

Exploring the physical properties of Type II Quasar candidates at intermediate redshifts with CIGALE

P. A. C. Cunha^{1,2,*}, A. Humphrey^{2,3}, J. Brinchmann^{1,2}, A. Paulino-Afonso², L. Bisigello^{4,5}, M. Bolzonella⁶, and D. Vaz^{1,2}

¹ Departamento de Física e Astronomia, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade do Porto, Rua do Campo Alegre 687, PT4169-007 Porto, Portugal

² Instituto de Astrofísica e Ciências do Espaço, Universidade do Porto, CAUP, Rua das Estrelas, PT4150-762 Porto, Portugal

³ DTx – Digital Transformation CoLab, Building 1, Azurém Campus, University of Minho, PT4800-058 Guimarães, Portugal

⁴ INAF–Osservatorio Astronomico di Padova, Vicolo dell’Osservatorio 5, I-35122, Padova, Italy

⁵ Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia "G. Galilei", Università di Padova, Via Marzolo 8, 35131 Padova, Italy

⁶ INAF–Osservatorio di Astrofisica e Scienza dello Spazio di Bologna, Via Piero Gobetti 93/3, 40129 Bologna, Italy

Received ; accepted

ABSTRACT

Context. Active Galactic Nuclei (AGN) play a vital role in the evolution of galaxies over cosmic time, significantly influencing their star formation and growth. As obscured AGNs are difficult to identify due to obscuration by gas and dust, our understanding of their full impact is still under study. Investigating their properties and distribution, in particular Type II quasars (QSO2), is essential to comprehensively account for AGN populations and understand how their fraction evolves over time. Such studies are important to provide critical insights into the co-evolution of AGNs and their host galaxies.

Aims. Following our previous study, where a machine learning approach was applied to identify 366 QSO2 candidates from SDSS and WISE surveys (median $z \sim 1.1$), we now aim to characterise this QSO2 candidate sample by analysing their spectral energy distributions (SEDs) and derive their physical properties.

Methods. We estimated relevant physical properties of the QSO2 candidates, including star formation rate (SFR), stellar mass (M_*), AGN luminosity, and AGN fraction, using SED fitting with CIGALE. We compared the inferred properties with analogous populations in the semi-empirical simulation SPRITZ, placing these results in the context of galaxy evolution.

Results. The physical properties derived for our QSO2 candidates indicate a diverse population of AGNs at various stages of evolution. In the SFR- M_* diagram, QSO2 candidates cover a wide range, with numerous high-SFR sources lying above the main sequence at their redshift, suggesting a link between AGN activity and enhanced star formation. Additionally, we identify a population of apparently quenched galaxies, which may be due to obscured star formation or AGN feedback. Furthermore, the physical parameters of our sample align closely with those of composite systems and AGN2 from SPRITZ, supporting the classification of these candidates as obscured AGNs.

Conclusions. This study confirms that our QSO2 candidates, selected via a machine learning approach, exhibit properties consistent with being AGN-host galaxies. This method proves to be reliable at identifying AGNs within large galaxy samples by considering AGN fractions and their contributions to the infrared luminosity, going beyond the limitations of traditional colour-colour selection techniques. The diverse properties of our candidates demonstrate the capability of this approach to identify complex AGN-host systems that might otherwise be missed. This shows the help that machine learning can provide in refining AGN classifications and advancing our understanding of galaxy evolution driven by AGN activity with new target selection.

Key words. methods: statistical – galaxies: star formation – galaxies: statistics – quasars: general – galaxies: active – galaxies: evolution

1. Introduction

Galaxies and active galactic nuclei (AGN) have an interlinked relationship, each being potentially able to affect the evolution of the other. An AGN consists of a supermassive black hole (SMBH; $10^{6-9}M_{\odot}$) with an accretion disk made of dust and gas. As interstellar matter falls under the gravitational influence of the SMBH, the accretion process produces a highly energetic signature observable across the entire electromagnetic spectrum (e.g., Seyfert 1943; Lynden-Bell 1969). AGN feedback, positive or negative, can directly influence galaxy evolution by quenching or enhancing star formation (e.g., Fabian 2012; Aversa et al. 2015). Therefore, the evolution of SMBHs

and their host galaxies are intrinsically linked, exemplified by AGN feedback, SMBH growth, and the $M-\sigma$ relation (e.g., Richstone et al. 1998; Magorrian et al. 1998; Gebhardt et al. 2000; Merritt & Ferrarese 2001a,b; Ferrarese & Ford 2005; Decarli et al. 2010; Alexander & Hickox 2012; Kormendy & Ho 2013; Harrison et al. 2018; López et al. 2023).

AGN unification schemes propose a paradigm where inclination, i.e., the line of sight angle, is responsible for some of the differences in the observed properties of AGNs (Antonucci 1993; Urry & Padovani 1995). Among the simplest AGN unification schemes is the separation of sources into two classes based on the orientation of an obscuring dusty torus with respect to our line of sight: Type I, called unobscured AGNs; and Type II, called obscured AGNs (AGN2). Type II quasars

* Corresponding author, e-mail: pedro.cunha@astro.up.pt

(QSO2) are luminous AGN2s with a dusty torus, oriented to hide the SMBH accretion disk from our line of sight (e.g., [Padovani et al. 2017](#); [Hickox & Alexander 2018](#), see references therein for a more complete review). Recent infrared (IR) and submillimeter observations introduce a new scenario in which a two-component dusty structure with equatorial and polar features is present, and radiation pressure plays an important role ([Hönig 2019](#); [Stalevski et al. 2023](#), and references therein).

The obscuration of the accretion disk at ultraviolet and optical wavelengths acts as a 'natural coronagraph,' enabling the study of galaxy and AGN co-evolution and the physical properties of the host galaxies, which would be challenging with the often overwhelming glare of the optically luminous accretion disk (e.g., [Brusa et al. 2009](#); [Lusso et al. 2011](#); [Symeonidis et al. 2013](#); [Lanzuisi et al. 2017](#)). Therefore, AGN2 are useful for understanding the evolution of galaxies across cosmic time (e.g., [Magorrian et al. 1998](#); [Di Matteo et al. 2008](#); [Greene et al. 2011](#); [Bessiere et al. 2012, 2014](#); [Humphrey et al. 2015b](#); [Padovani et al. 2017](#); [Villar Martín et al. 2020, 2021](#)).

Multiwavelength studies, particularly in the X-ray and IR ranges, are crucial for identifying and studying AGN2 and QSO2 (e.g., [Sturm et al. 2006](#); [Mainieri & Cosmos Collaboration 2009](#); [Rigopoulou et al. 2009](#); [Rodríguez et al. 2014](#); [Violino et al. 2016](#); [Lambrides et al. 2020](#); [Carroll et al. 2021](#); [Sokol et al. 2023](#); [Yan et al. 2023](#)). While X-ray observations are highly effective for detecting AGNs and estimating their obscuration (e.g., [Brandt & Hasinger 2005](#); [Xue et al. 2011](#); [Liu et al. 2017](#)), heavily obscured sources can sometimes be missed (e.g., [Comastri et al. 2011](#); [Donley et al. 2012](#); [Hatcher et al. 2021](#); [Carroll et al. 2021, 2023](#)). Despite this, optical to near-IR (NIR) observations remain the primary method for selecting AGN2 due to the abundance of data (e.g., [Hickox et al. 2007](#); [LaMassa et al. 2016](#)). These recent studies show the ongoing importance of multiwavelength observations in the study of the complexity of the obscured AGN population.

Whenever spectroscopic information is missing to study and derive the physical properties, photometric information can provide a useful alternative. By taking advantage of different types of spectral energy distribution (SED) models, i.e., empirical, semi-empirical, and theoretical, SED fitting tools have shown to be a reliable method to estimate photometric redshifts or to constrain physical properties (e.g., [Bolzonella et al. 2000](#); [Blain et al. 2003](#); [Polletta et al. 2007](#); [Salvato et al. 2009](#); [Conroy 2013](#); [Pacifci et al. 2023](#)). However, powerful tools also have shortcomings or caveats. For example, SED fitting is very dependent on initial assumptions and is sensitive to the quality and diversity of the photometric data. These factors can introduce uncertainties and biases in the computed properties, requiring careful interpretation and, where possible, complementary data to validate results (e.g., [Paulino-Afonso et al. 2022](#)).

The selection of QSO2 sources, in the optical, has relied on a combination of a few emission line properties or subjective qualitative criteria ([Zakamska et al. 2003, 2004](#); [Alexandroff et al. 2013](#); [Ross et al. 2014](#)). Although this kind of methodology is extremely valuable for the identification and characterisation of QSO2s, it requires optical spectroscopic information and specific emission lines to be detected or present in the spectrum (e.g. CIV λ 1549; [OIII] λ 4959, 5008).

In [Cunha et al. \(2024\)](#), hereafter C2024, we presented AMELIA, a novel machine learning pipeline that incorporates few-shot learning and generalised stacking to identify QSO2 candidates using optical and IR photometry. In C2024, we used the candidates identified by [Alexandroff et al. \(2013\)](#), with a focus on developing a quick and efficient methodology to identify

"hidden" QSO2 sources in large surveys. We used a combination of photometric magnitudes and optical, IR and optical-IR colours as input into the machine learning pipeline allowing it to learn multiple relationships, bypassing the limitations of typically lossy colour-colour selection criteria.

We identified a sample of 366 QSO2 candidates within the redshift desert ($1 \leq z \leq 2$). The SED fitting code CIGALE was used to estimate the contribution of AGN to the total IR dust luminosity for the QSO2 candidate sample. Here, we perform a more comprehensive SED fitting to estimate the host galaxies' physical properties and contextualise the sources into the overall process of galaxy evolution.

This paper is organised as follows. Section 2 details our photometric data selection and QSO2 candidate selection methodology. In Section 3, we describe the SED fitting tools used in this work, along with their setup. Section 4 tests the reliability of photometric redshift estimation using the SED fitting tool LePhare++ with spectroscopic redshifts from SDSS. Section 5 provides analysis and estimations of the physical properties of the QSO2 candidates using CIGALE. In Section 6, we explore the addition of radio and X-ray photometry to the SED fitting and how these influence the derived physical properties. Section 7 investigates the use of the derived star-formation rate (SFR) to gain insights into their physical nature. Section 8 compares our results with the current literature. In Section 9, we perform a comparison with the simulated semi-empirical catalogue SPRITZ. Finally, Section 10 summarises our conclusions. Throughout this paper, we adopt a flat-universe cosmology with $H_0 = 69.3 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ and $\Omega_M = 0.286$ (WMAP 9-year results, [Hinshaw et al. 2013](#)), similar to [Yang et al. \(2022\)](#).

