Early Results from GLASS-JWST. XXV. Electron Density in the Interstellar Medium at $0.7 \le z \le 9.3$ with NIRSpec High-resolution Spectroscopy*

SIJIA LI (D,^{1,2} XIN WANG (D,^{1,3,4} YUGUANG CHEN (D,⁵ TUCKER JONES (D,⁵ TOMMASO TREU (D,⁶ KARL GLAZEBROOK (D,⁷ XIANLONG HE (D,^{1,8} ALAINA HENRY (D,^{9,10} XIAO-LEI MENG (D,³ TAKAHIRO MORISHITA (D,¹¹ GUIDO ROBERTS-BORSANI (D,⁶ LILAN YANG (D,¹² HAO-RAN YU (D,² ANTONELLO CALABRÒ (D,¹³ MARCO CASTELLANO (D,¹⁴ NICHA LEETHOCHAWALIT (D,¹⁵ BENJAMIN METHA (D,¹⁶ THEMIYA NANAYAKKARA (D,⁷ NAMRATA ROY (D,¹⁰ AND BENEDETTA VULCANI (D)¹⁷

¹School of Astronomy and Space Science, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences (UCAS), Beijing 100049, China

³National Astronomical Observatories, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100101, China

⁴Institute for Frontiers in Astronomy and Astrophysics, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 102206, China

⁵Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California Davis, 1 Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616, USA

⁶Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Los Angeles, 430 Portola Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA

⁷Centre for Astrophysics and Supercomputing, Swinburne University of Technology, PO Box 218, Hawthorn, VIC 3122, Australia

⁸School of Physics and Technology, Wuhan University (WHU), Wuhan 430072, China

⁹Space Telescope Science Institute, 3700 San Martin Drive, Baltimore MD, 21218

¹⁰Center for Astrophysical Sciences, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, 21218

¹¹IPAC, California Institute of Technology, MC 314-6, 1200 E. California Boulevard, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

¹²Kavli Institute for the Physics and Mathematics of the Universe, The University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Japan 277-8583

¹³INAF Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma, Via Frascati 33, 00078 Monteporzio Catone, Rome, Italy

¹⁴INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma, via di Frascati 33, 00078 Monte Porzio Catone, Italy

¹⁵National Astronomical Research Institute of Thailand (NARIT), MaeRim, Chiang Mai, 50180, Thailand

¹⁶School of Physics, The University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, Australia

¹⁷INAF Osservatorio Astronomico di Padova, vicolo dell'Osservatorio 5, 35122 Padova, Italy

ABSTRACT

The electron density (n_e) of the interstellar medium (ISM) in star-forming galaxies is intimately linked to star formation and ionization condition. Using the high-resolution spectra obtained from the JWST NIRSpec micro shutter assembly (MSA) as part of the GLASS-JWST program, we have assembled the largest sample to date (34 galaxies) with individual n_e measurements derived from the [O II] $\lambda\lambda 3726,29$ and/or [S II] $\lambda\lambda 6718,32$ doublets at $0.7 \leq z \leq 9.3$. The gravitational lensing magnification by the foreground Abell 2744 cluster allows us to probe n_e in galaxies with stellar masses (M_*) down to $\simeq 10^{7.5}M_{\odot}$ across the entire redshift range. Our analysis reveals that the [O II] flux ratios are marginally anti-correlated with specific star formation rate (sSFR) within a 1- σ confidence interval, whereas the [S II] flux ratios show no significant correlation with sSFR. Despite clear correlation between sSFR and redshift within our sample, we find no apparent redshift evolution of n_e at $z \simeq 1-9$. Our dataset also includes 13 galaxies where n_e can be measured from both [O II] and [S II], indicating a complex gaseous environment with significant variations in n_e in high-redshift galaxies. This work highlights the unique capability of JWST NIRSpec/MSA high-resolution spectroscopy to characterize the detailed physical properties of the ISM in individual high-redshift galaxies.

Keywords: Galaxy formation (595); Galaxy evolution (594); Interstellar medium (847); Star formation (1569)

Corresponding author: Xin Wang, Yuguang Chen xwang@ucas.ac.cn, yugchen@ucdavis.edu

1. INTRODUCTION

Constraining the detailed properties of the interstellar medium (ISM) is paramount for a comprehensive understanding of the underlying physical mechanisms that drive

²Department of Astronomy, Xiamen University, Xiamen, Fujian 361005, China

^{*} Based on observations acquired by the JWST under the ERS program ID 1324 (PI T. Treu)

the evolution of galaxies. As pristine gas from the intergalactic medium is accreted into galaxies, it cools and subsequently fuels star formation. However, intense star formation instigates gas outflows, which, through feedback mechanisms, enrich the ISM and regulate both the cooling and gas accretion processes (Lilly et al. 2013; Hopkins et al. 2014; Kewley et al. 2019; Harikane et al. 2020; Berg et al. 2021). These intertwined processes, modulated by the ISM, concurrently influence the structure, dynamics, and chemical composition of the ISM through multifaceted physical activities such as heating and cooling, radiactive transfer, and turbulence (see the review by Klessen & Glover 2016). Given this intricate relationship, it is of great interest to probe gas properties, such as temperature, density, and ionization states, and their variation over cosmic times from direct observational data (Nagao et al. 2012; Nakajima & Ouchi 2014; Feltre et al. 2016; Steidel et al. 2016; Sanders et al. 2016; Schaerer et al. 2018). The density of free electrons (n_e) is particularly crucial, because it potentially reflects the gas density of ionized HII regions and the evolution of photoionization, which are directly linked to the galaxy evolution (Isobe et al. 2023; Reddy et al. 2023; Ferland et al. 2017). In addition, n_e influences the brightness of emission lines with low critical densities, e.g., [O III] $\lambda 88 \ \mu m$, that are often used to study galaxies at z > 6 (Fujimoto et al. 2024; Schouws et al. 2024).

In H II regions, n_e can be determined by analyzing the intensity ratios of collisionally excited emission lines from specific ionized atoms. These lines originate from upper energy levels with similar excitation energy but different critical densities (Osterbrock & Ferland 2006). Commonly used intensity ratios include [O II] $\lambda\lambda$ 3726/3729 (Rigby et al. 2011; Isobe et al. 2023; Reddy et al. 2023; Isobe et al. 2022), [S п] $\lambda\lambda 6716/6731$ (Brinchmann et al. 2008; Liu et al. 2008; Hainline et al. 2009; Bian et al. 2010; Miranda-Pérez & Hidalgo-Gámez 2023), [C III] *λλ*1907/1909 (Rubin et al. 2004; Quider et al. 2009; Kewley et al. 2019; Fujimoto et al. 2024), and [O III] 52µm/88µm (Killi et al. 2023; Chen et al. 2023). Given the variety of n_e tracers, it is essential to understand whether these lines ratios yield consistent values. Recent study by Mingozzi et al. (2022) found that UV line ratios typically result in n_e values that are 1–2 dex higher than those obtained from optical lines, as the UV lines have different critical densities and probe different layers of the H II regions. [S II] and [O II] have by far the most extensive density measurements from normal $z \sim 0$ star forming galaxies. Adding [SII] and [OII] densities at high-z, as studied in this work, is therefore critical because those are the density diagnostics that have a good $z \sim 0$ benchmark.

Spectroscopic surveys have extended measurement of n_e in ISM, using emission line flux ratios, to redshifts of approximately $z \sim 9$ (Brinchmann et al. 2008; Liu et al. 2008; Hainline et al. 2009; Quider et al. 2009; Bian et al. 2010; Rigby

et al. 2011; Bayliss et al. 2014; Kewley et al. 2019; Fujimoto et al. 2024; Isobe et al. 2023; Reddy et al. 2023; Strom et al. 2023). It is widely accepted that the $n_{\rm e}$ of the ISM in normal star-forming galaxies are generally higher in high-z galaxies compared their local counterparts, sometimes by a factor of up to 100 (Rubin et al. 2004; Brinchmann et al. 2008; Liu et al. 2008; Hainline et al. 2009; Quider et al. 2009; Bian et al. 2010; Shirazi et al. 2014a,b; Kewley et al. 2019; Reddy et al. 2023; Miranda-Pérez & Hidalgo-Gámez 2023). Leveraging the superior sensitivities and resolutions of JWST and Atacama Large Millimeter/submillimeter Array (ALMA), Fujimoto et al. (2024) derived $n_e([O \text{ III}]) = 220^{+170}_{-100} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ for a lensed galaxy at z = 8.496 using the flux ratio of [O III] $\lambda 5007$ and [O III] $\lambda 88\mu m$. By analyzing medium resolution (R = $\lambda/\Delta\lambda \sim 1000$) JWST Near-Infrared Spectrograph (NIRSpec) spectra that marginally resolve the [O II] $\lambda\lambda$ 3726, 29 doublet, Isobe et al. (2023) reported $n_e \ge 300 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ in the ISM of the z = 4-9 star-forming galaxies and found that n_e increases with higher redshift at a given M_* , star-formation rate (SFR), and specific SFR (sSFR). They also concluded that the variation of n_e as a function of redshift is consistent with the size evolution of star-forming galaxies. This redshift evolution of n_e may be attributed to the more compact H II regions in highredshift galaxies. Alternatively, Kaasinen et al. (2017) suggested that the higher n_e in many high-z galaxies are closely linked to their elevated SFRs. From this perspective, the observed large n_e in high-z galaxies may stem from a selection effect, as detections are biased towards galaxies undergoing intense star formation. Furthermore, Harshan et al. (2020) found that protocluster galaxies at $z \sim 2$ may have higher n_e compared to the field galaxies, suggesting that denser galaxy environments enhance the ISM density.

