst galaxies. We note that we chose to identify quiescent systems based on their sSFR values as opposed to overploting a MS from the literature (e.g. Whitaker et al. 2014; Schreiber et al. 2015) due to the systematics that this approach may introduce (for more details see e.g., Mountrichas et al. 2021b).

Most previous studies have found a strong, positive correlation between the SFR and the X-ray luminosity of AGN (e.g., Lanzuisi et al. 2017; Masoura et al. 2018, 2021), although more recent works have shown that this correlation is weaker when



Fig. 3: L_{bol} as a function of M_{BH} . Different symbols and colours correspond to different redshift intervals, as indicated in the legend. The lines correspond to $L_{bol} = L_{Edd}$ (green, long-dashed line), $L_{bol} = 0.1 L_{Edd}$ (solid, black line) and $L_{bol} = 0.01 L_{Edd}$ (grey, short-dashed line).

systematic effects are minimized and the M_* is taken into account (e.g., Mountrichas et al. 2021b, 2022c,a). Recently, Bluck et al. (2023) analyzed three cosmological hydrodynamical simulations (Eagle, Illustris and IllustrisTNG) and concluded that the M_{BH} is the predictive parameter of galaxy quenching and not the AGN luminosity. We apply Pearson correlation analysis splitting our data into the four redshift intervals, shown in the legend of Fig. 2. The results show that the sSFR and X-ray luminosity (or L_{bol}) have an (average over the four redshift bins) correlation coefficient of $r = 0.45 \pm 0.15$ (or $r = 0.37 \pm 0.22$). The correlation coefficient of the sSFR and M_{BH} is $r = 0.31 \pm 0.12$. The errors are the standard deviations. These results, although indicative, corroborate that observational works should examine the role of M_{BH} when studying the impact of AGN feedback on the host galaxy properties, as suggested by Bluck et al. (2023).

3.2. Lbol vs. MBH

In Fig. 3, we plot the L_{bol} calculations of CIGALE as a function of M_{BH} for the different redshift intervals used in our study. The lines correspond to $L_{bol} = L_{Edd}$ (green, long-dashed line), $L_{bol} = 0.1 L_{Edd}$ (solid, black line) and $L_{bol} = 0.01 L_{Edd}$ (grey, dashed line), where $L_{Edd} = 1.26 \times 10^{38} M_{BH}/M_{\odot} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. The vast majority of our AGN lie between Eddington ratios of 0.01 to 1, with a median value of 0.06, in agreement with previous studies (e.g., Trump et al. 2009; Lusso et al. 2012; Sun et al. 2015; Suh et al. 2020). The fact that the SMBHs of the X-ray luminous AGN in our dataset accrete at sub-Eddington rates, at all redshifts spanned by our sample, could indicate that most of their mass has been built up at earlier epochs.

3.3. The $M_{BH}-M_*$ relation

In this section, we examine the $M_{BH}-M_*$ relation and the evolution of the M_{BH}/M_* ratio with redshift. The top panel of Fig. 4 presents the M_{BH} measurements of the AGN as a function of their host galaxy M_* . Symbols are colour coded based on the redshift interval that the source belongs. The solid, black line



Fig. 4: M_{BH} as a function of M_* . Top panel shows the distribution of our AGN in the $M_{BH}-M_*$ space. Different colours correspond to different redshift bins. The bottom panel shows our results grouped in bins of redshift (red symbols) and M_* (green symbols). Median values are presented as well as the 1 σ uncertainties (calculated via bootstrap resampling). The labels next to the red points show the median redshift that corresponds to each bin. The solid, black line shows the best-fit on our measurements. The dashed lines, in both panels, present the best-fits from previous studies (see text for more details).

presents the best-fit of our measurements ($M_{BH} = 1.054 M_* - 3.010$). In the same panel, we also present the best fits from previous studies. The orange, dashed line shows the best fit from Häring & Rix (2004). In that study, the authors examined the black hole–bulge mass relation, using a sample of 30 nearby galaxies. The purple, long-dashed line, presents the best fit from Kormendy & Ho (2013) for local, bulge galaxies. The grey, dashed line is the best fit found by Suh et al. (2020), that combined their sample of 100 X-ray selected AGN in the *Chandra*–COSMOS Legacy Survey that spanned a redshift range up to 2.5, with the sample presented in Reines & Volonteri (2015) that consists of nearby, inactive early-type galaxies as well as local AGN.