2. Photometric data

In this work, we use data from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS; [Ahumada et al. 2020](#); [Abdurro'uf et al. 2022](#)), Wide-field Infrared Survey Explorer (WISE; [Wright et al. 2010](#)), X-ray Multi-Mirror Mission (XMM-Newton; [Lin et al. 2012](#)), and the LOw-Frequency ARray (LOFAR) Two-metre Sky Survey (LoTSS; [Shimwell et al. 2022](#)). In the following subsections, we describe the different samples used in this study and their motivation.

2.1. Control sample and QSO2 candidates

From the SDSS DR16 spectroscopic galaxy sample, we selected sources based on photometric constraints that meet the following criteria (AB magnitudes): (i) $19 \leq u \leq 26$; (ii) $19 \leq g \leq 24$; (iii) $19 \leq r \leq 24$; (iv) $19 \leq i \leq 24$; (v) $19 \leq z \leq 25$. This selection resulted in approximately 22,000 galaxies for identifying QSO2 candidates (see the methodology in Section 3 in C2024). These criteria were chosen to emulate the optical observational constraints applied to the class A sample described in [Alexandroff et al. \(2013\)](#), where QSO2 objects are identified by narrow emission lines (e.g., Ly α λ 1216 and CIV λ 1549), weak continuum, absence of associated absorption features, and high equivalent width (EW), within a redshift range of $2 \leq z \leq 4$. For further details on how this sample was used to derive QSO2 candidates, see C2024 ([Cunha et al. 2024](#)).

The selected galaxies were then used to identify QSO2 candidates using AMELIA. From this sample, we selected the candidates assuming a QSO2 classification probability ≥ 0.8 . As a final product of our pipeline, we obtained 366 QSO2 candidates, with redshift between 1 and 2, the so-called redshift desert. In

C2024, we added further observational evidence for the AGN nature of the QSO2 candidates by comparing photometric colour-colour criteria, performing spectroscopic analysis whenever possible, and estimating the fraction of AGN using CIGALE.

From the sample of non-QSO2 candidates, i.e. those with a QSO2 classification probability ≤ 0.5 , we randomly extracted 366 galaxies to serve as a control sample. This control sample is expected to reveal distinct properties in the colour-colour photometric space across both optical and IR wavelengths. By comparing their estimated physical properties with those of QSO2 candidates, we can validate the refined selection criteria provided by AMELIA.

2.2. Bongiorno sample

In Bongiorno et al. (2012), obscured AGNs were selected using a [NeV] λ 3426-based optical selection, within the zCOSMOS bright survey¹ (Lilly et al. 2007). The catalogue presents four classifications derived using spectra, CLASSSP: class 1, unobscured AGNs; class 2, obscured AGNs classified from the X-ray; class 22.2, obscured AGNs selected using the BPT diagram; class 22.4, obscured AGNs selected through the [NeV] emission line.

Two selection constraints were applied to the Bongiorno sample: $1 \leq z \leq 2$; and CLASSSP $\neq 1$. The first constraint ensures that the sample is within the redshift range of our candidate sample. The second removes the unobscured AGN from the sample. The final sample has 87 sources, with 78 sources with class 2 and 9 sources with class 22.4. In the catalogue, the authors also provide stellar mass and SFR estimates derived from photometric SED fitting. This sample will serve as an AGN control group, allowing us to compare the physical properties of our QSO2 candidates.

3. SED fitting

While the use of semi-supervised machine learning-based methodologies can help to accelerate astronomical analysis, it is crucial to validate and analyse the output of such methods. Since our QSO2 candidates do not have high S/N spectra available, we will base our inference of physical parameters on the photometric data available. When SED fitting techniques are explored, it can easily transform into a very complex and fascinating problem. In this work, we use the state of the art SED implementations to characterise our candidate sample, while taking into consideration the caveats of only using optical and IR data from SDSS and WISE.

3.1. LePhare++

LePhare++(Arnouts et al. 1999; Ilbert et al. 2006; Arnouts & Ilbert 2011)² is an SED fitting code optimised to compute photometric redshifts. It uses a chi-square minimisation approach to compare observed photometric data with theoretical models or SED templates. For each redshift, the code generates model photometry by redshifting the SED templates and integrating them over the filter transmission curves. Through a chi-square minimisation, LePhare++ identifies the best-fit class and redshift, for the observed photometry, and takes into account photometric

errors in its calculations (e.g. Hatfield et al. 2022). In this work, LePhare++ will be used to compare photometric redshifts with SDSS spectroscopic redshifts.

In our usage of LePhare++, we will take into consideration two outputs based on the chi-square minimisation: best-fit class and redshift. We consider libraries for stars, galaxies and QSOs. In particular, we are interested in the templates for composite systems, as we expect them to be the more suitable solution for our sample. For this study, we considered a comprehensive set of spectral templates tailored to capture the diversity in galaxy morphologies, AGN contributions, and stellar populations. The templates included a range of hybrid galaxy-AGN models from Salvato et al. (2009), with various percentages of AGN contribution, allowing for the modelling of composite galaxies. Additionally, we included templates from Ilbert et al. (2009). Furthermore, a range of stellar templates from Pickles (1998) were used to ensure accurate fitting across spectral types. This diverse template set allows the SED fitting to account for both galaxy and AGN contributions across a wide range of redshifts and physical conditions. We allow the redshift to vary between 0 and 6, with constant steps $\delta = 0.1$.

3.2. CIGALE

To better characterise our sample, we required a more sophisticated SED fitting code capable of inferring both the physical properties of the host galaxy and the AGN within it. We used the Code Investigating GALaxy Emission (CIGALE; Burgarella et al. 2005; Noll et al. 2009; Boquien et al. 2019; Yang et al. 2022, , version 2022.1). CIGALE performs the SED fitting within a self-consistent framework that balances UV/optical absorption with IR emission. By analysing the best-fit model, it can estimate various parameters, including the contributions from stellar, AGN, and star formation components, to match the photometric data from the rest-frame UV to the far-infrared (FIR) bands.

To model the star formation histories (SFHs) of our target galaxies, we adopted a delayed SFH with an optional exponential burst (sfhdelayed) within CIGALE. This model provides a good balance between simplicity and the ability to capture the key features expected in the SFHs of our sample, which includes both early-type and late-type galaxies. Mathematically, this SFH is represented as:

$$\text{SFR}(t) \propto \frac{t}{\tau^2} \times \exp(-t/\tau), t \in [0, t_0], \quad (1)$$

where t_0 represents the age of the galaxy, i.e. the time since the onset of star formation, and τ corresponds to the time at which the star formation rate (SFR) reaches its peak. By adjusting the parameter τ , we can effectively model a range of SFHs, from those with a rapid rise and fall in star formation, small τ , to those with a more gradual evolution, large τ .

This SFH model assumes that star formation begins after a delay, allowing for a period of quiescence before the onset of significant star formation activity (Małek et al. 2018). The optional exponential burst component enables us to account for potential short-lived increases in star formation that may occur.

For the stellar populations, we used the Bruzual & Charlot (2003) single stellar population models with the Chabrier (2003) initial mass function. We assumed solar metallicity ($Z=0.02$) for all SSPs. To account for the effects of dust on the observed light, we adopted the models from Calzetti et al. (2000) and Leitherer

¹ <https://cdsarc.cds.unistra.fr/viz-bin/cat/J/MNRAS/427/3103>

² <https://github.com/lephare-photoz/lephare/releases/tag/v0.1.13>

et al. (2002). This approach allows for differential reddening between young and old stellar populations, which we separated by an age of 10 Myr. This separation is motivated by the assumption that very young stars are still embedded in their dust-producing birth clouds, whereas older stars have migrated away from these regions. The colour excess of the nebular emission lines, $E(B-V)$, was allowed to vary between 0.1 and 0.9, with a step of 0.1, to explore a range of dust attenuation levels.

Finally, to model the infrared emission from dust, we used the model from Dale et al. (2014). This model considers the dust emission as a function of the radiation field intensity (U), with a single parameter, α , controlling the distribution of the dust mass with respect to U .

To account for the potential contribution of an active galactic nucleus (AGN) to the overall SED, we included the SKIRTOR model (Stalevski et al. 2012, 2016). This model provides a sophisticated representation of the AGN torus by considering it to be composed of dusty clumps. Specifically, the SKIRTOR model assumes that 97% of the torus mass is distributed in high-density clumps, while the remaining 3% is smoothly distributed. This two-phase distribution allows for a more realistic representation of the torus density structure. Additionally, the model accounts for the anisotropic emission from the accretion disk, which is the flattened disk of material spiralling onto the black hole.

To explore a range of possible AGN geometries, we considered four different values for the opening angle (oa) of the torus: 20, 40, 60, and 80 degrees. The opening angle is measured between the equatorial plane of the torus and its outer edge. The half-opening angle of the dust-free region, which represents a clear line of sight towards the central engine, is then defined as $90^\circ - oa$. We also varied the inclination parameter, which is the angle between our line of sight and the AGN axis, from 30° to 90° , in steps of 10° . This allows us to account for different viewing angles of the AGN.

For the extinction of light passing through the polar regions of the torus, we adopted the extinction law of polar dust from Gaskell et al. (2004). The amount of extinction in the polar direction, quantified by the colour excess $E(B-V)$, was allowed to vary between 0 and 1 magnitude (see Table A.2).

To quantify the relative contribution of the AGN to the total infrared (IR) dust luminosity, we used the AGN fraction, frac_{AGN} , defined as:

$$\text{frac}_{\text{AGN}} = \frac{L_{\text{dust,AGN}}}{L_{\text{dust,AGN}} + L_{\text{dust,galaxy}}} \quad (2)$$

where $L_{\text{dust,AGN}}$ is the luminosity of the dust heated by the AGN, and $L_{\text{dust,galaxy}}$ is the luminosity of the dust heated by stars within the galaxy. Both luminosities are integrated over all wavelengths. We allowed frac_{AGN} to vary from 0 to 0.99, covering a wide range of AGN contributions, from negligible (~ 0) to dominant (~ 1).