The GLASS-JWST Early Release Science (ERS) program (JWST-ERS-1324; PI: Treu; Treu et al. 2022) provides an excellent opportunity that extends the study of n_e to low M_* because of the lensing magnification introduced by the foreground galaxy cluster Abell 2744 (A2744). The total exposure time of NIRSpec is 17.7 kiloseconds with a spectral coverage of $1 - 5\mu m$ from three *high-resolution* $R \sim 2700$ gratings. In this work, we compile a sample of 34 star-forming galaxies at redshifts up to 9.3, with a lower limiting M_* of $10^{7.5} M_{\odot}$. This sample doubles the amount of z > 1 galaxies with individually measured n_e , allowing us to explore the relationship between n_e and host-galaxy properties (e.g., z, M_* , and SFR) with high fidelity.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the observations, sample selection, and data processing. We present the measurements of electron densities and other galaxy properties in Section 3. The discussion is provided in Section 4 and the conclusions are summarized in Section 5. Throughtout this work, we use AB magnitudes and assume $H_0 = 70$ km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹, $\Omega_M = 0.3$, and $\Omega_{\Delta} = 0.7$.

2. SPECTROSCOPIC DATA AND GALAXY SAMPLE

The multi-object spectroscopic data analyzed in this work are acquired from the GLASS-JWST program (Treu et al. 2022) under the NIRSpec micro-shutter assembly (MSA) mode. The exposures are taken using highresolution gratings of G140H/F100LP, G235H/F170LP, and G395H/F290LP, with an approximate resolving power of $R \approx 2700$. For each grating, an exposure time of 5 hours is used. The NIRSpec instrument has high sensitivity, such that emission lines H α , H β , [O II] doublets, and [O III] λ 5007 can be detected at > 3σ for a bright galaxy with $m_{\rm F150W} \leq$ 26.5 mag. The NIRSpec/MSA spectra cover a wavelength range of ~ 0.6–5.3 μ m, corresponding to $z \approx 1.68$ –12.40 for the [O II] doublets, and $z \approx 0.49-6.42$ for the [S II] doublets. The spectroscopic redshifts (z_{spec}) of our sample galaxies are determined based on the strong nebular emission lines [O III] λ 5007 after subtracting the stellar continuum.

For the data reduction of the NIRSpec/MSA spectra, the standard STScI JWST pipeline and the MSAEXP¹ software are employed, largely following the steps described in Jones et al. (2023). Initially, we generate the countrate maps from the uncalibrated data using the CAL-WEBB_DETECTOR1 module, incorporating up-to-date reference files (jwst_1040.PMAP) for accurate calibration. Subsequently, the MSAEXP software performs additional preprocessing steps to eliminate the 1/f noise and "snowball" features observed in the rate images. To extract the twodimensional (2D) spectra from individual exposures, we employ the level-2 CALWEBB_SPEC2 reduction scripts, which involved World Coordinate System (WCS) registration, slit path-loss correction, flat-fielding, wavelength calibration, and flux calibration. These steps ensure the precise alignment, correction, and calibration of the extracted 2D spectra. Then, leveraging the Horne (1986) algorithm, MSAEXP performs an optimal one-dimensional (1D) spectral extraction. This algorithm uses the target light profile along the direction of cross-dispersion to determine the optimal extraction aperture, resulting in an enhanced signal-to-noise ratio in the final 1D spectra. Overall, our data reduction approach that combines the STScI JWST pipeline and MSAEXP enables accurate calibration, extraction, and optimization of the NIRSpec spectra, facilitating detailed analysis and scientific investigations of celestial objects. Finally, to enhance the overall quality and reliability of the data, the 1D spectra obtained from multiple exposures taken at different dither positions and visits are merged using median stacking to remove any outliers.

From the extensive GLASS-JWST NIRSpec dataset, we identified 34 sources with [S II] or [O II] doublets significantly detected with signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs) greater than 3. The details of our defined sample can be found in Table 1. Among these 34 sources, 12 of them have only [O II] covered (the "[O II]" sample), 8 of them have only [S II] covered (the "[S II]" sample), and the rest 13 galaxies have both [S II] and [O II] doublets detected at high significance with SNR >3 (the "overlap" sample). The "overlap" sample is, to our knowl-edge, the first sample at high redshifts ($1.6 \le z \le 3.7$) where the ISM electron density can be probed using both tracers.

Figure 1 showcases two example galaxies in the overlap sample, with both [O II] $\lambda\lambda 3726,29$, and [S II] $\lambda\lambda 6718,32$ doublets detected with SNRs ≥ 20 . In previous works, n_e measured in similar redshift ranges often relied on stacking techniques to achieve a comparable SNR. The redshift of our entire galaxy samples ranges from 0.7 to 9.3, while their M_* covers log(M_*/M_{\odot}) ≈ 7.5 –10.4 derived from the spectral energy distribution (SED) fitting (see Section 3.5 for details). The samples span two orders of magnitude in SFR from 0.36 to 23.25 M_{\odot} yr⁻¹.

3. ANALYSIS AND MEASUREMENTS

3.1. Line Flux

Physical properties n_e , electron temperature (T_e), and SFR are derived from emission line fluxes or flux ratios. We use LIME² (Fernández et al. 2024) to measure the emission line fluxes and associated errors. LIME fits emission lines using Gasussian functions through non-linear least-squares minimization, which is implemented by LMFIT³.

For each emission line, LIME calculates the continuum surrounding the line and sets the fitting wavelength range to ± 50 Å around the line in the rest wavelengths. However, for a few H α lines, which exhibit faint broad components possibly due to stellar winds, the fitting region is further constrained to the central Gaussian components. This adjustment effectively reduces contamination. We note that the H α lines are significantly stronger than these broad components, indicating the impact of the broad components in the narrow central region is minimal and does not significantly adversely affect our results. This faint broad component could be due to the Raman scattering effect of H α as discovered in observations of H II regions in the LMC, SMC and Orion (M42) (Dopita et al. 2016).

We use LIME to fit a Gaussian function to $[O \ m] \lambda 5007$, which is relatively strong across all our galaxies, to determine redshift. Subsequently, we fit Gaussian functions to H α , H β , H γ , and $[O \ m] \lambda 5007$ lines. For the $[O \ n]$ and $[S \ n]$ doublets,

¹ https://github.com/gbrammer/msaexp

² https://github.com/Vital-Fernandez/lime

³ https://lmfit.github.io/lmfit-py/



Figure 1. Observed spectra and emission line fitting for GLASS-40202 at z = 3.7317 (top) and GLASS-20006 at z = 1.6751 (bottom). In both cases, the top two panels illustrate the emission line fits for the [O II] and [S II] doublets. The blue stepped lines represent the observed spectra, with the blue boxes indicating 1- σ uncertainties. The best-fit single Gaussian for each line is shown in red, while the green curves represent the best-fit double Gaussian model for the doublets. The orange steps display the residuals of the fit. The bottom panels present the full observed spectrum of each galaxy, with prominent emission lines labeled. Inset images show color-composite images of the galaxies.

we apply a double Gaussian fit, where the two functions are fitted simultaneously, sharing the same velocity dispersion (σ). The flux of a line is defined as the integrated flux of the best-fit Gaussian function, which the fitting error provided by LIME taken as the uncertainty of the flux. The centroids of the lines are allowed to be adjust slightly during the fitting process, while the wavelength separation of the doublets is fixed to theoretical values. Figure 1 illustrates the fitting process.

