
















































JWST reveals a possible $z \sim 11$ galaxy merger in triply-lensed MACS0647–JD

TIGER YU-YANG HSIAO ¹, DAN COE ^{2,3,1}, ABDURRO'UF ^{1,2}, LILY WHITLER ⁴, INTAE JUNG ²,
GOURAV KHULLAR ⁵, ASHISH KUMAR MEENA ⁶, PRATIKA DAYAL ⁷, KIRK S. S. BARROW ⁸,
LILLIAN SANTOS-OLMSTED ⁹, ADAM CASSELMAN ¹⁰, EROS VANZELLA ¹¹, MARIO NONINO ¹²,
YOLANDA JIMÉNEZ-TEJA ^{13,14}, MASAMUNE OGURI ^{15,16}, DANIEL P. STARK⁴, LUKAS J. FURTAK ⁶, ADI ZITRIN ⁶,
ANGELA ADAMO ¹⁷, GABRIEL BRAMMER ^{18,19}, LARRY BRADLEY ², JOSE M. DIEGO ²⁰, ERIK ZACKRISSON ²¹,
STEVEN L. FINKELSTEIN ²², ROGIER A. WINDHORST ²³, RACHANA BHATAWDEKAR ²⁴, TAYLOR A. HUTCHISON ^{25,*},
TOM BROADHURST ^{26,27,28}, PAOLA DIMAURO ²⁹, FELIPE ANDRADE-SANTOS ^{30,31}, JAN J. ELDRIDGE ³²,
ANA ACEBRON ^{33,34}, ROBERTO J. AVILA ², MATTHEW B. BAYLISS ³⁶, ALEX BENÍTEZ ³⁶, CHRISTIAN BINGGELI ²¹,
PATRICIA BOLAN ³⁷, MARUŠA BRADAČ ^{38,37}, ADAM C. CARNALL ³⁹, CHRISTOPHER J. CONSELICE ⁴⁰,
MEGAN DONAHUE ⁴¹, BRENDA FRYE ⁴², SELJI FUJIMOTO ^{22,18,19,†}, ALAINA HENRY ^{2,1}, BETHAN L. JAMES ²,
SUSAN A. KASSIN ^{2,1}, LISA KEWLEY ³¹, REBECCA L. LARSON ^{22,‡}, TOD LAUER ⁴³, DAVID LAW ²,
GUILLAUME MAHLER ^{44,45}, RAMESH MAINALI ²⁵, STEPHAN MCCANDLISS ¹, DAVID NICHOLLS ^{46,47},
NORBERT PIRZKAL ², MARC POSTMAN ², JANE R. RIGBY ²⁵, RUSSELL RYAN ², PETER SENCHYNA ⁴⁸,
KEREN SHARON ⁴⁹, IKKO SHIMIZU⁵⁰, VICTORIA STRAIT ^{18,19}, MENGTAO TANG ⁵¹, MICHELE TRENTI ^{52,53},
ANTON VIKAEUS ²¹ AND BRIAN WELCH ^{54,25,55}

¹Center for Astrophysical Sciences, Department of Physics and Astronomy, The Johns Hopkins University, 3400 N Charles St. Baltimore, MD 21218, USA

²Space Telescope Science Institute (STScI), 3700 San Martin Drive, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA

³Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy (AURA), Inc. for the European Space Agency (ESA)

⁴Steward Observatory, University of Arizona, 933 N Cherry Ave, Tucson, AZ 85721 USA

⁵Department of Physics and Astronomy and PITT PACC, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260, USA

⁶Physics Department, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, P.O. Box 653, Be'er-Sheva 84105, Israel

⁷Kapteyn Astronomical Institute, University of Groningen, P.O. Box 800, 9700 AV Groningen, The Netherlands

⁸Department of Astronomy, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1002 W Green St, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

⁹Kavli Institute for Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology, Stanford University, 452 Lomita Mall, Stanford, CA 94305-4085, USA

¹⁰Department of Aerospace Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana, Champaign 104 S Wright St, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

¹¹INAF – OAS, Osservatorio di Astrofisica e Scienza dello Spazio di Bologna, via Gobetti 93/3, I-40129 Bologna, Italy

¹²INAF-Trieste Astronomical Observatory, Via Bazzoni 2, 34124, Trieste, Italy

¹³Instituto de Astrofísica de Andalucía, Glorieta de la Astronomía s/n, 18008 Granada, Spain

¹⁴Observatório Nacional - MCTI (ON), Rua Gal. José Cristino 77, São Cristóvão, 20921-400, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

¹⁵Center for Frontier Science, Chiba University, 1-33 Yayoi-cho, Inage-ku, Chiba 263-8522, Japan

¹⁶Department of Physics, Graduate School of Science, Chiba University, 1-33 Yayoi-Cho, Inage-Ku, Chiba 263-8522, Japan

¹⁷Department of Astronomy, Oskar Klein Centre, Stockholm University, AlbaNova University Centre, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

¹⁸Cosmic Dawn Center (DAWN), Copenhagen, Denmark

¹⁹Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Jagtvej 128, Copenhagen, Denmark

²⁰Instituto de Física de Cantabria (CSIC-UC). Avda. Los Castros s/n. 39005 Santander, Spain

²¹Observational Astrophysics, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Uppsala University, Box 516, SE-751 20 Uppsala, Sweden

²²Department of Astronomy, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712

²³School of Earth and Space Exploration, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-1404, USA

²⁴European Space Agency, ESA/ESTEC, Keplerlaan 1, 2201 AZ Noordwijk, NL

²⁵Observational Cosmology Lab, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA

²⁶Department of Theoretical Physics, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, Bilbao, Spain

²⁷Donostia International Physics Center (DIPC), 20018 Donostia, Spain

²⁸IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, Bilbao, Spain

²⁹INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma, via di Frascati 33, 00078 Monte Porzio Catone, Italy

³⁰Department of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Berklee College of Music, 7 Haviland Street, Boston, MA 02215, USA

³¹Center for Astrophysics || Harvard & Smithsonian, 60 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

³²Department of Physics, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland, New Zealand

³³Dipartimento di Fisica, Università degli Studi di Milano, Via Celoria 16, I-20133 Milano, Italy

³⁴INAF - IASF Milano, via A. Corti 12, I-20133 Milano, Italy

³⁵Department of Physics, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221, USA

³⁶King's College London, University of London, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, UK

³⁷Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Davis, 1 Shields Ave, Davis, CA 95616, USA

³⁸Department of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, Jadranska ulica 19, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

³⁹Institute for Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Royal Observatory, Edinburgh EH9 3HJ, UK

⁴⁰Jodrell Bank Centre for Astrophysics, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester UK

⁴¹Michigan State University, Physics & Astronomy Department, East Lansing, MI, USA

⁴²Department of Astronomy, Steward Observatory, University of Arizona, 933 North Cherry Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

⁴³NSF's National Optical-Infrared Astronomy Research Laboratory, 950 North Cherry Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85719, USA

⁴⁴Institute for Computational Cosmology, Durham University, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE, UK

⁴⁵Centre for Extragalactic Astronomy, Durham University, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE, UK

⁴⁶Research School of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia

⁴⁷ARC Centre of Excellence for All Sky Astrophysics in 3 Dimensions (ASTRO 3D), Australia

⁴⁸Carnegie Observatories, 813 Santa Barbara Street, Pasadena, CA 91101, USA

⁴⁹Department of Astronomy, University of Michigan, 1085 S. University Ave, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA

⁵⁰Department of Literature, Shikoku Gakuin University, 3-2-1 Bunkyocho, Zentsuji, Kagawa 765-8505, Japan

⁵¹Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK

⁵²School of Physics, University of Melbourne, Parkville VIC 3010, Australia

⁵³ARC Centre of Excellence for All-Sky Astrophysics in 3 Dimensions, University of Melbourne, Parkville VIC 3010, Australia

⁵⁴Department of Astronomy, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA

⁵⁵Center for Research and Exploration in Space Science and Technology, NASA/GSFC, Greenbelt, MD 20771

Submitted to ApJ

ABSTRACT

MACS0647–JD is a triply-lensed $z \sim 11$ galaxy originally discovered with the *Hubble Space Telescope*. The three lensed images are magnified by factors of ~ 8 , 5, and 2 to AB mag 25.1, 25.6, and 26.6 at $3.5 \mu\text{m}$. The brightest is over a magnitude brighter than other galaxies recently discovered at similar redshifts $z > 10$ with *JWST*. Here we report new *JWST* imaging clearly resolves MACS0647–JD as having two components that are either merging galaxies or stellar complexes within a single galaxy. The brighter larger component “A” is intrinsically very blue ($\beta \sim -2.6 \pm 0.1$), likely due to very recent star formation and no dust, and is spatially extended with an effective radius $\sim 70 \pm 24$ pc. The smaller component “B” ($r \sim 20_{-5}^{+8}$ pc) appears redder ($\beta \sim -2 \pm 0.2$), likely because it is older (100–200 Myr) with mild dust extinction ($A_V \sim 0.1$ mag). With an estimated stellar mass ratio of roughly 2:1 and physical projected separation ~ 400 pc, we may be witnessing a galaxy merger 430 million years after the Big Bang. We identify galaxies with similar colors in a high-redshift simulation, finding their star formation histories to be dissimilar, which is also suggested by the SED fitting, suggesting they formed further apart. We also identify a candidate companion galaxy “C” ~ 3 kpc away, likely destined to merge with A and B. Upcoming *JWST* NIRSpec observations planned for January 2023 will deliver spectroscopic redshifts and more physical properties for these tiny magnified distant galaxies observed in the early universe.

Keywords: Galaxies (573), High-redshift galaxies (734), Strong gravitational lensing (1643), Galaxy clusters (584), Early universe (435)

* NASA Postdoctoral Fellow

‡ NSF Graduate Fellow

† Hubble Fellow

1. INTRODUCTION

Galaxies have formed from the repeated mergers of small star-forming clumps over cosmic time, with some small galaxies left over even today, such as the Magellanic clouds. *JWST* has now discovered two such small galaxies within the first 430 million years, that are seen close to the very start of this process. Studies have shown that up to 85% of present-day massive galaxies went through a galaxy merger in their lifetime, indicating that galaxy mergers play an important role in the formation and evolution of galaxies (e.g., Bell et al. 2006; Stewart et al. 2009; Hopkins et al. 2010b; Lotz et al. 2011; Rodriguez-Gomez et al. 2015; Duncan et al. 2019; Sotillo-Ramos et al. 2022). The Milky Way itself likely experienced a major merger at $z \sim 2$ with the so-called Gaia-Sausage-Enceladus galaxy (Helmi et al. 2018; Belokurov et al. 2018; Bonaca et al. 2020; Naidu et al. 2021; Xiang & Rix 2022). Based on reconstructions of this event, Naidu et al. (2021) concluded that $\approx 50\%$ of the stellar mass of the current halo of the Milky Way came from this galaxy. More generally speaking, mergers build up the stellar content and transform galaxy morphology (e.g., Toomre & Toomre 1972; Barnes 1992; Mihos & Hernquist 1996; Huško et al. 2023). Mergers are also believed to affect the kinematics and distribution of stars (e.g., Naab et al. 2009; van Dokkum et al. 2010; Newman et al. 2012), and play a key role in the growth of supermassive black holes (e.g., Treister et al. 2012; Ellison et al. 2019; Zhang et al. 2023).

JWST (Gardner et al. 2006) is a state-of-the-art infrared space-based telescope which was launched in December 2021 and started scientific observations recently in July 2022 (Rigby et al. 2022). Numerous high-redshift candidates have been discovered based on their photometric redshifts and drop-out selections (e.g., Naidu et al. 2022; Castellano et al. 2022; Adams et al. 2022; Yan et al. 2022; Donnan et al. 2022; Harikane et al. 2022; Atek et al. 2022; Finkelstein et al. 2022; Whitler et al. 2022a; Bradley et al. 2022; Castellano et al. 2022). Within its first few months, *JWST* is quickly transforming our understanding of the early Universe (e.g., with flat / disk galaxies reported at $z \sim 2 - 6$: Ferreira et al. 2022; Nelson et al. 2022).

Gravitational lensing by massive galaxy clusters magnifies the light and sizes of distant objects. Thanks to these cosmic telescopes, not only are the fluxes of faint objects in the early Universe are boosted to the observable regime, the sizes of small-scale structures are amplified (e.g., Welch et al. 2022a; Vanzella et al. 2022; Meštrić et al. 2022; Welch et al. 2022b; Claeysens et al. 2022). Thus, lensing has enabled us to discover early galaxies and study their properties (e.g., Coe et al.

2013). In order to study several key scientific topics in the early Universe, several lensing cluster surveys have been conducted, including the Cluster Lensing and Supernova survey with Hubble (CLASH¹; Postman et al. 2012a), the Hubble Frontier Fields (Lotz et al. 2017), and the Reionization Lensing Cluster Survey (RELICS² Coe et al. 2019).

CLASH is one of the large Hubble treasury programs which adopted the lensing technique to study distant galaxies (e.g., Zheng et al. 2012; Coe et al. 2013; Bouwens et al. 2014; Smit et al. 2014; Bradley et al. 2014), supernovae and cosmology (e.g., Graur et al. 2014; Patel et al. 2014; Rodney et al. 2014; Strolger et al. 2015; Riess et al. 2018; Gómez-Valent & Amendola 2018), dark matter in clusters (e.g., Pacucci et al. 2013; Eichner et al. 2013; Sartoris et al. 2014; Umetsu et al. 2014; Merten et al. 2015), and galaxies in clusters (e.g., Postman et al. 2012b; Burke et al. 2015; Donahue et al. 2015; Fogarty et al. 2017; Connor et al. 2017).