We apply a correlation analysis and we find a correlation coefficient of $r = 0.47 \pm 0.21$ between the two properties for



Fig. 5: $M_{BH}-M_*$ ratio as a function of redshift. Top panel shows the values for the total AGN sample. Bottom panels shows the results when we account for selection biases (see text for more details). The dashed, black, horizontal line, in both panels, indicates the mean $M_{BH}-M_*$ ratio value of our dataset. The green, long-dashed, horizontal line presents the mean $M_{BH}-M_*$ ratio value, when selection biases are taken into consideration.

the sources in our sample. This value is averaged over the four redshift intervals. The error presents the standard deviation of the four measurements. This result is consistent with the value we calculate using the M_{\ast} and M_{BH} measurements presented in Table 2 in Sun et al. (2015) that have a median redshift of \approx 1.2 (r = 0.43). It is also consistent with M_{BH}-M_{*} correlations reported in the local Universe (e.g., 0.54; Reines & Volonteri 2015). The correlation coefficients of our M_{BH} and M_* for each of the redshift bins are: 0.31, 0.35, 0.38, 0.36, at z < 0.9,0.9 < z < 1.5, 1.5 < z < 2.2 and z > 2.2, respectively. Although, the coefficient values are consistent across all redshifts spanned by our dataset, they appear a bit lower compared to the correlation coefficient of the full sample. This is, probably, mostly due to the smaller M_{BH} ranges spanned by the individual redshift bins compared to the full catalogue. The bottom panel of Fig. 4 presents the results when we bin the M_{BH} and M_* into the four redshift bins, we use in our analysis (red circles). The median M_{BH} and M_* values and their 1 σ uncertainties (calculated via bootstrap resampling) are shown. We also bin our M_* and M_{BH} calculations in four M_* bins within $10 < \log [M_*(M_{\odot})] < 12$ (green circles). Each bin has 0.5 dex width.

Next, we examine the M_{BH}/M_* ratio as a function of redshift. Based on the results presented in the top panel of Figure 5, the M_{BH}/M_* ratio does not evolve with redshift. The mean log(M_{BH}/M_{*}) value is found at -2.44 (with a 1 σ scatter of 0.61), shown by the dashed line. The scatter of the log(M_{BH}/M_{*}) ratio is similar at all redshifts spanned by the dataset. Specifically, $\sigma \sim 0.6$ up to redshift 2.2 and $\sigma \sim 0.45$ at z > 2.2. The value of the log(M_{BH}/M_{*}) ratio is in agreement with that found by Setoguchi et al. (2021) (-2.2), but somewhat higher compared to that found by Suh et al. (2020) (≈ -2.7) and that found in the local universe (-2.85; Häring & Rix 2004).

We note that our dataset is a high redshift, flux limited sample and this make it susceptible to suffer from Eddington bias. However, as has pointed out, for instance in Poitevineau et al. (2023), both M_{BH} and M_* scale with with BLR line and the infrared-to-optical luminosities, respectively, and thus have a similar dependence on redshift. Furthermore, the M_{BH}/M_* ratio spans a wide range, at least up to redshift 2, as shown in the top panel of Fig. 5. We also note that the mean value of the $\log(M_{BH}/M_*)$ ratio of the full sample is similar to that found in each of the redshift bins used in our study. Specifically, we find $\log(M_{BH}/M_*) = -2.52, -2.34, -2.29, -2.49$ at z < 0.9, 0.9 < z < 1.5, 1.5 < z < 2.2 and z > 2.2, respectively.

Nevertheless, to minimize possible selection biases, we choose from our dataset sources that lie in a M_* and M_{BH} space that is detected throughout z = 2. Specifically, we choose sources that fulfil the following criteria: $z \le 2$, log $[M_*(M_{\odot})] > 10.5$ and log $[M_{BH}(M_{\odot})] > 7.6$ (dashed lines in Fig. 1). 423 AGN meet these requirements. Their M_{BH}/M_* ratio as a function of the redshift is presented in the bottom panel of Fig. 5. No statistical significant evolution of the M_{BH}/M_* ratio with redshift is detected. The value of the M_{BH}/M_* ratio is similar in the four redshift bins used in our analysis, with a mean value of -2.50 (shown by the green, dashed line), which is close to the value found for the total sample. This confirms our previous finding of no evolution of the M_{BH}/M_* ratio with redshift.