To accurately determine the SFR from Balmer lines in Sect. 3.6, the total flux from the entire galaxy must be measured. However, slit spectroscopy inherently misses part of the galaxy light, making slit loss correction necessary to recover the total emission flux. We apply the default settings of the PATHLOSS correction step in the CALWEBB_SPEC2 pipeline to account for slit losses during data reduction. To further correct for any residual slit loss and potential inaccuracies in flux calibration, we convert the extracted 1D spectra into synthetic fluxes as observed by JWST NIRCam, using the filter throughput. The slit loss correction factor is then calculated as the ratio of the total galaxy flux from the photometric catalog constructed by the Dawn JWST Archive $(DJA)^4$ to the synthetic flux. The filter used for this calculation covers the Balmer line used for SFR determination. The correction factor is then multiplied by the measured Balmer line fluxes to obtain the slitloss-corrected fluxes. The DJA galaxy fluxes are also used for SED fitting to obtain stellar mass in Sect. 3.5. No slit loss correction is applied to other lines, such as the [O II] and [S II] doublets, as their flux ratios, rather than absolute fluxes, are used for deriving electron properties. Table 1 summarizes the measured redshifts, fluxes, and associated uncertainties.

3.2. Electron Density

Assuming an electron temperature (T_e) of 10,000 K, which is typical for galaxies at z > 2 (Steidel et al. 2014; Sanders et al. 2023, 2024), we performed nebular analysis with the default atomic databases to derive the n_e using the [S II] $\lambda\lambda 6718/6732$ and/or [O II] $\lambda\lambda 3276/3729$ ratios via PyNeB (Luridiana et al. 2015).

The relationship between the line ratio and n_e is nearly linear when n_e is near the critical density, but it flattens significantly when n_e deviates from the critical density (Draine 2011). The theoretical upper limit is achieved when n_e is close to zero. Some [O II] or [S II] doublets exceed their

theoretical upper limits, which are unphysical and cannot be explained by current models. A notable example is GLASS-20006, shown in Figure 1, where the $SNR_{[O II],\lambda3726} = 13$ and $SNR_{[O II]\lambda3729} = 29$, thanking to the high sensitivity of JWST. The best-fit models yield [O II] $\lambda\lambda 3729/3726 = 1.9 \pm 0.16$, significantly above the theoretical upper limit of 1.4. The observed high ratio should not be attributed to flux calibration errors, as the doublets are in close proximity. In these cases where the line ratio is 1- σ above the theoretical upper limit, the method totally fails and n_e is denoted as < 0. If the line ratio is higher than the theoretical upper limit, but the lower 1 σ value is below it, an upper limit for n_e is derived corresponding to the lower 1σ value. Sanders et al. (2016) provided relations between [O II] and [S II] line ratios and n_e at 10,000 K using updated atomic data. As a sanity check, we derived $n_{\rm e}$ from these relations and found them to be consistent with our values.

The calculation of n_e is largely insensitive to the input T_e (Osterbrock & Ferland 2006). For one galaxy in our sample where [O III] λ 4363 was detected, we derive T_e from the line flux (see next section) and used it to calculate n_e . The resulting n_e closely matched the value derived with $T_e = 10,000 K$, with a fractional difference of 5%.

We note that, when n_e is significantly higher or lower than the critical values, the uncertainty in n_e propagated from the uncertainty of line ratio is a large value because of the flattening of the relation between n_e and line ratio. To estimate the uncertainty in n_e , we performed Monte Carlo (MC) simulations by randomly perturbing the [O II] and [S II] doublets fluxes based on their errors and rerunning PyNEB with the same setup. This process was repeated 10,000 times. The lower and upper uncertainty in n_e were determined as the 16th and 84th percentiles of the recalculated n_e from the MC simulation. The derived n_e and their uncertainties are presented in Table 2.

3.3. Electron Temperature

Despite that the [O II] and [S II] doublets are almost only sensitive to n_e , thus, making them good n_e indicators, electron temperature (T_e) can still have small effects on the [O II] and [S II] line ratios. To understand the systematic uncertainties associated with T_e , we identified one galaxy (GLASS-40202) in our overlapping sample. This galaxy has the auroral line [O III] λ 4363 detected at SNR > 3, and thus T_e can be reliably measured. We find six galaxies in the overlapping sample with spectra available at the wavelength of the [O III] λ 4363 line and then calculate the upper flux limit of this line, which is used to estimate T_e . Ideally, we would like to detect the [O II] λ 7319,7330 auroral lines, which provides the direct T_e for the [O II] gas. However, none of our galaxies in the overlapping sample have the [O II] λ 7319,7330 reach-

⁴ https://dawn-cph.github.io/dja/index.html

Table 1. Observed properties of individual sources in our galaxy samples with ISM electron density (n_e) measurements.

ID	R.A.	Dec.	Zspec	$f_{[OII]\lambda3726}$	$f_{\rm [OII]\lambda3729}$	$f_{\rm [SII]\lambda6718}$	$f_{\rm [SII]\lambda6732}$	$f_{ m Hlpha}$	fнβ
	[0	deg]		Observed emission line fluxes [10 ⁻¹⁹ erg s ⁻¹ cm ⁻²]					
				overlap sat	mple				
GLASS-20006	3.571763	-30.380432	1.675	119 ± 9	225 ± 8	30 ± 4	30 ± 4	698 ± 9	234 ± 4
GLASS-20008	3.570194	-30.383723	1.8631	167 ± 4	195 ± 3	52 ± 2	43 ± 2	618 ± 10	144 ± 3
GLASS-20025	3.586964	-30.386998	1.8626	39 ± 3	65 ± 3	11 ± 1	10 ± 1	113 ± 2	39 ± 2
GLASS-40094	3.604914	-30.418699	2.6745	19 ± 7	53 ± 7	15 ± 4	21 ± 4	169 ± 4	
GLASS-40202	3.616540	-30.424521	3.7317	94 ± 2	110 ± 2	24 ± 1	20 ± 1	355 ± 4	95 ± 1
GLASS-80027	3.569293	-30.409627	3.5797	14 ± 2	20 ± 2	3.4 ± 0.8	3.2 ± 0.8	142 ± 3	
GLASS-320106	3.581208	-30.421063	2.5083	57 ± 2	64 ± 1	20 ± 1	13 ± 1	246 ± 3	89 ± 4
GLASS-320027	3.573612	-30.427573	1.6889	35 ± 7	36 ± 4	321 ± 14	298 ± 14	1690 ± 120	
GLASS-340899	3.566306	-30.378432	2.3437	119 ± 4	155 ± 4	22 ± 2	21 ± 2	443 ± 5	164 ± 7
GLASS-340920	3.605020	-30.375960	2.4874	12 ± 1	14 ± 1	8.3 ± 1.7	5.7 ± 1.6	45 ± 2	
GLASS-341691	3.561206	-30.419820	2.3717	34 ± 1	48 ± 1	4.7 ± 0.6	2.9 ± 0.5	138 ± 1	58 ± 2
GLASS-342363	3.581425	-30.429338	1.7567	221 ± 21	254 ± 17	122 ± 12	107 ± 12	1070 ± 20	145 ± 10
GLASS-342371	3.619580	-30.429116	2.5820	117 ± 3	142 ± 3	27 ± 2	24 ± 2	1020 ± 10	318 ± 5
GLASS-410044	3.612807	-30.390217	1.7285	26 ± 2	42 ± 2	8.7 ± 1.8	6.5 ± 1.5	121 ± 2	31 ± 1
				[O II] sam	ple				
GLASS-10003	3.617162	-30.425545	9.3127	13 ± 2	14 ± 2				
GLASS-10021	3.608511	-30.418541	7.2863	25 ± 3	35 ± 2				74 ± 2
GLASS-40050	3.579843	-30.426287	2.9845	58 ± 6	46 ± 6			109 ± 4	29 ± 4
GLASS-50038	3.565199	-30.394264	5.7720	8.3 ± 1.1	14 ± 1			88 ± 10	17 ± 2
GLASS-100001	3.603845	-30.382234	7.8732	8.9 ± 1.2	13 ± 1				8 ± 1
GLASS-110000	3.570642	-30.414638	5.7641	9.3 ± 1.0	6.0 ± 0.8			21 ± 1	10 ± 1
GLASS-150029	3.577166	-30.422576	4.5838	12 ± 1	17 ± 1			186 ± 3	50 ± 1
GLASS-160122	3.564901	-30.424956	5.3319	4.4 ± 1.1	4.8 ± 1.1			40 ± 1	18 ± 1
GLASS-160248	3.613190	-30.411679	3.0520	33 ± 2	40 ± 2				48 ± 3
GLASS-340935	3.605068	-30.376649	1.6506	39 ± 5	47 ± 5			13.3 ± 0.5	32 ± 3
GLASS-342321	3.619052	-30.431628	2.7100	83 ± 5	218 ± 5			589 ± 7	208 ± 4
GLASS-360007	3.577464	-30.410947	3.2055	10 ± 1	15 ± 1			44 ± 1	17 ± 1
[S II] sample									
GLASS-20021	3.576740	-30.393605	1.3667			63 ± 3	47 ± 3	834 ± 13	250 ± 4
GLASS-40054	3.569485	-30.427003	2.5796			2.5 ± 0.4	1.9 ± 0.4	20 ± 1	7 ± 1
GLASS-40066	3.599716	-30.431894	4.0199			21 ± 2	10 ± 1	425 ± 5	143 ± 2
GLASS-80029	3.603180	-30.415709	3.9513			6.0 ± 1.2	5.5 ± 1.2	117 ± 1	31 ± 1
GLASS-160133	3.580275	-30.424404	4.0165			5.0 ± 0.9	3.3 ± 0.9	526 ± 11	8 ± 1
GLASS-341721	3.562174	-30.416355	2.5605			20 ± 1	16 ± 1	275 ± 5	
GLASS-410024	3.579066	-30.395852	0.6879			44 ± 2	37 ± 2	396 ± 5	
GLASS-410063	3.608077	-30.377501	0.9614			67 ± 4	42 ± 4	536 ± 9	
GLASS-410067	3.586249	-30.416541	1.2694			7 ± 1	4.2 ± 0.9	66 ± 1	16 ± 1

