

Performance of Photometric Template Fitting for Ultra-High Redshift Galaxies

Thorbjørn Clausen^{1,2}, Charles L. Steinhardt^{3,4}, Arden Shao⁵, and Gaurav Senthil Kumar^{1,2}

¹ Cosmic Dawn Center (DAWN), Denmark

² Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Jagtvej 128, DK-2200, Copenhagen N, Denmark

³ Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO, USA

⁴ DARK Cosmology Center, University of Copenhagen, Jagtvej 128, DK-2200, Copenhagen N, Denmark

⁵ California Institute of Technology, 1200 E. California Blvd., Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

Received ; accepted

ABSTRACT

JWST has allowed the discovery of a significant population of galaxies at $z > 10$. Our understanding of the astrophysical properties of these galaxies relies on fitting templates developed using models predicting the differences between these first galaxies and lower-redshift counterparts. In this work, tests are performed on several of these high-redshift template sets in order to determine how successful they are at predicting both photometric redshifts and full spectroscopic energy distributions (SEDs). It is shown that the best templates for photometric redshift estimation differ from the best templates for predicting the full SED. Overall, some templates perform adequately at photometric redshift estimation, while all are generally poor predictors of the full SED, with a few objects in particular poorly fit by all template sets tested. We conclude that although photometric redshifts can be reliable, given high enough observational depth and adequate filters, models are not yet able to produce robust astrophysical properties for these ultra-high redshift galaxies.

1. Introduction

Due to the high observational cost, large blind spectroscopic surveys are infeasible at very high redshift. As a result, all recent high-redshift galaxy studies have used either photometric surveys alone or spectroscopic follow up of photometric targets. Consequently, our knowledge of these first galaxies relies on an ability to successfully identify high-redshift galaxies, as well as several of their properties, from photometry alone. This is done via fitting a series of spectral energy distribution (SED) models to the observed multi-wavelength photometry, then assuming that the properties of the best-fit model are also those of the galaxy.

However, there is a high computational complexity in fitting properties to photometry, due to a combination of many astrophysical parameters and a search space with a large number of local minima that can lie far from the global minimum (Speagle et al. 2016). In practice, solving this problem requires finding a way to reduce the search space significantly. One of the most successful techniques, employed by codes such as EAZY (Brammer et al. 2008), is to choose a limited basis of templates, then to find the best-fit linear combination of these to the observed photometry.

The main drawback of this method is that success hinges on the set of templates chosen and whether the limited basis spanned by these templates contains a good approximation for the true properties of these galaxies. This is a particularly strong assumption when observing in a new regime, since the template basis must be chosen based on extrapolations from existing observations.

Fortunately, follow-up spectroscopy has typically shown that photometric redshifts have generally been a good predictor of spectroscopic redshifts (Hildebrandt, H. et al. 2010). It is then assumed that the properties produced by

template fitting are similarly good predictors of true galaxy properties, although there is less direct evidence of these properties to use as a basis for comparison.

However, with the Cycle 1 observations from the James Webb Space Telescope (*JWST*), it appeared that the template basis extrapolated from lower-redshift observations were poor descriptions of galaxies at $z > 10$. Several candidates for $z > 15$ galaxies were reported using photometric template fitting (Donnan et al. 2022; Castellano et al. 2022; Yan et al. 2022), but spectroscopic followups and photometric observations at other wavelengths showed that these were much lower-redshift objects (Arrabal Haro et al. 2023; Zavala et al. 2023). Additionally, many $z \sim 10$ candidates were indeed found to lie at high redshift, but had spectroscopic redshifts 10% to 20% lower than those fitted photometrically (Fujimoto et al. 2023). These discrepancies were strong indicators that revised templates were needed to better describe early galaxies.

Several approaches have been taken to revising templates in order to better describe galaxies and their stellar populations at $z \sim 10$. Some template sets have been produced based on using astrophysical arguments to choose parameters in stellar population synthesis (SPS) models which should better reflect early galaxies (Steinhardt et al. 2023; Larson et al. 2023; Adams et al. 2022). Alternatively, the approach by Turner (in prep.) choose to restrict SPS models to those with younger stellar populations. Finally, a hybrid approach consists of taking star formation histories from early-universe simulations and synthesize a stellar population by including an age restriction (see table 1, Brammer et al. 2008).

This variety of meaningful approaches means that astronomers are now forced to choose which template to use. Here, different template sets and techniques are eval-

uated in order to determine which is most robust. Currently, photometric template fits are used in two different ways. In some cases, only the photometric redshift is relevant, since high-redshift candidates are then targeted for follow-up spectroscopy in order to better determine their properties. In other cases, physical parameters are inferred directly from photometric template fits and used to draw scientific conclusions without additional observations. As a result, two different tests are conducted, one to determine which template basis is best at redshift estimation and the other to determine which is most successful at recreating spectral features.

In § 2, the various datasets available for photometry and spectroscopy with high-redshift sources (here defined as $z > 5$) are described, along with the template sets used to fit them. The fitting technique is then described in § 3. In § 4, the template sets are evaluated on their ability to both provide photometric redshifts and predict the full SED. Finally, the implications for future surveys are discussed in § 5.

2. Sample description

Any evaluation of template performance requires a benchmark dataset with robust measurements of properties that template sets can then be asked to predict. This requires spectroscopic observations in addition to the photometry which will be made available for template fitting. Here, this is drawn from several *JWST* spectroscopic catalogs, with photometry supplemented by any additional available observations.

Templates are evaluated both on redshift prediction and SED feature prediction, since a template might excel in one and not the other. Evaluation of this is thus done with two separate tests and two separate samples:

An **SED sample** is chosen to determine whether reconstructed SEDs correctly predict observed SEDs. Many of the differences between models lie in the strength of the emission lines, which have been observed to be unexpectedly strong at higher redshifts (Boyett et al. 2024; Trump et al. 2023). Therefore, this test requires sufficiently deep spectra to separate the continuum emission from the spectral lines and to measure the continuum shape. This is further complicated by the significant discrepancies in spectral properties from independent spectroscopic catalogs (Mugnai et al. 2024) reporting the same *JWST* observations. This is likely due to differing assumptions about properties such as slit loss. Therefore, the SED sample is highly restricted to only the objects with clean and simple reduction. The result is a limited but robust test, where negligible future revisions are needed as spectroscopic reductions improve.

A far larger **redshift sample** is also chosen in order to determine which template sets produce photometric redshifts (z_{phot}) that most closely mirror spectroscopic redshifts (z_{spec}). This spectroscopic sample is more robust, since it is only necessary to demonstrate few emission lines, rather than a continuum. In addition, although independent spectroscopic catalogs often report differences in the strength of emission lines, there is a broad agreement on the observed wavelength and thus the redshifts. As a result, the redshift sample is far larger, allowing comprehensive results and subsampling.

2.1. Redshift sample

The redshift sample was used as a benchmark sample to evaluate the accuracy of the photometric redshift. The benchmark sample consists primarily of $z_{\text{spec}} > 5$ objects, which shall hence forth be defined to be high-redshift. However with practical analysis of high-redshift sources being inseparable to knowing a prior of whether an object is high-redshift in the first place, evaluation of an all-regime sample is also necessary (here cut by $z_{\text{spec}} > 0.1$). Datasets from three surveys were used for this analysis, collecting the following object counts:

114 objects in the high-redshift sample from CEERS: There are 76,637 total objects in The Cosmic Evolution Early Release Science Survey (CEERS) (Finkelstein 2023; Bagley et al. 2023; Yang et al. 2021) (2023-08-30 update used), in a combined dataset with data from the Hubble legacy field (HLF). CEERS employs photometric exposure times between 1.5 ks and 3.1 ks, achieving 5σ per-filter depths between 26.67 mag_{AB} and 29.22 mag_{AB} (avg. 28.4 mag_{AB}), reported with 0.2'' diameter aperture. Photometry includes bands in NIR and MIR, with additional bands from the HLF, all with varying coverage, as summarized in figure 1. A combined photometric catalog is provided by the DJA archive (Brammer 2023a).

Spectroscopy (Haro et al. 2023) is obtained in parallel using both the microshutter assembly (MSA) and wide-field slitless spectroscopy (WFSS), providing many robust z_{spec} measurements. A total of 466 objects have $z_{\text{spec}} > 0.1$ and are thus included in the all-range redshift sample, and 114 of these have $z_{\text{spec}} > 5$ placing them in the high-redshift sample.