CLASH imaged 25 massive galaxy clusters in 16 filters with *HST* from near-UV (~ 200 nm) to near-IR ($\sim 1.6 \mu\text{m}$). Five of the clusters were selected for their strong lensing strength, including MACSJ0647.7+7015 (MACS0647; $z = 0.591$; Ebeling et al. 2007) modeled by Zitrin et al. (2011). CLASH observations of MACSJ0647.7+7015 revealed 32 lensed $z \sim 6 - 8$ candidates (Bradley et al. 2014) and a triply-lensed $z \sim 11$ candidate MACS0647–JD (Coe et al. 2013).

MACS0647–JD had a photometric redshift $z = 10.7_{-0.4}^{+0.6}$ based on *HST* images, where it was detected in only the two reddest filters F140W and F160W, dropping out of 15 bluer filters, including *J* F125W, hence the name JD (J-band dropout). Despite lensing magnifications up to a factor of 8, MACS0647–JD was spatially unresolved in *HST* imaging.

MACS0647–JD was the first robust $z \sim 11$ candidate of the *HST* era, followed by GN-z11, which surpassed it at $z = 11.1$ (Oesch et al. 2016) and is similarly bright (F160W AB mag ~ 26) without the benefit of lensing magnification. Lensed as brightly as F356W AB mag 25.1, MACS0647–JD is 1 – 5 magnitudes brighter than recently discovered $z \sim 8 - 16$ candidates reported in *JWST* imaging (Figure 1; Bradley et al. 2022; Naidu et al. 2022; Adams et al. 2022; Atek et al. 2022; Leethochawalit et al. 2022; Donnan et al. 2022; Harikane et al. 2022; Finkelstein et al. 2022). Because it is so bright, we can study its physical properties in more detail. More detail about the photometry measurement

¹ <https://www.stsci.edu/~postman/CLASH/>

² <https://relics.stsci.edu>

and the lensing will be later described in Section 2 and 3.1.

Pirzkal et al. (2015) analyzed *HST* WFC3/IR G141 grism spectroscopy of MACS0647–JD, concluding that any emission line bright enough to reproduce the observed photometry was ruled out by the observations. Any line or combination of emission lines with a flux of 10^{-17} erg/s/cm²/Å would have been detected at the 5σ level, adding further support for $z \sim 11$ excluding a lower redshift interloper, as in Brammer et al. (2013).

Lens modeling contributes geometric redshift corroboration based on the measured separations between the lensed images. The models in Coe et al. (2013) and Chan et al. (2017) both supported $z \sim 11$.

Lam et al. (2019) analyzed deep *Spitzer* imaging (50 hours / band), modeling and subtracting light of nearby galaxies to arrive at tentative detections of MACS0647–JD. Photometry varied between the three lensed images, yielding estimates of stellar mass $M_*/M_\odot \sim 10^8 - 10^9$, specific star formation rates $\sim 3 - 10$ Gyr⁻¹, and ages ranging between ~ 10 Myr – 400 Myr (the age of the universe at $z \sim 11$).

JWST observing program GO 1433 (PI Coe) aims at studying MACS0647–JD in more detail, obtaining higher resolution images, measuring colors, and obtaining spectroscopy to more precisely measure the redshift and constrain other physical properties including metallicity. NIRCcam imaging was obtained in 6 filters spanning 1.0–5.0 μm , out to ~ 4300 Å rest-frame at $z = 10.6$. The second epoch of observations planned for January 2023 will obtain NIRSspec MSA PRISM observations and add the NIRCcam F480M filter, fully redward of the Balmer break to obtain better measurements of ages and stellar masses at $z \sim 11$. All data from this program are public. We are releasing high-level science products and analysis tools online.³

In this paper, we report new observations of MACS0647–JD with 6 *JWST* NIRCcam filters and derive physical properties including the stellar mass and dust content, while constraining the star formation history. This paper is organized as follows. In §2, we describe the *JWST* and *HST* observational data and the data reduction. In §3, we present the detected objects and their sizes and separations based on lens modeling. We detail photometry measurements in §4 and SED fitting in §5. In §6, we discuss our results, including measurements of physical parameters from SED fitting. We also present properties of analog galaxies identified with similar col-




Figure 1. F356W AB magnitude vs. redshift for MACS0647–JD and $z \sim 8 - 16$ candidates recently discovered in *JWST* imaging (Bradley et al. 2022; Naidu et al. 2022; Adams et al. 2022; Leethochawalit et al. 2022; Donnan et al. 2022; Harikane et al. 2022; Finkelstein et al. 2022). MACS0647–JD is shown both as observed (magnified) and delensed (intrinsic) according to our models.

ors in a hydrodynamic simulation. We summarize our conclusions in §7.

We adopt the AB magnitude system ($m_{\text{AB}} = 31.4 - 2.5 \log(f_\nu/\text{nJy})$; Oke 1974; Oke & Gunn 1983) and the *Planck* 2018 flat Λ CDM cosmology (Planck Collaboration et al. 2020) with $H_0 = 67.7$ km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹, $\Omega_{\text{M}} = 0.31$, and $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.69$, for which the universe is 13.8 billion years old, and $1'' \sim 4$ kpc at $z \sim 11$.

2. OBSERVATIONAL DATA

We analyze new *JWST* NIRCcam images (GO 1433, PI Coe) shown in Figure 2, as well as archival *HST* images described below and detailed in Table 1. All of the data are publicly available in the Mikulski Archive for Space Telescopes (MAST; DOI: 10.17909/d2er-wq71). We also provide reduced data products aligned to a common pixel grid (§2.3).

2.1. *HST* observations

MACS0647+70 has been observed with 39 orbits of *HST* imaging in 17 filters. It was first observed by programs GO 9722 (PI Ebeling) and GO 10493, 10793 (PI Gal-Yam) in the ACS F555W and F814W filters. Then CLASH (GO 12101, PI Postman) obtained imaging in 15 additional filters with WFC3/UVIS, ACS, and WFC3/IR, spanning 0.2–1.7 μm . Additional imaging in WFC3/IR F140W was obtained as part of a grism spectroscopy program (GO 13317, PI Coe).

2.2. *JWST* observations

³ <https://cosmic-spring.github.io>




Figure 2. JWST NIRCcam color image of MACS0647+70 with the three lensed images of MACS0647–JD labeled in red. Also circled in orange are the lensed images of a candidate companion galaxy C.

Here we present new *JWST* NIRCcam imaging in 6 filters, F115W, F150W, F200W, F277W, F365W, and F444W spanning 1–5 μm . These public data were obtained 2022 September 23 as part of Cycle 1 program GO 1433 (PI Coe). Total exposure times of 2104s in each filter achieve 5σ depths of AB mag 28.0 to 29.0 for small sources ($r = 0.1''$ aperture). Depths were mea-

sured by placing circular apertures in blank regions of the image using the PHOTUTILS `ImageDepth` routine⁴.

In each filter, we obtained 4 dithered exposures using INTRAMODULEBOX primary dithers to cover the 4–5'' gaps between the short wavelength detectors, while maximizing image area observed at full depth. Dithering also mitigates bad pixels and image artifacts, while improving resolution of the final drizzled images. Each

⁴ <https://photutils.readthedocs.io/en/stable/api/photutils.util.ImageDepth.html>

Table 1. *HST* and *JWST* Exposure Times and Depths

Camera	Filter	λ (μm)	Exp. Time (sec)	Depth ^a (AB)
<i>HST</i> WFC3/UVIS	F275W	0.23–0.31	3879	27.4
<i>HST</i> WFC3/UVIS	F336W	0.30–0.37	2498	27.6
<i>HST</i> WFC3/UVIS	F390W	0.33–0.45	2545	28.1
<i>HST</i> ACS/WFC	F435W	0.36–0.49	2124	28.0
<i>HST</i> ACS/WFC	F475W	0.39–0.56	2248	28.2
<i>HST</i> ACS/WFC	F555W	0.46–0.62	7740	28.7
<i>HST</i> ACS/WFC	F606W	0.46–0.72	2064	28.3
<i>HST</i> ACS/WFC	F625W	0.54–0.71	2131	27.9
<i>HST</i> ACS/WFC	F775W	0.68–0.86	2162	27.8
<i>HST</i> ACS/WFC	F814W ^b	0.69–0.96	8800	28.5
<i>HST</i> ACS/WFC	F850LP	0.80–1.09	4325	27.3
<i>HST</i> WFC3/IR	F105W	0.89–1.21	2914	28.3
<i>HST</i> WFC3/IR	F110W	0.88–1.41	1606	28.7
<i>HST</i> WFC3/IR	F125W	1.08–1.41	2614	28.3
<i>HST</i> WFC3/IR	F140W	1.19–1.61	2411	28.7
<i>HST</i> WFC3/IR	F160W	1.39–1.70	5229	28.4
<i>JWST</i> NIRCam	F115W	1.0–1.3	2104	28.1
<i>JWST</i> NIRCam	F150W	1.3–1.7	2104	28.3
<i>JWST</i> NIRCam	F200W	1.7–2.2	2104	28.4
<i>JWST</i> NIRCam	F277W	2.4–3.1	2104	28.9
<i>JWST</i> NIRCam	F356W	3.1–4.0	2104	29.0
<i>JWST</i> NIRCam	F444W	3.8–5.0	2104	28.8

^a 5σ point source AB magnitude limit (within a $0.2''$ diameter aperture).

^bWe excluded one dataset (J8QU04020: 3960 s) because it is contaminated by scattered light from the WFPC2 internal lamp, which was in use for a parallel program.

exposure uses the SHALLOW4 readout pattern with ten groups and one integration.

Backgrounds were relatively high that time of year for this target ($\sim 80\%$ higher than minimum). The telescope was rolled to Position Angle 280° . We observed the cluster in NIRCam module A and a nearby “blank” field with module B. The brighter lensed images MACS0647–JD1 and JD2 were observed with NIRCam SW detector A3, while JD3 was observed with A1.

This program GO 1433 will obtain additional public data expected in January 2023: NIRCam imaging in F200W and F480M and NIRSpect MSA PRISM spectroscopic observations.

2.3. Data Reduction

We process imaging data from MAST from all the programs above. The reduced images, along with source catalogs, are publicly available online⁵ along with public data from other *JWST* programs.

We retrieve the individual calibrated exposures processed by the *HST* and *JWST* pipelines (FLT and Level 2b CAL images, respectively). We then process all of these using the GRIZLI pipeline (Brammer et al. 2022), co-adding all exposures in each filter, and aligning all stacked images to a common $0.04''$ pixel grid with coordinates registered to the GAIA DR3 catalogs (Gaia Collaboration et al. 2021). The NIRCam short wavelength images are drizzled to $0.02''$ pixels (on the same pixel grid supersampled $2\times$) to provide the highest possible resolution. We leave out the bluest filter *HST* WFC3/UVIS F225W image, which contains very few sources making it difficult to process.

We make use of the latest NIRCam calibrations `JWST_0995.pmap` , based on data from NIRCam CAL program data and made operational 2022 October 6. These were not available at the time of processing, so we recalibrate our data in several steps. The *JWST* pipeline used NIRCam calibrations first made available July 29 in `JWST_0942.pmap` ; these were the first photometric calibrations based on in-flight data. Subsequently in late August, updated NIRCam calibrations⁶ were calculated independently and utilized in GRIZLI v4 image processing of many public datasets, including this one. These calibrations are consistent to within $< 5\%$ of the most recent `JWST_0995.pmap` calibrations in each filter and detector. We measure photometry (§4) in the GRIZLI v4 images, then finally apply the necessary flux corrections (Table 2) to JD1 and JD2 observed in NIRCam detectors A3 and A5, and JD3 in detectors A1 and A5.

The GRIZLI pipeline applies corrections for $1/f$ noise striping and masks “snowballs”⁷ caused by high-energy cosmic rays. It also corrects for stray light features known as “wisps” that are static and have been modeled in the A3, B3, and B4 detectors in F150W and F200W images.⁸

Finally, the GRIZLI pipeline combines all images in each filter, drizzling them to a common pixel grid using ASTRODRIZZLE (Koekemoer et al. 2003; Hoffmann et al. 2021). The NIRCam short wavelength images F115W,

⁵ <https://s3.amazonaws.com/grizli-v2/JwstMosaics/v4/index.html>

⁶ <https://zenodo.org/record/7143382>

⁷ <https://jwst-docs.stsci.edu/data-artifacts-and-features/snowballs-artifact>

⁸ <https://jwst-docs.stsci.edu/jwst-near-infrared-camera/nircam-features-and-caveats/nircam-claws-and-wisps>

Table 2. Photometric Recalibration

Filter	JD1, JD2	JD3
F115W	A3 0.9687	A1 0.9826
F150W	A3 0.9536	A1 0.9777
F200W	A3 0.9658	A1 0.9891
F277W	A5 1.0239	A5 1.0239
F356W	A5 0.9763	A5 0.9763
F444W	A5 1.0073	A5 1.0073

NOTE—We multiply JD1,2,3 fluxes and uncertainties by these values to correct from GRIZLI v4 calibration to `JWST_0995.pmap`.

F150W, and F200W are drizzled to 0''.02 pixels, and all other images are drizzled to 0''.04 pixels (on the same grid at half the resolution). All *HST* and *JWST* images are aligned to a common world coordinate system (WCS) registered to the GAIA DR3 catalogs (Gaia Collaboration et al. 2021). We create color images using *Trilogy*⁹ (Coe et al. 2012).