Note— R.A. and Dec. are the right ascension and declination in J2000, respectively. The line fluxes presented in this table are measured from the observed spectra without the slitloss correction, reddening correction, or lensing magnification correction.

ing the SNR > 3 threshold. Therefore, we use the empirical T_2 - T_3 relationship from Pérez-Montero (2017), i.e.,

$$T_2 = T_e[O^+] = T_e[S^+],$$
 (1)

$$T_3 = T_e[O^{++}], (2)$$

and,

$$T_2 = \frac{2 \times 10^4 K}{(0.8 + 10^4 K/T_3)}.$$
(3)

To estimate $T_e[O^{++}]$, we adopt the empirical relation between $R_{O3} = (F_{4959} + F_{5007})/F_{4363}$, where F_{4959} , F_{5007} , and F_{4363} are the flux of [O III] λ 4959, [O III] λ 5007, and [O III] λ 4363, respectively, and T_e from Pérez-Montero (2017):

$$T_e[O^{++}] = 10^4 K * (0.7840 - 0.0001357 \times R_{O3} + 48.44/R_{O3}).$$
(4)

The $T_e[O^{++}]$ is calculated from the dust-corrected $(F_{4959} + F_{5007})/F_{4363}$ ratio using the nebular E(B-V) and the Calzetti et al. (1994) extinction curve in PyNeB. The resulting T_e is

Table 2.	Derived	physical	properties	of	individual	sources	in	our
galaxy sar	nples wit	h ISM ele	ectron densi	ity ((<i>n</i> _e) measur	ements.		

ID	$n_e([SII])$	$n_e([\text{OII}])$	$\log(M_*/M_{\odot})$	Av _{SED}	SFR _{Balmer}				
	[cm	[cm ⁻³]			$[M_{\odot}\mathrm{yr}^{-1}]$				
overlap sample									
GLASS-20006	660 ⁺⁵⁹⁰	< 0	8.16+0.01	$0.15^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	8.53+0.18				
GLASS-20008	257 ⁺⁹³	267^{+38}_{-22}	9.06 ^{+0.0}	$0.37^{+0.03}_{-0.02}$	$13.0^{+0.5}_{-0.5}$				
GLASS-20025	520 ⁺⁴⁵⁰	<0	7.85+0.01	$0.09^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$1.99^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$				
GLASS-40094	2000+5600	< 0	8.96 ^{+0.0}	$0.0^{+0.0}_{-0.0}$	2.33+0.05				
GLASS-40202	280^{+140}_{-120}	272^{+46}_{-43}	8.97 ^{+0.02}	$0.3^{+0.02}_{-0.03}$	22.5+0.6				
GLASS-80027	590 ⁺¹⁵⁰⁰	< 148	8.44 ^{+0.01}	$0.16^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$2.45^{+0.08}_{-0.08}$				
GLASS-320106	< 52	303+57	9.03+0.0	$0.2^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$7.38^{+0.2}_{-0.2}$				
GLASS-320027	530^{+160}_{-150}	470^{+450}_{-300}	$10.52^{+0.0}_{-0.0}$	$0.26^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$21.1^{+1.9}_{-1.9}$				
GLASS-340899	620^{+330}_{-290}	135^{+54}_{-46}	$7.53^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.39^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$5.84^{+0.2}_{-0.19}$				
GLASS-340920	13^{+590}_{-13}	280 ⁺²³⁰	$7.92^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$0.07^{+0.02}_{-0.03}$	$0.73^{+0.04}_{-0.05}$				
GLASS-341691	< 164	52^{+46}_{-40}	$8.24^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	$0.2^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$	$2.39^{+0.09}_{-0.09}$				
GLASS-342363	390^{+390}_{-260}	300^{+170}_{-150}	$8.95^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$0.37^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$3.08^{+0.13}_{-0.13}$				
GLASS-342371	400^{+260}_{-180}	218^{+44}_{-41}	$8.11^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$0.18^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$12.2^{+0.2}_{-0.2}$				
GLASS-410044	99 ⁺⁶⁷⁰ -99	< 12	$9.04^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$0.03^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$2.7^{+0.16}_{-0.16}$				
		[O II] Sal	npic	0.0010.02					
GLASS-10003		420^{+370}_{-290}	$9.11^{+0.03}_{-0.05}$	$0.03^{+0.02}_{-0.01}$	aa a 0.0				
GLASS-10021		$68^{+14.5}_{-68}$	$8.42^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$0.12^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$23.3^{+0.9}_{-0.9}$				
GLASS-40050		1090_{-440}^{+080}	8.76 ^{+0.01}	$0.1^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$1.7^{+0.08}_{-0.08}$				
GLASS-50038		< 2	8.85+0.01	$0.13_{-0.02}^{+0.02}$	145				
GLASS-100001		58 ⁺¹⁸⁰ -58	$9.26^{+0.04}_{-0.07}$	$0.42_{-0.05}^{+0.05}$	$5.9^{+1.45}_{-1.32}$				
GLASS-110000		1900_{-730}^{+1400}	$8.78^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.17^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$2.96^{+0.12}_{-0.12}$				
GLASS-150029		65 ⁺⁸⁸ -65	8.31+0.02	$0.23_{-0.02}^{+0.02}$	$6.92^{+0.26}_{-0.25}$				
GLASS-160122		370^{+780}_{-370}	$8.41^{+0.16}_{-0.17}$	$0.03^{+0.04}_{-0.02}$	$1.62^{+0.08}_{-0.05}$				
GLASS-160248		208_{-79}^{+90}	8.69 ^{+0.01}	$0.25_{-0.02}^{+0.02}$	$9.62_{-0.79}^{+0.8}$				
GLASS-340935		260^{+230}_{-170}	8.1 ^{+0.02} -0.03	$0.0^{+0.01}_{-0.0}$	$0.36^{+0.0}_{-0.0}$				
GLASS-342321		< 0	$8.64_{-0.04}^{+0.05}$	$0.27^{+0.05}_{-0.04}$	$5.96^{+0.3}_{-0.25}$				
GLASS-360007		32_{-32}^{+140}	$9.02_{-0.01}^{+0.0}$	$0.14_{-0.02}^{+0.02}$	$2.47^{+0.11}_{-0.11}$				
[S II] sample									
GLASS-20021	100^{+120}_{-100}		$9.18^{+0.0}_{-0.0}$	$0.0^{+0.0}_{-0.0}$	$6.53^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$				
GLASS-40054	110^{+460}_{-110}		$9.24^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	$0.24^{+0.07}_{-0.07}$	$3.4^{+0.28}_{-0.28}$				
GLASS-80029	440^{+940}_{-440}		$7.97^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.21^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$4.32^{+0.12}_{-0.12}$				
GLASS-160133	< 489		7.83 ^{+0.0} _{-0.0}	$0.25^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$10.7^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$				
GLASS-341721	190^{+160}_{-120}		8.16 ^{+0.02}	$0.04^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.44^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$				
GLASS-410024	320^{+160}_{-150}		$8.67^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$0.18^{+0.02}_{-0.01}$	$0.74^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$				
GLASS-410063	< 10		$9.45^{+0.0}_{-0.0}$	$0.14^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$2.8^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$				
GLASS-410067	< 144		9 17+0.0	0.0+0.0	$1.12^{+0.04}$				

Note— n_e ([S II]) and n_e ([O II]) are the ISM electron density derived from the [S II] or [O II] doublets, respectively, assuming a uniform electron temperature of 10,000 K (see Section 3). The error bars and upper limits reported in this table all correspond to 1- σ confidence intervals. The measurements presented in this table have been corrected for lensing magnification, if applicable.

then used to calculate n_e following Sect. 3.2 and used to discuss the impact of T_e on n_e measurement in Sect. 4.3.