4. Testing the SDSS spectroscopic redshifts

CIGALE requires the redshift to be fixed during the fitting process. Thus it is important to validate the spectroscopic redshifts from SDSS, since they are in the redshift desert. While SDSS redshifts in general are reliable, our sample is extreme and shows very noisy spectra, sometimes with clearly wrong redshifts (e.g. Yuan et al. 2016, see discussion in Sect. 2.3 for QSO2 sources at $z < 1$), and in some cases we are unable to see any emission lines, in sources analogous to the 'line-dark' radio galaxies (Humphrey

et al. 2015a, 2016, see also Sect. 8 in C2024). To assess this reliability, we took two different approaches: spectroscopic validation via spectral stacking; and photometric redshift estimation using LePhare++ SED fitting code.

4.1. Spectral stacking

To apply the spectral stacking technique, we collected the available spectra for the QSO2 sample from SDSS DR17. In total, we obtained 310 spectra, no flags or warnings were considered here, with spectroscopic redshifts derived using `id1spec2d`. Given the lack of high signal-to-noise ratio spectroscopic data, we did not correct for possible contaminants in the sample when producing the final stacked spectrum. Although some contamination is anticipated due to the sample's non-pure composition, this does not interfere with one of our main objectives, validating the AGN nature of the sources. Each spectrum was then moved to the rest frame wavelength, normalised by the mean flux, and then summed into a single spectrum after spline-interpolation.

For sources with an identifiable emission line, e.g. $[\text{OII}]\lambda\lambda 3727, 3730$, if the derived spectroscopic redshift is incorrect, or with a high deviation from the true redshift, we expect the stacked spectrum to have multiple features to appear at unexpected wavelengths. Moreover, small redshift deviations will only produce an artificial broadening effect in the detected emission lines. In contrast, noisy or featureless spectra will be cancelled out during the stacking procedure.

The final stacked spectrum, shown in Figure 1, reveals a mixture of emission lines, primarily originating from the host galaxies, with a clear detection of the $[\text{NeV}]\lambda\lambda 3346, 3426$ line with $S/N \sim 6.7$. The extremities of the spectrum are under-represented due to the redshift distribution, meaning certain features, such as $\text{CIII}\lambda 1909$ and $[\text{OIII}]\lambda\lambda 4959, 5007$, are only visible in a subset of sources. In the 3900–4300 Å range, the continuum is dominated by noise, probably due to imperfect sky subtraction.

To explore how the redshift might influence emission properties, we measured the EW of the stacked $[\text{OII}]\lambda\lambda 3727, 3730$ line, finding a value of $21.1 \pm 2.1 \text{ \AA}$. This is in line with the $[\text{OII}]$ EW of $18.0 \pm 1.8 \text{ \AA}$ reported by Greene & Ho (2005) for a sample of type 2 Seyfert galaxies, which are associated with lower ionising luminosities. Furthermore, our result is also consistent with the median $[\text{OII}]$ EW of $18.8 \pm 1.9 \text{ \AA}$ found in the SDSS QSO2 sample studied by Zakamska et al. (2003) at $0.3 < z < 0.83$. Thus, the measured $[\text{OII}]$ EW in our stacked spectrum aligns well with previous studies.

4.2. LePhare++: photometric vs spectroscopic redshift

We estimated the photometric redshifts using the SED fitting code LePhare++ to compare them with the ones derived from SDSS spectra. We divide this study into two parts. First, we compared the LePhare++ photometric redshifts with the spectroscopic redshift derived from the $[\text{OII}]\lambda\lambda 3727, 3730$ emitters. Then we performed the same analysis with the complete QSO2 candidate sample.

To perform this analysis, we considered the following metrics: the normalised median absolute deviation (NMAD),

$$\text{NMAD} = 1.48 \text{ median} \left(\frac{|z_{\text{phot}} - z_{\text{spec}}|}{1 + z_{\text{spec}}} \right) \quad (3)$$

to compute the variability between measurements, where z_{spec} is the spectroscopic redshift from SDSS and z_{phot} is the photo-




Fig. 1: Stacked spectrum of QSO2 candidates with normalized median flux in the rest-frame wavelength, obtained through spline interpolation using available SDSS spectra. The spectrum is additionally normalized based on the number of contributing spectra for each rest-frame wavelength. Grey vertical lines mark the positions of emission lines in the rest frame. The plot includes two zoomed-in regions: (1) 3326–3526 Å, highlighting the [NeV] λ 3426 emission line, and (2) 3630–3830 Å, highlighting the [OII] λ 3727, 3730 emission lines. The red line represents the Gaussian fit applied to the spectrum.

Table 1: Statistical metrics for the photo- z derived using LePhare++, compared with SDSS spectroscopic redshifts, when considering QSO and galaxies templates.

photo- z	NMAD	bias	f_{out}
z_{QSO} or z_{GAL}	0.195	0.132	0.474
z_{GAL}	0.125	0.085	0.299

Notes. The photometric redshift output can be selected either by using the best χ^2 value between the QSO templates or the galaxies templates (z_{QSO} or z_{GAL}) or by considering only the best galaxy model (z_{GAL}). NMAD represents the normalised median absolute deviation, and f_{out} indicates the fraction of catastrophic outliers. For all metrics, an ideal value is 0.

metric redshift derived using LePhare++; the fraction of catastrophic outliers (f_{out}), as defined in Hildebrandt et al. (2010), where a value is considered to be a catastrophic outlier when

$$\frac{|z_{\text{phot}} - z_{\text{spec}}|}{1 + z_{\text{spec}}} > 0.15; \quad (4)$$

and the bias, where the systematic deviations error are calculated as

$$\text{bias} = \text{median} \left(\frac{|z_{\text{phot}} - z_{\text{spec}}|}{1 + z_{\text{spec}}} \right). \quad (5)$$

In Table 1, we present the statistical metrics that compare the z_{phot} derived with LePhare++ to the z_{spec} from SDSS. We performed two analyses that differ in the selection method for z_{phot} : one based on the best χ^2 value, choosing between z_{QSO} (if the QSO template is the best fit) or z_{GAL} (if the galaxy template is the best fit), and the other considering only z_{GAL} . The results show that the estimates of z_{phot} tend to be systematically lower than the SDSS z_{spec} , with only a few cases where z_{phot} exceeds the spectroscopic values. This pattern suggests that the combination of optically faint and mid-IR enhanced components introduces degeneracies, denigrating the redshift estimation using SED fitting. In Figure B.1, we show four fitting examples along with their distribution of the probability density function (PDF).

We should point out that for the best-fit template class, we found that 78% of sources are best fitted with an AGN template (including composite systems with an AGN component and QSO templates), 28% of sources are best fitted by a composite template with an AGN component higher than 50%, and 50% are best fitted by a QSO template. This result is consistent with the AGN classification presented in C2024, using CIGALE. Due to the degeneracies observed with the LePhare++ z_{phot} , we will adopt the spectroscopic redshifts derived by the SDSS pipeline in Section 5.

5. CIGALE: physical properties estimation

Here, we present the results of physical property estimation for our QSO2 candidates using CIGALE. The parameter grids for the control sample and the QSO2 candidates are shown in Tables A.1 and A.2, respectively. We took into account the parameters provided in Yang et al. (2020) and modified them according to our needs. The main reason for using two different grids for the control sample and the QSO2 candidates is that, when the same grid was applied to both, we observed that the derived SFRs were hitting a plateau at the upper limit. We found that for our control sample, a more recent starburst event was required to explain the bright UV emission. Therefore, a more recent SFH was required to successfully fit the control sample and derive its physical properties, compared to the QSO2 candidates. We adjusted the stellar age components for SFH, allowing the inference to converge and provide a more reliable estimation.

5.1. AGN classification with frac_{AGN}

Since CIGALE uses a multi-component models to fit the SEDs of galaxies and a Bayesian approach to refine the output properties, it allows to derive well-constrained physical properties and uncertainties, under the assumption that the model we fit are representative of the sample under consideration. We take advantage of the implementation of the SKIRTOR model to infer the best-fitting parameters related to the AGN component. The AGN model will be of high importance for fitting the enhanced




Fig. 2: 2D histogram of the stellar mass, M_* , (top) and specific AGN luminosity, L_{AGN}/M_* , defined in Thorne et al. (2022), (bottom) as a function of frac_{AGN} for the QSO2 sample. The colour gradient indicates the density of sources for each bin. The median and standard deviation are represented by the solid and dashed orange lines, respectively. The vertical black line indicates the $\text{frac}_{\text{AGN}} > 0.1$ threshold used in Leja et al. (2018), to characterise sources with significant AGN contribution.

IR emission observed in our candidate sample. In Fig. C.1, we show four examples of the best-fit model using CIGALE.

As previously observed in C2024, the SKIRTOR model consistently estimates a high frac_{AGN} . In this study, we will also consider a source to have a substantial AGN contribution when $\text{frac}_{\text{AGN}} > 0.1$, following the criteria established by Leja et al. (2018) and Thorne et al. (2022). This criterion is satisfied by all members of our candidate sample, aligning with their AGN classification. Furthermore, we applied the SKIRTOR model to the control sample to study its ability to recover the frac_{AGN} in sources without a considerable AGN contribution. We found that all galaxies within the control sample exhibited a $\text{frac}_{\text{AGN}} \leq 0.1$, consistent with our expectation that these are primarily star-forming galaxies without a significant AGN contribution.

The specific AGN luminosity is defined as the ratio between the AGN luminosity (L_{AGN}) and the stellar mass (M_*): L_{AGN}/M_* (Bernhard et al. 2016; Thorne et al. 2022). In Fig. 2, we show a 2D histogram of M_* and L_{AGN}/M_* , as a function of frac_{AGN} of our sample. For analysis purposes, we plot the median and standard deviation of each physical property, as solid and dashed orange lines, to guide the reader. While studies focusing on the stellar mass (M_*) distribution of QSO2s are limited, Bessiere et al. (2014) estimated the M_* of the QSO2 SDSS J002531-104022 to be $4\text{--}17 \times 10^{10} M_{\odot}$, which is within our derived M_* distribution interval.