The survey, generally having relatively shorter exposures (see figure 1) but broad wavelength coverage, yields a large and relatively shallow wide-field survey of high-redshift objects.

30 objects in the high-redshift sample from UNCOVER: There are 61,648 objects in the Ultradeep NIR-Spec and NIRCams Observations before the Epoch of Reionization (UNCOVER) catalog (Bezanson et al. 2022; Weaver et al. 2023; Furtak et al. 2023; Fujimoto et al. 2023; Wang et al. 2023) (downloaded 2024-03-06) in a combined dataset from the Hubble Frontier Field (HFF) (and other programs not utilized here) (Lotz et al. 2017). NIRCams measurements have exposures ranging from 9.4 ks to 21.6 ks (average ~ 15 ks), yielding per-filter 5σ depths of ~ 29.5 mag_{AB} with variable aperture (0.16'' – 0.32''). Bands are included from NIRCams with additional bands from the HFF, all summarized in figure 1. The photometric catalog is provided by DJA. Crucially, the survey predominantly covers lensed regions, with expected magnifications between mild values of ~ 1.2 and very high values of ~ 10 (Bezanson et al. 2022). This yields effective depths up to ~ 32 mag_{AB}, albeit highly variable within the field.

Spectroscopy in the UNCOVER field includes both prior HST coverage and *JWST*'s MSA and WFSS observations, providing robust redshift measurements of 447 objects ($z_{\text{spec}} > 0.1$), and 30 with $z_{\text{spec}} > 5$ (values are collected from the DJA archive).

99 objects in the high-redshift sample from JADES: The JADES catalog contains 94,000 objects in a combined catalog including *JWST* Advanced Deep Extragalactic Survey (JADES; Bunker et al. 2024; Eisenstein et al. 2023b; Hainline et al. 2024; Rieke et al.

2023; Eisenstein et al. 2023a; D'Eugenio et al. 2024), JWST Extragalactic Medium-band Survey (JEMS) (Williams et al. 2023) and the Hubble Legacy Field (HLF) with parts of the Hubble Ultra Deep Field (HUDF) (downloaded on 2024-03-06). JADES has mixed exposure times between 8.7 ks and 77.6 ks, achieving 10σ depths of $\sim 29.7 \text{ mag}_{\text{AB}}$ with $0.2''$ aperture diameter with NIR bands. The adjacent JEMS survey has exposure times of ~ 23.6 ks, achieving 5σ depth of 23.6 ks with $0.3''$ aperture diameter in MIR bands. The HLF adds additional coverage in optical bands. A summary of band coverage is provided in figure 1.

Spectroscopy is measured through follow-up observations using JWST/MSA and from the HST, achieving reliable redshifts for 446 objects with $z_{\text{spec}} > 0.1$ (predominantly from the DJA archive). 99 objects have $z_{\text{spec}} > 5$ and are thus included in the high-redshift sample.

JADES includes variable coverage across the survey rather than a fixed number of available bands (e.g., there are 74 objects with 20 bands available). In brief, JADES is a prototypical example of a large "conventional" (non-lensed) JWST survey with deep measurements in NIR bands and additional shallow measurements in MIR bands. Furthermore, the inclusion of MSA metadata allowed the use of several spectra in the SED sample, as described below.

2.2. SED Subsample

The high-redshift SED subsample requires spectroscopy sufficiently deep and resolved to be able to measure the continuum emission in addition to spectral lines. Specifically, the SED subsample is restricted to spectra from the high redshift sample with a continuum average $S/N \geq 5$, and $R > 1000$.

In addition, due to significant discrepancies between the reduced versions of the same spectra from different catalogs, further restrictions are applied to the SED subsample to minimize these effects. These discrepancies are likely due to complicated distortions from neighboring objects, slit misalignment effects, assumptions about the shape of the source, and differing techniques employed to mitigate those differences. To decrease contamination from neighboring sources, only slit spectroscopy is used (specifically MSA). Additionally objects are constrained to not have neighboring emission within the slit length of $\sim 0.46''$ (thus angular distance + PSF FWHM radius $\geq 0.46''$). Further to simplify the data reduction of a given object, a selection is performed towards "centered" objects, where the majority of the object's flux must be enclosed in the slit. In practice, this limits the dataset to a subset of JADES where both dimensions of slit-offset are available in the metadata. Finally, sources are limited to only point-like sources ($\text{FWHM} \leq 0.15''$).

In summary, the additional cuts made to the SED subsample with the high-redshift sources are:

1. **Combined-grating average $S/N \geq 5$ in the rest frame 1000 to 5000 with $R=1000$:** This signal strength requirement is necessary in order to meaningfully compare the distribution between the continuum and the line flux from the best-fit and observed SEDs. Eddington bias is introduced as a consequence and should be considered when evaluating the results.




Fig. 1. Filters covered in the surveys used and the reported observational depth of individual filters. Apertures are set variably according to the Rayleigh criterion formula and thus range from $0.035''$ to $0.81''$. The depth data presented are derived from reported values by survey authors (Weaver et al. 2023; D'Eugenio et al. 2024; Rieke et al. 2023; Hainline et al. 2024; Guo et al. 2013; Bagley et al. 2023; Yang et al. 2023). Some surveys employ in-house processes to the Hubble data, and thus report adjusted depths.

2. **$R \geq 1000$:** SED's are limited to objects with highly resolved measurements to ensure resolved spectral features for the comparison. If available, additional measurements with $R < 1000$ were combined to observations with $R > 1000$, upon the condition that most of the SED had spectroscopic coverage with $R > 1000$.
3. **Only MSA spectroscopy with $R_{\text{FWHM}}/2$ within the slit opening:** This ensures the majority of the object flux is within the slit, safeguarding against anomalies in the compensation of slit-edge effects. It also puts an upper bound on object radius, effectively limiting sources to point-like sources. This decouples spectra quality from any assumptions of object shape/size in the reduction, while biasing towards lower observed object sizes. This will yield a heavy bias towards object type and/or distance.
4. **No other object with its R_{FWHM} F444W emission within $0.46''$ of target object ($0.46''$ being the length of the micro-shutters):** This is done to

prevent other objects from contaminating observations within the same slit. This cut also eliminates known cases of two objects located within one slit, but at the same time will remove any mergers that have been cataloged as separate objects.

As with any cuts, these choices can introduce biases into the sample, some of which may be significant. This includes an Eddington bias with the continuum S/N limit, and a bias towards higher redshift/smaller objects with the point-like source requirement. Perhaps the strongest is that the selection will be biased against objects such as disk-like galaxies, with higher angular momentum and/or mass, since these typically have a larger source diameter (Romanowsky & Fall 2012). However, these quality cuts are deemed necessary in order to produce a robust sample.

JADES is the only survey with the required metadata to perform these cuts easily available. The survey measures its spectra with the JWST parallel (MSA). It consists of two deep pointings of 192 ks exposure, 14 "medium-depth" pointings of ~ 43 ks, and a shallow set of 15 with ~ 14 ks exposure times. The observations of each object include a coarse prism observation with $R \sim 30 - 300$, three medium dispersion $R \approx 1000$ gratings, and one $R \approx 2700$ grating, giving a combined overlapping coverage over $0.6 \mu\text{m} - 5.3 \mu\text{m}$.

These quality restrictions yield six objects for use, summarized in figure 2. Given the small sample size, it is likely that the SED sample is not fully representative of the high-redshift galaxy population. However the sample is still sufficient to draw conclusions of ill-fit sources.




Fig. 2. Objects in the SED subsample. Selected by the criteria above from JADES Data Release 2. Cutouts are selected from the DJA archive and are produced with the GRIZLI utility (Brammer 2023b). Redshifts, catalog NIRC2 ID and coordinates are noted. F150W, F277W and F444W was used to make an RGB cutout with equal weighing. The MSA shutter placement is overlaid in orange, with primary source slits marked in magenta.

2.3. Template Sets

The templates included are chosen as a representative set of high-redshift templates in current use. Each of these templates have in their development somewhat started with

lower redshift templates, but made modifying choices designed for high redshift application.

Three broad approaches were taken in choosing which modifications were needed for the high-redshift regime: (1) changes driven by empirical differences between low-redshift and high-redshift SEDs; (2) changes motivated by pen-and-paper theory, predicting the ways in which high-redshift galaxies are predicted to be distinct; and (3) changes driven by simulations modeling the ways in which high-redshift galaxies are predicted to be distinct.