3.4. Unphysical Line Ratios and Their Detectability Using Medium Resolution Spectroscopy

To properly resolve the [O II] $\lambda\lambda 3726,29$ emission line doublets for accurate n_e measurements, a wavelength resolution of $\Delta\lambda \lesssim 1.4$ Å (FWHM ~ 120 km/s) is required in the rest frame to separate the doublet peaks by at least two resolution elements. This is equivalent to $R \gtrsim 2660$. The NIRSpec/MSA high-resolution spectroscopy obtained by GLASS-JWST adequately resolve the [O II] doublets with an instrument resolution of $R \sim 2700$. This results in the discovery of 5 galaxies in our sample, of which the [O II] ratios are observed to be unphysical with high fidelity. An example, GLASS-20006, is presented in the lower panel of Fig. 1.



Figure 2. Observed high-resolution ($R \sim 2700$) and synthetic medium-resolution ($R \sim 1000$) spectroscopy of the [O II] doublets of GLASS-20006. The top panel shows the original spectrum of the [O II] doublets secured with the high-resolution G140H grating. In the bottom panel, we show smoothed spectrum with effective resolution downgraded to that similar to the medium-resolution G140M grating, to which we also perform emission line profile fitting. We fit both doublets shown in the green Gaussian profile with their addition in green. We found that the value of n_e estimated from the synthetic medium-resolution data significantly deviates from that given by the original high-resolution spectrum. This test highlights the caveat of estimating n_e from the [O II] doublets marginally resolved by the JWST NIRSpec medium-resolution spectroscopy.

The GLASS-JWST NIRSpec data provide a unique opportunity to investigate the detectability of these unphysical [O II] line ratios using the medium-resolution ($R \sim 1000$) data taken by the NIRSpec/MSA medium-resolution gratings, e.g., G140M/F100LP, G235M/F170LP, and G395M/F290LP. This test is timely, since the vast majority of the JWST NIRSpec/MSA observations were taken with the medium resolution gratings, e.g., JADES⁵ (Eisenstein et al. 2023), CEERS⁶ (Backhaus et al. 2024), CECILIA (Strom et al. 2023), and AURORA (Shapley et al. 2024).

Figure 2 shows an example of the impact of using mediumresolution spectroscopy on GLASS-20006. We convolved our high-resolution G140H/F100LP spectrum with a Gaussian kernel to match the R = 1000 spectral resolution of the G140M/F100LP grating, and resampled the convolved spectra with the typical G140M/F100LP sampling to create the synthetic spectrum. The new spectrum was then fitted using the same two-Gaussian model as the high-resolution spectrum with a fixed separation and identical line widths for both components.

The synthetic medium-resolution spectrum presents a significantly different $n_{\rm e}$. The f_{3729}/f_{3726} ratio shifts from $1.90^{+0.16}_{-0.16}$ (pre-convolution) to $1.3^{+1.2}_{-0.6}$ (post-convolution), causing a change in the derived $n_{\rm e}$ ([O II]) from a 3σ upper limit of $n_{\rm e} < 1$ cm⁻³ to $n_{\rm e} = 113^{+1}_{-78}$ cm⁻³. With medium-resolution spectroscopy, this galaxy would have been misclassified as an ordinary galaxy with a reasonable $n_{\rm e}$ measurement.

3.5. SED Fitting

We performed SED fitting to derive M_* for each galaxy. The photometric galaxy fluxes used in the SED fitting were acquired from the photometric catalog constructed by DJA. We adopt the fluxes observed by both JWST and HST.

Our fitting methodology follows that of Santini et al. (2023), employing the Bayesian SED-fitting code Bagpipes (Carnall et al. 2018) and the 2016 version of the stellar population models by Bruzual & Charlot (2003). The nebular continuum and emission lines were modeled using the photoionization code CLOUDY (Ferland et al. 2017), following the methodology developed by Byler et al. (2017). We assumed a Chabrier (2003) initial mass function (IMF) and double-power-law star formation histories, applying the Calzetti et al. (2000) dust attenuation law.

The GLASS-JWST field is gravitationally lensed by the foreground cluster A2744. Consequently, it is necessary to account for the lensing magnification in order to accurately determine the physical parameters of each galaxy. To achieve this, we use the magnification model CATSV4.1 developed by Jauzac et al. (2015), which allows us to calculate the magnification of each source based on its location. This magnification is then corrected for when deriving M_* , as well as for the SFR (Section 3.6).

We compare our derived M_* values with those obtained by Merlin et al. (2024) using photometric z and found good agreement, with a median difference of 0.03 dex and scatter of 0.1 dex. The scatter is primarily due to the variance between their photometric redshifts and our more robust spectroscopic redshifts. We caution that at $z \ge 4.7$, the F444W band fails to observe rest-frame NIR wavelengths where fluxes are dominated by old stars, potentially making stellar mass derivations for these high-z galaxies less reliable. Our M_* measurements are summarized in Table 2. We refrain from using SFRs from the SED fitting due to their unreliability caused by the lack of rest-frame UV imagings in some of our galaxies. Instead, we measure SFRs using Balmer lines, as discussed in the next section.

⁵ https://jades-survey.github.io/

⁶ https://ceers.github.io/



Figure 3. The distribution of M_* and SFR for the galaxies in our sample. The data points are color-coded by their redshifts. The solid thick lines indicate the star-forming main sequence at the corresponding redshifts adopted from Speagle et al. (2014). Our galaxy samples are represented by large squares, and are roughly representative of the star-forming main sequence at the corresponding redshifts.

3.6. Balmer-line Based SFR

We estimate the SFR for each galaxy using the Balmer emission lines, following the calibration proposed by Kennicutt (1998) with the Chabrier (2003) IMF:

SFR =
$$1.3 \times 10^{-41} \frac{L(H\beta)}{[\text{erg s}^{-1}]} [M_{\odot} \,\text{yr}^{-1}],$$
 (5)

where $L(H\beta)$ represents the intrinsic luminosity of the $H\beta$ line after correcting for dust extinction and lensing magnification. In cases where $H\beta$ is not available due to wavelength coverage limitations, we estimate the $H\beta$ flux by converting the $H\alpha$ flux using the theoretical ratio of $L(H\alpha)/L(H\beta) =$ 2.86 in the case B recombination scenario. To correct for dust extinction using the Balmer decrement, at least two significantly detected Balmer lines are required. However, in our sample, 5 out of 34 galaxies does not have reliable Balmer decrement measurements. To maximize the number of galaxies in our analysis, we employ the SED-derived A_V , which is available for all galaxies in our sample. We verified that the SED-derived A_V values are consistent with those derived from the Balmer decrement.

The extinction A_V is used to derive $E(B - V)_{\text{SED}}$, using the relation $R_V \equiv \frac{A_V}{E(B-V)}$ with $R_V = 4.05$ following the Calzetti et al. (2000) dust law. We then apply the correction $E(B - V)_{\text{Balmer}} = (0.44 \pm 0.03) \times E(B - V)_{\text{SED}}$, as suggested by Theios et al. (2019) for the model combing Bruzual & Charlot (2003) and Calzetti et al. (2000) SED model. The resulting $E(B - V)_{\text{Balmer}}$ is then used to correct for the dust attenuation in the SFR calculation. Our derived A_V and SFR are listed in Table 2. We compared SFR and M_* of our sam-



Figure 4. The relationship between n_e and sSFR of all galaxies in our sample. The color coding represents z, with the same scale shown in Fig. 3. The thin gray lines mark 50 random draws from the linear regression, with the dark gray line representing the best-fit.

ples with the star-forming main sequence (SFMS) derived by Speagle et al. (2014) in Figure 3. We found that our samples are consistent with star-forming galaxies, showing higher SFR for galaxies at higher redshift.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1. n_e vs. sSFR

Previous studies have indicated a connection between $n_{\rm e}$ and star formation activity. Reddy et al. (2023) demonstrated that the star formation surface density (Σ_{SFR}) is correlated with the [S II] $\lambda\lambda 6718/6732$ flux ratio in galaxies at z = 2.7-6.3. This relation may be the result of the Kennicutt-Schmidt relation (Kennicutt 1998), where a dense ISM plays a crucial role in promoting star formation. This is further supported by the observed correlation between the ionization parameter and Σ_{SFR} (Reddy et al. 2023). However, measuring galaxy sizes at high redshift is challenging, as these galaxies often exhibit irregular structures that significantly deviate from the assumed Sersic profile used in 2D fitting, resulting in large uncertainties. Furthermore, the wide redshift range of our sample implies that JWST NIRCam does not consistently capture a rest-frame size, which is crucial for accurately characterizing galaxy size (van der Wel et al. 2014). Instead, we probe the dependence on sSFR. The UV radiation from a large number of massive stars in intensely starforming galaxies may ionize more atoms in the gas, releasing more free electrons and thereby increasing the electron density. sSFR is preferred over SFR because we aim to use mass as a proxy for size, recognizing that more massive galaxies



Figure 5. The relationships between line flux ratios and specific star formation rate (sSFR) of our sample galaxies. The left panel shows the $[O \ II] \lambda 3726/[O \ II] \lambda 3$

typically have larger sizes (van der Wel et al. 2014), while also attempting to remove any mass dependence.