When looking at how frac_{AGN} varies with M_* , we see that M_* decreases as frac_{AGN} increases. This indicates a significant

anti-correlation: less massive galaxies tend to have a higher fractional AGN contribution. This trend is supported by a Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient of -0.488 ($p < 0.001$), showing a moderate negative relationship between the two variables.

Considering that only nine photometric points are being used in this study, due to the lack of observations in other wavelength regimes (including FIR), one can argue that CIGALE might be assigning most of the total luminosity to the AGN component, resulting in an underestimation of the stellar mass. We investigated the relationship between AGN activity and stellar mass through two approaches. First, for sources with high AGN contribution ($\text{frac}_{\text{AGN}} > 0.5$), the Pearson correlation coefficient between AGN luminosity and stellar mass was -0.02 , indicating no significant linear relationship. Second, expanding to the full sample (all frac_{AGN} values), the coefficient was -0.17 , showing a very weak negative correlation. A visual inspection of the frac_{AGN} vs AGN luminosity plot, colour-coded by stellar mass, focused on AGN-dominated sources ($\text{frac}_{\text{AGN}} > 0.5$), revealed no clear trends or evidence that AGN luminosity affects the estimation of stellar mass.

A possible justification is the role of AGN feedback, through outflows or radiation pressure that can heat and expel gas from the galaxy, effectively suppressing star formation (Harrison & Ramos Almeida 2024). This effect is more significant in galaxies with a higher frac_{AGN} , where the AGN energy output plays a dominant role (e.g. Cresci et al. 2015). The observed anti-correlation remains consistent even when focusing on a subsample of galaxies within a narrow range of M_* .

On the other hand, we identify a positive correlation in L_{AGN}/M_* with frac_{AGN} . Thorne et al. (2022) also identifies such trend for sources with $\text{frac}_{\text{AGN}} > 0.8$. Since our sample is much smaller and represents a specific subtype of AGNs, we do not expect the same trend in Thorne et al. (2022) to be present. An important caveat to remember is that only optical and IR data, from $0.3\text{--}22 \mu\text{m}$, is being used in this study. Therefore, because of optical obscuration observed in our sample, we expect the IR part of the SED to dominate, which increases L_{AGN} with frac_{AGN} .

A significant caveat of our study is the absence of far-infrared (FIR) data, which would support the derivation of accurate SFRs, as noted by Ciesla et al. (2015). Consequently, the estimation of AGN luminosity would also be improved by incorporating FIR and sub-millimetre data. We conducted a $4''$ radius search of the updated Herschel/PACS Point Source Catalogue (Marton et al. 2024) but did not find any counterparts. Since both C2024 and this current work focus on the analysis of QSO2 candidates selected from a large survey focused on the Northern Hemisphere, and therefore covering a significant area of the sky, we are directly impacted by the limited availability of all-sky multi-wavelength data. Thus, our analysis provides a preliminary exploration of the physical properties of our candidate sample, forming the basis for future observational time proposals to further characterise our QSO2 candidates, in the redshift desert.

5.2. SFR- M_* diagram

The intrinsic connection between SFR and M_* has been extensively discussed in the literature as a key relationship to study and understand galaxy evolution (e.g. Brinchmann & Ellis 2000; Brinchmann et al. 2004; Noeske et al. 2007; Bisigello et al. 2018, and references therein). Schreiber et al. (2015) parameterise the SFR of main sequence (MS) galaxies as a function of redshift and stellar mass:




Fig. 3: The star formation rate (SFR) as a function of stellar mass (M_*) for the QSO2 candidates (black dots) is plotted on a logarithmic scale. The star formation main sequence (MS) described by Schreiber et al. (2015) at the mean SDSS spectroscopic redshift of our candidates ($z = 1.1$) is shown as a solid line, with dashed lines indicating a 0.4 dex deviation. The contours display the M_* -SFR distribution for X-ray and optically selected AGN2 from the zCOSMOS survey by Bongiorno et al. (2012) with redshifts $1 \leq z \leq 2$ (orange) and for the control sample of SDSS galaxies (blue).




Fig. 4: Difference between the estimated SFR and the main sequence SFR for the QSO2 candidates, the control sample, the Bongiorno sample (Bongiorno et al. 2012), and the Zakamska sample (Zakamska et al. 2003). The solid grey line represents the main sequence of star formation found by Schreiber et al. (2015) at $z = 1.1$, and the dashed lines give a scatter of ± 0.4 dex.

$$\log_{10}(\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}[M_{\odot}/\text{yr}]) = m - m_0 + a_0 r - a_1 [\max(0, m - m_1 - a_2 r)]^2 \quad (6)$$

with $m_0 = 0.5 \pm 0.07$, $a_0 = 1.5 \pm 0.15$, $a_1 = 0.3 \pm 0.08$, $m_1 = 0.36 \pm 0.3$, $a_2 = 2.5 \pm 0.6$, $r = \log_{10}(1 + z)$ where z is the redshift, and $m = \log_{10}(M_*/10^9 M_{\odot})$. The parameters are physically motivated to preserve the slope increase with redshift and the "bending" effect, verified at low stellar mass and high redshift (see Schreiber et al. 2015, for more details).

In Figure 3, we plot the SFR- M_* diagram for the QSO2 candidates and SDSS galaxies. The star formation main sequence (MS) described by Schreiber et al. (2015), at the mean SDSS spectroscopic redshift of our candidates ($z = 1.1$), is plotted as a solid line. In the contours, we show the SFR- M_* distribution for a sample of 87 X-ray and optically selected AGN2 from the zCOSMOS survey by Bongiorno et al. (2012) with redshift $1 \leq z \leq 2$. This analysis allows us to understand and compare the distribution of our candidates with confirmed AGN2. We observe a similar distribution in the SFR- M_* diagram, with some candidates having higher M_* and SFR. For the SDSS control sample, we observe, on average, a higher SFR estimation within similar M_* .

In Zakamska et al. (2003), a sample of 291 QSO2, at redshift between 0.3 and 0.83, using SDSS spectroscopic data. These sources were identified by their narrow emission lines (FWHM < 2000 km/s), and their high EWs and high-ionisation lines ratios (e.g. $[\text{OIII}]\lambda 5008/\text{H}\beta\lambda 4861$). We used the available $[\text{OII}]$ lumi-

nosities³ to compute their SFR using the Kewley et al. (2004) relation:

$$\text{SFR}([\text{OII}])(M_{\odot}\text{yr}^{-1}) = (6.58 \pm 1.65) \times 10^{-42} L([\text{OII}]) \text{ ergs s}^{-1} \quad (7)$$

In Fig. 4, we plot the difference between the CIGALE estimated SFR and the MS SFR for the QSO2 candidates, the control sample, the Bongiorno sample (Bongiorno et al. 2012), and the Zakamska sample (Zakamska et al. 2003). It is clear that our candidate sample has a broader distribution of SFR, encompassing a mixture of starburst to quiescent galaxies. Regarding the higher SFR seen for the control sample, selection bias can play a role here, as for star-forming galaxies to be detected at these redshifts, the $[\text{OII}] \lambda\lambda 3727, 3730$ lines must be bright, which in itself requires higher SFR. Finally, we observe that our sample of QSO2 candidates is spread across the SFR- M_* diagram, from the starburst to the quiescent regime.

6. CIGALE: Multi-wavelength analysis

The SED fitting results presented above are based on optical to MIR photometry, but it is well-known that AGNs have clear signatures outside these wavelength ranges. For a subset of our candidates we can check our SED fitting results by incorporating radio and/or X-ray data, and in the following we will discuss the resulting impact on the inferred physical parameters.

³ <https://cdsarc.cds.unistra.fr/viz-bin/cat/J/AJ/127/2002>




Fig. 5: Comparison between physical properties estimated with and without radio LoTSS photometry, using CIGALE. The left column shows scatter plots comparing various galaxy properties such as AGN fraction, AGN luminosity, stellar mass, and star formation rate between galaxies with radio LoTSS photometry and without. All values are provided in logarithmic scale, with the exception of the frac_{AGN} . Each scatter plot includes a 1:1 reference line, as a dashed red line. The right column presents bar plots of the differences in the same properties, for each source (numbered in the x axis): SDSS+WISE - SDSS+WISE+LoTSS.

6.1. Including LoTSS radio photometry

We tested the inclusion of LoTSS radio photometry (Shimwell et al. 2022) alongside SDSS and WISE data to assess its impact on the fit in CIGALE. A $5''$ radius search of our coordinates against the LoTSS Data Release 2⁴ identified matches with 16 sources. Our primary objective was to evaluate how the inclusion of radio data influences the estimation of AGN physical properties, particularly by altering the IR fit and its effect on the inferred galaxy properties.

⁴ https://lofar-surveys.org/public/DR2/catalogues/LoTSS_DR2_v110_masked.srl.fits

In Fig. 5, we show the scatter plot with the physical properties with and without radio photometry. Additionally, we show the difference between the physical properties estimated with radio photometry subtracted by those estimated without. We observed that the properties of the host galaxies, M_* and SFR, show only slight variations, which do not have a profound impact on the overall study. When including the radio data, the frac_{AGN} and L_{AGN} inferred are somewhat higher than if radio data are excluded. In particular, we see a tendency to estimate a smaller frac_{AGN} . The root cause of this difference is that when including radio data, there is tension between the non-thermal radio model fit and the mid-IR part of the SED fit, leading to the latter being less well constrained. This signals a potential inconsistency in the MIR to radio modelling and to make progress a more in-depth study of this is needed with potentially updates to the model, this is however outside the bounds of this work.

6.2. Including XMM-Newton X-ray photometry

Taking advantage of the flexibility provided by CIGALE, we conducted a similar comparison to evaluate the impact of incorporating X-ray photometry into the SED fitting process. A $2''$ radius search for our QSO2 candidates identified matches with five sources. We then integrated the 2–12 keV XMM-Newton photometry (Lin et al. 2012) into CIGALE for analysis.

The comparison study is presented in Fig. 6, similar to Fig. 5, where the physical properties of five X-ray emitters are presented. In this case, we see that the introduction of X-ray data changes the estimated properties for both the AGN and the host galaxy. The parameter less affected is the SFR, which increases for sources with a lower estimated SFR, using SDSS+WISE. For two of the five sources, the stellar mass estimates when including X-ray data increase by nearly 1 dex, indicating a significant underestimate of the stellar mass when X-rays are included.