Perhaps the most straightforward approach is to modify previous templates based on empirical differences between high-redshift galaxies and those at lower redshift. This can both take the form of empirically motivated adjustment, or direct empirical changes. For example, $z \gtrsim 8$ galaxies have significantly stronger emission lines than previously predicted (Boyett et al. 2024; Trump et al. 2023). Thus, templates can be modified by re-scaling emission line strengths in order to better match observations, such as in the A22 template (Adams et al. 2022) (see table 1). Other similar approaches include B1SFH and L23 (Brammer et al. 2008; Larson et al. 2023), motivated by favoring bluer spectra than predecessors; and CaSFH and T22 (Brammer et al. 2008; Turner in prep.), based on wider varieties of synthetic stellar populations with varying properties. A significant disadvantage of a purely empirical approach is that the templates are not necessarily produced by underlying astrophysical models, making it more difficult to infer astrophysical parameters from the best-fit spectrum. Thus, a model-driven approach would be preferred if it can reproduce observed SEDs equivalently well.

An alternate approach is to use theoretical predictions about the properties of the first galaxies to modify astrophysical parameters, then to use stellar population synthesis codes to turn those parameters into template sets. For example, because the cosmic microwave background temperature at $z > 7$ exceeds temperatures in galactic star-forming regions, the IMF is expected to be bottom-lighter than previously assumed (Jermyn et al. 2018; Sneppen et al. 2022; Steinhardt et al. 2023). Similarly, an unconstrained fit often produces stellar populations or other features of the SED which must be older than the presumed age of the Universe under the standard Λ CDM cosmological paradigm (Steinhardt et al. 2024). Thus, limited template sets have been constructed which are constrained to remain consistent with Λ CDM (B1SFH, CaSFH, S23, (Brammer et al. 2008; Steinhardt et al. 2023)). T22 has taken a similar approach, adjusting population synthesis parameters to better represent high-redshift populations, with a "bursty" SFH and generally younger stellar populations ((Turner in prep.), private communication).

Another approach is to derive spectra from the properties of the first galaxies from numerical simulations. Here, template sets are intended to be representative of the properties of a wide array of simulated galaxies, while avoiding the inclusion of properties which are uncharacteristic of simulated results. This approach has been taken by (Larson et al. 2023), with the goal of producing bluer templates to better match observations at high-redshift. These bluer spectra are added to a previous template "tweak_fps_QSF_v12_v3" (TwSPS) (Brammer et al. 2008). TwSPS is also added as a control sample, since L23 is an extension to this template set.

Finally, a template originally developed for lower redshift, "eazy_v1.3" (Brammer et al. 2008), is included as a control sample. No modifications have been made to tune this template set to the properties of high-redshift galaxies. Thus, it is expected that if the differences are significant, this lower redshift template set should perform relatively poorly.

Determining which of these approaches are the most successful at reconstructing observed SED's, is also a tracer for gauging the current state of template fitting and the underlying physical models. If the empirical approaches are better, it would suggest that the current models of the first galaxies are still insufficient at inferring meaningful astrophysical parameters. In this case, only redshifts and properties which can be calculated from the redshift alone, such as luminosity functions, would be meaningful. However, if the theoretical approach is more successful, it would indicate that the major differences between the first galaxies and subsequent evolution are now well understood. Similarly, if simulation-driven approaches are successful, it would indicate that the constrained set of astrophysics which has been included is adequate for the high-redshift regime.

Table 1. Template sets used

Name	Abbr.	Size
Blue-SFHz-13 ^a	B1SFH	14 [*]
Carnall-SFHz-13 ^a	CaSFH	14 [*]
EAZY-v1.3 ^a	Ev3	9
EMLines ^b	A22	39
Fsps-45K ^c	S23	6
Larson-SED-template ^d	L23	18
fsps-v3.2-Chabrier03 ^{e **}	T22	12
tweak-fsps-QSF-12-v3 ^a	TwSPS	12

Notes. The eight template sets used here are selected to span the range of current models. B1SFH, CaSFH, Tweak_fsp and Ev3 are template sets included with the current version of the EAZY software package. ^(*) The given size is the number of templates in the full basis, however the SFHz templates employ a variable template size dependent on redshift. With fewer available at highest redshifts, this makes them effectively more constrained. ^(**) The author provides a large set of templates for use. In preliminary tests, their redshift performance was found to be largely homogeneous; however, the one listed above was found to perform marginally better, and so is selected for use. ^(a) (Brammer et al. 2008) ^(b) (Adams et al. 2022) ^(c) (Steinhardt et al. 2023) ^(d) (Larson et al. 2023) ^(e) (Turner in prep.)

3. Methodology and metrics

As described in §2, two tests were performed, one of redshift accuracy for the 243-object high-redshift sample and 1359-object all-range sample, and another of full SED reconstruction for the 6-object SED sample. All template fits were done with EAZY, as it provides a platform to exhaustively explore the entire template fit search space up to a few minor nonlinear fit improvements (G. Brammer, private communication).

By default, EAZY uses a luminosity prior function when assessing highest likelihood redshifts. It should be noted that some results might be sensitive the choice of prior

(see Brammer et al. 2008 for the specific prior distribution). Here, the default recommended EAZY settings are chosen since those are likely to be the settings most commonly used, and a proper investigation of alternative priors is left to future work.

3.1. Redshift performance

The redshift test followed the methodology outlined in Hildebrandt, H. et al. (2010), in order to use established metrics for testing photometric redshift performance. All comparisons are expressed in terms of the fractional difference between the photometric and spectroscopic redshifts,

$$\Delta z \equiv \frac{(1 + z_{\text{phot}}) - (1 + z_{\text{spec}})}{1 + z_{\text{spec}}} = \frac{z_{\text{phot}} - z_{\text{spec}}}{1 + z_{\text{spec}}}. \quad (1)$$

Template sets were then compared on three initial criteria, each potentially most important under different circumstances. For the purposes of producing a sample suitable for follow-up spectroscopy, the most important metric is the catastrophic error fraction $\eta \equiv \frac{N(|\Delta z| > 0.15)}{N}$. However, often if photometric redshifts are to be used directly, the scatter $\sigma_{\text{nmad}} \equiv \sigma(\Delta z)$ or bias $\Delta_{\text{bias}} \equiv \overline{\Delta z}$ might be more important.

One may naturally expect the set of metrics $\{\Delta_{\text{bias}}, \sigma_{\text{nmad}}, \eta\}$ to be well correlated, in that a very poor fitting procedure is likely to produce photometric redshifts that perform poorly in all three metrics. Similarly, if a model better describes the underlying astrophysics, it would naturally perform better in all three. However, it is also possible to over-tune a model to a limited dataset such as early *JWST* observations. In such cases there will instead be a trade-off between bias and variance (von Luxburg & Schoelkopf 2008; Geman et al. 1992). As models become more complex and use additional parameters to match a training set, the bias decreases. Since additional tuning may not describe the data better, the model will typically produce a higher variance when fit to a new sample. Specific science results might depend almost solely on the bias or variance alone, but for more purposes, a balance of low bias and low variance is optimal.

There is a significant variation between the different catalogs for the same *JWST* photometry. Therefore, in estimating uncertainties, it was assumed that a significant source of error might be attributed to unspecified systematics within the encompassing *JWST* photometry pipeline. Estimated errors were assigned to each photometric band, and propagated using bootstrapping within the attained errors for each band. Errors were conservatively set to a 2% baseline, to both account for the < 1% reported calibration and potential reduction systematics. F277W, F430M, F460M and F470M, being filters with reported greater systematics, are cautiously assigned 6%, 4%, 4%, 8%, respectively given reported pipeline issues (STScI 2024). These errors are propagated through the fitting procedure to attain distributions of redshift metrics. Average values are reported with 3σ deviations. Combined with the conservative bounds, this ensures that the reported metrics are robust towards even major future systematics mitigation. ≥ 250 resamples were produced until convergence of the metrics (specifically ~ 250 , ~ 250 , ~ 350 for UNCOVER, CEERS, JADES respectively).

3.2. SED performance

The *SED performance* was tested by how well the photometrically-reconstructed SEDs from templates reproduce the measured SEDs. In the reconstruction, EAZY might have found incorrect redshifts to be more favorable for reconstructing the SED. To standardize the test, the reconstructed SEDs were specifically chosen to be the best matches at z_{spec} . Here χ^2_ν was compared against the observed SED across templates to give a quantitative measure of template performance.