We conclude that the M_{BH}/M_* ratio does not evolve with cosmic time, at least up to z = 2, even when we account for selection effects. This is in agreement with most similar studies (e.g., Jahnke et al. 2009; Sun et al. 2015; Suh et al. 2020; Setoguchi et al. 2021) that examined the $M_*/M_{BH} - z$ relation using moderate luminosity X-ay AGN. Merloni et al. (2010) reported an evolution of the M_{BH}/M_* ratio with redshift, by comparing their results with those in the local Universe (Häring & Rix 2004). However, based on the more recent results of Kormendy & Ho (2013) in the local Universe, no evolution would have been detected (see Sect. 3.3 in Setoguchi et al. 2021).

3.4. The L_{bol} as a function of SFR

In the previous section, we examined the relation between M_* and M_{BH} . Here, we investigate the relation between their time derivatives, that is the SFR and L_{bol} . The results are shown in the top panel of Fig. 6. To minimize selection effects, the measurements are divided into four redshift bins, as shown in the legend of the figure. The solid line corresponds to the local $M_{BH}-M_*$ relation that would be expected from exactly simultaneous evolution of the SMBH and the host galaxy (see Sect. 4.4 and 3.4 in Ueda et al. 2018; Setoguchi et al. 2021, respectively). Most of the AGN (75%) lie above the solid line. This implies that these sources are in a SMBH growth phase (AGN dominant systems). However, there is a smaller number of AGN (173) that lie below the solid line, which indicates that in these systems the galaxy growth is dominant (SF dominant systems).

The systems in which the SF is dominant are mainly high redshift galaxies (median z = 1.85 compared to z = 1.21 for the AGN dominant systems) and are in starburst phase



Fig. 6: Correlation of AGN and host galaxy properties. The top panel presents the L_{bol} as a function of SFR. Different symbols and colours correspond to different redshift intervals, as shown in the legend. The solid line indicates the local $M_{BH}-M_*$ relation that would be expected from exactly simultaneous evolution of the SMBH and the host galaxy. AGN that lie above this line live in galaxies that the SMBH growth is dominant. AGN that lie below the line are systems in which the galaxy growth dominates. The bottom panel shows the distribution of AGN (red circles) and SF (blue circles) dominant systems in the $M_{BH}-M_*$ space. The dashed lines are the same as those used in Fig. 4.

(log sSFR(Gyr⁻¹) > 0.5). They also have similar M_{BH} with their AGN dominated counterparts, at fixed redshift. SF dominated galaxies also have, on average, lower log(M_{BH}/M_*) ratio (-2.63) compared to AGN dominated systems (-2.39).

The bottom panel of Fig. 6 presents the $M_{BH}-M_*$ relation for the two AGN populations. A pearson correlation analysis yields an average (over the four redshift intervals) of $r = 0.62 \pm 0.15$ and $r = 0.29 \pm 0.11$, for the SF dominated and the AGN dominated galaxies, respectively. This implies a significantly higher correlation between the M_{BH} and M_* for the systems that SF is dominant compared to those that the SMBH growth dominates.

We repeat the same exercise utilizing the sample of 69 AGN from the COSMOS and CDFS fields, presented in Sun et al. (2015) and using the values shown in their Table 2. We identify six AGN that are in SF dominated systems. The median redshift of the two AGN populations is similar (z = 1.32 for systems that

the galaxy growth is dominant and z = 1.16 for galaxies that the SMBH growth is dominant). A correlation analysis yields r = 0.41 and r = 0.86, for the AGN dominated and SF dominated systems, respectively. The $\log(M_{BH}/M_*)$ ratio is -2.60 and -2.99 for the galaxies that the SMBH growth dominates and for systems that the galaxy growth dominates, respectively. It is worth mentioning that using L_{bol} and SFR values from the literature and compare them with our measurements, may hint at systematics (this is also true when comparing our M_{*} and M_{BH} with calculations from the literature), as different methods have been applied for the calculation of these parameters (see e.g., Mountrichas et al. 2021b). Taking into account this caveat and the size of the sample of Sun et al. (2015) (in particular the small number of SF dominated systems it includes), these results confirm the trends we find in our dataset. This could also provide an (alternative) possible explanation for the higher M_{BH}/M_* ratio value presented by Setoguchi et al. (2021) and the lack of correlation they found regarding the $M_{BH}-M_*$ relation (see the discussion in their Sect. 3.3). Their AGN dataset consists exclusively of AGN dominated galaxies (see their Fig. 4).