The physical properties of AGN have the highest variance in this study. For two sources, the L_{AGN} is overestimated, according to the one estimated with the addition of X-ray photometry. The most affected property is frac_{AGN} , with two sources having a difference of ~ 0.6 , resulting in $\text{frac}_{\text{AGN}} \sim 0.4$. Although the AGN contribution remains significant, the observed difference in AGN physical properties arises from the reduced fit to the IR part of the SED when the X-ray model is included. When X-ray photometry is included, the fit places less weight on the mid-IR, resulting in an underestimate of the mid-IR emission. This leads to a decrease in frac_{AGN} while compensating for the increase in stellar mass.

7. Separating QSO2 candidates using SFR

The ratio between SFR and SFR_{MS} allows us to create different regions that separate galaxies into starbursts, star formation, and quiescent (e.g. Azadi et al. 2015; Aird et al. 2019; Vietri et al. 2022). In our sample, the galaxies are divided into four regimes: starburst, $\log(\text{SFR}/\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}) > 0.4$ dex; star-forming, $\log(\text{SFR}/\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}) \pm 0.4$ dex; sub-MS, $\log(\text{SFR}/\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}})$ between -0.4 and -1.3; and quiescent, $\log(\text{SFR}/\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}) < -1.3$ (e.g. Aird et al. 2019; Vietri et al. 2022).

To understand how the quantity $\text{SFR}/\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}$ relates to the M_* , we show the results for our QSO2 candidates in Figure 7. The sources are colour-coded according to the estimated frac_{AGN} . In summary, we obtain 31 sources in the starburst region ($\sim 8.49\%$); 88 sources in the star-forming region ($\sim 24.11\%$); 98 sources in the sub-MS region ($\sim 26.85\%$); and 148




Fig. 6: Comparison between physical properties estimated with and without X-ray XMM-Newton photometry, using CIGALE. The left column shows scatter plots comparing various galaxy properties such as AGN fraction, AGN luminosity, stellar mass, and star formation rate between galaxies with X-ray XMM-Newton photometry and without. All values are provided in logarithmic scale, with the exception of the frac_{AGN} . Each scatter plot includes a 1:1 reference line, as a dashed red line. The right column presents bar plots of the differences in the same properties, for each source (numbered in the x axis): SDSS+WISE - SDSS+WISE+XMM-Newton.

sources in the quiescent region ($\sim 40.55\%$). The candidates in the quiescent region are among the most massive candidates with M_* within the range $10^{10.5-12} M_{\odot}$, while the starburst and main sequence regions show a wider M_* range. Similarly to the results of [Vietri et al. \(2022\)](#), we do verify a preference for massive host galaxies ($M_* \geq 10^{10} M_{\odot}$) to have a lower SFR.

Due to the proximity of the redshift of our sample to the peak of star formation ($z \sim 2$, [Madau & Dickinson 2014](#)), the diversity of the estimated SFR is noteworthy. For example, we observe sources in the starburst region with $M_* \sim 10^{9-11}$ and a




Fig. 7: Measurements of the logarithm of the ratio $\text{SFR}/\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}$ as a function of the logarithm of stellar, M_* . The SFRs relative to the main sequence of star formation for galaxies were computed assuming the average redshift from our QSO2 candidate sample, $z=1.1$ and using the relation by [Schreiber et al. \(2015\)](#). The dashed line separates the main sequence and the starburst region at 0.4 dex, as defined by [Aird et al. \(2019\)](#). The blue-shaded area defines the main sequence region. Each point is colour coded based on the estimated AGN fraction of CIGALE, frac_{AGN} .

mean $\text{frac}_{\text{AGN}} \sim 0.7$. Starburst galaxies have been reported as a direct consequence of major merging processes (e.g., [Sanders & Mirabel 1996](#); [Lonsdale et al. 2006](#)), which can trigger AGN activity (e.g., [Sanders et al. 1988](#); [Di Matteo et al. 2005](#); [Hopkins et al. 2006](#)), explaining the high SFR and dust content. Furthermore, we obtain a high percentage of sources in the quiescent region, with a median $\text{frac}_{\text{AGN}} \sim 0.6$. These can be sources with obscured star-formation due to the dusty nature of galaxy (e.g. [Blain et al. 1999](#); [Daddi et al. 2007](#); [Alexander et al. 2008](#)), therefore being a direct consequence of a merger-driven system, or it can be a consequence of AGN feedback which may be redistribution of the gas content of the galaxy, diminishing the ability of the galaxy to produce new stars (e.g. [Treister & Urry 2012](#); [Vergani et al. 2018](#); [Harrison & Ramos Almeida 2024](#); [Bugiani et al. 2025](#)). Another explanation can be a 'cocooned' AGN with Compton thick obscuration ($N_{\text{H}} \geq 10^{24} \text{ cm}^{-2}$), whose optical emission is absorbed and enshrouded by gas and dust (also known as optically quiescent quasars (OQQs), [Greenwell et al. 2021, 2022](#)).

To further study the distribution of the frac_{AGN} parameter, Figure 8 shows the distribution of $\text{SFR}/\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}$ as a function of frac_{AGN} with the total luminosity of AGN, L_{AGN} . Galaxies within the star-forming MS present a wide range of frac_{AGN} , similar to the fraction of galaxies in the starburst region. We observe an increase in L_{AGN} with frac_{AGN} , expected due to the contribution of the IR emission, with AGN-like luminosities between $10^{44-47} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. In the MS region, galaxies are luminous and have a high frac_{AGN} .

The detection of emission from star formation, while presenting apparent dust emission in the IR, matches the descrip-




Fig. 8: Similar plot to Figure 7, but with $\text{SFR}/\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}$ as a function of frac_{AGN} . Each point is colour-coded based on the CIGALE estimated $\log_{10} L_{\text{AGN}}$.

tion of AGN2 found as [NeV] λ 3426 emitters (e.g. Vergani et al. 2018), known as composite systems with a combined contribution of star formation and AGN to the electromagnetic spectrum, also presented in C2024. These results are also consistent with Hatcher et al. (2021), where AGN2 are typically found on or near the star-forming MS, and Ward et al. (2022), where cosmological simulations predict at $0 \leq z \leq 2$ that AGNs are preferentially found in star-forming galaxies.

8. Comparison with AGN2 samples from the literature

In Vietri et al. (2022), optically selected AGN2 with redshifts between 0.5 and 0.9 from the VIPERS and VVDS surveys was studied to better understand the connection between AGN activity and the physical properties of the host galaxies. Similarly to this work, in Vietri et al. (2022) the CIGALE code was used to derive the stellar masses, while the SFR was computed using the [OIII] λ 3726+3728 doublet line. We compared our results to understand how the physical properties of our candidates are distributed. For stellar masses higher than $10^{10} M_{\odot}$, the majority of our sources are also below the MS.

The distribution of the Bongiorno sample and Vietri et al. (2022) on the SFR- M_{\star} diagram is very similar, with the majority of AGN2 clustered below the MS region and $\log_{10}\text{SFR} \leq 1.5$. Both studies based their classification of AGN on standard diagnostic diagrams [OIII]/H β versus [OII]/H β (see Rola et al. 1997; Lamareille 2010, and references therein). Therefore, their selection bias will provide sources with lower SFR as the majority of star-forming galaxies will be excluded from the sample⁵. Nevertheless, from Fig. 3, our selection provides us with a selection of sources with lower SFR than the aforementioned samples.

⁵ In Ji et al. (2022), the authors discuss a similar effect, where AGN selection methods for X-ray AGNs and IR AGNs show different physical properties for the AGN host galaxies

In this study, we constrain the photometry of our sample to preferentially select faint optical sources that align with the QSO2 sample from Alexandroff et al. (2013), as detailed in Section 2.1. This selection criterion will directly affect the estimated optical contribution to the SFR, enabling the infrared (IR) contribution to be treated as a free parameter, that is, no constraints are applied to the IR data from WISE. Consequently, the results presented in Fig. 3 become particularly pertinent, as the optical contribution to the SFR estimation will be relatively minor compared to the IR contribution. Through our methodology, we identify QSO2 candidates across a broader range of SFRs, thus presenting a complex sample that potentially reflects different evolutionary mechanisms driving the observed properties.

9. Comparison with simulations: SPRITZ

We performed a comparison with the semi-empirical simulated catalogue Spectro-Photometric Realisations of Infrared-selected Targets⁶ (SPRITZ; Bisigello et al. 2021a,b, 2022, master catalogue v1.131). In this catalogue, luminosity functions and galaxy populations are combined with SED simulated galaxies to reproduce physical properties, emission features, and expected fluxes using SED fitting for all simulated sources (see Bisigello et al. 2021b, and references therein). The galaxy populations are classified in SPRITZ based on the observations results presented in Gruppioni et al. (2013):

- Non-AGN dominated: star-forming (SF) galaxies, with no clear AGN activity, which includes spiral and dwarf galaxies; starburst (SB) galaxies; and passive elliptical galaxies with little or no star-formation;
- AGNs: unobscured AGN (AGN1); and luminous galaxies with an AGN component dominating over the star-forming activity, with UV-optical obscuration due to dust (AGN2);
- Composite systems: SB-AGN typically have highly obscured AGN or Compton-thick ($N_{\text{H}} \geq 10^{23.5} \text{cm}^{-2}$) with a non-negligible component of star formation, and enhanced mid-IR emission; SF-AGN with properties similar to a spiral galaxy while having a low-luminosity or obscured AGN, with a "flattening" in the 3-10 μm range. Furthermore, SF-AGN(SB) and SF-AGN(spiral) are divided based on their far-IR/near-IR colours and SED similarities;

For this work, we are particularly interested in the following subgroups within SPRITZ: AGN2, SB-AGN and SF-AGN galaxies. These subgroups are expected to have similar properties to QSO2, where dust obscuration plays a pivot role similarly to the SPRITZ subgroups, while having or not significant contribution from star-formation scenarios (e.g. Telesco et al. 1984; Farrah et al. 2003; Ivison et al. 2019; Jarvis et al. 2020, see also references in Section 7).