The differences between the observed and reconstructed SEDs comes from two primary sources: (1) spectral features that are unrepresented in template sets; and (2) a lack of information available from the photometric bands with sufficient S/N, as opposed to a higher-resolution spectrum. To determine which is more significant, a secondary fit was produced with information from spectroscopic observations calibrated to photometry, where again the best fit at z_{spec} was obtained. This enables a more controlled analysis of whether a template represents an object well, as opposed to the photometry based fit, where other effects like lacking information, degeneracies or strong covariances can affect the fit.

4. Template Performance

Using the samples described in § 2 and methods described in § 3, all eight template sets (table 1) are evaluated based on their predictive performance in the redshift and SED samples.

4.1. Redshift analysis

Overall, most of the template sets designed for high-redshift galaxies are broadly successful at using photometry to predict spectroscopic redshifts. Here, they are compared using three datasets with varying survey designs: UNCOVER, with the deepest observations (due to its lensed field) but with fewer bands; JADES, which is not as deep as UNCOVER but has wider photometric coverage; and CEERS, a wide-band but relatively shallow survey, making it the best probe for galaxies near detection thresholds. For all three, the redshift subsample only consists of galaxies with spectroscopic $z > 5$, since the S23 template sets preferentially do not include templates which would be valid for older (lower redshift) galaxies (subsequently reducing the number of fit parameters at higher redshift).

Previous evaluations have typically focused on the catastrophic error rate, $\eta \equiv \frac{N(|\Delta z| > 0.15)}{N}$ (Hildebrandt, H. et al. 2010). A template set which minimizes the catastrophic error rate is then considered the most useful. However, the template sets considered here have two potential failure modes. A catastrophic error in redshift is what might be termed a *silent error*, since there is no indication given that the photometric redshift is wrong. In addition, several template sets considered here have *noisy error* modes, in which they are unable to return any photometric redshift because there is no good fit. A noisy error is certainly preferable to a silent error, since additional information allows for the selection of a high-purity sample. However, this also leads to a sample with lower completeness, and if the noisy errors are predominantly due to a specific SED shape (which

arguably likely is true), quite possibly a biased sample as well. Thus, here two metrics are used, η_f , the catastrophic error fraction in the sample which returns a photometric redshift, and η_c , which includes both silent and noisy errors and is given as a fraction of the complete sample. This distinction is greatest in the two control samples, Ev3 and TwSPS, as they were not designed for high-redshift fitting, and thus are unable to return fits for 1%-10% of the high-redshift objects.

For UNCOVER (Fig. 3), the S23 ($\eta_f = 5.0\%$), and L23 (5.5%) template sets produce the highest-purity redshifts. Furthermore, S23 is shown to have the smallest σ and Δ as compared to other template sets. With a complete sample, S23 is thus best for characterizing redshifts in a UNCOVER-like sample. Most of the other template sets with small silent error fractions are unable to return photometric redshifts for 1%-3% of the full sample.

For most template sets, the difficulty in constraining photometric redshifts comes from insufficient wavelength coverage rather than from insufficient depth. As a result, with the additional filters available in JADES (Fig. 3), most template sets now return fits for 99% or more of the available sample. Still, the effectively reduced depth means that most template set performs worse than for UNCOVER. L23 ($\eta_f = 8.8\%$), B1SFH (9.2%), and T22 (9.7%) have significantly lower catastrophic error rates and are thus preferred. However S23 (with $\eta_f = 9.8\%$) has the smallest RMS error while maintaining high purity. On the entire sample, L23 again has the smallest $\eta_c = 9.1\%$, although S23 ($\eta_c = 9.9\%$) still has the smallest RMS error with a less significant difference in η , and therefore may be preferred.

Finally, CEERS is toughest to fit, as every template set has a catastrophic error rate over 22%. Despite the decreased depth, fit return rates are relatively high $\sim 99\%$. However all RMS redshift errors are $\geq 22\%$. S23 produces the best performance by every metric, returning a fit for every object with $\eta_f \approx \eta_c = 22.4\%$. T22, with $\eta_f = 24.1\%$ and $\eta_c = 25.3\%$, is the next best choice for a high-purity and completeness sample. Still, no template performs satisfactory for the full CEERS sample. The results for all three datasets are summarized in Table 8.

4.2. Asymmetry in Catastrophic Redshift Errors

Catastrophic redshift errors comes in two types: lower redshift objects scattering to higher redshift and higher redshift objects scattering to lower redshift. Since a common cause of catastrophic errors is an inability to distinguish between Lyman and Balmer breaks (Hovis-Afflerbach et al. 2021; Pirzkal et al. 2013), these errors commonly result in objects being included in or excluded from high-redshift samples. Thus, for a purely photometric study, scattering an object up, would result in the overestimation of the luminosity and mass functions at high redshifts, and similarly an object mistakenly excluded results in the underestimation of such functions. For studies with planned follow-up spectroscopy, false high-redshift targets result in wasted observing time, whereas objects scattered to low redshifts result in incomplete and likely biased samples. Depending upon the specific study, either type of error could be more important to avoid.

A strong asymmetry exists due to relative population sizes, as there are far more galaxies at $z \sim 3 - 5$ than $z > 10$ which are at the detection limit. For example, if




Fig. 3. JADES, CEERS, and UNCOVER template set redshift performance mosaics. The template sets are set against each other, comparing their accuracy, completeness and bias in the high-redshift domain ($z_{\text{spec}} > 5$) through η , σ_{nmad} , Δ_{bias} and e . Color coding is based on the relative $1 - s + \eta_f$ value, with the color scale centered on the median. Points are colored blue to red after its color index ($U - V$) in rest frame. Point markers designate filter coverage with ‘x’ marking objects lacking 4/5 of the NIRC filters otherwise in the catalog, ‘o’ marking objects with next to full NIRC filter coverage, and ‘•’ marks full NIRC filter coverage, among with additional MIRI filters.

Table 2. JADES $z > 5$ photometric redshift performance metrics

Template	$\Delta_{\text{bias}, z>5} [\%]$	$\sigma_{\text{nmad}, z>5} [\%]$	$\eta_{f, z>5} [\%]$	$\eta_{c, z>5} [\%]$	$s_{z>5} [\%]$
A22	-3.7 ± 0.2	19.3 ± 0.3	12.0 ± 0.3	$13.3^{+0.3}_{-0.4}$	98.74 ± 0.07
B1SFH	-3.4 ± 0.2	18.3 ± 0.3	9.2 ± 0.3	9.4 ± 0.3	$99.82^{+0.08}_{-0.11}$
CaSFH	-4.1 ± 0.2	19.4 ± 0.4	10.6 ± 0.4	11.8 ± 0.4	98.8 ± 0.1
Ev3	-4.5 ± 0.3	22.4 ± 0.4	14.7 ± 0.4	15.2 ± 0.4	99.5 ± 0.1
L23	-2.2 ± 0.2	17.9 ± 0.4	8.8 ± 0.3	9.1 ± 0.3	$99.72^{+0.08}_{-0.09}$
S23	-1.6 ± 0.2	16.0 ± 0.3	9.8 ± 0.3	9.9 ± 0.3	99.88 ± 0.05
T22	-1.7 ± 0.3	17.6 ± 0.4	9.7 ± 0.4	9.8 ± 0.4	99.82 ± 0.08
TwSPS	-8.4 ± 0.5	26.8 ± 0.5	15.8 ± 0.6	24.8 ± 0.9	$90.9^{+0.6}_{-0.7}$

Notes. Overview of template performance within the $z_{\text{spec}} > 5$ JADES sample. Specific metrics are defined above (§ 3.1). The JADES survey is typical of the expected performance of a conventional deep photometric survey in the high redshift regime. Initial observations include portion of non-catastrophic estimations, where only B1SFH and L22 get $> 90\%$ with a complete sample. Further, lower bias and deviation indicate S23, T22 and L22 to be somewhat more indicative of underlying physics.