AGN dominated galaxies appear to have, on average, lower M_* compared to their SF dominated counterparts with similar M_{BH} (bottom panel of Fig. 6). This, in conjunction with their lower correlation between the M_{BH} and M_* compared to SF dominated systems, could suggest that SF growth becomes dominant at a later stage compared to the SMBH growth, moving these galaxies rightwards in the M_{BH} – M_* plane and in line with local scaling relations. This could also explain the higher M_{BH}/M_* ratio of the AGN dominated systems, in the sense that their M_* growth lacks behind compared to their M_{BH} (or equivalently that their black holes are overweight compared to their stellar mass).

3.5. SMBH mass growth rate vs. galaxy stellar mass growth rate

To examine the possible pathways of the AGN in the $M_{BH}-M_*$ plane, we calculate the specific SMBH growth rate, defined as $\dot{sM} = \dot{M}/M_{BH}$ (Merloni et al. 2010; Sun et al. 2015), where \dot{M} is the accretion rate ($\dot{M} = \frac{(1-\eta)L_{boll}}{\eta c^2}$, where $\eta = 0.1$ is the assumed radiative efficiency of the accretion disk and c is the speed of light) and their specific galaxy stellar mass growth rate, sSFR. The distribution of the AGN used in our study in the $\dot{sM}/sSFR-M_{BH}/M_*$ space is presented in the top panel Fig. 7. Different colours and symbols correspond to different redshift bins. In agreement with Sun et al. (2015), we find a strong anticorrelation between the two parameters, at all redshifts spanned by our dataset ($r = -0.75 \pm 0.12$). The horizontal dashed line indicates the $\dot{sM}/sSFR = 1$, i.e., when the specific SMBH accretion rate and the sSFR are equal. The vertical dashed line denotes the average M_{BH}/M_* ratio value found for our sample.

The bottom panel of Fig. 7 presents the distribution of systems that are in a SMBH growth dominant phase (red circles) and those that are in galaxy growth dominant phase (blue circles), in the $s\dot{M}/sSFR-M_{BH}/M_*$ plane. We also define as "underweight", AGN that lie below the line that describes the best-fit on our data in the $M_{BH}-M_*$ plane (see black line in Fig. 4) and as "overweight", AGN that lie above this line (including, in both cases, its uncertainty of ~ 0.4 dex). These sources are marked with a square (overweight) and a triangle (underweight) in the bottom panel of Fig. 7. We notice that the vast majority of galaxies with underweight SMBHs, have $s\dot{M}/sSFR>$ 1, that is their specific SMBH mass growth rate is higher than their spe-



Fig. 7: Distribution of AGN in the $sM/sSFR-M_{BH}/M_*$ space. In the top panel, different colours and symbols correspond to different redshift bin, as shown in the legend. The bottom panel presents the distribution of SF (blue circles) and AGN (red circles) in the the $sM/sSFR-M_{BH}/M_*$ space. Sources marked with a square are classified as galaxies with overweight SMBHs, while those marked with a triangle are classified as galaxies with underweight SMBHs. The classification is based on the location of the AGN in the $M_{BH}-M_*$ plane relative to the line that describes the best-fit on our M_{BH} - M_* measurements (see text and Fig. 4 for more details).

cific stellar mass growth rate. In other words, their M_{BH} is trying to catch up their M_{*}. On the opposite side, the vast majority of galaxies with overweight SMBHs have sM/sSFR< 1, that implies that the stellar mass growth rate is higher than the SMBH mass growth rate.