2.4. JWST Stellar Diffraction Spikes and Scattered Light Artifacts

At relatively low Galactic latitude $b = 25^\circ$, there are many stars affecting the image. One particularly bright ~ 8 th magnitude star $\sim 2'$ southwest of JD1 and JD2 (observed in module B) produces a diffraction spike that crosses the entire module A image of the cluster. Fortunately, none of the lensed images JD1, 2, 3 are impacted by the spikes, with the possible exception of one that comes close to JD2 in F277W.

Other scattered light artifacts are isolated and do not impact the lensed images of MACS0647–JD. “Claws”¹⁰ are visible as horizontal stripes in our F200W image well south of JD3. These are presumably due to an extremely bright ($K \lesssim 3$ Vega mag) star very far from the field of view (10° in the telescope V3 direction). They do not move significantly between dithers and cannot be modeled or subtracted.

Dragon’s Breath Type II¹¹ is visible as vertical stripes in our F200W image, near the west edge, extending

south of center in the A4 detector, also far from JD1, 2, 3.

3. THREE STELLAR COMPONENTS

The *JWST* NIRC*am* images clearly resolve MACS0647–JD into two galaxies or components: A and B (Figure 3). Component A is brighter and spatially extended, while B is fainter, more compact, and redder in the short wavelength filters. These two components are clearly seen in each of the three lensed images JD1, 2, 3. Both are J-band dropouts, not detected in F115W.

Additionally, we identify a candidate companion galaxy C, another J-band dropout (Figure 4) observed 2.2'', 2.2'', and 0.9'' from JD1A, JD2A, and JD3A, respectively (see Figure 2). It is fainter than A and B and even more compact.

3.1. Lens Modeling

A first lens model for this cluster, prior to CLASH imaging, was presented by Zitrin et al. (2011). Lens modeling enabled by the CLASH *HST* images has been presented in Coe et al. (2013); Zitrin et al. (2015); Chan et al. (2017) using various methods: Lenstool (Jullo et al. 2007; Jullo & Kneib 2009), Zitrin-LTM (Zitrin et al. 2009; Broadhurst et al. 2005), and WSLAP+ (Diego et al. 2005, 2007). Magnification estimates range from 6.0–8.4, 5.5–7.7, and 2.1–2.8 for JD1, 2, 3, respectively. Uncertainties are thus roughly $\pm 17\%$, similar to performances modeling simulated lenses with excellent constraints. These models have decent constraints with between 9 and 12 multiply-lensed galaxies, however none have spectroscopic redshift.

JWST imaging reveals more multiply-lensed image systems which will be published alongside a new lens model in Meena et al. (in preparation). The model was obtained using a revised, analytic version of the parametric method presented in Zitrin et al. (2015) and was recently used, for example, in Pascale et al. (2022). This preliminary, new parametric lens model yields magnification estimates of $\sim 6.9, 6.3, \text{ and } 2.1$ for JD1, 2, 3, with tangential (linear) magnifications of $\sim 4.7, 4.4, \text{ and } 1.8$. Another preliminary new mass model using GLAFIC (Oguri 2010) predicts magnifications of $\sim 9.1, 5.5, \text{ and } 1.8$ for JD1, 2, 3, respectively.

JWST imaging also yields direct new measurements of the observed flux ratios $\sim 3.5 : 2.3 : 1$ for JD1, 2, 3 based on NIRC*am* photometry measured in F200W and redward, averaging 340, 223, 97 nJy (AB mag 25.1, 25.5, 26.4). Based on these measured flux ratios, we adopt fiducial magnification estimates of $\sim 8.0, 5.3, \text{ and } 2.2$ for JD1, 2, 3, respectively, with tangential magnifications of $\sim 5, 4 \text{ and } 2$. These are roughly consistent with previous

⁹ <https://github.com/dancoe/trilogy>

¹⁰ <https://jwst-docs.stsci.edu/jwst-near-infrared-camera/nircam-features-and-caveats/nircam-claws-and-wisps>

¹¹ <https://jwst-docs.stsci.edu/jwst-near-infrared-camera/nircam-features-and-caveats/nircam-dragon-s-breath-type-ii>




Figure 3. MACS0647–JD observed in the NIRCcam SW color image (B=F115W, G=F150W, R=F200W) and in each NIRCcam filter. Each image stamp is $1''$ across. Grayscale images for all filters are scaled to the same flux densities per $0''.02$ pixel, as shown in the colorbar. Data are recalibrated to `jwst_0995.pmap`.




Figure 4. Candidate companion galaxy MACS0647–JDc. Color and grayscale images as in Figure 3.

estimates¹² and the total magnification ~ 15.5 is roughly equal to the total in our new preliminary lens model. The average de-lensed flux in F200W, F277W, F356W, F444W is 43 nJy (AB mag 27.3, $M_{UV} = -20.4$) with an uncertainty of $\sim 17\%$.

3.2. Sizes and Separations

¹² Previous magnification estimates for JD1, JD2, and JD3 were 8, 7, 3 (Coe et al. 2013); 6, 6, 2 (Zitrin et al. 2015); and 8, 8, 3 (Chan et al. 2017).

We use GALFIT (Peng et al. 2010) to model JD1 A & B in the sharpest image, F150W. Galaxy A is fit well by a 2-component Sérsic model (see Figure 5), including a compact core and a more extended host with a radius of 4.4 ± 1.5 pixels = $0.09''$ (adopting a Gaussian profile for both, Sérsic index $n=0.5$). De-lensing that by the tangential linear magnification ~ 5 , yields a radius $\sim 70_{-24}^{+24}$ pc. Galaxy B is well-fitted by a single compact source with a radius of $1.3_{-0.3}^{+0.5}$ pixels, with a de-lensed radius $\sim 20_{-5}^{+8}$ pc. This analysis method was tested and validated with simulations in Meštrić et al. (2022). Note that we use the morphology measurements from F150W




Figure 5. GALFIT modeling (center) of JD1ABC in the F150W and F200W images (left) with residuals shown at right. Sérsic model parameters are fit in F150W and held constant (aside from flux) in F200W. A possible noise fluctuation A' apparent only in the F150W image was included as a 4th model component so as not to bias the fitting. A' and C are compact and modeled as point sources (convolved with the image PSF). Based on this model combined with our lens model, we measure A and B have radii of $\sim 70^{+24}_{-24}$ and 20^{+8}_{-5} pc, respectively (§3.2).

to model the F200W image as shown in Figure 5 and is well-fitted.

A similar independent analysis with IMFIT (Erwin 2015) fitting galaxy A to a single component yields a radius of 3 pixels (with higher Sérsic index $n \sim 2$ vs. 0.5 for the GALFIT extended component). This yields a smaller deensed radius ~ 45 pc for A.

A third analysis measuring the curve of growth (flux vs. radius) yields deensed effective radii ~ 70 and 50 pc for A and B, respectively.

To measure separations between A, B, and C, we de-lens images JD1, 2, 3 to the source plane (Figure 6). We find the cores of A and B are separated by $\sim 0.1''$ (~ 400 pc) in both the Zitrin-analytic GLAFIC models. The candidate companion C is ~ 3 kpc away.

4. PHOTOMETRY MEASUREMENTS

The GRIZLI pipeline uses SEP (Barbary 2016), a Python implementation of SourceExtractor (Bertin & Arnouts 1996), to detect sources in a stacked NIRCcam image and measure aperture-matched photometry in all filters. Photometry is measured in circular apertures with radii $0.5''$.

JD1, 2, 3 are detected as objects #3593, 3349, 4871 in the public v4 catalog (§2.3). Table 3 provides their measured coordinates and photometry recalibrated using Table 2. These are total fluxes measured for galaxies A+B. To measure photometry of these components individually, we use the methods below. The photometry of individual galaxies A and B is organized in Table 4.

The candidate companion galaxy C is detected as objects #3621, 3314, 4858.

4.1. PIXEDFIT

To spatially resolve the SEDs of the two galaxies, we use PIXEDFIT (Abdurro'uf et al. 2021). For this resolved SED analysis, we use 13-band imaging from ACS and NIRCcam (excluding ACS F850LP and WFC3/IR filters with broader PSF, as well as the lower wavelength WFC3/UVIS filters), similar to the analyses carried out in Abdurro'uf et al. (2023). First, all images are resampled to $0.02''$ pixels using reproject (Robitaille et al. 2020). Then, we use SEP (Barbary 2016) to detect objects in the NIRCcam images, generating a segmentation map defining pixels belonging A+B.




Figure 6. Delensed images of JD1, 2, 3 based on our Zitrin-analytic lens model (Meena et al. in preparation) compared to a pair of merging galaxies in the Renaissance simulations (Barrow et al. 2017) shown at bottom on the same physical scale. Galaxies A & B are separated by $\sim 0.1'' \sim 400$ pc in the delensed source plane. The candidate companion C is $\sim 0.63'' \sim 2.5$ kpc away. Note the relative positions are reproduced well here assuming A, B, and C are all at $z = 10.6$. The reconstruction is similar for C at $z \sim 9$, with delensed positions changing slightly. Redshifts $z < 5$ are ruled out for B and C (assuming A is at $z \sim 11$), as the relative separations would change significantly.

Photometry is measured in elliptical apertures defined within the segments and without overlap. Aperture A is an ellipse with semi-major axis $0.2''$ and semi-minor axis $0.1''$. Aperture B is a circle with radius $0.1''$. Radial profiles decrease within these apertures, reaching a minimum between them that defines their boundary.

We initially forgo PSF-matching to retain spatial resolution. However, we note measured colors may be affected by lost and/or blended flux in the redder filters. The F444W PSF FWHM is $0.14''$ with 54% encircled energy within $r = 0.1''$, compared to 70% for F150W.¹³ We perform aperture corrections based on point source encircled energy and discuss how this affects results below. The effect is to make colors redder, though we note this may be an overcorrection with flux also blending between A and B.

Aside from A and B, there are no other nearby objects affecting the photometry. Local backgrounds are small, consistent with zero, and not subtracted.

¹³ <https://jwst-docs.stsci.edu/jwst-near-infrared-camera/nircam-performance/nircam-point-spread-functions>

4.2. IMFIT

IMFIT (Erwin 2015) has been used to perform 2D fitting to MACS0647-JD. The PSF used in the fitting has been generated, for each filter, using isolated stars. The two clumps have been fitted separately, alternately masking them, followed by a simultaneous fitting step with the parameters for clump A kept fixed. A Sérsic profile has been used for clump A, while for clump B both Sérsic and pointlike profiles resulted in similar values for the reduced χ^2 . Photometry has then been performed on the models generated from the results from the 2D fitting, using an elliptical aperture for clump A.

4.3. CHEFs

CHEFs (from Chebyshev-Fourier functions, Jiménez-Teja & Benítez 2012) are mathematical orthonormal basis specially designed to model the surface luminous distribution of galaxies. First, a segmentation map is created using SourceExtractor (Bertin & Arnouts 1996) to identify the regions that are dominated by each object. Then, objects are sorted by magnitude and fitted with CHEFs, so the light contribution from the brightest objects is removed previous to the modeling of the fainter

Table 3. Coordinates and multiwavelength photometry of MACS0647–JD

Filter	JD1	JD2	JD3
RA(J2000)	101.9822676	101.971326	101.9811153
DEC(J2000)	70.24328239	70.2397157	70.26059029
F275W	-31 ± 35	11 ± 30	43 ± 27
F336W	-8 ± 27	32 ± 24	-24 ± 21
F390W	-12 ± 17	-5 ± 44	24 ± 23
F435W	-25 ± 21	70 ± 18	-23 ± 21
F475W	7 ± 15	-26 ± 113	21 ± 12
F555W	-2 ± 10	15 ± 8	8 ± 7
F606W	-16 ± 10	4 ± 12	-1 ± 28
F625W	-38 ± 20	-24 ± 17	15 ± 17
F775W	24 ± 28	-16 ± 21	-18 ± 17
F814W	-8 ± 9	0 ± 8	-3 ± 7
F850LP	-55 ± 33	-11 ± 30	29 ± 30
F105W	3 ± 19	4 ± 16	-1 ± 14
F110W	-25 ± 13	5 ± 12	7 ± 10
F115W	-1 ± 8	-35 ± 7	-2 ± 6
F125W	-13 ± 19	-9 ± 17	6 ± 14
F140W	126 ± 11	97 ± 12	59 ± 9
F150W	304 ± 7	173 ± 6	92 ± 5
F160W	301 ± 17	203 ± 17	85 ± 13
F200W	354 ± 6	227 ± 6	115 ± 4
F277W	351 ± 6	248 ± 5	93 ± 3
F356W	322 ± 6	203 ± 5	86 ± 3
F444W	330 ± 9	214 ± 7	95 ± 5

Note. All fluxes are given in nJy.

objects. As CHEF are orthonormal basis, they can fit any shape, thus recovering all the light even in the case of irregular morphologies. The CHEFs model of each object is calculated in a circular region with radius twice the equivalent radius of the area assigned to the object by the segmentation map. However, the flux is measured up to the radius where the profile of the model either converges to zero or submerges into the sky noise.

5. SED FITTING

We perform spectral energy distribution (SED) fitting with various methods to estimate the photometric redshift and physical parameters of MACS0647–JD. The various methods adopt different SED templates and assumptions about physical parameters summarized in Table 5. We also match the observed clump colors to

simulated galaxies with realistic bursty star formation histories (§5.6).

5.1. EAZY

Our public dataset includes SED fitting results from EAZY (Brammer et al. 2008) using recently implemented SFHZ templates with redshift-dependent star formation histories.¹⁴ EAZY fits non-negative linear combinations of these templates to the observed photometry. The code is fast, analyzing thousands of galaxies in minutes. It estimates photometric redshifts $z = 10.6_{-0.2}^{+0.3}$, $z = 10.6_{-0.4}^{+0.3}$, $z = 10.2_{-0.6}^{+0.5}$ (95% C.L.) for JD1, 2, 3, respectively (A+B components combined, with F200W AB mag 25.0, 25.5, 26.2).