Figure 4 compares the n_e with sSFR for the galaxies in our sample. However, we do not find a significant linear correlation between n_e and sSFR. By doing linear regression, the best-fit slope yields $-0.15^{+0.07}_{-0.06}$. The *p* value of Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.47, indicating that the linear correlation between sSFR and n_e is not statistically significant.

To further investigate the lack of correlation between n_e and sSFR, we split the sample into the ones with [O II] measurements (the "[O II]" + "overlap" samples) and the ones with [S II] measurements (the "[S II]" + "overlap" samples), and compared the relationship between the doublet ratios and sSFR (Fig. 5). By doing linear regression between [O II] ratio and log(sSFR/Gyr⁻¹), the best-fit slope yields -0.04 ± 0.02 with *p* value = 0.22. For [S II] the best-fit slope is -0.01 ± 0.04 with *p* value = 0.44.

Although these high *p* values suggest that the two correlations are not statistically significant, the marginal correlation between the [S II] ratio and sSFR may echo the [S II] ratio vs. Σ_{SFR} correlation discovered in Reddy et al. (2023). In contrast, the reversion correlation between the [O II] ratio and sSFR may be surprising since the errors assocaited with the [O II] flux ratios are typically ~ 3 times lower than the errors of the [S II] ratios. To test whether this discrepancy is caused by the redshift differences between the two samples, we removed galaxies with *z* > 6 in the [O II] ratio and sSFR. Therefore, our results may suggest that the *n*_e derived from [O II] does not reflect the similar correlation found for [S II].

In §4.3, we will continue the discussion of the comparison between the [O II] and [S II] n_e .

4.2. $n_{\rm e} vs. z$

The potential redshift evolution of n_e has been discussed by Davies et al. (2021); Isobe et al. (2023); Abdurro'uf et al. (2024) up to $z \sim 9$. Using medium resolution spectra of the [O II] doublet, they found that $n_e = (1 + z)^k$, where $k \simeq 1-2$. This connection could be the result of the redshift evolution of galaxy size (e.g., van der Wel et al. 2014), so that higherz galaxies have denser ISM simply because they are more compact.

Figure 6 plots the dependence of our measured n_e on z. To investigate this redshift evolution in our sample, we divide our samples into five bins, and calculate the median n_e in each bin, marked by blue stars. Based on these median values, we derive the power-law index by fitting them to the $n_e = (1 + z)^k$ function using maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) through the MCMC method using EMCEE (Foreman-Mackey et al. 2013). Through our sample, we did not find significant connection between n_e and z for our sample, with the best-fit $k = 0.48^{+0.44}_{-0.42}$.

We further include an average n_e at z = 0, marked by blue hexagon in Fig.6, measured by Kaasinen et al. (2017). Kaasinen et al. (2017) measured the n_e based on the measurement of emission lines of spectra from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) provided by Kauffmann et al. (2003). The median stellar mass of their sample follow $\log(M_*/M_{\odot}) = 10.6$. Note that the insufficient number of high-*z* samples makes it difficult to ensure sample similarity. By including the $z \approx 0$ measurement, we re-fit the correlation between n_e and *z*, and





In Sect. 4.1, we have shown that using [O II] and [S II]ratios could yield different correlations in $n_{\rm e}$. Different diagnostics have been found to give different densities. In particular, [O II] is more sensitive to slightly higher densities (Mingozzi et al. 2022), perhaps causing inconsistent $n_{\rm e}$ calculated based on [O II] and [S II]. Our data are superior for resolving the [O II] doublet among all currently existing NIRSpec/MSA spectroscopy. In this section, we investigate whether the two $n_{\rm e}$ indicators are intrinsically consistent in our sample. Similar analyses has been conducted for local star-burst galaxies (Fernández-Arenas et al. 2023) and for $z \sim 2$ galaxies by Sanders et al. (2016). For $z \sim 2$ galaxies, Sanders et al. (2016) found that $n_e([O II])$ and $n_e([S II])$ are consistent within ~ 20%. While Fernández-Arenas et al. (2023) found that $n_{\rm e}([S \ II])$ are higher than $n_{\rm e}([O \ II])$ on average.

In Fig. 7, we present the correlation between $n_{\rm e}([{\rm O \ II}])$ and $n_{\rm e}([S \ II])$. The robust measurement with $T_{\rm e}$ of 10,000 K are marked by orange dots, and those upper limit are marked by triangle. Those for local star-burst galaxies (Fernández-Arenas et al. 2023) are marked by gray dots, and those for planetary nebulae in the Milky Way (Osterbrock & Ferland 2006) are marked by light yellow dots. The dotted line and its associated purple shaded region corresponds to the bestfit function and 1- σ confidence level from the $n_{\rm e}$ comparison of a sample of local HII regions analyzed by Sanders et al. (2016). Although our sample contains only 13 galaxies, it is evident that our $n_{\rm e}([O \ II])$ vs. $n_{\rm e}([S \ II])$ relation has a much larger scatter compared to the other samples. This large scatter partly comes from measurement uncertainties, and is partly driven by large amount of galaxies with upper limits in $n_{\rm e}$ from the unphysical flux ratios. Excluding the upper limits, the large scatter persists due to one galaxy with low $n_e([O II])$ but significantly high $n_e([S II])$.

Although the [O II] and [S II] doublets are mostly sensitive to n_e , thus, making them optimal n_e indicators, T_e could still have small but non-negligible effect on the flux ratios. To further remove this systematic uncertainty, we include one robust T_e measurement and upper limits of five galaxies in the overlap sample and present the resulting n_e as green symbols in Fig. 7. As expected, while T_e changes the $n_e([O II])$ and $n_e([S II])$ slightly, its effect is inadequate to reconcile the large scatter.

The scatter could also be connected to the sSFR as we show in the right panel of Fig. 7. 3/13 galaxies with $\log(sSFR/Gyr^{-1}) \gtrsim 1$ and 1 galaxy $\log(sSFR/Gyr^{-1}) = 0.85$ are inconsistent to the one-to-one ratio by 1- σ , while $\log(sSFR/Gyr^{-1}) \lesssim 0.8$ has all n_e consistent within 1 σ . This



Figure 6. Redshift evolution of the ISM electron density (n_e) of the high-redshift galaxies analyzed in this work. The n_e measurements based on the low-ionization emission line flux ratios of the [O II] and [S II] doublets are represented by the green and orange circles, respectively. The blue stars correspond to the running median n_e values measured in the five redshift bins. The hexagon shows the median measurement from the SDSS galaxies at $z \sim 0$. The black dashed line marks our best-fit redshift evolution with 1- σ uncertainties of $n_e \propto (1+z)^{0.984^{+1.085}_{-0.900}}$ to our measurements at high redshifts and the SDSS measurement at $z \sim 0$. The thin gray lines denote 50 random draws based on the 1- σ uncertainties of the linear regression. We note that our constrained relation between n_e and z is also compatible with no redshift evolution of $n_e \arccos z \sim 2$ to $z \sim 9$.

plot the best-fit function as black dashed curve in Fig. 6. This increases the power-law index to $k = 0.98^{+1.09}_{-0.91}$.