Table 3. UNCOVER $z > 5$ photometric redshift performance metrics

Template	$\Delta_{\text{bias}, z>5} [\%]$	$\sigma_{\text{nmad}, z>5} [\%]$	$\eta_{f, z>5} [\%]$	$\eta_{c, z>5} [\%]$	$s_{z>5} [\%]$
A22	$-5.1^{+0.4}_{-0.5}$	23.6 ± 0.5	9.7 ± 0.5	9.9 ± 0.5	$99.8^{+0.1}_{-0.2}$
B1SFH	-5.2 ± 0.6	$21.0^{+0.9}_{-1.0}$	7.7 ± 0.7	9.5 ± 0.6	98.2 ± 0.4
CaSFH	-6.5 ± 0.6	22.8 ± 0.9	9.8 ± 0.9	$11.6^{+0.9}_{-0.8}$	98.2 ± 0.4
Ev3	-21.8 ± 0.7	35.2 ± 0.3	32 ± 1	34.7 ± 0.9	$97.0^{+0.4}_{-0.5}$
L23	-2.1 ± 0.6	17 ± 1	$5.8^{+0.8}_{-0.7}$	7.8 ± 0.6	98.0 ± 0.4
S23	$-1.7^{+0.2}_{-0.3}$	13.2 ± 0.4	5.0 ± 0.3	5.0 ± 0.3	100 ± 0
T22	-4.0 ± 0.6	23.4 ± 0.7	9.4 ± 0.6	9.7 ± 0.6	99.6 ± 0.2
TwSPS	-38 ± 1	$39.7^{+0.2}_{-0.3}$	45 ± 1	53 ± 1	92 ± 1

Notes. Overview of template performance within the $z_{\text{spec}} > 5$ UNCOVER sample. Specific metrics are defined above (§ 3.1). The UNCOVER survey demonstrates the possibility of strong performance with the high depth of a lensed field despite fewer available filters. In such a survey S23 can achieve a complete sample with $< 5\%$ catastrophic outliers. However, there is a lower fit completeness rates across several templates, indicating missing representation. With both low bias and deviation, results suggests that S23 is more physically representative.

Table 4. CEERS $z > 5$ photometric redshift performance metrics

Template	$\Delta_{\text{bias}, z>5} [\%]$	$\sigma_{\text{nmad}, z>5} [\%]$	$\eta_{f, z>5} [\%]$	$\eta_{c, z>5} [\%]$	$s_{z>5} [\%]$
A22	-5.5 ± 0.6	$29.0^{+0.5}_{-0.4}$	26.1 ± 0.6	26.6 ± 0.6	99.5 ± 0.1
B1SFH	-11.9 ± 0.5	33.0 ± 0.5	27.7 ± 0.7	28.4 ± 0.7	99.3 ± 0.1
CaSFH	-16.4 ± 0.5	$34.9^{+0.4}_{-0.5}$	35.8 ± 0.7	36.7 ± 0.7	99.1 ± 0.1
Ev3	$-10.0^{+0.5}_{-0.6}$	33.6 ± 0.5	$32.0^{+1.0}_{-0.9}$	33.5 ± 0.9	98.5 ± 0.2
L23	-7.2 ± 0.7	30.9 ± 0.6	26.3 ± 0.7	27.3 ± 0.7	$98.94^{+0.07}_{-0.08}$
S23	-2.2 ± 0.3	22.6 ± 0.5	22.4 ± 0.7	22.4 ± 0.7	$99.996^{+0.004}_{-0.014}$
T22	-2.9 ± 0.5	28.2 ± 0.5	24.1 ± 0.7	25.3 ± 0.7	98.8 ± 0.1
TwSPS	-30 ± 1	43.4 ± 0.4	46.3 ± 0.8	56 ± 1	90.0 ± 0.6

Notes. Overview of template performance within the $z_{\text{spec}} > 5$ CEERS sample. Specific metrics are defined above (§ 3.1). The CEERS survey has lower depth, and it can be seen that this requires caution when fitting in the high-redshift regime. In both bias, deviation and catastrophic fit proportion, S23 performs best, perhaps supported by its smaller basis and thus larger constraint.

5% of each population were misclassified, this would result in a high-redshift selection that would be 95% complete; yet, it would also be dominated by low-redshift interlopers due to their relative abundances. An extreme version of this effect occurred in very early *JWST* studies, in which several $z \gtrsim 15$ candidates were selected from photometry, yet none of them was found to lie at these extreme redshifts in follow-up observations (Yan et al. 2022; Castellano et al.

2022; Bunker et al. 2024). Several fitting techniques place a Bayesian prior on the redshift distribution in an attempt to mitigate this effect (including a luminosity prior in EAZY). However an incorrect prior will produce a biased sample, and an accurate prior is typically only possible at redshifts where complete statistical samples already exist.

Table 5. JADES $z > 0.1$ photometric redshift performance metrics

Template	$\Delta_{\text{bias}, z>5} [\%]$	$\sigma_{\text{nmad}, z>5} [\%]$	$\eta_{f, z>5} [\%]$	$\eta_{c, z>5} [\%]$	$s_{z>5} [\%]$
A22	-3.7 ± 0.2	19.3 ± 0.3	12.0 ± 0.3	$13.3^{+0.4}_{-0.3}$	98.74 ± 0.07
B1SFH	-3.4 ± 0.2	18.3 ± 0.3	9.2 ± 0.3	9.4 ± 0.3	$99.82^{+0.08}_{-0.11}$
CaSFH	-4.1 ± 0.2	19.4 ± 0.4	10.6 ± 0.4	11.8 ± 0.4	98.8 ± 0.1
Ev3	-4.5 ± 0.3	22.4 ± 0.4	14.7 ± 0.4	15.2 ± 0.4	99.5 ± 0.1
L23	-2.2 ± 0.2	17.9 ± 0.4	8.8 ± 0.3	9.1 ± 0.3	$99.72^{+0.08}_{-0.09}$
T22	-1.7 ± 0.3	17.6 ± 0.4	9.7 ± 0.4	9.8 ± 0.4	99.82 ± 0.08
TwSPS	-8.4 ± 0.5	26.8 ± 0.5	15.8 ± 0.6	24.8 ± 0.9	$90.9^{+0.6}_{-0.7}$

Notes. Overview of template performance in the all-redshift ($z_{\text{spec}} > 0.1$) JADES sample. Specific metrics are defined above (§ 3.1). With the main purpose of "the all-regime" sample being the selection of a high-redshift sample, it is clear that B1SFH performs best. T22 and S23 are not included in this analysis because they require pre-selection of high-redshift candidates.

Table 6. UNCOVER $z > 0.1$ photometric redshift performance metrics

Template	$\Delta_{\text{bias}, z>5} [\%]$	$\sigma_{\text{nmad}, z>5} [\%]$	$\eta_{f, z>5} [\%]$	$\eta_{c, z>5} [\%]$	$s_{z>5} [\%]$
A22	$-5.1^{+0.4}_{-0.5}$	23.6 ± 0.5	9.7 ± 0.5	9.9 ± 0.5	$99.8^{+0.1}_{-0.2}$
B1SFH	$-5.2^{+0.5}_{-0.6}$	$21.0^{+0.9}_{-1.0}$	7.7 ± 0.7	9.5 ± 0.6	98.2 ± 0.4
CaSFH	-6.5 ± 0.6	22.8 ± 0.9	9.8 ± 0.9	$11.6^{+0.9}_{-0.8}$	98.2 ± 0.4
Ev3	-21.8 ± 0.7	35.2 ± 0.3	32 ± 1	34.7 ± 0.9	$97.0^{+0.4}_{-0.5}$
L23	-2.1 ± 0.6	17 ± 1	$5.8^{+0.8}_{-0.7}$	7.8 ± 0.6	98.0 ± 0.4
T22	-4.0 ± 0.6	23.4 ± 0.7	9.4 ± 0.6	9.7 ± 0.6	99.6 ± 0.2
TwSPS	-38 ± 1	$39.7^{+0.2}_{-0.3}$	45 ± 1	53 ± 1	92 ± 1

Notes. Overview of template performance on the all-redshift ($z_{\text{spec}} > 0.1$) UNCOVER sample. Specific metrics are defined above (§ 3.1). Within UNCOVER, sample selection of high-redshift galaxies seems largely independent of the templates as long as they are designed with high redshift in mind. With B1SFH, the fraction of successful photometric redshifts is $\sim 75\%$. Despite the increased depth due to lensing in UNCOVER, the overall performance of template fitting in the all-redshift sample is not improved over JADES (as opposed to the high-redshift sample). This is most likely due to the more complicated foreground field associated with lensed surveys (Vujeva et al. 2024). T22 and S23 are not included in this analysis because they require pre-selection of high-redshift candidates.