The fainter companion galaxy C (F200W AB mag 28.0, 27.3, 27.8 with large uncertainties) is also a J-dropout that can be well fit to SEDs at $z = 10.6$ given its larger photometric uncertainties, as we show in §6.6. The photometric redshifts are highly uncertain, with 95% confidence ranges 0.5–10.2, 2.2–10.3, and 9.8–11.5 for JD1C, JD2C, and JD3C, respectively.

While EAZY also provides quick estimates of physical parameters, we turn to other methods to more fully explore the parameter space and estimate values with uncertainties for the individual clumps A and B.

5.2. BAGPIPES

BAGPIPES¹⁵ (Carnall et al. 2018) fits redshift along with a multidimensional space of physical parameters using the MultiNest nested sampling algorithm (Feroz & Hobson 2008; Feroz et al. 2009; Feroz & Skilling 2013). We run BAGPIPES with various sets of assumptions.

We use BPASS v2.2.1 SED templates (Eldridge & Stanway 2009), importantly including binary stars, resulting in brighter rest-UV flux (Eldridge 2020; Eldridge & Stanway 2022). We use the fiducial BPASS IMF `imf135.300`: Kroupa et al. (1993) slope $\alpha = -2.35$ between $0.5 - 300 M_{\odot}$ and shallower $\alpha = -1.3$ for lower mass stars $0.1 - 0.5 M_{\odot}$. This is close to the shallower upper mass slope IMF of Kroupa (2002). Metallicities range from $(0.0005 - 2) Z_{\odot}$.

We reprocess the templates using the photoionization code CLOUDY c17.03 (Ferland et al. 1998, 2013, 2017) to include nebular continuum and emission lines. We generate templates for ionization parameter U ranging between $\log(U) = -4$ to -1 .

We assume an analytic star formation history (SFH) model “delayed τ ”: $\text{SFR}(t) \propto t \exp(-t/\tau)$. SFR rises

¹⁴ <https://github.com/gbrammer/eazy-photoz/tree/master/templates/sfhz>

¹⁵ <https://bagpipes.readthedocs.io>

Table 4. Multiwavelength photometry of two individual galaxies in MACS0647–JD (i.e., JDa and JDb).

Filter	JD1a	JD1b	JD2a	JD2b	JD3a	JD3b
F435W	-16 ± 6	-2 ± 5	4 ± 5	8 ± 5	-5 ± 4	-3 ± 4
F475W	-9 ± 5	-2 ± 3	-10 ± 4	-9 ± 3	-3 ± 3	0 ± 2
F555W	-10 ± 3	-5 ± 2	-3 ± 3	-5 ± 2	-1 ± 2	-2 ± 1
F606W	-6 ± 7	-2 ± 4	0 ± 4	-1 ± 3	6 ± 14	1 ± 3
F625W	-19 ± 7	-4 ± 4	2 ± 5	-6 ± 4	8 ± 5	-3 ± 2
F775W	-23 ± 9	-6 ± 8	-25 ± 6	3 ± 5	-8 ± 5	-3 ± 3
F814W	-15 ± 4	-5 ± 3	-8 ± 3	-4 ± 2	-1 ± 2	-1 ± 2
F115W	-18 ± 3	-2 ± 2	-10 ± 3	-7 ± 2	-2 ± 2	-3 ± 1
F150W	144 ± 3	27 ± 2	91 ± 3	16 ± 2	55 ± 2	7 ± 1
F200W	160 ± 3	43 ± 2	115 ± 2	27 ± 2	60 ± 2	13 ± 1
F277W	143 ± 2	37 ± 2	90 ± 2	27 ± 1	43 ± 1	8 ± 1
F356W	106 ± 2	39 ± 1	64 ± 2	25 ± 1	30 ± 1	9 ± 1
F444W	97 ± 3	44 ± 2	59 ± 2	26 ± 1	28 ± 1	8 ± 1

Note. All fluxes are described in nJy and were measured using piXedfit (Abdurro’uf et al. 2021).**Table 5.** SED fitting methods, templates, and assumptions used

Method	SEDs	IMF	SFH	Dust	Ionization $\log(U)$
EAZY	SFHZ				
BAGPIPES	BPASS+CLOUDY	Kroupa et al. (1993)	delayed tau	Salim et al. (2018)	-4 to -1
PIXEDFIT	FSPS+CLOUDY	Chabrier (2003)	double power-law	Charlot & Fall (2000)	-2
Prospector	FSPS+CLOUDY	Chabrier (2003)	constant / non-parametric	SMC (Pei 1992)	-4 to -1
BEAGLE	BC03+CLOUDY	Chabrier (2003)	constant	SMC (Pei 1992)	-4 to -1

linearly, then slows before declining exponentially, unless the free parameter τ is larger than the formation age (as in our fits), in which case there is no decline.

For dust attenuation, we use the Salim et al. (2018) parameterization with slope δ allowed to vary between 0 (Milky Way) and steeper -0.45 (Small Magellanic Cloud; SMC), and 2175\AA bump strength B allowed to vary between 0 and 5 (where the Milky Way has $B = 3$ and SMC has $B \sim 0$). Young stars (age < 10 Myr) residing in stellar birth clouds experience more dust extinction by a factor η in the range 1 to 3.

5.3. PIXEDFIT

As an independent comparison, we also perform SED fitting using PIXEDFIT (Abdurro’uf et al. 2021). For SED modelling, we use Flexible Stellar Population Syn-

thesis (FSPS¹⁶; Conroy et al. 2009; Leja et al. 2017), initial mass function of Chabrier (2003), Padova isochrones (Girardi et al. 2000; Marigo & Girardi 2007; Marigo et al. 2008), MILES stellar spectral library (Sánchez-Blázquez et al. 2006; Falcón-Barroso et al. 2011), and the two-component dust attenuation law by Charlot & Fall (2000). We assume a parametric SFH model in the form of double power-law. FSPS incorporates CLOUDY code for modeling the nebular emission. We model the attenuation due to intergalactic medium using Inoue et al. (2014) model. We assume uniform priors for redshift (2.0 – 15.0), age (0.01 – 10.0 Gyr), Z ($\log(Z/Z_{\odot}) : [-2.0, 0.2]$), and SFH time scale τ (0.1 – 32 Gyr). The fitting with double power law SFH has two more free parameters that control the slopes of the ris-

¹⁶ <https://github.com/cconroy20/fps>

ing and falling star formation episodes (β and α). We assume a uniform prior for these parameters with the range of $10^{-2.0} - 10^{2.0}$. For the fitting method, we apply the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) and set the number of walkers and steps to be 100 and 1000, respectively.

5.4. *Prospector*

To get an independent comparison with non-parametric SFH models, we run SED fitting using *Prospector* (Leja et al. 2017; Johnson et al. 2021), adopting both constant and non-parametric SFHs. Similar to *PIXEDFIT*, this code uses FSPS stellar population synthesis models and *CLOUDY* code to account for the nebular emission. We assume a Chabrier (2003) IMF with mass range $0.1 - 300 M_{\odot}$ the IGM attenuation model of Inoue et al. (2014). We assume a uniform prior for redshift ($z = 6 - 15$), and log-uniform priors for stellar mass ($5 \leq \log(M/M_{\odot}) \leq 12$), V -band optical depth assuming an SMC dust extinction law ($-3 \leq \log(\tau_V) \leq 0.7$; Pei 1992), stellar metallicity ($-2.2 \leq \log(Z/Z_{\odot}) \leq -0.3$, and we assume that the interstellar gas-phase metallicity is equal to the stellar metallicity), and ionization parameter ($-4 \leq \log(U) \leq -1$). For our constant SFH model, we assume a log-uniform prior on formation age from 1 Myr to the age of the universe at the redshift under consideration. Throughout this process, we remove $\text{Ly}\alpha$ from the fitting templates.

The non-parametric SFH models implemented in *Prospector* are piecewise constant functions in time. We adopt eight time bins spanning from the time of observation to a formation redshift, $z_{\text{form}} = 15 - 30$ (uniform prior), where the two most recent bins range from 0 – 3 Myr and 3 – 10 Myr and the remaining six are spaced evenly in logarithmic lookback time. We adopt the “continuity” prior in *Prospector*, which tends to weight against sharp changes in SFR between adjacent time bins, though we note that the choice of non-parametric prior can have a significant influence on the inferred physical parameters (e.g., Leja et al. 2019; Tacchella et al. 2022; Whitler et al. 2022b).

5.5. *BEAGLE*

We also perform SED fitting using *BEAGLE* tool (Chevallard & Charlot 2016). *BEAGLE* uses templates by Gutkin et al. (2016) which combines the 2016 version of BC03 with the *CLOUDY* code to incorporate nebular emission. We assume a constant SFH model and fit for age with a uniform prior ranging from 1 Myr to the age of the universe at the redshift under consideration. We adopt the same priors on redshift, stellar mass, τ_V , Z , and $\log(U)$ as for the non-parametric *Prospector* models. We assume that the total interstellar (dust- and




Figure 7. Redshift likelihood distributions $P(z)$ of JD1 A+B estimated by various methods (§6.1). Also shown are *BAGPIPES* results for the individual clumps A and B.

gas-phase) metallicity is equal to the stellar metallicity, but note that *BEAGLE* self-consistently accounts for the depletion of metals onto dust grains, regulated in part by the dust-to-metal mass ratio (ξ_d), which we fix to $\xi_d = 0.3$.

5.6. *GAINN*

Finally, we identified simulated galaxies with colors similar to those observed for MACS0647–JD to estimate its redshift and star formation history. We analyzed detailed ENZO (Bryan et al. 2014) star-forming radiative-hydrodynamic simulations of the early universe with synthetic photometry generated by Barrow et al. (2020). The simulated galaxy redshifts and colors were used as a training set for the Galaxy Assembly and Interaction Neural Network (*GAINN*; Santos-Olmsted et al. 2023). Additional details are provided in §A.3 and results are presented below.

6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

6.1. Photometric Redshift

MACS0647–JD is confidently at $z = 10.6 \pm 0.3$ (Figure 7), with this range spanning the most likely redshifts from 5 SED fitting packages as well as the *GAINN* deep learning network, which estimates $z = 10.48, 10.81, 10.54$ for JD1, 2, 3, respectively. The components A and B are also each independently strong $z \sim 11$ candidates (with no significant likelihood below $z < 9.5$), despite lower SNR photometry in each individual object.

Table 6. Physical properties of MACS0647–JD estimated from **Bagpipes** corrected for magnification (flux ratio).

	JD1	JD2	JD3	Combined
Formation age (Myr)	160_{-69}^{+69}	151_{-74}^{+60}	153_{-75}^{+121}	177_{-71}^{+73}
Mass-weighted age (Myr)	54_{-23}^{+24}	51_{-25}^{+20}	51_{-25}^{+43}	59_{-24}^{+25}
Stellar Mass ($\log(M_*/M_\odot)$)	$8.62_{-0.15}^{+0.11}$	$8.61_{-0.18}^{+0.10}$	$8.51_{-0.22}^{+0.18}$	$8.65_{-0.14}^{+0.11}$
SFR (M_\odot/yr) within 100 Myr	4_{-1}^{+1}	4_{-1}^{+1}	3_{-1}^{+1}	4_{-1}^{+1}
\log sSFR (yr^{-1})	$-7.98_{-0.09}^{+0.05}$	$-7.96_{-0.08}^{+0.04}$	$-7.97_{-0.16}^{+0.04}$	$-8.00_{-0.10}^{+0.07}$
Photometric Redshift	$10.64_{-0.07}^{+0.06}$	$10.76_{-0.09}^{+0.08}$	$10.50_{-0.16}^{+0.14}$	$10.65_{-0.10}^{+0.09}$
Relative flux (\geq F200W)	1	0.66	0.28	1.94
Magnification (flux ratio)	8	5.3	2.2	15.5
Magnification (lens model)	6.9	6.3	2.1	15.3
Tangential Magnification	4.7	4.4	1.8	

Note. Magnification uncertainties are on the order of 15% (Meneghetti et al. 2017) and are not included in the uncertainties quoted above for stellar mass and SFR.

Table 7. Physical properties of A and B analyzed individually by various methods assuming $z = 10.6$. Photometry is measured in the brightest image JD1 by PIXEDFIT, analyzed with and without inflated uncertainties and corrected for magnification.