While the measurements of n_e show a clear jump from $z \simeq 0$ to 2, it is not enough to offset the lack of correlation at $z \simeq 2-10$. Compared to Isobe et al. (2023), the $n_{\rm e}$ results measured in our sample at $z \simeq 2-3$ are about twice their value. This might be caused by the difference in galaxy mass. However, we tested the dependence of $n_{\rm e}$ on stellar mass and did not find a correlation for them. Although Isobe et al. (2023) adopted the literature n_e measured from [S II] or [O II], similar to our sample, without JWST and lensing magnification, these galaxies have a typical $M_* \sim 10^{10} M_{\odot}$ that is larger than all our galaxies. For galaxies at $z \simeq 6-10$, our measurements are only ~ 0.2–0.3 in $n_{\rm e}$ compared to Isobe et al. (2023). Since there are only 3-4 galaxies in this redshift range in both works, this could be caused by the smallsample variation. In conclusion, using the internally consistent sample with similar M_* across z = 1.5-10, we detect no significant redshift evolution of $n_{\rm e}$. This may arise from the



Figure 7. Comparison of the ISM electron density derived from the $[O \ II] \lambda\lambda 3726,3729$ and $[S \ II] \lambda\lambda 6718,6732$ doublet flux ratios. In the left panel, the orange circles denote n_e measured using both tracers, assuming a fiducial electron temperature of T_e ($[O \ II]$)= T_e ($[S \ II]$)=10,000 K, with the error bars showing 1- σ uncertainties. The 1- σ upper limits are marked by triangles. We also estimate T_e ($[O \ II]$) from the detection or 1- σ upper limit of the $[O \ III] \lambda 4363$ auroral line using Eq. 4, listed in green numbers, and then derive n_e constraints, marked in green symbols. In both panels, the gray points show the comparison for planetary nebulae in the Milky Way (Kingsburgh & English 1992), the yellow dots mark the n_e comparison in individual H II regions within a local starburst galaxy (Fernández-Arenas et al. 2023), and the purple shaded band corresponds to the 1- σ confidence interval of the n_e comparison of a sample of local H II regions analyzed in Sanders et al. (2016). In the right panel, we instead color code our results using their corresponding sSFR measurements (see Sect. 3.6).

echoes the consistently large $n_{\rm e}([S \ II])$ measured in local starburst galaxies, where feedback from rapid star formation could drive larger density perturbations in the ISM. Since S⁺ has a lower ionization energy (23.33 eV) compared to O^+ (35.12 eV), [S II] emission could be biased toward low- T_e and high n_e gas. These effects are amplified in the high-z universe, where galaxies experience stronger and often bursty star formation (e.g. Faucher-Giguère 2018; Sun et al. 2023), causing the T_e and n_e structures of H II regions in these galaxies more complex. Our results fit into the complex nature of HII regions supported by temperature fluctuations (Peimbert 2002, 2019, 1993) and the recent observational evidence for density fluctuations (Méndez-Delgado et al. 2023). Our result also suggests that processes driven by star-formation (e.g., stellar feedback, turbulence, and shock heating) may play a significant role in creating density fluctuations. More spectroscopic observations with similar setup to that of the NIRSpec component of GLASS-JWST are needed to increase the sample size of such detailed comparisons between $n_{\rm e}$ measured from both doublets, in order to provide a more definitive characterization of the high-z ISM structure at high statistical significance.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we provided n_e measurements in a sample of 34 galaxies using the high-resolution NIRSpec/MSA data

acquired by the GLASS-JWST project. These galaxies span a wide redshift range of 0.7 < z < 9.3 and have stellar masses of $\log(M_*/M_{\odot}) \approx 7.5-10.5$ across all redshifts, thanks to the sensitivity boost from lensing magnification introduced by the foreground A2744 cluster. The n_e were measured from the [O II] $\lambda\lambda 3727/3729$ and [S II] $\lambda\lambda 6716/6731$ ratios, and compared to the redshift and sSFR of the host galaxies. Our results are summarized below.

- There is positive correlation between the $[O \ II]\lambda\lambda 3726/3729$ ratio and sSFR and a negative correlation between the [S II] $\lambda\lambda 6718/6732$ ratio and sSFR, supporting the previously discovered connection between $n_{\rm e}$ and star formation. However, the [O II] ratio and the [S II] ratio has opposite trends as the sSFR increases. That means that the $n_{\rm e}[[O \ II]]$ decreases with the sSFR increases while the $n_{\rm e}[[S \Pi]]$ increases as the sSFR increases. Meanwhile, the combined n_e measured from [O II] and [S II] show a negative correlation between $n_{\rm e}$ and sSFR, indicating that different gas may have varying sensitivity and activity in response to the star-formation activities in H II regions.
- From redshift $z \approx 0$ to $z \approx 2$, n_e significantly increases from ~ 30 cm⁻³ to ~ 400 cm⁻³. However, there is no obvious redshift evolution of n_e in the range of $z \approx 2-$ 10 in our sample.

- In the sample of 13 galaxies where both n_e ([O II]) and n_e ([S II]) can be measured, there is a much larger scattering in n_e ([O II]) vs. n_e ([S II]) compared to the local samples of star-burst galaxies and planetary nebulae. Galaxies that deviate more significantly from the one-to-one ratio may be associated with larger sSFR, supporting the idea that star formation feedback drives complexity in H II regions.
- From the high-resolution ($R \sim 2700$) spectroscopy from JWST/NIRSpec, we discovered 4 galaxies with a [O II] line ratio that exceeds the theoretical upper limit by > 3σ . By simulating observations of these galaxies from the medium-resolution ($R \sim 1000$) JWST/NIRSpec observations, we found that the measured line ratio is significantly underestimated, and thus the intrinsic unphysical line ratio cannot be recovered. This highlights the importance of high spectral resolution in n_e measurements.

Our study provides valuable insight into the properties of high-z emission line galaxies and their relationship with redshift and sSFR. Our sample also underscores the importance of using similar observations in high-sensitivity and high spectral resolution to study the ISM environment in high-z galaxies, particularly by JWST. However, the sample size of our sample is limited to only ~ 34 galaxies, increasing the sample size of which n_e can be directly measured in high-z galaxies with future observations will be important to confirm our results.

We thank the anonymous referee for valuable suggestions. We thank Si-Yue Yu, Yuki Isobe, and David Fernández-Arenas for useful discussions. This paper is dedicated to the memory of our beloved colleague Mario Nonino who passed away prematurely. We miss him and are indebted 5 to him for his countless contributions to the GLASS-JWST 6 project. XW is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant 12373009), the CAS Project for 8 Young Scientists in Basic Research Grant No. YSBR-062, 9 the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universi-10 ties, the Xiaomi Young Talents Program, and the science re-11 search grant from the China Manned Space Project. XW also 12 acknowledges the work carried out, in part, at the Swinburne 13 University of Technology, sponsored by the ACAMAR visit-14 ing fellowship. HRY is supported by National Science Foun-15 dation of China grant No. 12173030. This work is based 16 on observations made with the NASA/ESA/CSA JWST, as-17 sociated with program JWST-ERS-1324. The JWST data 18 presented in this article were obtained from the Mikulski 19 Archive for Space Telescopes (MAST) at the Space Tele-20 scope Science Institute. The specific observations analyzed 21 can be accessed via DOI:10.17909/kw3c-n857. The MAST 22 at the Space Telescope Science Institute, which is operated 23 by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., under NASA contract NAS 5-03127 for JWST. We 25 acknowledge support from the INAF Large Grant 2022 "Ex-26 tragalactic Surveys with JWST" (PI Pentericci). K.G. and T.N. acknowledge support from Australian Research Council 28 Laureate Fellowship FL180100060. BV is supported by the European Union - NextGenerationEU RFF M4C2 1.1 PRIN 2022 project 2022ZSL4BL INSIGHT. 31

REFERENCES

- Abdurro'uf, Larson, R. L., Coe, D., et al. 2024, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2404.16201, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2404.16201
- Backhaus, B. E., Trump, J. R., Pirzkal, N., et al. 2024, ApJ, 962, 195, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ad1520
- Bayliss, M. B., Rigby, J. R., Sharon, K., et al. 2014, ApJ, 790, 144, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/790/2/144
- Berg, D. A., Chisholm, J., Erb, D. K., et al. 2021, ApJ, 922, 170, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac141b
- Bian, F., Fan, X., Bechtold, J., et al. 2010, ApJ, 725, 1877, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/725/2/1877
- Brinchmann, J., Pettini, M., & Charlot, S. 2008, MNRAS, 385, 769, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2966.2008.12914.x
- Bruzual, G., & Charlot, S. 2003, MNRAS, 344, 1000, doi: 10.1046/j.1365-8711.2003.06897.x
- Byler, N., Dalcanton, J. J., Conroy, C., & Johnson, B. D. 2017, ApJ, 840, 44, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/aa6c66

- Calzetti, D., Armus, L., Bohlin, R. C., et al. 2000, ApJ, 533, 682, doi: 10.1086/308692
- Calzetti, D., Kinney, A. L., & Storchi-Bergmann, T. 1994, ApJ, 429, 582, doi: 10.1086/174346
- Carnall, A. C., McLure, R. J., Dunlop, J. S., & Davé, R. 2018, MNRAS, 480, 4379, doi: 10.1093/mnras/sty2169
- Chabrier, G. 2003, PASP, 115, 763, doi: 10.1086/376392
- Chen, Y., Jones, T., Sanders, R., et al. 2023, Nature Astronomy, 7, 771, doi: 10.1038/s41550-023-01953-7
- Davies, R. L., Förster Schreiber, N. M., Genzel, R., et al. 2021, ApJ, 909, 78, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/abd551
- Dopita, M. A., Nicholls, D. C., Sutherland, R. S., Kewley, L. J., & Groves, B. A. 2016, ApJL, 824, L13, doi: 10.3847/2041-8205/824/1/L13
- Draine, B. T. 2011, Physics of the Interstellar and Intergalactic Medium