Table 7. CEERS $z > 0.1$ photometric redshift performance metrics

Template	$\Delta_{\text{bias}, z>5} [\%]$	$\sigma_{\text{nmad}, z>5} [\%]$	$\eta_{f, z>5} [\%]$	$\eta_{c, z>5} [\%]$	$s_{z>5} [\%]$
A22	-5.5 ± 0.6	$29.0^{+0.5}_{-0.4}$	26.1 ± 0.6	26.6 ± 0.6	99.5 ± 0.1
B1SFH	-11.9 ± 0.5	33.0 ± 0.5	27.7 ± 0.7	28.4 ± 0.7	99.3 ± 0.1
CaSFH	-16.4 ± 0.5	34.9 ± 0.5	35.8 ± 0.7	36.7 ± 0.7	99.1 ± 0.1
Ev3	$-10.0^{+0.5}_{-0.6}$	33.6 ± 0.5	32.0 ± 0.9	33.5 ± 0.9	98.5 ± 0.2
L23	-7.2 ± 0.7	30.9 ± 0.6	26.3 ± 0.7	27.3 ± 0.7	$98.94^{+0.07}_{-0.08}$
T22	-2.9 ± 0.5	28.2 ± 0.5	24.1 ± 0.7	25.3 ± 0.7	98.8 ± 0.1
TwSPS	$-30.0^{+0.9}_{-1.0}$	43.4 ± 0.4	46.3 ± 0.9	56 ± 1	$90.0^{+0.6}_{-0.7}$

Notes. Overview of template performance on the all-redshift ($z_{\text{spec}} > 0.1$) CEERS sample. Specific metrics are defined above (§ 3.1). CEERS, being a lower depth survey, offers a relatively low accuracy and precision when determining object redshift, and thus a high-redshift sample derived herefrom will have lower purity. However, with the large and cheaper nature of the survey, astrometric use cases could be employed, with A22 exhibiting the lowest bias of all measurements. T22 and S23 are not included in this analysis because they require pre-selection of high-redshift candidates.

Catalog	Best for Purity	Best for Completeness
UNCOVER	S23 or L23	S23
JADES	L23	S23 or L23
CEERS	S23	S23

Table 8. Overview of the most successful templates for photometric redshift in different scenarios.

4.2.1. Redshift Overestimation

The most common class of high-redshift interlopers are seen in CEERS at $z_{\text{spec}} \sim 4 - 5$, where a Balmer break in dusty star-forming galaxies can be mistaken for a Lyman break, leading to a significantly overestimated z_{phot} . Several of these easily mistakable objects have previously been reported (Zavala et al. 2023). The lack of similar interlopers the JADES and UNCOVER surveys suggest that

additional observational depth is the key to avoiding this type of catastrophic error.

Additional catastrophic redshift overestimates are common at $z_{\text{spec}} < 5$ for all catalogs. Although there is no single and/or common cause that would produce $z_{\text{phot}} \gg z_{\text{spec}}$. However, for these objects as well, it is likely that additional observing time or different observing strategies would mitigate such catastrophic redshift overestimations the need for spectroscopy.

For JADES, these catastrophic overestimates only occur in objects without full filter coverage. This illustrates the importance of broad SED coverage to avoid confusion between the emission lines and spectral breaks. CEERS, with similar filter coverage at lower depths, contains overestimates even for objects with full coverage. Thus, it is a combination of depth and coverage that ensures low catastrophic redshift overestimation rates. Specifically, one can conclude that the JADES&JEMS > 20 filters with depth $\gtrsim 29$ should be sufficient to produce a high-purity photometric sample of high-redshift galaxies.

UNCOVER has a distinct lack of similar catastrophic redshift overestimations for all $z_{\text{spec}} > 1$ despite offering a lower number of filters as compared to JADES. With the main other relative difference between the two surveys being effective depth, it suggests that the additional depth also provides sufficient constraint to hinder catastrophic redshift overestimation. The additional effective depth of a lensed field is thus an effective solution to benefit purity in high-redshift selection.

4.2.2. Catastrophic Redshift Underestimation

The same confusion between Balmer and Lyman breaks also causes high-redshift galaxies to be fit at $z_{\text{phot}} \ll z_{\text{spec}}$. The problem is exacerbated because the highest-redshift objects in any survey, regardless of depth, will always lie near the detection threshold, producing low signal-to-noise. Further, for the highest-redshift objects, fewer bands are available with non-zero detections due to the longer observed wavelength of the Lyman break.

Technically, this would be avoided by using template sets which do not contain galaxies with older stellar populations or high extinction, since any discernible break would only be fit as a Lyman break by such templates. Thus, by construction, there are fewer catastrophic redshift underestimates produced especially by the S23 template set. However, the same lack of templates with Balmer breaks would result in an overwhelming population of catastrophic redshift overestimates if used without a prior high/low redshift cut. Using S23 as an example, it is clear to see that these young-population templates only are valid for use after a prior demarcation of whether objects are high redshift or not.

Overall, the best procedure for determining photometric redshifts of high-redshift galaxies should therefore be to combine two template sets. First, L23 should be run to produce an initial selection of high-redshift candidates. Of the template sets which include older stellar populations and lower redshift models, it has the fewest catastrophic redshift underestimates. Therefore, it produces the most complete sample of high-redshift candidates. Subsequently, S23 should be run on that restricted sample.

4.3. SED analysis

The templates are also evaluated on their ability to reproduce the full observed SED using the six objects from the SED sample (Fig. 2). Although this is a small sample, the test itself is critical because in order for the properties derived using models to be reliable, these models must satisfactorily reproduce the full SED. If uncertainties are properly calibrated and independent, this would result in a $\chi^2_{\nu} \leq 1$, with respect to either the spectra or the photometry.

For photometry, this is indeed what results from template fitting. For five of the six objects in the SED sample, the best-fit reconstructed SEDs have $\chi^2_{\nu} \leq 1$ compared against the photometry. This demonstrates that the photometric information has been entirely exhausted. The test presented here determines whether these reconstructions are good approximations to the true SED or whether the additional information from spectroscopy is necessary to produce a meaningful fit.

The overall performance is summarized in table 9. Although several templates have comparable performance, L23 and T22 produces the closest match to the observed spectroscopy. S23, which was the most successful at producing complete samples of high-redshift galaxies from photometry, is unable to successfully describe any of the six full spectroscopic SEDs. B1SFH has similar behavior, if slightly less extreme.

S23 is unique in its treatment of the high-redshift IMF, but does not produce a consistent set of corresponding changes to nebular emission. Nebular emission has been observed to be significantly stronger than anticipated at high redshift (Carnall et al. 2023), so a failure to model the nebular emission properly leads to an inability to match the full SED. However, the salient features used to produce photometric redshifts instead rely on the stellar population and its age, which is improved in the astrophysical model used by S23. An ideal template set would therefore combine the improved models for both the stellar population and nebular emission in a consistent manner.

For most models, the reduced χ^2_{ν} between observed spectroscopy and the SED reconstructed from photometry alone is similar to the best-fit χ^2_{ν} given the full spectrum. Thus, photometry alone is generally sufficient to produce the best-fit reconstruction with a template. Further, EAZY will be able to successfully find the right solution within a set of templates, even if that template set does not always produce a good description of the true SED.

If this remains true as models improve, it would produce a surprising and optimistic conclusion. For more local galaxies, it has been well established that multi-wavelength observations are necessary to robustly determine the best reconstructed SEDs (Hayward & Smith 2014; Schreiber et al. 2004; Smith & Hayward 2015). As a result, broad wavelength coverage is required to constrain stellar masses, star formation rates, and other physical parameters. However, at high-redshift there is a more limited set of bands with non-zero detections. If these fewer bands are sufficient to robustly determine astrophysical parameters, then purely photometric surveys with JWST will be sufficient to produce mass functions and related studies.

However, at present the most successful models still yield fits with a median $\chi^2_{\nu} \sim 2-5$, suggesting that even the best current models still are unable to accurately describe




Fig. 4. Best fit L23 reconstruction for NIRCam-ID=113585, with $z_{\text{spec}} = 5.9$ and $z_{\text{phot}} = 5.9$. z is in this fit constrained to z_{spec} . The template is fit both photometry (in blue) and a concatenated photometric/spectroscopic dataset (orange). JADES 113585 appears to be poorly represented in template sets optimized for high-redshift galaxies, likely due to emission lines and Lyman break physics.