Clump	Photometric Uncertainty	Method	Star Formation History	Age ^a Myr	Stellar Mass $\log(M_*/M_\odot)$	specific SFR ^b Gyr^{-1}	Dust A_V mag	χ^2
JD1A	...	BAGPIPES	delayed τ exponential	1.3 ± 0.2	7.2 ± 0.1	101_{-1}^{+1}	$0.00_{-0.00}^{+0.01}$	93
	+3%	BAGPIPES	delayed τ exponential	1_{-1}^{+1}	$7.2_{-0.1}^{+0.1}$	101_{-1}^{+1}	$0.00_{-0.00}^{+0.01}$	82
	+10%	BAGPIPES	delayed τ exponential	14_{-9}^{+14}	$7.7_{-0.3}^{+0.2}$	48_{-22}^{+52}	$0.01_{-0.01}^{+0.02}$	67
	...	PIXEDFIT	double power-law	23_{-9}^{+19}	$8.2_{-0.1}^{+0.1}$	8_{-7}^{+9}	$0.34_{-0.21}^{+0.22}$	105
	...	Prospector	non-parametric cont.	43_{-20}^{+25}	8.3 ± 0.1	0	$0.01_{-0.01}^{+0.02}$	18 ^c
	...	Prospector	constant	35_{-6}^{+8}	8.0 ± 0.1	14 ± 3	$0.00_{-0.00}^{+0.00}$	90 ^c
	...	BEAGLE	constant	35 ± 7	8.1 ± 0.1	14_{-3}^{+4}	$0.00_{-0.00}^{+0.00}$	103 ^c
JD1B	...	BAGPIPES	delayed τ exponential	70_{-44}^{+49}	$7.8_{-0.3}^{+0.1}$	11_{-4}^{+16}	$0.10_{-0.03}^{+0.06}$	15
	+3%	BAGPIPES	delayed τ exponential	67_{-40}^{+45}	$7.8_{-0.3}^{+0.2}$	12_{-5}^{+16}	$0.10_{-0.04}^{+0.07}$	14
	+10%	BAGPIPES	delayed τ exponential	81_{-50}^{+41}	$7.8_{-0.3}^{+0.1}$	10_{-3}^{+14}	$0.10_{-0.05}^{+0.08}$	12
	...	PIXEDFIT	double power-law	111_{-30}^{+32}	$8.3_{-0.3}^{+0.1}$	0_{-0}^{+2}	$0.25_{-0.15}^{+0.14}$	20
	...	Prospector	non-parametric cont.	127_{-58}^{+50}	8.1 ± 0.2	3_{-2}^{+10}	$0.12_{-0.08}^{+0.12}$	2.9 ^c
	...	Prospector	constant	3_{-2}^{+35}	6.9 ± 0.2	185_{-171}^{+319}	$0.03_{-0.02}^{+0.03}$	1.5 ^c
	...	BEAGLE	constant	10_{-8}^{+49}	7.3 ± 0.6	51_{-42}^{+198}	$0.01_{-0.01}^{+0.03}$	0.6 ^c

^aMass-weighted.

^bWithin recent 10 Myr.

^cCalculated in F200W and redder photometry.

Note. Most of these SED fitting methods assume a Chabrier (2003) IMF (Table 5). BAGPIPES assumes Kroupa et al. (1993); to renormalize those results, we multiplied the stellar masses by 0.94 (Madau & Dickinson 2014).




Figure 8. Photometry and `BAGPIPES` BPASS SED fits for JD1, 2, 3, both as observed and delensed by fiducial magnifications $\mu = 8.0, 5.3, 2.2$. Filled circles with errorbars give measured photometry in each filter, and open boxes show model fluxes for each best fit SED model spectrum shown. *JWST* photometry are highlighted by magenta stars. $P(z)$ of JD1, 2, 3, and the stack one is shown in the small box in the upper panel.




Figure 9. Star formation rate (SFR) vs. stellar mass for MACS0647-JD and recently discovered $z \sim 9 - 12$ candidates analyzed in *JWST* imaging (Furtak et al. 2022; Bradley et al. 2022; Naidu et al. 2022; Leethochawalit et al. 2022). We plot **BAGPIPES** results for JD1 (A+B). The results lie along predictions for the $z = 10$ star-formation main sequence from semi-analytic modeling Yung et al. (2019) and the DELPHI simulations (Dayal et al. 2014, 2022). Note that we show the stellar mass estimated from delayed τ SFH for JD1 (A+B). Possible systematic uncertainty from different assumed SFH is shown in a dotted line.




Figure 10. Specific star-formation rate as a function of redshift. We show the **BAGPIPES** result for the JD1 photometry, while acknowledging the results vary from different methods. We compare with published results from Tasca et al. (2015, $\log(M_*/M_\odot) > 9.7$); Khusanova et al. (2021, $9.6 < \log(M_*/M_\odot) < 9.8$); Stefanon et al. (2022, $\log(M_*/M_\odot) \sim 8.4$); Topping et al. (2022); Furtak et al. (2022); and Di Cesare et al. (2022). We also compare with predictions from Dekel et al. (2013); Whitaker et al. (2014); Tacchella et al. (2018) and DELPHI (Dayal et al. 2014, 2022). Note that we show the stellar mass estimated from delayed τ SFH for JD1 (A+B). Possible systematic uncertainty from different assumed SFH is shown in a dotted line.

We also tried restricting $z < 9$ with **BAGPIPES**, finding significantly worse ($\chi^2 \sim 500$) fits at $z \sim 0.2$ for JD1, 2, 3 (that reproduce the flat NIRCcam colors at $2-5 \mu\text{m}$ but miss the NIRCcam F150W and F115W photometry, also failing to drop out in bluer filters). Dusty / old galaxies at $z \sim 2 - 5$ have SEDs that are far too red, with SEDs rising through the near-IR.

6.2. Physical properties

In Table 6, we report the physical properties of MACS0647-JD treated as a single galaxy analyzed by **BAGPIPES** with photometry from the grizli v4 catalog (recalibrated). SED fits are shown in Figure 8. We report results for each of the 3 lensed images JD1, 2, 3 and for the stacked photometry, correcting SFR and mass for magnification. Assuming A+B had the same star formation history, this analysis estimates a mass-weighted age 60 ± 25 Myr, with SFR $4 \pm 1 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$ averaged over 100 Myr, stellar mass between $3-6 \times 10^8 M_\odot$, and specific SFR $\sim 10 \text{ Gyr}^{-1} (\pm 10\%)$. We acknowledge the stellar masses estimates are subject to uncertainties in the star formation history, stellar mass function, stellar metallicities, and dust properties.

The SFR and stellar mass are consistent with the predicted stellar main sequence from semi-analytic models Dayal et al. (2014); Yung et al. (2019); Dayal et al. (2022) and simulations (Dekel et al. 2013; Whitaker et al. 2014; Tacchella et al. 2018; Behroozi et al. 2019). We plot these relations and results from other $z \sim 9 - 12$ candidates measured in *JWST* observations in Figure 9.

The specific SFR is also consistent with predictions at this redshift as shown in Figure 10. Note in these model predictions (Dekel et al. 2013; Whitaker et al. 2014; Tacchella et al. 2018; Behroozi et al. 2019; Dayal et al. 2022), sSFR is relatively flat at high redshifts, increasing only 0.2 dex from $z = 6$ to 11. This suggests a significant role for mergers in the early universe; sSFR(z) would continue to rise more as $\propto (1+z)^{2.25}$ if growth were dominated by cold-mode accretion (e.g., Dekel et al. 2009).

6.3. Components A and B: Ages, Dust, and Mass

In Table 7, we report results for components A and B analyzed individually by various SED fitting methods with photometry from PIXEDFIT. The fiducial values are organized in Table 8. SED fits from **BAGPIPES** are plotted in Figure 11. The corner plots of A and B are provided in Figure 12. Star formation histories from SED fitting methods are plotted in Figure 13. Star formation histories from simulated galaxies matching the colors of A and B using GAINN are plotted in Figure 14.




Figure 11. BAGPIPES SED fits to photometry of individual clumps A and B measured by PIXEDFIT with 3% uncertainty added in quadrature.




Figure 12. Constraints on age, stellar mass, metallicity, and dust for JD1A (left) and JD1B (right) from BAGPIPES with +3% uncertainty. Note that the mass estimates shown here are not delensed.




Figure 13. Star formation histories (SFH) of clumps A and B for the median ages estimated by each method. The various SFH parameterizations and assumptions are summarized in Table 7. For **BAGPIPES**, we plot results from adding 3% photometric uncertainty. Shaded regions indicate the 68 percentile confidence intervals.




Figure 14. Star formation histories of simulated galaxies with colors similar to clumps A (top) and B (bottom). Note the anti-correlation: A analogs form most stars while most B analogs are less active, and vice versa. Time scales are the same on both x axes. Mass-weighted ages and χ^2 values from SED fits are given in the legend. Photometry of the simulated galaxies was measured by Barrow et al. (2020) and matched to the observations using the GAINN deep learning network (Santos-Olmsted et al. 2023).

B’s redder color may be explained by age and/or dust. Results vary depending on the method and assumptions, including star formation history. Dust is negligible ($A_V < 0.02$ mag) for A in most analyses, and slightly higher ($A_V \sim 0.1$ mag) for B, assuming steep SMC-like attenuation strongly suppressing the rest-UV.

Stellar mass estimates are on the order of $10^8 M_\odot$ with some agreement on higher mass for clump A by a factor of 2 or more (e.g., A $\sim 2 \times 10^8 M_\odot$; B $\sim 10^8 M_\odot$).

Mass-weighted ages from the SED fitting methods range up to ~ 50 Myr and ~ 100 Myr for A and B, respectively. GAINN analog simulated galaxies, similarly, have mass-weighted ages 50 ± 5 Myr and 125^{+24}_{-12} Myr for A and B, respectively.

B’s SED was relatively rare among the simulated galaxies. It was best matched by galaxies that formed most of their stars over 80 Myr prior to observation, then either remained less active ($< 0.01 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$) or perhaps had some shorter burst of star formation. The simulated galaxies with colors similar to A had star formation dissimilar: bursty during that period when B was less active.

JD1A is intrinsically very blue ($\beta \sim -2.6 \pm 0.1$) as measured with a power-law fit to the F200W, F277W, and F356W photometry measured by PIXEDFIT, where β is the rest-frame UV continuum slope $F_\lambda \propto \lambda^\beta$ (or $F_\nu \propto \lambda^{\beta+2}$). We measure $\beta = -2.69$ without PSF correction and $\beta = -2.54$ after correcting for point source encircled energy within $r = 0.2''$ (see §4.1).

Other recent *JWST* observations have revealed even bluer slopes ($\beta \sim -3$) in galaxies at $z \sim 7 - 8.5$ (Topping et al. 2022) and in a candidate $z \sim 16$ galaxy (Furtak et al. 2022), all with stellar masses of the order of $10^8 M_\odot$. Topping et al. (2022) found these blue colors required large escape fractions $f_{\text{esc,H II}} \sim 0.6 - 0.8$ of photons leaking directly from stellar H II regions, bypassing nebular reprocessing. Our measured $\beta \sim -2.6 \pm 0.1$ is slightly redder and can be fit by our SED models that all assume $f_{\text{esc}} = 0$. Nevertheless, it is in the regime where some significant f_{esc} should be considered to avoid biasing age and mass measurements.

Binary stars are important to include in SED modeling as in BPASS, especially for such blue galaxies (Eldridge 2020; Eldridge & Stanway 2022). Binary interactions produce more Wolf-Rayet / helium stars at later ages, generating more energetic photons. Thus blue observed SEDs may be fit well by older (tens of Myr) BPASS templates including binaries, whereas templates without binaries may require very young ages (< 10 Myr).

We also note uncertainty in the photometry and some variation in β measured by the various methods and in

the three lensed images. Ultimately, upcoming NIRSpect spectroscopy will improve measures of β , age, and reveal other signatures of large escape fractions.

6.4. Stellar Mass and SFR Densities

The stellar complexes in MACS0647–JD are very dense with $\sim 10^8 M_\odot$ stellar mass packed into effective radii of $\sim 70^{+24}_{-24}$ and 20^{+8}_{-5} pc for A and B, respectively. Assuming fiducial masses 10^8 and $6 \times 10^7 M_\odot$ for A and B, respectively, the stellar mass surface densities Σ_{eff} are roughly on the order of ~ 2000 and $\sim 12000 M_\odot \text{ pc}^{-2}$, where $\Sigma_{\text{eff}} = (M/2)/(\pi R_{M/2}^2)$ and the half-mass radius $R_{M/2} = (4/3)R_{\text{eff}}$.¹⁷ These are higher than the highest density $\sim 1800 M_\odot \text{ pc}^{-2}$ reported by Chen et al. (2022) because their size measurements, unaided by lensing, were only sensitive to structures with radii > 150 pc. The density for clump B is just an order of magnitude less than the maximal density $10^5 M_\odot \text{ pc}^{-2}$ reported by Hopkins et al. (2010a).

A similar rough estimate of SFR densities yields ~ 20 and $\sim 120 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1} \text{ kpc}^{-2}$. These are high values, though less than the highest values $> 1000 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1} \text{ kpc}^{-2}$ reported for SMGs.

6.5. Galaxy clumps or merger?

The stellar components A and B may be two merging galaxies, or they may be two clumps that formed together in situ ~ 400 pc apart within a single galaxy. We cannot distinguish these scenarios with the current data.

Given their masses $\sim 10^8 M_\odot$, they would affect their surroundings such that we would expect them to form at the same time within a galaxy. A significant age difference would suggest they are separate galaxies now merging. We cannot conclusively distinguish the ages of A and B given the current data, though the simulated analog galaxies at similar redshift and SED fitting do strongly suggest star formation to be dissimilar (see A.3).

MACS0647–JD was discovered in CLASH imaging with a search volume of a few times $1000 \text{ Mpc}^3 = (10 \text{ cMpc})^3$ at $z \sim 11$ (Coe et al. 2013). We employ the Astraeus cosmological simulations (Hutter et al. 2021) to calculate the likelihood of finding such a merger within that search volume. With a box-size of $(230 \text{ cMpc})^3$ and a minimum resolved halo mass of $M_h \sim 10^{8.6} M_\odot$,

¹⁷ The factor of 4/3 might not be warranted since these are much larger than star clusters, in which case the densities would increase by a factor of ~ 2 . See Portegies Zwart et al. (2010).