To ensure the SPRITZ simulated data represents the distribution in the SDSS survey, we set a constraint on the number density of galaxies. We limited the number of galaxies within each infrared luminosity, i.e. $L_{\text{IR-z}}$ redshift bin per square degree, to match the SDSS observations. We set the following threshold: $N * \text{SDSS area} > 1$, where N represents the simulated galaxy count. This criterion ensures that only galaxies common enough to be observed at least once within the SDSS area are included in our analysis. We then apply the same magnitude criteria as described in Section 2. This step ensures the selection of optically faint sources, consistent with the selection criteria employed by both Alexandroff et al. (2013) and our sample. Finally, we imposed

⁶ <http://spritz.oas.inaf.it/catalogs.html>




Fig. 9: Distribution plots of the frac_{AGN} and L_{AGN} for the QSO2 candidates (blue), SB-AGN (red), SF-AGN (orange), and AGN2 (green) from SPRITZ catalogue.

constraints on the physical properties of the simulated galaxies, $\log_{10}(M_*/M_\odot) < 12$ and $\log_{10}(\text{SFR} [M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}]) < 3$. These limits are based on established physical boundaries for galaxies and filter out objects with unrealistically high stellar masses or star formation rates, which would create an unphysical bias.

In the SPRITZ catalogue, the physical properties were derived using the Multi-wavelength Analysis of Galaxy Physical Properties (da Cunha et al. 2012, MAGPHYS) code, or the SED3FIT (Berta et al. 2013), depending on the type of source and the presence of an AGN contribution. Although these codes differ from CIGALE, a comparison can be made to study the similarity between the simulated sources and our sample of QSO2 candidates.

In Figure 9, we show the density plots for the L_{AGN} , frac_{AGN} , M_* , SFR diagram for SF-AGN, SB-AGN, and AGN2 from SPRITZ alongside with our QSO2 candidates. The AGN sources selected from SPRITZ follow a similar distribution in the M_* -SFR diagram as the QSO2 candidates within and above the main-sequence, where the majority of candidates are placed. Although the estimates of physical properties used in SPRITZ and our work use different SED fitting codes, we observe a coherent range of physical properties between SPRITZ sources and our candidates.

Considering these results, we can argue that the QSO2 sample comprises a mix of composite systems, with both SB and SF-AGN galaxies, and more "traditional" AGN2 galaxies, whose host galaxy matches the properties of quiescent galaxies. To further study the true nature of our QSO2 sample, multi-wavelength analysis and morphological studies are necessary.

10. Conclusions

We have studied the physical properties of a sample of QSO2 candidates in the redshift desert, i.e., $1 \leq z \leq 2$, selected via machine learning in C2024 (Cunha et al. 2024), using the SED fitting code CIGALE. Our aim was to obtain new insights into galaxy and AGN evolution across cosmic time.

We estimated relevant physical properties such as SFR, M_* , frac_{AGN} , and AGN luminosity. Figure 3 illustrates the distribution of SDSS galaxies (used as a control sample, i.e., galaxies classified as non-QSO2 candidates in C2024), QSO2 candidates,

and the Bongiorno sample (a subset of Bongiorno et al. (2012)) on the SFR- M_* diagram. While SDSS galaxies are primarily concentrated in the high-SFR region, the QSO2 candidates exhibit a broader distribution, including sources with lower SFRs. The QSO2 candidates also span a wide range of SFRs and high M_* values, from 10^9 to $10^{12} M_\odot$ (see Fig. 4). We argue that our results demonstrate the ability of our methodology to identify QSO2 candidates independently of their host galaxy's physical properties. This can be helpful in unveiling new AGN2 candidates and increasing our knowledge and statistics on this type of AGNs.

Additionally, we computed the $\text{SFR}/\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}$ parameter, which allowed us to classify our candidates into four areas: starburst, $\log(\text{SFR}/\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}) > 0.4$ dex; star-forming, $\log(\text{SFR}/\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}) \pm 0.4$ dex; sub-MS, $\log(\text{SFR}/\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}})$ between -0.4 and -1.3 ; and quiescent, $\log(\text{SFR}/\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}) < -1.3$ (e.g., Aird et al. 2019; Vietri et al. 2022). Our candidates are distributed across the four regions, with higher concentrations in the quiescent and star-forming regions.

Sources in the quiescent region have high M_* , significant frac_{AGN} , and AGN luminosities matching the observed properties for AGN galaxies. The derived values for the AGN and host galaxy properties are consistent with those reported in the AGN literature (e.g., Hönig & Beckert 2007; Bongiorno et al. 2012; Vietri et al. 2022) and with those of Alexandroff sample ($L_{\text{AGN}} \sim 10^{46.3-46.8} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$; Alexandroff et al. 2013).

Speculating on their nature, we suggest that these sources may be subject to Compton-thick obscuration ($N_{\text{H}} \sim 10^{24} \text{ cm}^{-2}$), which would lead to an underestimation of the SFR due to the significant attenuation of optical light. Alternatively, they could be experiencing the effects of AGN feedback. Further observational data, spanning from imaging to spectroscopy, are necessary to unveil their nature and the co-evolution of the AGN and host galaxy, as well as to test these hypotheses. In particular, far-infrared (FIR) data will be crucial to better constrain the physical properties derived in this study, especially SFR and AGN luminosities.

We also compared our QSO2 candidate sample with the semi-empirical simulated catalogue SPRITZ. We compared our sample with the composite systems (SB-AGN and SF-AGN) and the AGN2 sources. We observe a consistent distribution in the

SFR- M_* diagram when comparing with our QSO2 candidates. This result provides compelling evidence that supports the effectiveness of our methodology in selecting a diverse population of obscured AGNs.

In conclusion, we have studied the physical properties of our sample of QSO2 candidates in the redshift desert using the available optical and infrared photometry, from SDSS and WISE. The estimated physical properties and consequent analysis herein showcase the relevance of novel methodologies for the identification of QSO2 galaxies, particularly in the less explored redshift regime where studies are scarce. To further study the nature of QSO2 host galaxies, more multi-wavelength observations are essential (e.g., Zakamska et al. 2004, 2005; Ptak et al. 2006; Ramos Almeida et al. 2013). For example, imaging observations would allow for morphological studies, which would help to study their merger history through disturbed morphologies or other distinctive features, testing the so-called merging paradigm (e.g., Zakamska et al. 2006; Villar-Martín et al. 2011; Bessiere et al. 2012; Ramos Almeida et al. 2012; Villar-Martín et al. 2012; Liu et al. 2013; Humphrey et al. 2015b,a, 2016; Pierce et al. 2023).

Acknowledgements. PACC thank the comments and suggestions from M. Villar-Martín, R. Carvajal, and I. Matute. PACC acknowledges financial support from Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (FCT) through grant 2022.11477.BD, and through research grants UIDB/04434/2020 and UIDP/04434/2020. AH acknowledges support from NVIDIA through an NVIDIA Academic Hardware Grant Award. This publication uses data products from the Wide-field Infrared Survey Explorer, which is a joint project of the University of California, Los Angeles, and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory/California Institute of Technology, funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Funding for the Sloan Digital Sky Survey IV has been provided by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science, and the Participating Institutions. SDSS-IV acknowledges support and resources from the Center for High Performance Computing at the University of Utah. The SDSS website is www.sdss.org. SDSS-IV is managed by the Astrophysical Research Consortium for the Participating Institutions of the SDSS Collaboration including the Brazilian Participation Group, the Carnegie Institution for Science, Carnegie Mellon University, Center for Astrophysics | Harvard & Smithsonian, the Chilean Participation Group, the French Participation Group, Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, The Johns Hopkins University, Kavli Institute for the Physics and Mathematics of the Universe (IPMU) / University of Tokyo, the Korean Participation Group, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Leibniz Institut für Astrophysik Potsdam (AIP), Max-Planck-Institut für Astronomie (MPIA Heidelberg), Max-Planck-Institut für Astrophysik (MPA Garching), Max-Planck-Institut für Extraterrestrische Physik (MPE), National Astronomical Observatories of China, New Mexico State University, New York University, University of Notre Dame, Observatório Nacional / MCTI, The Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, Shanghai Astronomical Observatory, United Kingdom Participation Group, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, University of Arizona, University of Colorado Boulder, University of Oxford, University of Portsmouth, University of Utah, University of Virginia, University of Washington, University of Wisconsin, Vanderbilt University, and Yale University. In preparation for this work, we used the following codes for Python: Numpy Harris et al. (2020), Scipy (Virtanen et al. 2020), Pandas (Wes McKinney 2010), matplotlib (Hunter 2007), and seaborn (Waskom 2021).

Data Availability

The photometric data used were obtained through CasJobs⁷ and the SQL queries can be found here: <https://github.com/pedro-acunha/AMELIA/tree/main/data>. The machine learning code is available on GitHub: <https://github.com/pedro-acunha/AMELIA>. The derived physical properties of all candidates are available in electronic form at the CDS database.