Fig. 5. Best fit B1SFH reconstruction for NIRCam-ID=110996, with $z_{\text{spec}} = 7.3$ and $z_{\text{phot}} = 7.7$. z is in this fit constrained to z_{spec} . The template is fit both to photometry (in blue) and a concatenated photometry/spectroscopy dataset (orange). The template produces significantly stronger emission lines than in the observed SED of JADES 110996, since there are no B1SFH templates with minimal emission lines.

the full SED. For object 113585 (NIRCam ID, MAST), the mismatch is particularly strong, with no model producing $\chi^2_{\nu} \lesssim 50$. This appears to be part of a class of extremely blue object which have features not represented in any of the template sets. The L23 reconstruction is a good match for the rest-frame UV emission (Fig. 4). However this is with the strong exceptions of the Lyman break, and the strong Ly α $\lambda 121.6$ and [CIV] $\lambda 154.9$ lines (1035 ± 60 and 386×10^{-19} erg/s/cm $^2 \pm 30 \times 10^{-19}$ erg/s/cm 2 respectively (Bunker et al. 2024)). In the redder end, emission lines are seen to be stronger in the residuals without consistent over/under estimations between the two fits. The continuum emission is overestimated in the red end, with the effect stronger among the other templates (see appendix B), making the object bluer than expected by templates.




Fig. 6. Best fit template with L23 on object NIRCam-ID=110996, with $z_{\text{spec}} = 7.3$ and $z_{\text{phot}} = 7.7$. z is in this fit constrained to z_{spec} . The template is fit both photometry (in blue) and a concatenated photometry/spectroscopy dataset (orange). ID denotes the JADES catalog photometric ID, and χ^2_{ν} for "spec" and "phot" refers to which data input is used. Here again, the largest discrepancy is due to overestimated emission lines, and to a minor degree infrared features.




Fig. 7. Best fit template with L23 on object NIRCam-ID=110996, with $z_{\text{spec}} = 7.3$ and $z_{\text{phot}} = 7.8$. z is in this fit constrained to z_{spec} . The template is fit both photometry (in blue) and a concatenated photometry/spectroscopy dataset (orange). ID denotes the JADES catalog photometric ID, and χ^2_{ν} for "spec" and "phot" refers to which data input is used. Here again, the largest discrepancy are due to overestimated emission lines, but in this fit, the minimization of χ^2_{ν} caused the overall features to be under-scaled.

An example of a strong difference between template sets is 110996 (Trussler et al. 2024), which is fit well by T22 and L23 but poorly by several other template sets (As seen in figures 6,5,7). 110996 has very weak emission lines, a possibility which is only part of the T22 template set. As a result, this object is best fit by T22. All other templates (including to a small degree L23), were forced to fit strong emission lines, which leads to incorrect stellar populations and ages.

In summary, a majority of high-redshift galaxies are currently poorly described by every template set evaluated. The size of the discrepancy between observation and model varies, both between template sets and depending upon the shape of the SED. The best template set, L23 and T22, only

Table 9. Fit residuals for the SED sample on both photometric and spectroscopic data

NIRCam ID	A22		B1SFH		CaSFH		Ev3		L23		S23		T22		TwSPS	
	χ_s^2	χ_p^2	χ_s^2	χ_p^2	χ_s^2	χ_p^2	χ_s^2	χ_p^2	χ_s^2	χ_p^2	χ_s^2	χ_p^2	χ_s^2	χ_p^2	χ_s^2	χ_p^2
110996	5.5	7.8	4.4	5.4	4.4	5.4	2	2.2	1.1	3.8	12	15	1	1.3	7.8	8.6
132780	6.9	7.8	9.1	23	7	7.3	6.6	34	2.8	3.4	9.9	20	3.4	5.3	8.4	9.2
110319	2.9	2.9	4.5	11	1.6	1.9	3.3	14	1.5	1.8	4.4	9.1	1.8	1.9	3.3	3.4
113585	110	110	140	330	74	48	110	1100	59	50	100	210	62	54	100	100
106292	9.5	11	12	22	12	18	13	29	4.2	4.8	17	28	4.2	3.9	13	13
106885	6.5	8.1	7.5	23	5.8	19	4.4	18	2.7	5.4	10	24	2.5	3.6	8.1	9

Notes. Overview of fitting performance when comparing the reconstructed SED to NIRSpec observations for the SED sample. Both results solely using photometric observations ($\chi_{\nu,phot}^2 = \chi_p^2$), as well as fits to the full combination of photometry and spectroscopy ($\chi_{\nu,spec}^2 = \chi_s^2$) are compared to indicate how well the observed SEDs are represented in each template set. Note that the errors used to calculate (χ^2) for each case come from the observed SEDs, and thus rely on the accuracy of these. Although a few objects such as 110996 and 110319, are relatively well fit by some templates, others (113585) seem entirely unrepresented in current template sets. It should be noted that, occasionally $\chi_{spec}^2 > \chi_{phot}^2$, which is ideally not to be expected. This is most likely associated with potential minor nonlinearities in the EAZY fitting procedure which can lead to slightly approximated solutions (G. Brammer, private communication).

have $\chi_\nu^2 < 2$ for two of the six objects. Furthermore, the templates with the best performance in determining photometric redshifts did not fit any of the six SEDs successfully. Significant improvements will be needed before template fitting, can be used to derive reliable astrophysical properties. However, for the better fit cases, $\chi_{\nu,spec}^2 \sim \chi_{\nu,phot}^2 \sim 1.5$, implying that improved models would enable extracting successful SEDs from purely photometric surveys even at high redshift.

5. Discussion

In summary, if template sets are selected correctly and used on deep datasets, they can fit adequate models for typical high-redshift galaxies. Within the redshift sample, most templates can in such case be trusted to rarely produce catastrophic redshift errors, since the cause of bad fits often can be attributed to poor filter coverage and/or depth (see figure 3). Of the templates considered, the S23 template has roughly the best performance when constrained to the high-redshift set ($\eta \sim 10$), however it must be paired with a prior selection screen. L23 is generally the template set that performs best in creating such a prior. It performs with a lower, but not great, $\eta \sim 10\%$. If a prior is not possible, L23 also has the best rough estimation performance of the templates considered.

L23 and T22 are the template sets which best represents the full SED for the six high-redshift objects tested, albeit for a small sample which likely does not represent the full range of high-redshift galaxies. Even within the limited sample, it is clear that some classes of objects are not well represented by the current templates. This includes both largely featureless objects, indicating a class of even lower metallicity objects than has been expected in these templates, and a set of extremely blue objects. Thus, some revision in the astrophysical models producing these templates appears to be required.

High-redshift templates are primarily developed using one of several approaches to choose parameters for SPS models. These can include simulations, astrophysical arguments from first principles, or even empirical constraints. In

catalogs with fewer observational constraints (depth, coverage), the most successful redshift predictions come predominantly from templates adopting simple astrophysical models to generate their templates. This includes mainly S23, produced primarily from first principles. The more detailed models arising from either more complex astrophysical constraints or numerical simulations produce less reliable photometric redshifts. Thus, one might be tempted to conclude that the additional complexity introduced by these models is a poor description of the true astrophysics of the earliest galaxies.

However, improved observations produce a different picture. In the UNCOVER and CEERS high redshift samples, S23 and T22 outperform other templates in redshift estimation in many metrics (especially η_f). In JADES however, with the increased depth and coverage, S23 no longer produces the fewest catastrophic outliers. A closer examination of the objects with incorrect redshifts finds that with the increased depth in the NIR bands, these simple models are no the best performing. As measurements improve, it is the more sophisticated models that start to produce the best redshifts.

This is seen even more strongly when comparing reconstructed SEDs with JWST spectroscopy. There, the more sophisticated models such as L23 and T22 strongly outperform S23. Some of this might be due to specific missing features, such as damped Ly α which is not present in any S23 template. However, more generally this indicates that the simpler models cannot reproduce the full complexity of high-redshift SEDs. This simplicity also avoids complex degeneracies, and thus is well suited for photometric redshift estimation from limited information. Still, the fits are poor predictors of the full SED and thus should not be used to estimate other astrophysical properties, such as stellar masses.

The best performance in predicting the full SED comes from models which are empirically motivated to match observations. Thus, both the simpler first principles arguments and more complex simulations appear to still be incomplete descriptions of the earliest galaxies. A natural path towards improvement, then, comes from modeling

galaxies that are poorly represented by templates generated using these techniques.

Perhaps the most intriguing objects are those such as 113585, which is poorly fitted by every template set considered here. Even empirical models fail to fit the extremely blue spectra of 113585, suggesting that it has properties that are uncommon in previous samples at only slightly lower redshifts. One might expect that rather than merely an individual object, 113585 could be typical of larger classes of $z > 10$ galaxies. An additional feature of the object is the strong flux from otherwise minor emission lines, with the [HeI] λ 587.5 line in object 113585 being the most pronounced ($25.6 \pm 1.5 \times 10^{-19} \frac{\text{erg}}{\text{s cm}^2}$ (Bunker et al. 2024)) emission, which is not prominent in any of the template sets.