Table 8. Estimated clump properties adopting fiducial stellar mass and star formation rate

Clump	Radius	Stellar Mass	Stellar Mass Density	SFR	SFR Density
JD1A	70_{-24}^{+24} pc	$10^8 M_\odot$	$1800 M_\odot \text{ pc}^{-2}$	$1 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$	$18 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1} \text{ kpc}^{-2}$
JD1B	20_{-5}^{+8} pc	$6 \times 10^7 M_\odot$	$12000 M_\odot \text{ pc}^{-2}$	$0.6 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$	$120 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1} \text{ kpc}^{-2}$

Note. The estimated stellar mass and SFR vary from different SED fitting packages under different assumptions (e.g., star formation history). The uncertainties of stellar mass density and SFR density may be up to 200%.

these simulations are ideally suited for such statistics. We find 0.176 mergers in a $(10 \text{ cMpc})^3$ volume for systems such as JD1 and JD2 and 0.056 mergers per $(10 \text{ cMpc})^3$ for three clumps with $M_* \sim 10^{8-9} M_\odot$ (Legrand et al. 2022).

Dust may also contribute to the different colors observed between A and B. Clumps are often obscured by different amounts of dust within a galaxy. Atacama Large Millimeter/submillimeter Array (ALMA) observations of $z \sim 7$ galaxies reveal spatially varying dust that is sometimes even offset from the stars observed in the rest-UV (Bowler et al. 2022; Dayal et al. 2022). *JWST* observations of $z \sim 6 - 8$ galaxies in blank fields reveal clumpy morphologies are common; each galaxy has a few multi-colored star-forming complexes separated by $\sim 300 - 4300 \text{ pc}$ with various ages, dust reddening, and masses (Chen et al. 2022).

The ground-based spectroscopic survey VIMOS UltraDeep Survey (VUDS) found 21–25% of $z \sim 2 - 6$ galaxies are dominated by two massive clumps, each $\sim 10^9 - 10^{10} M_\odot$, with smaller fractions of galaxies having 3, 4, or more clumps (Ribeiro et al. 2017). Major mergers are invoked to explain the galaxies with two massive clumps, while disk instability can explain the formation of 3 or more smaller clumps in situ.

6.6. A possible companion

The candidate companion galaxy C is also a J-band dropout with three lensed images at the predicted locations for a galaxy 3 kpc away at $z \sim 11$. It is > 2 mags fainter, so the photometric redshifts are more uncertain. In Figure 15, we show the photometry for JD1C, JD2C, and JD3C can all be well fit with EAZY SEDs assuming $z = 10.6$. (This is also the most likely redshift for JD3C, though it is not for JD1C and JD2C.)

The redshift can also be constrained from strong lens mass modeling. Both of our lens models (§3.1) find the observed lensed image locations are best fit by high-redshift solutions $z \sim 11$.

6.7. Comparisons to Simulated Galaxies

We compare our results to various expectations from large cosmological semi-analytic models (SAMs), an N-body cosmological simulation, and high-resolution zoom-in hydrodynamic simulations of the early universe.

We first compare to the DELPHI semi-analytic model (Dayal et al. 2014, 2022). In brief, this model reconstructs galaxy halo assembly histories from $z \sim 40 - 4.5$, tracking buildup of gas and star formation, including feedback. With minimal free parameters and calibration, it reproduces observed high- z luminosity functions, stellar mass functions, and ALMA dust estimates. Details are provided in §A.2.

Given a stellar mass of $10^8 (10^9) M_\odot$ at $z \sim 10.6$, DELPHI predicts a host halo mass $M_h \sim 10^{10} (10^{11}) M_\odot$, absolute UV magnitude $M_{UV} \sim -19.5 (-20)$, dust $A_V \sim 0.03 (0.12)$ mag, and a stellar radius $\sim 70 (350)$ pc for galaxies at $z \sim 10$, consistent with our observations, especially for the lower end stellar mass $10^8 M_\odot$. Finally, this model predicts stellar mass-weighted ages that range between 35–180 Myr for galaxies of a similar mass at $z \sim 10$; the range of ages reflects the varied assembly histories.

These small amounts of dust are also consistent with recent modeling by Ferrara et al. (2022) suggesting that negligible dust at these redshifts could help explain the unexpectedly large numbers of $z \sim 10 - 14$ candidates reported in early *JWST* observations.

Next, we consider the merging galaxies from a hydrodynamic simulation (Barrow et al. 2017) presented in Figure 6 that bears a resemblance to MACS0647–JD A+B and C. This was the most massive halo in that simulation, and it has a total stellar mass $4 \times 10^7 M_\odot$. The analog C is connected by a faint filament of stars and gas. This configuration was likely the result of previous galaxy mergers, including A+B, as evidenced by hot regions tracing supernova remnants.

Within a separate hydrodynamic simulation of a 66 Mpc^3 co-moving volume with adaptive mesh refinement resolution sufficient to track gas down to 0.25 pc at $z = 12$ and form individual Population III stars as well as metal-enriched star clusters (Santos-Olmsted et al.




Figure 15. Candidate companion C is fainter and the photometric redshift is less clear, but its photometry can be well fit by SEDs at $z = 10.6$. EAZY SED fits are shown for JD1C, JD2C, and JD3C, left to right. Their redshift likelihood distributions $P(z)$ are shown in the insets before fixing their redshifts to $z = 10.6$ for the SED fits shown.

2023), we perform a more thorough search for simulated galaxies with colors similar to A and B. The best-matching analogs have mass-weighted ages of ~ 50 and ~ 125 Myr, with B having little or no SFR within the past 100 Myr before observation. Bursty SFHs with dormant periods of several 10 Myr are common in these simulations. Observationally, the question is whether we observe them when they are active with SFR in the past 10 Myr and thus brightest in the rest-UV.

JD1A’s photometry was well matched to SEDs from the simulation (Santos-Olmsted et al. 2023) showing routine bursts of star formation, while JD1B showed clear evidence of suppressed star formation with a relatively flat UV slope and weaker evidence for the presence of emission lines. The close projected distance of only 400 pc in a halo that should be several kpc wide for stellar population of this mass might imply that the two regions formed in the same halo, but the SED fits SFHs with suppressed star formation for several dynamical times in only B. The difference in SFHs implies that both halos were subject to independent radiative and dynamical environments and likely formed much farther apart than 400 pc before coming closer or alternatively, both objects may be farther apart than their projected separation despite their coincident redshift. Both scenarios, the SED model and the simulation suggest an in-progress merger. This interaction merits further study with models tuned to investigate bursty star formation events and may yield more insight into high-redshift galaxy interactions and mergers.

6.8. Prospects of future *JWST* observations

The physical properties of MACS0647–JD inferred by our *JWST* NIRCcam observations indicate that future *JWST* spectroscopy should allow the detection of several strong emission lines which would make it possible to improve constraints on the metallicity, gas ionization state, dust reddening, and star formation history of this intriguing $z \approx 11$ system. Based on the photometric

redshift, the planned *JWST*/NIRSpec prism observations extending to $5.3\mu\text{m}$ ($\sim 4300\text{\AA}$ rest-frame) may detect strong emission lines like [C III] $\lambda 1908$, [O II] $\lambda 3727$, $\text{H}\gamma$ and [Ne III] $\lambda 3869 + \text{H}\zeta + \text{He I } \lambda 3889$ (blended).

Other strong rest-frame optical emission lines like [O III] $\lambda 5007$ and $\text{H}\alpha$ will fall in the wavelength domain of *JWST* MIRI. The inferred SFR of MACS0647–JD suggests that both [O III] $\lambda 5007$ and $\text{H}\alpha$ may be detected with MIRI medium-resolution spectroscopy (MRS) targeting JD1, which would then also allow simultaneous MIRI imaging of part of the MACS0647 cluster field. Such MIRI imaging could, depending on the position angle, also cover JD3, which is predicted to be sufficiently bright for detection in both F560W and F770W.

7. CONCLUSIONS

In this study, we report on public *JWST* imaging observations of the $z \sim 11$ galaxy MACS0647–JD taken with 6 NIRCcam filters (F115W, F150W, F200W, F277W, F356W, and F444W) by GO program 1433 (PI Coe). Three lensed images are observed with magnifications ~ 8 , 5, and 2 and F356W AB mags of 25.1, 25.6, 26.6. The delensed F356W magnitude is 27.3, with $M_{UV} = -20.4 \pm 17\%$. MACS0647–JD is a J-band dropout appearing in all filters redward of F115W. Its photometric redshift is $z = 10.6 \pm 0.3$ as estimated by 6 different methods.

MACS0647–JD is spatially resolved into two components A and B separated by ~ 400 pc in projection. They may be merging galaxies or two clumps that formed in situ within one galaxy.

Component A is brighter and very blue ($\beta \sim -2.6 \pm 0.1$), dust-free with a delensed radius $\sim 70^{+24}_{-24}$ pc and mass-weighted age ~ 50 Myr. Component B is smaller and redder with perhaps some dust $A_V \sim 0.1$ mag, a delensed radius $\sim 20^{+8}_{-5}$ pc, and mass-weighted age ~ 100 Myr. Simulated galaxies with similar colors as observed for A and B at similar redshift have star formation histories to be dissimilar despite their proximity,

which is consistent with our SED fitting results, suggesting they formed some distance apart, perhaps as separate galaxies observed now as they were on their way to merge.

Both have stellar masses $\sim 10^8 M_\odot$ with A likely more massive by a factor of 2 or so. With star formation rates on the order of $1 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$ averaged over the past 10 Myr and specific SFRs $\sim 10 \text{ Gyr}^{-1}$, these galaxies are consistent with expectations for the stellar main sequence at $z \sim 11$. Given their small radii $< 100 \text{ pc}$, they have very high stellar mass surface densities, up to $\sim 10^4 M_\odot \text{ pc}^{-2}$, with correspondingly large SFR surface densities up to $\sim 100 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1} \text{ kpc}^{-2}$. These are large, though not exceeding theoretical limits or values measured for other extreme objects.

A small candidate companion galaxy C is identified $\sim 3 \text{ kpc}$ away. Three lensed images of C are at the expected locations are all J-band dropouts. While fainter (F356W AB mag ~ 28) with more uncertain photometry, its SED consistent with $z \sim 10.6$.

The NIRCcam imaging spans $1\text{--}5 \mu\text{m}$ to rest-frame 4300 \AA at $z = 10.6$. F444W is only partially redward of the Balmer break, limiting our ability to estimate ages and stellar masses. Additional observations with the reddest NIRCcam filter F480M and the NIRSpec MSA PRISM are upcoming and planned for January 2023.

8. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful and indebted to all 20,000 people who worked to make *JWST* an incredible discovery machine.

We dedicate these *JWST* observations to Rob Hawkins, former lead developer of the Astronomer’s Proposal Tool (APT). Rob lost his life in November 2020 while astronomers around the world were using APT to prepare observations we proposed for *JWST* Cycle 1.

This work is based on observations made with the NASA/ESA/CSA *James Webb Space Telescope* (*JWST*) and *Hubble Space Telescope* (*HST*). The data were obtained from the Mikulski Archive for Space Telescopes (MAST) at the Space Telescope Science Institute (STScI), which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy (AURA), Inc., under NASA contract NAS 5-03127 for *JWST*. These observations are associated with program *JWST* GO 1433 and *HST* GO 9722, 10493, 10793, and 12101.

TH and A were funded by a grant for JWST-GO-01433 provided by STScI under NASA contract NAS5-03127. LW acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. DGE-2137419. AA acknowledges support from the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet project grants 2021-05559). PD acknowledges support from the NWO grant 016.VIDI.189.162 (“ODIN”) and the European Commission’s and University of Groningen’s CO-FUND Rosalind Franklin program and warmly thanks the Institute for Advanced Study (IAS) Princeton, where a part of this work was carried out, for their generous hospitality and support through the Bershadsky Fund. The Cosmic Dawn Center is funded by the Danish National Research Foundation (DNRF) under grant #140. EZ and AV acknowledge support from the Swedish National Space Agency. MB acknowledges support from the Slovenian national research agency ARRS through grant N1-0238. MO acknowledges support from JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP22H01260, JP20H05856, JP20H00181, JP22K21349. AZ, AKM and LJF acknowledge support by Grant No. 2020750 from the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF) and Grant No. 2109066 from the United States National Science Foundation (NSF), and by the Ministry of Science & Technology, Israel. EV and MN acknowledge financial support through grants PRIN-MIUR 2017WSCC32, 2020SKSTHZ and INAF “main-stream” grants 1.05.01.86.20 and 1.05.01.86.31. Y.J-T acknowledges financial support from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 898633, the MSCA IF Extensions Program of the Spanish National Research Council (CSIC), and the State Agency for Research of the Spanish MCIU through the Center of Excellence Severo Ochoa award to the Instituto de Astrofísica de Andalucía (SEV-2017-0709). ACC thanks the Leverhulme Trust for their support via a Leverhulme Early Career Fellowship.

Facilities: JWST(NIRCcam), HST(ACS, WFC3)

Software: ASTROPY (Astropy Collaboration et al. 2022, 2018, 2013), PHOTUTILS (Bradley et al. 2022), GRIZLI (Brammer et al. 2022), EAZY (Brammer et al. 2008), PIXEDFIT (Abdurro’uf et al. 2021, 2022) BAGPIPES (Carnall et al. 2018), CLOUDY (Ferland et al. 1998, 2013, 2017), Prospector (Leja et al. 2017; Johnson et al. 2021), BEAGLE (Chevallard & Charlot 2016), JDAVIZ (JDADF Developers et al. 2022)

APPENDIX




Figure 16. Photometry of JD1A and JD1B measured from different methods, PIXEDFIT, IMFIT, and CHEFs. With 3% and 10% uncertainty added in quadrature are shown for PIXEDFIT.

A. APPENDIX

A.1. Photometry measurement for individual clumps

In Section. 4, we measure the photometry for components A and B using different methods including PIXEDFIT, IMFIT, and CHEFs. Only the photometry from PIXEDFIT was used for SED fitting to estimate physical properties. Here we provide the comparison among three different methods, which is shown in Figure 16. We also test the SED fitting for the photometry from IMFIT and CHEFs. The results are similar to the result using PIXEDFIT photometry.