References

- Abdurro'uf, Accetta, K., Aerts, C., et al. 2022, ApJS, 259, 35
- Ahumada, R., Prieto, C. A., Almeida, A., et al. 2020, ApJS, 249, 3
- Aird, J., Coil, A. L., & Georgakakis, A. 2019, MNRAS, 484, 4360
- Alexander, D. M., Chary, R. R., Pope, A., et al. 2008, ApJ, 687, 835
- Alexander, D. M. & Hickox, R. C. 2012, New A Rev., 56, 93
- Alexandroff, R., Strauss, M. A., Greene, J. E., et al. 2013, MNRAS, 435, 3306
- Antonucci, R. 1993, ARA&A, 31, 473
- Arnouts, S., Cristiani, S., Moscardini, L., et al. 1999, MNRAS, 310, 540
- Arnouts, S. & Ilbert, O. 2011, LePHARE: Photometric Analysis for Redshift Estimate, Astrophysics Source Code Library, record ascl:1108.009
- Aversa, R., Lapi, A., de Zotti, G., Shankar, F., & Danese, L. 2015, ApJ, 810, 74
- Azadi, M., Aird, J., Coil, A. L., et al. 2015, ApJ, 806, 187
- Bernhard, E., Mullaney, J. R., Daddi, E., Ciesla, L., & Schreiber, C. 2016, MNRAS, 460, 902
- Berta, S., Lutz, D., Santini, P., et al. 2013, A&A, 551, A100
- Bessiere, P. S., Tadhunter, C. N., Ramos Almeida, C., & Villar Martín, M. 2012, MNRAS, 426, 276
- Bessiere, P. S., Tadhunter, C. N., Ramos Almeida, C., & Villar Martín, M. 2014, MNRAS, 438, 1839
- Bisigello, L., Caputi, K. I., Grogan, N., & Koekemoer, A. 2018, A&A, 609, A82
- Bisigello, L., Gruppioni, C., Calura, F., et al. 2021a, PASA, 38, e064
- Bisigello, L., Gruppioni, C., Feltre, A., et al. 2021b, A&A, 651, A52
- Bisigello, L., Vallini, L., Gruppioni, C., et al. 2022, A&A, 666, A193
- Blain, A. W., Barnard, V. E., & Chapman, S. C. 2003, MNRAS, 338, 733
- Blain, A. W., Jameson, A., Smail, I., et al. 1999, MNRAS, 309, 715
- Bolzonella, M., Miralles, J. M., & Pelló, R. 2000, A&A, 363, 476
- Bongiorno, A., Merloni, A., Brusa, M., et al. 2012, MNRAS, 427, 3103
- Boquien, M., Burgarella, D., Roehly, Y., et al. 2019, A&A, 622, A103
- Brandt, W. N. & Hasinger, G. 2005, ARA&A, 43, 827
- Brinchmann, J., Charlot, S., White, S. D. M., et al. 2004, MNRAS, 351, 1151
- Brinchmann, J. & Ellis, R. S. 2000, ApJ, 536, L77
- Brusa, M., Fiore, F., Santini, P., et al. 2009, A&A, 507, 1277
- Bruzual, G. & Charlot, S. 2003, MNRAS, 344, 1000
- Bugiani, L., Belli, S., Park, M., et al. 2025, ApJ, 981, 25
- Burgarella, D., Buat, V., & Iglesias-Páramo, J. 2005, MNRAS, 360, 1413
- Calzetti, D., Armus, L., Bohlin, R. C., et al. 2000, ApJ, 533, 682
- Carroll, C. M., Ananna, T. T., Hickox, R. C., et al. 2023, ApJ, 950, 127
- Carroll, C. M., Hickox, R. C., Masini, A., et al. 2021, ApJ, 908, 185
- Chabrier, G. 2003, PASP, 115, 763
- Ciesla, L., Charmandaris, V., Georgakakis, A., et al. 2015, A&A, 576, A10
- Comastri, A., Ranalli, P., Iwasawa, K., et al. 2011, A&A, 526, L9
- Conroy, C. 2013, ARA&A, 51, 393
- Cresci, G., Mainieri, V., Brusa, M., et al. 2015, ApJ, 799, 82
- Cunha, P. A. C., Humphrey, A., Brinchmann, J., et al. 2024, A&A, 687, A269
- da Cunha, E., Charlot, S., Dunne, L., Smith, D., & Rowlands, K. 2012, in The Spectral Energy Distribution of Galaxies - SED 2011, ed. R. J. Tuffs & C. C. Popescu, Vol. 284, 292–296
- Daddi, E., Alexander, D. M., Dickinson, M., et al. 2007, ApJ, 670, 173
- Dale, D. A., Helou, G., Magdis, G. E., et al. 2014, ApJ, 784, 83
- Decarli, R., Falomo, R., Treves, A., et al. 2010, MNRAS, 402, 2453
- Di Matteo, T., Colberg, J., Springel, V., Hernquist, L., & Sijacki, D. 2008, ApJ, 676, 33
- Di Matteo, T., Springel, V., & Hernquist, L. 2005, Nature, 433, 604
- Donley, J. L., Koekemoer, A. M., Brusa, M., et al. 2012, ApJ, 748, 142
- Fabian, A. C. 2012, ARA&A, 50, 455
- Farrar, D., Afonso, J., Efstathiou, A., et al. 2003, MNRAS, 343, 585
- Ferrarese, L. & Ford, H. 2005, Space Sci. Rev., 116, 523
- Gaskell, C. M., Goosmann, R. W., Antonucci, R. R. J., & Whysong, D. H. 2004, ApJ, 616, 147
- Gebhardt, K., Kormendy, J., Ho, L. C., et al. 2000, ApJ, 543, L5
- Greene, J. E. & Ho, L. C. 2005, ApJ, 627, 721
- Greene, J. E., Zakamska, N. L., Ho, L. C., & Barth, A. J. 2011, ApJ, 732, 9
- Greenwell, C., Gandhi, P., Lansbury, G., et al. 2022, ApJ, 934, L34
- Greenwell, C., Gandhi, P., Stern, D., et al. 2021, MNRAS, 503, L80
- Gruppioni, C., Pozzi, F., Rodighiero, G., et al. 2013, MNRAS, 432, 23
- Harris, C. R., Millman, K. J., van der Walt, S. J., et al. 2020, Nature, 585, 357
- Harrison, C. M., Costa, T., Tadhunter, C. N., et al. 2018, Nature Astronomy, 2, 198
- Harrison, C. M. & Ramos Almeida, C. 2024, Galaxies, 12, 17
- Hatcher, C., Kirkpatrick, A., Fornasini, F., et al. 2021, AJ, 162, 65
- Hatfield, P. W., Jarvis, M. J., Adams, N., et al. 2022, MNRAS, 513, 3719
- Hickox, R. C. & Alexander, D. M. 2018, ARA&A, 56, 625
- Hickox, R. C., Jones, C., Forman, W. R., et al. 2007, ApJ, 671, 1365
- Hildebrandt, H., Arnouts, S., Capak, P., et al. 2010, A&A, 523, A31
- Hinshaw, G., Larson, D., Komatsu, E., et al. 2013, ApJS, 208, 19
- Hönig, S. F. 2019, ApJ, 884, 171
- Hönig, S. F. & Beckert, T. 2007, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc., 000, 1
- Hopkins, P. F., Hernquist, L., Cox, T. J., et al. 2006, ApJS, 163, 1
- Humphrey, A., Roche, N., Gomes, J. M., et al. 2015a, MNRAS, 447, 3322

