

THE ULTRAVIOLET-INFRARED COLOR-MAGNITUDE RELATION OF STAR-FORMING GALAXIES

M. J. I. Brown,¹ J. Moustakas,² T. H. Jarrett,³ and M. Cluver^{4,5}

¹*School of Physics and Astronomy, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria 3800, Australia*

²*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Siena College, 515 Loudon Road, Loudonville, NY 12211*

³*Astrophysics, Cosmology and Gravity Centre (ACGC), Astronomy Department, University of Cape Town, Private Bag X3, Rondebosch 7701, South Africa*

⁴*Centre for Astrophysics and Supercomputing, Swinburne University of Technology, Hawthorn, VIC 3122, Australia*

⁵*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of the Western Cape, Robert Sobukwe Road, Bellville, 7535, South Africa*

Keywords: galaxies: general — galaxies: evolution — galaxies: photometry — stars: formation

Galaxy bimodality, described by the red sequence and blue cloud, has been central to our understanding of galaxy evolution since the turn of this century (e.g., Baldry et al. 2004; Bell et al. 2004; Blanton & Moustakas 2009). Passive galaxies follow a narrow color-magnitude relation while star-forming galaxies in the blue cloud have a broader range of optical colors, resulting from a range of stellar populations, star formation rates and dust obscuration. Although star-forming galaxies are diverse, they do fall along well-established correlations with mass, including the mass-metallicity relation (e.g., Tremonti et al. 2004), star formation rate versus mass (e.g., Noeske et al. 2007) and declining dust content with decreasing mass (e.g., Wu et al. 2006). These relations manifest themselves in broadband photometry, albeit outside the optical wavelength range, as illustrated by the dependence of infrared colors on galaxy type (e.g., Jarrett et al. 2011).

The far-ultraviolet and mid-infrared are both star formation rate tracers, with the former tracing massive stars while the latter traces blackbody emission from warm dust. While far-ultraviolet luminosity is directly proportional to star formation rate, for $\lesssim L^*$ galaxies mid-infrared luminosity is proportional to star formation rate to the power of ~ 1.3 (e.g., Catalán-Torrecilla et al. 2015; Brown et al. 2017), which is a consequence of dust content varying with galaxy mass. We thus expect a blue sequence to be present in ultraviolet-infrared color-magnitude diagrams.

To measure the ultraviolet-infrared color-magnitude relation, we use the local galaxy sample of Brown et al. (2014, 2017) and their multiwavelength matched aperture photometry (in AB magnitudes). We limit the sample to galaxies with $m_{W2} - m_{W3} > -0.5$, which excludes passive galaxies from the Brown et al. (2014) sample, and we remove active galactic nuclei with the emission line ratio criterion of Kauffmann et al. (2003). To correct the GALEX FUV photometry for internal dust obscuration we use $A_{FUV} \propto (M_{FUV} - M_{NUV})$, leaving the constant as a free parameter that we use to minimize the scatter of the color-magnitude relation.

In Figure 1 we present the ultraviolet-infrared color-magnitude plot of $z \sim 0$ star-forming galaxies, using the FUV , NUV , and WISE $W3$ photometry. We find the best relation is produced when $A_{FUV} = 2.6(M_{FUV} - M_{NUV})$, which is shallower than the dust extinction relation of Hao et al. (2011), where $A_{FUV} = (3.83 \pm 0.48)[M_{FUV} - M_{NUV} - (0.022 \pm 0.024)]$. As a cross check of our results, in Figure 1 we also plot photometry of $z < 0.05$ GAMA galaxies (Wright et al. 2016) with WISE $m_{W2} - m_{W3} > -0.5$, and we find good agreement although GAMA spans a smaller range of M_{W3} than Brown et al. (2014, 2017). We also observe similar relations when we replace WISE $W3$ with WISE $W4$ or *Spitzer* 24 μm , albeit with more scatter.

The best-fit color-magnitude relation is given by

$$M_{W3} = -14.8 - 2.1 \times [2.6(M_{FUV} - M_{NUV}) - M_{W3}]. \quad (1)$$




Figure 1. The ultraviolet-infrared (left) and $g - H$ (right) color-magnitude relations for star-forming galaxies. Some of the outliers in the $g - H$ are labelled, and these are often merging galaxies rather than spirals. As the Brown et al. (2014, 2017) sample deliberately selected galaxies to span parameter space, it shows more scatter than the magnitude limited GAMA sample.

Using the Brown et al. (2014, 2017) sample, we find the 1σ scatter of M_{W3} about the relation is $\sigma_{W3} = 1.6$ mag. If ultraviolet - infrared color was used as a distance indicator then the 68% scatter of the distance would be a factor of ~ 2 .

We note color-magnitude relations for blue galaxies have been identified previously, including the median optical color of blue galaxies varying with magnitude (Baldry et al. 2004). Furthermore, Tully et al. (1982) identified a tight $B - H$ color-magnitude relation for spiral galaxies, and in the right panel of Figure 1 we reproduce this relation for star-forming galaxies using SDSS g and 2MASS H -band photometry. Tully et al. (1982) attributed this relation to specific star formation rate, chemical abundances and/or initial mass function varying with mass. Interestingly, we do see some outliers in the $g - H$ versus M_H diagram, including merging starbursts. These outliers are not unexpected, given g and H trace different galaxy properties, whereas the ultraviolet and mid-infrared are both (primarily) star formation rate tracers.

In this note we have identified and characterized the ultraviolet-infrared color-magnitude relation of star-forming galaxies. The ultraviolet to mid-infrared flux ratios of star-forming galaxies span over two orders of magnitude and show a clear dependence on absolute magnitude from $M_{W3} \sim -13$ to $M_{W3} \sim -25$, which may present problems for models of galaxy spectral energy distributions that have been largely verified on $\sim L^*$ galaxies. The color-magnitude relation of star-forming galaxies illustrates the (broadband) spectral diversity of star-forming galaxies that results from established correlations between the physical properties and mass, including the mass-metallicity relation.

REFERENCES

- Baldry, I. K., Glazebrook, K., Brinkmann, J., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 600, 681
- Bell, E. F., Wolf, C., Meisenheimer, K., et al. 2004, *ApJ*, 608, 752
- Blanton, M. R., & Moustakas, J. 2009, *ARA&A*, 47, 159
- Brown, M. J. I., Moustakas, J., Smith, J.-D. T., et al. 2014, *ApJS*, 212, 18
- Brown, M. J. I., Moustakas, J., Kennicutt, R. C., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 847, 136
- Catalán-Torrecilla, C., Gil de Paz, A., Castillo-Morales, A., et al. 2015, *A&A*, 584, 87
- Gil de Paz, A., Boissier, S., Madore, B. F., et al. 2007, *ApJS*, 173, 185
- Hao, C.-N., Kennicutt, R. C., Johnson, B. D., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 741, 124
- Jarrett, T. H., Cohen, M., Masci, F., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 735, 112
- Kauffmann, G., Heckman, T. M., Tremonti, C., et al. 2003, *MNRAS*, 2003, 346, 1055
- Noeske, K. G., Weiner, B. J., Faber, S. M., et al. 2007, *ApJL*, 660, L43
- Tremonti, C. A., Heckman, T. M., Kauffmann, G., et al. 2004, *ApJ*, 2004, 613
- Tully, R. B., Mould, J. R. & Aaronson, M., et al. 1982, *ApJ*, 257, 527
- Wright, A. H., Robotham, A. S. G., Bourne, N., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 460, 765
- Wu, Y., Charmandaris, V., Hao, L., et al. 2006, *ApJ*, 639, 157