It is particularly surprising that the extremely blue 113585 is not fit well by L23, which had fitting extremely blue objects as an explicit goal when developing the template set. Although one possible explanation is missing astrophysics, another possible explanation could still lie in the data reduction. JWST catalogs produced using different reduction pipelines still exhibit significant differences in the resulting spectroscopy more than two years since first light. Currently, the standard approach still relies on calibrating spectroscopy to photometric observations rather than on an absolute calibration¹. Errors in data reduction could also be responsible for the mismatch between observation and theory. If so, any template set empirically tuned to match spectroscopic observations would essentially be overfit to incorrect reductions, and would need to be regenerated every time an improvement is made to the reduction pipeline.

Finally, it is worth noting that because no template set is representative of the full SED for even a majority of high-redshift galaxies, there is no single optimal choice. Rather, the best choice depends upon the use case, survey plan, and survey depth. The best basis for producing photometric redshifts from lower-depth photometry is only suitable as the second step in a two-step procedure. Here, a prior screening of whether an object can be classified as high-redshift or not is needed. For multi-wavelength surveys with many bands and high depth, a different basis becomes optimal. And yet a different basis is best for fitting the full SED, although no basis can fit the majority of the galaxies tested. Thus, significant improvements in both modeling and data reduction will be needed before template fitting can produce robust results with well-constrained astrophysical properties for high-redshift sources. Perhaps additional observations would be beneficial to uncover the astrophysics of objects that cannot currently be fitted. Until then, only redshift and luminosity appear to be reliable properties (however only when specific observational criteria of depth and coverage are imposed), so that the primary result of high-redshift surveys will be luminosity functions. SEDs and astrophysical parameters on the other hand, require further development in the reliability of the spectral pipeline and of our understanding of high-redshift objects to achieve a complete fit of even the current sample. The authors would like to thank Charlie Lind-Thomsen, Gabriel Brammer, Gustav Lindstad, Harley Katz, Jack Turner, Nathan Adams, Martin Rey, Ryan Endsley and Stephen Wilkins for helpful

comments, and Vadim Rusakov for code contributions. The Cosmic Dawn Center (DAWN) is funded by the Danish National Research Foundation under grant No. 140. C.S. was supported by research grants (VIL16599, VIL54489) from VILLUM FONDEN.

References

- Adams, N. J., Conselice, C. J., Ferreira, L., et al. 2022, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 518, 4755
- Arrabal Haro, P., Dickinson, M., Finkelstein, S. L., et al. 2023, *Nature*, 622, 707
- Bagley, M. B., Finkelstein, S. L., Koekemoer, A. M., et al. 2023, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 946, L12
- Bezanson, R., Labbe, I., Whitaker, K. E., et al. 2022, *The JWST UNCOVER Treasury survey: Ultradeep NIRSpec and NIRCам Observations before the Epoch of Reionization*
- Boyett, K., Bunker, A. J., Curtis-Lake, E., et al. 2024, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, stae2430
- Brammer, G. 2023a, *The Dawn Jwst Archive*
- Brammer, G. 2023b, *grizli*
- Brammer, G. B., van Dokkum, P. G., & Coppi, P. 2008, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 686, 1503
- Bunker, A. J., Cameron, A. J., Curtis-Lake, E., et al. 2024, *JADES NIRSpec Initial Data Release for the Hubble Ultra Deep Field: Redshifts and Line Fluxes of Distant Galaxies from the Deepest JWST Cycle 1 NIRSpec Multi-Object Spectroscopy*
- Carnall, A. C., McLure, R. J., Dunlop, J. S., et al. 2023, *Nature*, 619, 716–719
- Castellano, M., Fontana, A., Treu, T., et al. 2022, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 938, L15
- D'Eugenio, F., Cameron, A. J., Scholtz, J., et al. 2024, *JADES Data Release 3 – NIRSpec/MSA spectroscopy for 4,000 galaxies in the GOODS fields*
- Donnan, C. T., McLeod, D. J., Dunlop, J. S., et al. 2022, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 518, 6011
- Eisenstein, D. J., Johnson, B. D., Robertson, B., et al. 2023a, *The JADES Origins Field: A New JWST Deep Field in the JADES Second NIRCам Data Release*
- Eisenstein, D. J., Willott, C., Alberts, S., et al. 2023b, *Overview of the JWST Advanced Deep Extragalactic Survey (JADES)*
- Finkelstein, Bagley, Y. 2023, *Data from The Cosmic Evolution Early Release Science Survey (CEERS)*
- Fujimoto, S., Haro, P. A., Dickinson, M., et al. 2023, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 949, L25
- Furtak, L. J., Zitrin, A., Weaver, J. R., et al. 2023, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 523, 4568
- Geman, S., Bienenstock, E., & Doursat, R. 1992, *Neural Computation*, 4, 1
- Guo, Y., Ferguson, H. C., Gialvalisco, M., et al. 2013, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 207, 24
- Hainline, K. N., Johnson, B. D., Robertson, B., et al. 2024, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 964, 71
- Haro, P. A., Dickinson, M., Finkelstein, S. L., et al. 2023, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 951, L22
- Hayward, C. C. & Smith, D. J. B. 2014, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 446, 1512
- Hildebrandt, H., Arnouts, S., Capak, P., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 523, A31
- Hovis-Afflerbach, B., Steinhardt, C. L., Masters, D., & Salvato, M. 2021, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 908, 148
- Jermyn, A. S., Steinhardt, C. L., & Tout, C. A. 2018, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 480, 4265
- Larson, R. L., Hutchison, T. A., Bagley, M., et al. 2023, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 958, 141
- Lotz, J. M., Koekemoer, A., Coe, D., et al. 2017, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 837, 97
- Mugnai, L. V., Swain, M. R., Estrela, R., & Roudier, G. M. 2024, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 531, 35–51
- Pirzkal, N., Rothberg, B., Ryan, R., et al. 2013, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 775, 11
- Rieke, M. J., Robertson, B., Tacchella, S., et al. 2023, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 269, 16
- Romanowsky, A. J. & Fall, S. M. 2012, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 203, 17
- Schreiber, N. M. F., van Dokkum, P. G., Franx, M., et al. 2004, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 616, 40

¹ Such as the DAWN JWST archive; <https://dawn-cph.github.io/dja/>

- Smith, D. J. B. & Hayward, C. C. 2015, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 453, 1597
- Sneppen, A., Steinhardt, C. L., Hensley, H., et al. 2022, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 931, 57
- Speagle, J. S., Capak, P. L., Eisenstein, D. J., Masters, D. C., & Steinhardt, C. L. 2016, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 461, 3432
- Steinhardt, C. L., Kokorev, V., Rusakov, V., Garcia, E., & Sneppen, A. 2023, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 951, L40
- Steinhardt, C. L., Sneppen, A., Clausen, T., et al. 2024, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 967, 172
- STScI. 2024, *NIRCam Imaging Calibration Status*
- Trump, J. R., Haro, P. A., Simons, R. C., et al. 2023, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 945, 35
- Trussler, J., Conselice, C., Adams, N., et al. 2024, *Like a candle in the wind: The embers of once aflame, now smouldering galaxies at $5 < z < 8$*
- Turner, J. C. in prep.
- von Luxburg, U. & Schoelkopf, B. 2008, *Statistical Learning Theory: Models, Concepts, and Results*
- Vujeva, L., Steinhardt, C. L., Jespersen, C. K., et al. 2024, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 974, 23
- Wang, B., Leja, J., Labbé, I., et al. 2023, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 270, 12
- Weaver, J. R., Cutler, S. E., Pan, R., et al. 2023, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 270, 7
- Williams, C. C., Tacchella, S., Maseda, M. V., et al. 2023, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 268, 64
- Yan, H., Ma, Z., Ling, C., Cheng, C., & Huang, J.-S. 2022, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 942, L9
- Yang, G., Papovich, C., Bagley, M. B., et al. 2021, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 908, 144
- Yang, G., Papovich, C., Bagley, M. B., et al. 2023, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 956, L12
- Zavala, J. A., Buat, V., Casey, C. M., et al. 2023, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 943, L9

Appendix A: Best SED fits




Fig. A.1. Best fitting template fit for every object in SED sample

Appendix B: Object 113585 fits with additional templates




Fig. B.1. Best fits for object 113585 with various templates