4. Summary

We used 687 X-ray luminous (median log $[L_{X,2-10keV}(ergs^{-1})] =$ 44.3), broad line AGN, at 0.2 < z < 4.0 (median $z \approx 1.4$) that lie in the XMM-XXL North field. Their bolometric luminosities span nearly three orders of magnitude $(44 < \log L_{bol} (erg/s) <$ 47), while their BH and stellar masses range from 7.5 < $\log [M_{BH}(M_{\odot})] < 9.5$ and $10 < \log [M_{*}(M_{\odot})] < 12$, respectively. Our goal was to study the co-evolution of the SMBHs and their host galaxies, over a wide redshift range. Our main results can be summarised as follows:

- The vast majority of the AGN in our dataset are in starforming systems (Sect. 3.1). Their Eddington ratios range from 0.01 to 1, with a median value of 0.06 (Sect. 3.2).
- The M_{BH} and M_{*} are correlated. No statistical significant evolution of the M_{BH}/M_* ratio is found with redshift, up to z = 2. The mean log(M_{BH}/M_{*}) = -2.44, with a 1 σ scatter of 0.61 (Sect. 3.3).
- Most of the AGN (75%) are in a SMBH growth phase (AGN dominant phase). In systems that the galaxy mass growth is dominant, the M_{BH} - M_* relation is significantly tighter compared to the galaxies that are in an AGN dominant phase. This could suggest that the growth of black hole mass occurs first, while the early stellar mass assembly may not be so efficient (Sect. 3.4).
- We detect a strong anti-correlation between the M_{BH}/M_* ratio and the ratio of the specific SMBH and galaxy mass growth rates. Most of the AGN that their SMBH is classified as underweighted have sM/sSFR> 1, that is their specific SMBH mass growth rate is higher than their specific stellar mass growth rate. The majority of the AGN with overweighted SMBH have $s\dot{M}/sSFR < 1$, which implies that their stellar masses are catching up their M_{BH} (Sect. 3.5).

Acknowledgements. The author acknowledges support by the Agencia Estatal de Investigación, Unidad de Excelencia María de Maeztu, ref. MDM-2017-0765. This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement n^o 101004168, the XMM2ATHENA project. This research has made use of TOPCAT version 4.8 (Taylor 2005).

References

- Bluck, A. F. L., Piotrowska, J. M., & Maiolino, R. 2023, ApJ [2301.03677]
- Boquien, M., Burgarella, D., Roehlly, Y., et al. 2019, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 622, A103
- Bruzual, G. & Charlot, S. 2003, MNRAS, 344, 1000
- Buat, V., Ciesla, L., Boquien, M., Małek, K., & Burgarella, D. 2019, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 632, A79
- Buat, V., Mountrichas, G., Yang, G., et al. 2021, A&A, 654, A93
- Charlot, S. & Fall, S. M. 2000, ApJ, 539, 718
- Ciesla, L., Elbaz, D., & Fensch, J. 2017, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 608, A41
- Ciesla, L. et al. 2015, A&A, 576, 19
- Dale, D. A., Helou, G., Magdis, G. E., et al. 2014, ApJ, 784, 83
- Ferrarese, L. & Merritt, D. 2000, ApJ, 539, 9
- Gebhardt, K. et al. 2000, ApJ, 543, 5
- Georgakakis, A., Aird, J., Schulze, A., et al. 2017, MNRAS, 471, 1976 Georgakakis, A. & Nandra, K. 2011, MNRAS, 414, 992
- Gültekin, K., Richstone, D. O., Gebhardt, K., et al. 2009, The Astrophysical Journal, 698, 198
- Häring, N. & Rix, H.-W. 2004, ApJl, 604, L89
- Jahnke, K. et al. 2009, ApJ, 706, 215
- Komatsu, E., Smith, K. M., Dunkley, J., et al. 2011, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 192, 18
- Kormendy, J. & Ho, L. C. 2013, ARAA, 51, 511
- Koutoulidis, L., Mountrichas, G., Georgantopoulos, I., Pouliasis, E., & Plionis, M. 2022, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 658, A35
- Lanzuisi, G. et al. 2017, A&A, 602, 13
- Liu, Z., Merloni, A., Georgakakis, A., et al. 2016, MNRAS, 459, 1602
- Lusso, E. et al. 2012, MNRAS, 425, 623
- Magorrian, J. et al. 1998, AJ, 115, 2285
- Małek, K., Buat, V., Roehlly, Y., et al. 2018, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 620, A50
- Marconi, A. & Hunt, L. K. 2003, The Astrophysical Journal, 589, L21
- Masoura, V. A., Mountrichas, G., Georgantopoulos, I., & Plionis, M. 2021, As-
- tronomy & Astrophysics, 646, A167 Masoura, V. A., Mountrichas, G., Georgantopoulos, I., et al. 2018, A&A, 618, 31
- Menzel, M.-L. et al. 2016, MNRAS, 457, 110
- Merloni, A. et al. 2010, ApJ, 708, 137