A.2. DELPHI Semi-Analytic Model

In brief, the DELPHI semi-analytic model (Dayal et al. 2014, 2022) uses a binary merger tree approach to build the dark matter assembly histories of $z \sim 4.5$ galaxies with halo masses $\log(M_h/M_\odot) = 8 - 14$ up to $z \sim 40$. It then jointly tracks the build-up of dark matter halos and their baryonic components (gas, stellar, metal and dust mass) between $z \sim 40 - 4.5$ including the impact of both internal (supernova) and external (reionization) feedback; here we consider a case that ignores reionization feedback since reionization affects $\lesssim 20\%$ of the volume of the Universe at $z \sim 10.5$ (Dayal et al. 2020). The key strength of this model lies in its minimal free parameters (the star formation efficiency and fraction of supernova energy coupling to gas) and the fact that it is baselined against all available high- z datasets including the evolving ultra-violet luminosity function, the stellar mass function and against the most recent dust estimates at $z \sim 7$ from the REBELS (Reionization Era Bright Emission Line Survey) ALMA large program (Bouwens et al. 2022).

A.3. GAINN Analog Simulated Galaxies

Synthetic fluxes from *JWST*'s wideband filters F115W, F150W, F200W, F277W, F356W, and F444W were used as a training set for photometric redshift predictions of the combined fluxes of the A and B objects using the Galaxy Assembly and Interaction Neural Network (GAINN) method (Santos-Olmsted et al. 2023), which trains deep convolutional neural networks on synthetic photometry created in post processing from in-situ star-forming ENZO (Bryan

et al. 2014) radiative-hydrodynamic simulations. GAINN was originally designed for redshifts higher than 11.4 and so star formation histories were shifted forward in time by 50, 100, and 150 Myr to produce a training set. Then a 20-layer network was trained on the approximately 12,000 SEDs in the set that fell between $z = 12$ and $z = 10$ to accommodate the likely redshift of MACS0647–JD, and achieved a mean absolute error of 0.0261 in the validation set. Predicted redshifts for MACS0647–JD were consistent with galaxies at $z \sim 10.6$, returning a value of $z = 10.6417$ for object A and a value of $z = 10.5614$ for object B.

Additionally, χ^2 SED-fitting to GAINN simulated galaxies was performed on JD1A and JD1B’s fluxes in F200W, F277W, F356W, and F444W, which focus on the rest-UV slope of both objects. Fitting was accomplished by first shifting over 10,000 synthetic observations in GAINN to $z = 10.6$ and then using relative synthetic flux to create a mass and redshift-independent comparison. Then, the synthetic flux of the SED was scaled to the observed flux of JD1A and JD1B and χ^2 values were calculated for the other three bands. We report four star formation histories corresponding to the lowest values of χ^2 for both JD1A and JD1B along with their mass weighted mean stellar age after restricting our output to the best fit result in any particular halo tree branch.

JD1B’s spectra was relatively rare in the simulation, resulting in various predictions with higher squared error, but it often matched to star formation histories with the strongest episodes of star formation ending earlier than 100 Myr before the observation, with some results showing a more recent burst. Predicted mean stellar ages were between 100 and 160 Myr, which is consistent with an absence of young stars and the flat UV slope of JD1B.

All histories matched to JD1A featured bursty episodes of star formation peaking between 50 and 100 Myr before the observation, followed by a turn off and a resumption of star formation at the time of observation. Predictions for mean stellar age also converged between 45 and 80 Myr, which was consistent with the observed blue UV slope. All matched SED’s had strong emission lines, implying that previous episodes of star formation well-enriched the ISM.

REFERENCES

- Abdurro’uf, Lin, Y.-T., Wu, P.-F., & Akiyama, M. 2021, *ApJS*, 254, 15, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/abebe2](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/abebe2)
- . 2022, piXedfit: Analyze spatially resolved SEDs of galaxies, *Astrophysics Source Code Library*, record ascl:2207.033. <http://ascl.net/2207.033>
- Abdurro’uf, Coe, D., Jung, I., et al. 2023, *ApJ*, 945, 117, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/acba06](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/acba06)
- Adams, N. J., Conselice, C. J., Ferreira, L., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2207.11217. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.11217>
- Astropy Collaboration, Robitaille, T. P., Tollerud, E. J., et al. 2013, *A&A*, 558, A33, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201322068](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201322068)
- Astropy Collaboration, Price-Whelan, A. M., Sipőcz, B. M., et al. 2018, *AJ*, 156, 123, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aabc4f](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aabc4f)
- Astropy Collaboration, Price-Whelan, A. M., Lim, P. L., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 935, 167, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac7c74](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac7c74)
- Atek, H., Shuntov, M., Furtak, L. J., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2207.12338. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.12338>
- Barbary, K. 2016, *Journal of Open Source Software*, 1, 58, doi: [10.21105/joss.00058](https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00058)
- Barnes, J. E. 1992, *ApJ*, 393, 484, doi: [10.1086/171522](https://doi.org/10.1086/171522)
- Barrow, K. S. S., Robertson, B. E., Ellis, R. S., et al. 2020, *ApJL*, 902, L39, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/abbd8e](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/abbd8e)
- Barrow, K. S. S., Wise, J. H., Norman, M. L., O’Shea, B. W., & Xu, H. 2017, *MNRAS*, 469, 4863, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stx1181](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx1181)
- Behroozi, P., Wechsler, R. H., Hearin, A. P., & Conroy, C. 2019, *MNRAS*, 488, 3143, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stz1182](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz1182)
- Bell, E. F., Phleps, S., Somerville, R. S., et al. 2006, *ApJ*, 652, 270, doi: [10.1086/508408](https://doi.org/10.1086/508408)
- Belokurov, V., Erkal, D., Evans, N. W., Koposov, S. E., & Deason, A. J. 2018, *MNRAS*, 478, 611, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty982](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty982)
- Bertin, E., & Arnouts, S. 1996, *A&AS*, 117, 393, doi: [10.1051/aas:1996164](https://doi.org/10.1051/aas:1996164)
- Bonaca, A., Conroy, C., Cargile, P. A., et al. 2020, *ApJL*, 897, L18, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ab9caa](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab9caa)
- Bouwens, R. J., Bradley, L., Zitrin, A., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 795, 126, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/795/2/126](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/795/2/126)
- Bouwens, R. J., Smit, R., Schouws, S., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 931, 160, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac5a4a](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac5a4a)
- Bowler, R. A. A., Cullen, F., McLure, R. J., Dunlop, J. S., & Avison, A. 2022, *MNRAS*, 510, 5088, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stab3744](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab3744)
- Bradley, L. D., Zitrin, A., Coe, D., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 792, 76, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/792/1/76](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/792/1/76)
- Bradley, L. D., Coe, D., Brammer, G., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2210.01777. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.01777>

- Brammer, G., Strait, V., Matharu, J., & Momcheva, I. 2022, grizli, 1.5.0, Zenodo, doi: [10.5281/zenodo.6672538](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6672538)
- Brammer, G. B., van Dokkum, P. G., & Coppi, P. 2008, *ApJ*, 686, 1503, doi: [10.1086/591786](https://doi.org/10.1086/591786)
- Brammer, G. B., van Dokkum, P. G., Illingworth, G. D., et al. 2013, *ApJL*, 765, L2, doi: [10.1088/2041-8205/765/1/L2](https://doi.org/10.1088/2041-8205/765/1/L2)
- Broadhurst, T., Benítez, N., Coe, D., et al. 2005, *ApJ*, 621, 53, doi: [10.1086/426494](https://doi.org/10.1086/426494)
- Bryan, G. L., Norman, M. L., O’Shea, B. W., et al. 2014, *ApJS*, 211, 19, doi: [10.1088/0067-0049/211/2/19](https://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/211/2/19)
- Burke, C., Hilton, M., & Collins, C. 2015, *MNRAS*, 449, 2353, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stv450](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv450)
- Carnall, A. C., McLure, R. J., Dunlop, J. S., & Davé, R. 2018, *MNRAS*, 480, 4379, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty2169](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty2169)
- Castellano, M., Fontana, A., Treu, T., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2207.09436. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.09436>
- Chabrier, G. 2003, *PASP*, 115, 763, doi: [10.1086/376392](https://doi.org/10.1086/376392)
- Chan, B. M. Y., Broadhurst, T., Lim, J., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 835, 44, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/835/1/44](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/835/1/44)
- Charlot, S., & Fall, S. M. 2000, *ApJ*, 539, 718, doi: [10.1086/309250](https://doi.org/10.1086/309250)
- Chen, Z., Stark, D. P., Endsley, R., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2207.12657. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.12657>
- Chevallard, J., & Charlot, S. 2016, *MNRAS*, 462, 1415, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stw1756](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stw1756)
- Claeysens, A., Adamo, A., Richard, J., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2208.10450. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.10450>
- Coe, D., Umetsu, K., Zitrin, A., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 757, 22, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/757/1/22](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/757/1/22)
- Coe, D., Zitrin, A., Carrasco, M., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 762, 32, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/762/1/32](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/762/1/32)
- Coe, D., Salmon, B., Bradač, M., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 884, 85, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab412b](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab412b)
- Connor, T., Donahue, M., Kelson, D. D., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 848, 37, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa8ad5](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa8ad5)
- Conroy, C., Gunn, J. E., & White, M. 2009, *ApJ*, 699, 486, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/699/1/486](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/699/1/486)
- Dayal, P., Ferrara, A., Dunlop, J. S., & Pacucci, F. 2014, *MNRAS*, 445, 2545, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stu1848](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu1848)
- Dayal, P., Volonteri, M., Choudhury, T. R., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 495, 3065, doi: [10.1093/mnras/staa1138](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa1138)
- Dayal, P., Ferrara, A., Sommovigo, L., et al. 2022, *MNRAS*, 512, 989, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stac537](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stac537)
- Dekel, A., Zolotov, A., Tweed, D., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 435, 999, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stt1338](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stt1338)
- Dekel, A., Birnboim, Y., Engel, G., et al. 2009, *Nature*, 457, 451, doi: [10.1038/nature07648](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature07648)
- Di Cesare, C., Graziani, L., Schneider, R., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2209.05496. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.05496>
- Diego, J. M., Protopapas, P., Sandvik, H. B., & Tegmark, M. 2005, *MNRAS*, 360, 477, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2005.09021.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2005.09021.x)
- Diego, J. M., Tegmark, M., Protopapas, P., & Sandvik, H. B. 2007, *MNRAS*, 375, 958, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2007.11380.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2007.11380.x)
- Donahue, M., Connor, T., Fogarty, K., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 805, 177, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/805/2/177](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/805/2/177)
- Donnan, C. T., McLeod, D. J., Dunlop, J. S., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2207.12356. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.12356>
- Duncan, K., Conselice, C. J., Mundy, C., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 876, 110, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab148a](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab148a)
- Ebeling, H., Barrett, E., Donovan, D., et al. 2007, *ApJL*, 661, L33, doi: [10.1086/518603](https://doi.org/10.1086/518603)
- Eichner, T., Seitz, S., Suyu, S. H., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 774, 124, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/774/2/124](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/774/2/124)
- Eldridge, J. J. 2020, *Astronomy and Geophysics*, 61, 2.24, doi: [10.1093/astrogeo/ataa029](https://doi.org/10.1093/astrogeo/ataa029)
- Eldridge, J. J., & Stanway, E. R. 2009, *MNRAS*, 400, 1019, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15514.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15514.x)
- . 2022, *ARA&A*, 60, 455, doi: [10.1146/annurev-astro-052920-100646](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-astro-052920-100646)
- Ellison, S. L., Viswanathan, A., Patton, D. R., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 487, 2491, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stz1431](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz1431)
- Erwin, P. 2015, *ApJ*, 799, 226, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/799/2/226](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/799/2/226)
- Falcón-Barroso, J., Sánchez-Blázquez, P., Vazdekis, A., et al. 2011, *A&A*, 532, A95, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201116842](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201116842)
- Ferland, G. J., Korista, K. T., Verner, D. A., et al. 1998, *PASP*, 110, 761, doi: [10.1086/316190](https://doi.org/10.1086/316190)
- Ferland, G. J., Porter, R. L., van Hoof, P. A. M., et al. 2013, *RMxAA*, 49, 137. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1302.4485>
- Ferland, G. J., Chatzikos, M., Guzmán, F., et al. 2017, *RMxAA*, 53, 385. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.10877>
- Feroz, F., & Hobson, M. P. 2008, *MNRAS*, 384, 449, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2007.12353.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2007.12353.x)
- Feroz, F., Hobson, M. P., & Bridges, M. 2009, *MNRAS*, 398, 1601, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.14548.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.14548.x)