Eisenstein, D. J., Johnson, B. D., Robertson, B., et al. 2023, The JADES Origins Field: A New JWST Deep Field in the JADES Second NIRCam Data Release, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2310.12340

Faucher-Giguère, C.-A. 2018, MNRAS, 473, 3717, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stx2595

Feltre, A., Charlot, S., & Gutkin, J. 2016, MNRAS, 456, 3354, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stv2794

Ferland, G. J., Chatzikos, M., Guzmán, F., et al. 2017, RMxAA, 53, 385, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.1705.10877

Fernández, V., Amorín, R., Firpo, V., & Morisset, C. 2024, A&A, 688, A69, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/202449224

Fernández-Arenas, D., Carrasco, E., Terlevich, R., et al. 2023, MNRAS, 519, 4221, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stac3309

Foreman-Mackey, D., Hogg, D. W., Lang, D., & Goodman, J. 2013, Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 125, 306, doi: 10.1086/670067

Fujimoto, S., Ouchi, M., Nakajima, K., et al. 2024, ApJ, 964, 146, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ad235c

Hainline, K. N., Shapley, A. E., Kornei, K. A., et al. 2009, ApJ, 701, 52, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/701/1/52

Harikane, Y., Ouchi, M., Inoue, A. K., et al. 2020, ApJ, 896, 93, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ab94bd

Harshan, A., Gupta, A., Tran, K.-V., et al. 2020, ApJ, 892, 77, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ab76cf

Hopkins, P. F., Kereš, D., Oñorbe, J., et al. 2014, MNRAS, 445, 581, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stu1738

Horne, K. 1986, Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 98, 609, doi: 10.1086/131801

Isobe, Y., Ouchi, M., Nakajima, K., et al. 2023, ApJ, 956, 139, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/acf376

Isobe, Y., Ouchi, M., Suzuki, A., et al. 2022, ApJ, 925, 111, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac3509

Jauzac, M., Richard, J., Jullo, E., et al. 2015, MNRAS, 452, 1437, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stv1402

Jones, T., Sanders, R., Chen, Y., et al. 2023, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 951, L17, doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/acd938

Kaasinen, M., Bian, F., Groves, B., Kewley, L. J., & Gupta, A. 2017, MNRAS, 465, 3220, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stw2827

Kauffmann, G., Heckman, T. M., White, S. D. M., et al. 2003, MNRAS, 341, 54, doi: 10.1046/j.1365-8711.2003.06292.x

Kennicutt, Robert C., J. 1998, ApJ, 498, 541, doi: 10.1086/305588

Kewley, L. J., Nicholls, D. C., Sutherland, R., et al. 2019, ApJ, 880, 16, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ab16ed

Killi, M., Watson, D., Fujimoto, S., et al. 2023, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 521, 2526, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stad687

Kingsburgh, R. L., & English, J. 1992, MNRAS, 259, 635, doi: 10.1093/mnras/259.4.635 Klessen, R. S., & Glover, S. C. O. 2016, in Saas-Fee Advanced Course, Vol. 43, Saas-Fee Advanced Course, ed. Y. Revaz,
P. Jablonka, R. Teyssier, & L. Mayer, 85,
doi: 10.1007/978-3-662-47890-5_2

Lilly, S. J., Carollo, C. M., Pipino, A., Renzini, A., & Peng, Y. 2013, The Astrophysical Journal, 772, 119, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/772/2/119

Liu, X., Shapley, A. E., Coil, A. L., Brinchmann, J., & Ma, C.-P. 2008, ApJ, 678, 758, doi: 10.1086/529030

Luridiana, V., Morisset, C., & Shaw, R. A. 2015, A&A, 573, A42, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201323152

Madau, P., & Dickinson, M. 2014, ARA&A, 52, 415, doi: 10.1146/annurev-astro-081811-125615

- Méndez-Delgado, J. E., Esteban, C., García-Rojas, J., et al. 2023, MNRAS, 523, 2952, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stad1569
- Merlin, E., Santini, P., Paris, D., et al. 2024, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2409.00169, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2409.00169
- Mingozzi, M., James, B. L., Arellano-Córdova, K. Z., et al. 2022, ApJ, 939, 110, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac952c

Miranda-Pérez, B. E., & Hidalgo-Gámez, A. M. 2023, ApJ, 952, 76, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/acdb4b

Nagao, T., Maiolino, R., De Breuck, C., et al. 2012, A&A, 542, L34, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201219518

Nakajima, K., & Ouchi, M. 2014, MNRAS, 442, 900, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stu902

Osterbrock, D. E., & Ferland, G. J. 2006, Astrophysics of gaseous nebulae and active galactic nuclei

Peimbert, M. 1993, RMxAA, 27, 9

Peimbert, M. 2002, in Revista Mexicana de Astronomia y Astrofisica Conference Series, Vol. 12, Revista Mexicana de Astronomia y Astrofisica Conference Series, ed. W. J. Henney, J. Franco, & M. Martos, 275–279, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.astro-ph/0106063

—. 2019, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1905.01244, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.1905.01244

Pérez-Montero, E. 2017, PASP, 129, 043001, doi: 10.1088/1538-3873/aa5abb

Quider, A. M., Pettini, M., Shapley, A. E., & Steidel, C. C. 2009, MNRAS, 398, 1263, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15234.x

Reddy, N. A., Topping, M. W., Sanders, R. L., Shapley, A. E., & Brammer, G. 2023, The Astrophysical Journal, 952, 167, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/acd754

Reddy, N. A., Sanders, R. L., Shapley, A. E., et al. 2023, ApJ, 951, 56, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/acd0b1

Rigby, J. R., Wuyts, E., Gladders, M. D., Sharon, K., & Becker, G. D. 2011, ApJ, 732, 59, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/732/1/59

Rubin, R. H., Ferland, G. J., Chollet, E. E., & Horstmeyer, R. 2004, ApJ, 605, 784, doi: 10.1086/382528

Sanders, R. L., Shapley, A. E., Topping, M. W., Reddy, N. A., & Brammer, G. B. 2023, ApJ, 955, 54, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/acedad

- Sanders, R. L., Shapley, A. E., Kriek, M., et al. 2016, ApJ, 816, 23, doi: 10.3847/0004-637X/816/1/23
- Santini, P., Fontana, A., Castellano, M., et al. 2023, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 942, L27, doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/ac9586
- Schaerer, D., Izotov, Y. I., Nakajima, K., et al. 2018, A&A, 616, L14, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201833823
- Schouws, S., Bouwens, R. J., Ormerod, K., et al. 2024, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2409.20549, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2409.20549
- Shapley, A. E., Sanders, R. L., Topping, M. W., et al. 2024, The AURORA Survey: A New Era of Emission-line Diagrams with JWST/NIRSpec. https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.00157
- Shirazi, M., Brinchmann, J., & Rahmati, A. 2014a, ApJ, 787, 120, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/787/2/120

- Shirazi, M., Vegetti, S., Nesvadba, N., et al. 2014b, MNRAS, 440, 2201, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stu316
- Speagle, J. S., Steinhardt, C. L., Capak, P. L., & Silverman, J. D. 2014, ApJS, 214, 15, doi: 10.1088/0067-0049/214/2/15
- Steidel, C. C., Strom, A. L., Pettini, M., et al. 2016, ApJ, 826, 159, doi: 10.3847/0004-637X/826/2/159
- Steidel, C. C., Rudie, G. C., Strom, A. L., et al. 2014, ApJ, 795, 165, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/795/2/165
- Strom, A. L., Rudie, G. C., Trainor, R. F., et al. 2023, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 958, L11, doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/ad07dc
- Sun, G., Faucher-Giguère, C.-A., Hayward, C. C., & Shen, X. 2023, MNRAS, 526, 2665, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stad2902
- Theios, R. L., Steidel, C. C., Strom, A. L., et al. 2019, ApJ, 871, 128, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/aaf386
- Treu, T., Roberts-Borsani, G., Bradac, M., et al. 2022, ApJ, 935, 110, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac8158
- van der Wel, A., Franx, M., van Dokkum, P. G., et al. 2014, The Astrophysical Journal, 788, 28, doi: 10.1088/0004-637x/788/1/28