Article number, page 7 of 8

- Mountrichas, G., Buat, V., Yang, G., et al. 2021a, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 646, A29
- Mountrichas, G., Buat, V., Yang, G., et al. 2021b, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 653, A74
- Mountrichas, G., Buat, V., Yang, G., et al. 2022a, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 663, A130
- Mountrichas, G., Buat, V., Yang, G., et al. 2022b, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 667, A145
- Mountrichas, G., Masoura, V. A., Xilouris, E. M., et al. 2022c, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 661, A108
- Mountrichas, G. & Shankar, F. 2023, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 518, 2088
- Park, D., Woo, J.-H., Bennert, V. N., et al. 2015, The Astrophysical Journal, 799, 164
- Pierre, M. et al. 2016, A&A, 592, 1
- Poitevineau, R., Castignani, G., & Combes, F. 2023, A&A [2301.05186]
- Reines, A. E. & Volonteri, M. 2015, The Astrophysical Journal, 813, 82
- Sani, E., Marconi, A., Hunt, L. K., & Risaliti, G. 2011, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 413, 1479
- Schramm, M. & Silverman, J. D. 2013, The Astrophysical Journal, 767, 13
- Schreiber, C. et al. 2015, A&A, 575, 29
- Setoguchi, K., Ueda, Y., Toba, Y., & Akiyama, M. 2021, The Astrophysical Journal, 909, 188
- Shankar, F., Bernardi, M., Richardson, K., et al. 2019, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 485, 1278
- Shankar, F., Bernardi, M., Sheth, R. K., et al. 2016, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 460, 3119
- Shen, Y., Greene, J. E., Strauss, M. A., Richards, G. T., & Schneider, D. P. 2008, The Astrophysical Journal, 680, 169
- Shen, Y. & Liu, X. 2012, The Astrophysical Journal, 753, 125
- Shen, Y., Richards, G. T., Strauss, M. A., et al. 2011, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 194, 45
- Shen, Y. et al. 2013, ApJ, 778, 98
- Shirley, R., Duncan, K., Varillas, M. C. C., et al. 2021, MNRAS, 507, 129
- Shirley, R., Roehlly, Y., Hurley, P. D., et al. 2019, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 490, 634
- Stalevski, M., Fritz, J., Baes, M., Nakos, T., & Popović, L. Č. 2012, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 420, 2756
- Stalevski, M., Ricci, C., Ueda, Y., et al. 2016, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 458, 2288
- Suh, H., Civano, F., Trakhtenbrot, B., et al. 2020, The Astrophysical Journal, 889, 32
- Sun, M., Trump, J. R., Brandt, W. N., et al. 2015, The Astrophysical Journal, 802, 14
- Sutherland, W. & Saunders, W. 1992, MNRAS, 259, 413

Taylor, M. B. 2005, in Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series, Vol. 347, Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XIV, ed. P. Shopbell, M. Britton, & R. Ebert, 29

- Tremaine, S., Gebhardt, K., Bender, R., et al. 2002, The Astrophysical Journal, 574, 740
- Trump, J. R. et al. 2009, ApJ, 696, 1195
- Ueda, Y., Hatsukade, B., Kohno, K., et al. 2018, The Astrophysical Journal, 853, 24
- Whitaker, K. E., Franx, M., Leja, J., et al. 2014, The Astrophysical Journal, 795, 104
- Yang, G., Boquien, M., Brandt, W. N., et al. 2022, The Astrophysical Journal, 927, 192
- Yang, G., Boquien, M., Buat, V., et al. 2020, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 491, 740