- Feroz, F., & Skilling, J. 2013, in *American Institute of Physics Conference Series*, Vol. 1553, *Bayesian Inference and Maximum Entropy Methods in Science and Engineering: 32nd International Workshop on Bayesian Inference and Maximum Entropy Methods in Science and Engineering*, ed. U. von Toussaint, 106–113, doi: [10.1063/1.4819989](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4819989)
- Ferrara, A., Pallottini, A., & Dayal, P. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2208.00720. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.00720>
- Ferreira, L., Adams, N., Conselice, C. J., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2207.09428. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.09428>
- Finkelstein, S. L., Bagley, M. B., Arrabal Haro, P., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2207.12474. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.12474>
- Fogarty, K., Postman, M., Larson, R., Donahue, M., & Moustakas, J. 2017, *ApJ*, 846, 103, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa82b9](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa82b9)
- Furtak, L. J., Shuntov, M., Atek, H., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2208.05473. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.05473>
- Gaia Collaboration, Brown, A. G. A., Vallenari, A., et al. 2021, *A&A*, 649, A1, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202039657](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202039657)
- Gardner, J. P., Mather, J. C., Clampin, M., et al. 2006, *SSRv*, 123, 485, doi: [10.1007/s11214-006-8315-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-006-8315-7)
- Girardi, L., Bressan, A., Bertelli, G., & Chiosi, C. 2000, *A&AS*, 141, 371, doi: [10.1051/aas:2000126](https://doi.org/10.1051/aas:2000126)
- Gómez-Valent, A., & Amendola, L. 2018, *JCAP*, 2018, 051, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2018/04/051](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2018/04/051)
- Graur, O., Rodney, S. A., Maoz, D., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 783, 28, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/783/1/28](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/783/1/28)
- Gutkin, J., Charlot, S., & Bruzual, G. 2016, *MNRAS*, 462, 1757, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stw1716](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stw1716)
- Harikane, Y., Ouchi, M., Oguri, M., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2208.01612. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.01612>
- Helmi, A., Babusiaux, C., Koppelman, H. H., et al. 2018, *Nature*, 563, 85, doi: [10.1038/s41586-018-0625-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0625-x)
- Hoffmann, S. L., Mack, J., Avila, R., et al. 2021, in *American Astronomical Society Meeting Abstracts*, Vol. 53, *American Astronomical Society Meeting Abstracts*, 216.02
- Hopkins, P. F., Murray, N., Quataert, E., & Thompson, T. A. 2010a, *MNRAS*, 401, L19, doi: [10.1111/j.1745-3933.2009.00777.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3933.2009.00777.x)
- Hopkins, P. F., Bundy, K., Croton, D., et al. 2010b, *ApJ*, 715, 202, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/715/1/202](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/715/1/202)
- Hutter, A., Dayal, P., Yepes, G., et al. 2021, *MNRAS*, 503, 3698, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stab602](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab602)
- Huško, F., Lacey, C. G., & Baugh, C. M. 2023, *MNRAS*, 518, 5323, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stac3152](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stac3152)
- Inoue, A. K., Shimizu, I., Iwata, I., & Tanaka, M. 2014, *MNRAS*, 442, 1805, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stu936](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu936)
- JDADF Developers, Averbukh, J., Bradley, L., et al. 2022, *Jdaviz*, 2.10.0, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5513927>
- Jiménez-Teja, Y., & Benítez, N. 2012, *ApJ*, 745, 150, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/745/2/150](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/745/2/150)
- Johnson, B. D., Leja, J., Conroy, C., & Speagle, J. S. 2021, *ApJS*, 254, 22, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/abef67](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/abef67)
- Jullo, E., & Kneib, J. P. 2009, *MNRAS*, 395, 1319, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.14654.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.14654.x)
- Jullo, E., Kneib, J. P., Limousin, M., et al. 2007, *New Journal of Physics*, 9, 447, doi: [10.1088/1367-2630/9/12/447](https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/9/12/447)
- Khusanova, Y., Bethermin, M., Le Fèvre, O., et al. 2021, *A&A*, 649, A152, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202038944](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202038944)
- Koekemoer, A. M., Fruchter, A. S., Hook, R. N., & Hack, W. 2003, in *HST Calibration Workshop : Hubble after the Installation of the ACS and the NICMOS Cooling System*, 337
- Kroupa, P. 2002, *Science*, 295, 82, doi: [10.1126/science.1067524](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1067524)
- Kroupa, P., Tout, C. A., & Gilmore, G. 1993, *MNRAS*, 262, 545, doi: [10.1093/mnras/262.3.545](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/262.3.545)
- Lam, D., Bouwens, R. J., Coe, D., et al. 2019, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1903.08177. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.08177>
- Leethochawalit, N., Trenti, M., Santini, P., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2207.11135. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.11135>
- Legrand, L., Dayal, P., Hutter, A., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2207.06786. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.06786>
- Leja, J., Carnall, A. C., Johnson, B. D., Conroy, C., & Speagle, J. S. 2019, *ApJ*, 876, 3, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab133c](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab133c)
- Leja, J., Johnson, B. D., Conroy, C., van Dokkum, P. G., & Byler, N. 2017, *ApJ*, 837, 170, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa5ffe](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa5ffe)
- Lotz, J. M., Jonsson, P., Cox, T. J., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 742, 103, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/742/2/103](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/742/2/103)
- Lotz, J. M., Koekemoer, A., Coe, D., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 837, 97, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/837/1/97](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/837/1/97)
- Madau, P., & Dickinson, M. 2014, *ARA&A*, 52, 415, doi: [10.1146/annurev-astro-081811-125615](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-astro-081811-125615)
- Marigo, P., & Girardi, L. 2007, *A&A*, 469, 239, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361:20066772](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361:20066772)

- Marigo, P., Girardi, L., Bressan, A., et al. 2008, *A&A*, 482, 883, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361:20078467](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361:20078467)
- Meneghetti, M., Natarajan, P., Coe, D., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 472, 3177, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stx2064](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx2064)
- Merten, J., Meneghetti, M., Postman, M., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 806, 4, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/806/1/4](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/806/1/4)
- Meštrić, U., Vanzella, E., Zanella, A., et al. 2022, *MNRAS*, 516, 3532, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stac2309](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stac2309)
- Mihos, J. C., & Hernquist, L. 1996, *ApJ*, 464, 641, doi: [10.1086/177353](https://doi.org/10.1086/177353)
- Naab, T., Johansson, P. H., & Ostriker, J. P. 2009, *ApJL*, 699, L178, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/699/2/L178](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/699/2/L178)
- Naidu, R. P., Conroy, C., Bonaca, A., et al. 2021, *ApJ*, 923, 92, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac2d2d](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac2d2d)
- Naidu, R. P., Oesch, P. A., van Dokkum, P., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2207.09434, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.09434>
- Nelson, E. J., Suess, K. A., Bezanson, R., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2208.01630, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.01630>
- Newman, A. B., Ellis, R. S., Bundy, K., & Treu, T. 2012, *ApJ*, 746, 162, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/746/2/162](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/746/2/162)
- Oesch, P. A., Brammer, G., van Dokkum, P. G., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 819, 129, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/819/2/129](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/819/2/129)
- Oguri, M. 2010, *PASJ*, 62, 1017, doi: [10.1093/pasj/62.4.1017](https://doi.org/10.1093/pasj/62.4.1017)
- Oke, J. B. 1974, *ApJS*, 27, 21, doi: [10.1086/190287](https://doi.org/10.1086/190287)
- Oke, J. B., & Gunn, J. E. 1983, *ApJ*, 266, 713, doi: [10.1086/160817](https://doi.org/10.1086/160817)
- Pacucci, F., Mesinger, A., & Haiman, Z. 2013, *MNRAS*, 435, L53, doi: [10.1093/mnras/slt093](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/slt093)
- Pascale, M., Frye, B. L., Diego, J., et al. 2022, *ApJL*, 938, L6, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ac9316](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ac9316)
- Patel, B., McCully, C., Jha, S. W., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 786, 9, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/786/1/9](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/786/1/9)
- Pei, Y. C. 1992, *ApJ*, 395, 130, doi: [10.1086/171637](https://doi.org/10.1086/171637)
- Peng, C. Y., Ho, L. C., Impey, C. D., & Rix, H.-W. 2010, *AJ*, 139, 2097, doi: [10.1088/0004-6256/139/6/2097](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-6256/139/6/2097)
- Pirzkal, N., Coe, D., Frye, B. L., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 804, 11, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/804/1/11](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/804/1/11)
- Planck Collaboration, Aghanim, N., Akrami, Y., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 641, A6, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201833910](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833910)
- Portegies Zwart, S. F., McMillan, S. L. W., & Gieles, M. 2010, *ARA&A*, 48, 431, doi: [10.1146/annurev-astro-081309-130834](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-astro-081309-130834)
- Postman, M., Coe, D., Benítez, N., et al. 2012a, *ApJS*, 199, 25, doi: [10.1088/0067-0049/199/2/25](https://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/199/2/25)
- Postman, M., Lauer, T. R., Donahue, M., et al. 2012b, *ApJ*, 756, 159, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/756/2/159](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/756/2/159)
- Ribeiro, B., Le Fèvre, O., Cassata, P., et al. 2017, *A&A*, 608, A16, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201630057](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201630057)
- Riess, A. G., Rodney, S. A., Scolnic, D. M., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 853, 126, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aaa5a9](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aaa5a9)
- Rigby, J., Perrin, M., McElwain, M., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2207.05632, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.05632>
- Robitaille, T., Deil, C., & Ginsburg, A. 2020, reproject: Python-based astronomical image reprojection, Astrophysics Source Code Library, record ascl:2011.023, <http://ascl.net/2011.023>
- Rodney, S. A., Riess, A. G., Strolger, L.-G., et al. 2014, *AJ*, 148, 13, doi: [10.1088/0004-6256/148/1/13](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-6256/148/1/13)
- Rodriguez-Gomez, V., Genel, S., Vogelsberger, M., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 449, 49, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stv264](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv264)
- Salim, S., Boquien, M., & Lee, J. C. 2018, *ApJ*, 859, 11, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aabf3c](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aabf3c)
- Sánchez-Blázquez, P., Peletier, R. F., Jiménez-Vicente, J., et al. 2006, *MNRAS*, 371, 703, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2006.10699.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2006.10699.x)
- Santos-Olmsted, L., Barrow, K., & Hartwig, T. 2023, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2305.17158, doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2305.17158](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.17158)
- Sartoris, B., Biviano, A., Rosati, P., et al. 2014, *ApJL*, 783, L11, doi: [10.1088/2041-8205/783/1/L11](https://doi.org/10.1088/2041-8205/783/1/L11)
- Smit, R., Bouwens, R. J., Labbé, I., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 784, 58, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/784/1/58](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/784/1/58)
- Sotillo-Ramos, D., Pillepich, A., Donnari, M., et al. 2022, *MNRAS*, 516, 5404, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stac2586](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stac2586)
- Stefanon, M., Bouwens, R. J., Labbé, I., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2206.13525, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.13525>
- Stewart, K. R., Bullock, J. S., Barton, E. J., & Wechsler, R. H. 2009, *ApJ*, 702, 1005, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/702/2/1005](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/702/2/1005)
- Strolger, L.-G., Dahlen, T., Rodney, S. A., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 813, 93, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/813/2/93](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/813/2/93)
- Tacchella, S., Bose, S., Conroy, C., Eisenstein, D. J., & Johnson, B. D. 2018, *ApJ*, 868, 92, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aae8e0](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aae8e0)
- Tacchella, S., Finkelstein, S. L., Bagley, M., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 927, 170, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac4cad](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac4cad)
- Tasca, L. A. M., Le Fèvre, O., Hathi, N. P., et al. 2015, *A&A*, 581, A54, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201425379](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201425379)
- Toomre, A., & Toomre, J. 1972, *ApJ*, 178, 623, doi: [10.1086/151823](https://doi.org/10.1086/151823)
- Topping, M. W., Stark, D. P., Endsley, R., et al. 2022, *MNRAS*, 516, 975, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stac2291](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stac2291)
- Treister, E., Schawinski, K., Urry, C. M., & Simmons, B. D. 2012, *ApJL*, 758, L39, doi: [10.1088/2041-8205/758/2/L39](https://doi.org/10.1088/2041-8205/758/2/L39)

- Umetsu, K., Medezinski, E., Nonino, M., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 795, 163, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/795/2/163](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/795/2/163)
- van Dokkum, P. G., Whitaker, K. E., Brammer, G., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 709, 1018, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/709/2/1018](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/709/2/1018)
- Vanzella, E., Castellano, M., Bergamini, P., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 659, A2, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202141590](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202141590)
- Welch, B., Coe, D., Zitrin, A., et al. 2022a, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2207.03532. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.03532>
- Welch, B., Coe, D., Zackrisson, E., et al. 2022b, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2208.09007. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.09007>
- Whitaker, K. E., Franx, M., Leja, J., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 795, 104, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/795/2/104](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/795/2/104)
- Whitler, L., Endsley, R., Stark, D. P., et al. 2022a, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2208.01599. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.01599>
- Whitler, L., Stark, D. P., Endsley, R., et al. 2022b, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2206.05315. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.05315>
- Xiang, M., & Rix, H.-W. 2022, *Nature*, 603, 599, doi: [10.1038/s41586-022-04496-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04496-5)
- Yan, H., Ma, Z., Ling, C., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2207.11558. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.11558>
- Yung, L. Y. A., Somerville, R. S., Popping, G., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 490, 2855, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stz2755](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz2755)
- Zhang, H., Behroozi, P., Volonteri, M., et al. 2023, *MNRAS*, 518, 2123, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stac2633](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stac2633)
- Zheng, W., Postman, M., Zitrin, A., et al. 2012, *Nature*, 489, 406, doi: [10.1038/nature11446](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11446)
- Zitrin, A., Broadhurst, T., Barkana, R., Rephaeli, Y., & Benítez, N. 2011, *MNRAS*, 410, 1939, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.17574.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.17574.x)
- Zitrin, A., Broadhurst, T., Umetsu, K., et al. 2009, *MNRAS*, 396, 1985, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.14899.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.14899.x)
- Zitrin, A., Fabris, A., Merten, J., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 801, 44, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/801/1/44](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/801/1/44)