⁷ <https://casjobs.sdss.org/casjobs/>

- Humphrey, A., Villar-Martín, M., & Lagos, P. 2016, *A&A*, 585, A32
- Humphrey, A., Villar-Martín, M., Ramos Almeida, C., et al. 2015b, *MNRAS*, 454, 4452
- Hunter, J. D. 2007, *Computing in Science & Engineering*, 9, 90
- Ilbert, O., Arnouts, S., McCracken, H. J., et al. 2006, *A&A*, 457, 841
- Ilbert, O., Capak, P., Salvato, M., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 690, 1236
- Ivison, R. J., Page, M. J., Cirasuolo, M., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 489, 427
- Jarvis, M. E., Harrison, C. M., Mainieri, V., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 498, 1560
- Ji, Z., Giavalisco, M., Kirkpatrick, A., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 925, 74
- Kewley, L. J., Geller, M. J., & Jansen, R. A. 2004, *AJ*, 127, 2002
- Kormendy, J. & Ho, L. C. 2013, *ARA&A*, 51, 511
- Lamareille, F. 2010, *A&A*, 509, A53
- LaMassa, S. M., Civano, F., Brusa, M., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 818, 88
- Lambrides, E. L., Chiaberge, M., Heckman, T., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 897, 160
- Lanzuisi, G., Delvecchio, I., Berta, S., et al. 2017, *A&A*, 602, A123
- Leitherer, C., Calzetti, D., & Martins, L. P. 2002, *ApJ*, 574, 114
- Leja, J., Johnson, B. D., Conroy, C., & van Dokkum, P. 2018, *ApJ*, 854, 62
- Lilly, S. J., Le Fèvre, O., Renzini, A., et al. 2007, *ApJS*, 172, 70
- Lin, D., Webb, N. A., & Barret, D. 2012, *ApJ*, 756, 27
- Liu, G., Zakamska, N. L., Greene, J. E., Nesvadba, N. P. H., & Liu, X. 2013, *MNRAS*, 430, 2327
- Liu, T., Tozzi, P., Wang, J.-X., et al. 2017, *ApJS*, 232, 8
- Lonsdale, C. J., Farrah, D., & Smith, H. E. 2006, in *Astrophysics Update 2*, ed. J. W. Mason, 285
- López, I. E., Brusa, M., Bonoli, S., et al. 2023, *A&A*, 672, A137
- Lusso, E., Comastri, A., Vignali, C., et al. 2011, *A&A*, 534, A110
- Lynden-Bell, D. 1969, *Nature*, 223, 690
- Madau, P. & Dickinson, M. 2014, *ARA&A*, 52, 415
- Magorrian, J., Tremaine, S., Richstone, D., et al. 1998, *AJ*, 115, 2285
- Mainieri, V. & Cosmos Collaboration. 2009, in *Chandra's First Decade of Discovery*, ed. S. Wolk, A. Fruscione, & D. Swartz, 147
- Małek, K., Buat, V., Roehly, Y., et al. 2018, *A&A*, 620, A50
- Marton, G., Gezer, I., Madarász, M., et al. 2024, *A&A*, 688, A203
- Merritt, D. & Ferrarese, L. 2001a, *MNRAS*, 320, L30
- Merritt, D. & Ferrarese, L. 2001b, *ApJ*, 547, 140
- Noeske, K. G., Weiner, B. J., Faber, S. M., et al. 2007, *ApJ*, 660, L43
- Noll, S., Burgarella, D., Giovannoli, E., et al. 2009, *A&A*, 507, 1793
- Pacifici, C., Iyer, K. G., Mobasher, B., et al. 2023, *ApJ*, 944, 141
- Padovani, P., Alexander, D. M., Assef, R. J., et al. 2017, *A&A Rev.*, 25, 2
- Paulino-Afonso, A., González-Gaitán, S., Galbany, L., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 662, A86
- Pickles, A. J. 1998, *PASP*, 110, 863
- Pierce, J. C. S., Tadhunter, C., Ramos Almeida, C., et al. 2023, *MNRAS*, 522, 1736
- Polletta, M., Tajer, M., Maraschi, L., et al. 2007, *ApJ*, 663, 81
- Ptak, A., Zakamska, N. L., Strauss, M. A., et al. 2006, *ApJ*, 637, 147
- Ramos Almeida, C., Bessiere, P. S., Tadhunter, C. N., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 436, 997
- Ramos Almeida, C., Bessiere, P. S., Tadhunter, C. N., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 419, 687
- Richstone, D., Ajhar, E. A., Bender, R., et al. 1998, *Nature*, 385, A14
- Rigopoulou, D., Mainieri, V., Almaini, O., et al. 2009, *MNRAS*, 400, 1199
- Rodríguez, M. I., Villar-Martín, M., Emonts, B., et al. 2014, *A&A*, 565, A19
- Rola, C. S., Terlevich, E., & Terlevich, R. J. 1997, *MNRAS*, 289, 419
- Ross, N., Strauss, M. A., Greene, J. E., et al. 2014, in *American Astronomical Society Meeting Abstracts*, Vol. 223, American Astronomical Society Meeting Abstracts #223, 115.04
- Salvato, M., Hasinger, G., Ilbert, O., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 690, 1250
- Sanders, D. B. & Mirabel, I. F. 1996, *ARA&A*, 34, 749
- Sanders, D. B., Soifer, B. T., Elias, J. H., et al. 1988, *ApJ*, 325, 74
- Schreiber, C., Pannella, M., Elbaz, D., et al. 2015, *A&A*, 575, A74
- Seyfert, C. K. 1943, *ApJ*, 97, 28
- Shimwell, T. W., Hardcastle, M. J., Tasse, C., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 659, A1
- Sokol, A. D., Yun, M., Pope, A., Kirkpatrick, A., & Cooke, K. 2023, *MNRAS*, 521, 818
- Stalevski, M., Fritz, J., Baes, M., & Popovic, L. C. 2012, in *Torus Workshop 2012*, ed. R. Mason, A. Alonso-Herrero, & C. Packham, 170
- Stalevski, M., González-Gaitán, S., Savić, Đ., et al. 2023, *MNRAS*, 519, 3237
- Stalevski, M., Ricci, C., Ueda, Y., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 458, 2288
- Sturm, E., Hasinger, G., Lehmann, I., et al. 2006, *ApJ*, 642, 81
- Symeonidis, M., Kartaltepe, J., Salvato, M., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 433, 1015
- Telesco, C. M., Becklin, E. E., Wynn-Williams, C. G., & Harper, D. A. 1984, *ApJ*, 282, 427
- Thorne, J. E., Robotham, A. S. G., Davies, L. J. M., et al. 2022, *MNRAS*, 509, 4940
- Teister, E. & Urry, C. M. 2012, *Advances in Astronomy*, 2012, 516193
- Urry, C. M. & Padovani, P. 1995, *PASP*, 107, 803
- Vergani, D., Garilli, B., Polletta, M., et al. 2018, *A&A*, 620, A193
- Vietri, G., Garilli, B., Polletta, M., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 659, A129
- Villar-Martín, M., Cabrera Lavers, A., Bessiere, P., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 423, 80
- Villar-Martín, M., Emonts, B. H. C., Cabrera Lavers, A., et al. 2021, *A&A*, 650, A84
- Villar-Martín, M., Perna, M., Humphrey, A., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 634, A116
- Villar-Martín, M., Tadhunter, C., Humphrey, A., et al. 2011, *MNRAS*, 416, 262
- Violino, G., Stevens, J., & Coppin, K. 2016, in *Active Galactic Nuclei 12: A Multi-Messenger Perspective (AGN12)*, 68
- Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T. E., et al. 2020, *Nature Methods*, 17, 261
- Ward, S. R., Harrison, C. M., Costa, T., & Mainieri, V. 2022, *MNRAS*, 514, 2936
- Waskom, M. L. 2021, *Journal of Open Source Software*, 6, 3021
- Wes McKinney. 2010, in *Proceedings of the 9th Python in Science Conference*, ed. Stéfan van der Walt & Jarrod Millman, 56 – 61
- Wright, E. L., Eisenhardt, P. R. M., Mainzer, A. K., et al. 2010, *AJ*, 140, 1868
- Xue, Y. Q., Luo, B., Brandt, W. N., et al. 2011, *ApJS*, 195, 10
- Yan, W., Brandt, W. N., Zou, F., et al. 2023, *ApJ*, 951, 27
- Yang, G., Boquien, M., Brandt, W. N., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 927, 192
- Yang, G., Boquien, M., Buat, V., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 491, 740
- Yuan, S., Strauss, M. A., & Zakamska, N. L. 2016, *MNRAS*, 462, 1603
- Zakamska, N. L., Schmidt, G. D., Smith, P. S., et al. 2005, *AJ*, 129, 1212
- Zakamska, N. L., Strauss, M. A., Heckman, T. M., Ivezić, Ž., & Krolik, J. H. 2004, *AJ*, 128, 1002
- Zakamska, N. L., Strauss, M. A., Krolik, J. H., et al. 2003, *AJ*, 126, 2125
- Zakamska, N. L., Strauss, M. A., Krolik, J. H., et al. 2006, *AJ*, 132, 1496

Appendix A: SED fitting parameters

Appendix B: LePhare++ photo-z estimations

We present examples of photometric redshift estimation using LePhare++. By fitting templates to observed flux densities from SDSS and WISE, we classify sources based on the reduced χ^2 value, as shown in Figure B.1. The fitting process includes galaxy, QSO, and star templates, highlighting the challenges LePhare++ faces with composite systems. In such cases, the optical portion of the SED often aligns closely with the galaxy template, while the IR portion is dominated by the QSO template. These examples show the limitations of current templates in accurately modelling optical-obscured AGNs.

Appendix C: CIGALE fitting examples

In this section, we present four example fits generated with CIGALE, corresponding to the same candidates shown in Section B. Each plot illustrates the contributions of various components to the overall SED of each candidate: the attenuated stellar emission is shown in yellow, unattenuated stellar emission in blue, nebular emission in green, dust emission in red, and AGN emission in orange. The complete model spectrum, combining all components, is represented by the black line. These examples show how more complex models, such as SKIRTOR, are important to model the AGN contribution to the SED of our candidates. For comparison purposes, we show in Table C.1 the physical properties derived for the sources shown in Figure C.1.

Table C.1: Physical properties derived using CIGALE for the four sources shown in Figures B.1 and C.1.

ID	frac _{AGN}	M _*	SFR	L _{AGN}
SDSSJ231353.79+005432.2	0.88	10.12	1.08	38.55
SDSSJ141904.16+590852.5	0.63	10.07	1.31	38.18
SDSSJ022705.97-005917.7	0.63	11.27	0.89	38.15
SDSSJ011219.64+023732.6	0.97	9.62	0.09	38.33

Notes. All physical properties, with the exception of frac_{AGN}, are presented in logarithmic scale.

Appendix D: SED mock comparison

To understand whether the estimated physical properties using CIGALE, with SDSS and WISE photometry, we used the mock catalogue option provided in the CIGALE configuration file.

The mock catalogue is built, for each source, using the best fit and introducing random errors to each quantity from a Gaussian distribution with the same standard deviation as the observation uncertainty. In Figures D.1, we show the linear correlation between the mock and predicted values.

Table A.1: Summary of the CIGALE SED fitting parameters used for the control sample (galaxies).

Module	Parameter	Values
Star formation history (<i>sfhdelayed</i>):	<i>e</i> -folding time τ_{main} (Myr)	5, 10, 30, 50, 100, 300, 500
	Stellar Age, t_{main} (Myr)	15, 35, 40, 50, 75, 100, 200, 300, 500
	<i>e</i> -folding time τ_{burst} (Myr)	5, 10, 15, 20
	Stellar Age, t_{burst} (Myr)	2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14
	Mass fraction, last burst	0.0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5
Galactic dust emission (Dale et al. 2014):	α slope	0.5, 1, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, 3, 3.5
	frac_{AGN}	0.0, 0.1, 0.25
<i>dustatt_modified_starburst</i> :	E(B-V)	0.1, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9

Table A.2: Summary of the CIGALE SED fitting parameters used for the QSO2 candidates.

Module	Parameter	Values	
Star formation history:	<i>e</i> -folding time τ_{main} (Myr)	5-20 (step 5), 30, 50, 100-300 (step 100), 500.0, 1000.0, 3000.0, 5000.0	
	<i>sfhdelayed</i>	Stellar Age, t_{main} (Myr)	31, 35, 40, 50, 75, 100-500 (step 100), 1000, 3000, 4000, 5000, 5500
		<i>e</i> -folding time τ_{burst} (Myr)	5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 50
		Stellar Age, t_{burst} (Myr)	5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30
		Mass fraction, last burst	0.0, 0.1, 0.2
Galactic dust emission (Dale et al. 2014):	α slope	0.5, 1, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, 3, 3.5	
AGN: SKIRTOR	Average edge-on optical depth at $9.7 \mu\text{m}$	3, 7, 11	
Stalevski et al. (2016)	AGN contribution to IR luminosity, frac_{AGN}	0.0-0.9 (step 0.1), 0.99	
	inclination (i.e. viewing angle)	40, 60, 80	
	Intrinsic disk type	Schartmann (2005) spectrum	
	Polar extinction E(B-V)	0, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3	




Fig. B.1: Examples of the best-fitting models for photometric redshift estimation using LePhare++ for four sources. Filled symbols represent the observed flux densities from SDSS and WISE. Source classification is defined by the reduced χ^2 value. The best-fit galaxy template is shown in blue, the best-fit QSO template in orange, and the best-fit star template in green. The histograms within each plot show the probability distribution function for the photometric redshift estimation, with the vertical dashed line indicating the spectroscopic redshift from SDSS.




Fig. C.1: Best-fitting models for four candidates using CIGALE, similar to Figure B.1. Open symbols represent observed flux densities, while the red filled symbols indicate modelled flux densities. The goodness of fit is shown by the reduced χ^2 value, with the residuals of the fit displayed at the bottom of each panel. The derived physical properties are shown in Table C.1.




Fig. D.1: Comparison between the estimated physical properties as derived from the mock analysis and the estimated values using CIGALE. The grey dashed line indicates the 1:1 relation between the parameters. From top to bottom, left to right: star-formation rate; stellar mass; AGN luminosity; AGN fraction; viewing angle (inclination); and polar-dust extinction, $E(B-V)$.