



The Lyman alpha reference sample. IV. Morphology at low and high redshift

L. Guaita, J. Melinder, M. Hayes, G. Östlin, J. E. Gonzalez, G. Micheva, A. Adamo, J. M. Mas-Hesse, A. Sandberg, H. Otí-Floranes, et al.

► To cite this version:

L. Guaita, J. Melinder, M. Hayes, G. Östlin, J. E. Gonzalez, et al.. The Lyman alpha reference sample. IV. Morphology at low and high redshift. *Astronomy and Astrophysics - A&A*, 2015, 576, 10.1051/0004-6361/201425053 . insu-03645089

HAL Id: insu-03645089

<https://insu.hal.science/insu-03645089>

Submitted on 25 Apr 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

The Lyman alpha reference sample

IV. Morphology at low and high redshift^{★,★★}

L. Guaita¹, J. Melinder¹, M. Hayes¹, G. Östlin¹, J. E. Gonzalez¹, G. Micheva^{1,2}, A. Adamo¹, J. M. Mas-Hesse⁴,
 A. Sandberg¹, H. Oti-Floranes^{5,14}, D. Schaerer^{3,6}, A. Verhamme⁶, E. Freeland¹, I. Orlitová⁷, P. Laursen⁸,
 J. M. Cannon⁹, F. Duval¹, T. Rivera-Thorsen¹, E. C. Herenz¹⁰, D. Kunth¹¹, H. Atek¹², J. Puschignig¹,
 P. Gruyters¹³, and S. A. Pardy^{14,15}

¹ Department of Astronomy, Oskar Klein Centre for cosmoparticle physics, Stockholm University, AlbaNova, 10691 Stockholm, Sweden

e-mail: lguai@astro.su.se

² Subaru Observatory, Hilo, Hawaii, USA

³ CNRS, IRAP, 14 avenue Edouard Belin, 31400 Toulouse, France

⁴ Centro de Astrobiología (CSIC-INTA), Departamento de Astrofísica, POB 78, Villanueva de la Cañada, Spain

⁵ Instituto de Astronomía, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Apdo. Postal 106, 22800 Ensenada B. C., Mexico

⁶ Geneva Observatory, University of Geneva, 51 Chemin des Maillettes, 1290 Versoix, Switzerland

⁷ Astronomical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Boční II 1401/1a, 141 00 Praha 4, Czech Republic

⁸ Dark Cosmology Centre, Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Juliane Maries Vej 30, 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark

⁹ Department of Physics and Astronomy, Macalester College, 1600 Grand Avenue, Saint Paul, MN 55105, USA

¹⁰ Leibniz-Institut für Astrophysik (AIP), An der Sternwarte 16, 14482 Potsdam, Germany

¹¹ Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris, UMR 7095 CNRS & UPMC, 98bis Bd Arago, 75014 Paris, France

¹² Laboratoire d'Astrophysique, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Observatoire, 1290 Sauverny, Switzerland

¹³ Department of Physics and Astronomy, Uppsala University, Box 515, 751 20 Uppsala, Sweden

¹⁴ Centro de Radioastronomía y Astrofísica, UNAM, Campus Morelia, Mexico

¹⁵ Astronomy Department, University of Wisconsin – Madison, 475 N. Charter Street, Madison, Wisconsin, 53706, USA

Received 25 September 2014 / Accepted 15 December 2014

ABSTRACT

Context. The transport of Ly α photons in galaxies is a complex process and the conditions under which Ly α photons manage to escape from certain galaxies is still under investigation. The Lyman alpha reference sample (LARS) is a sample of 14 local star-forming galaxies, designed to study Ly α in detail and relate it to rest-frame UV and optical emission.

Aims. With the aim of identifying rest-frame UV and optical properties, which are typical of Ly α emitters (LAEs, galaxies with $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 20 \text{ \AA}$) at both low and high redshift, we investigated the morphological properties of the LARS galaxies, in particular the ones that exhibit intense Ly α radiation.

Methods. We measured sizes and morphological parameters in the continuum, Ly α , and H α images. We studied morphology by using the Gini coefficient vs. M20 and asymmetry vs. concentration diagrams. We then simulated LARS galaxies at $z \sim 2$ and 5.7, performing the same morphological measurements. We also investigated the detectability of LARS galaxies in current deep field observations. The subsample of LAEs within LARS (LARS-LAEs) was stacked to provide a comparison to stacking studies performed at high redshift.

Results. LARS galaxies have continuum size, stellar mass, and rest-frame absolute magnitude typical of Lyman break analogues in the local Universe and also similar to $2 < z < 3$ star-forming galaxies and massive LAEs. LARS optical morphology is consistent with the one of merging systems, and irregular or starburst galaxies. For the first time we quantify the morphology in Ly α images: even if a variety of intrinsic conditions of the interstellar medium can favour the escape of Ly α photons, LARS-LAEs appear small in the continuum, and their Ly α is compact. LARS galaxies tend to be more extended in Ly α than in the rest-frame UV. It means that Ly α photons escape by forming haloes around HII regions of LARS galaxies.

Conclusions. The stack of LARS-LAE Ly α images is peaked in the centre, indicating that the conditions, which make a galaxy an LAE, tend to produce a concentrated surface brightness profile. On the other hand, the stack of all LARS galaxies is shallower and more extended. This can be caused by the variety of dust and HI amount and distribution, which produces a more complex, patchy, and extended profile, like the one observed for Lyman break galaxies that can contribute to the stack. We cannot identify a single morphological property that controls whether a galaxy emits a net positive Ly α flux. However, the LARS-LAEs have continuum properties consistent with merging systems.

Key words. techniques: imaging spectroscopy – galaxies: star formation – galaxies: starburst

[★] Based on observations made with the NASA/ESA *Hubble* Space Telescope. These observations are associated with programme 12310.

^{★★} Figures 5, 6 and 18, Tables 5–6, and Appendices are available in electronic form at <http://www.aanda.org>

1. Introduction

Originating mainly in recombining gas being ionized by hot O and B stars, Lyman alpha (Ly α) radiation has proved an excellent

probe of star-forming galaxies at both low (e.g., Cowie et al. 2011) and high (e.g., Ouchi et al. 2010) redshift.

Hayes et al. (2005, 2009) and Östlin et al. (2009) developed a method to separate the rest-frame UV and Ly α emission in *Hubble* Space Telescope (HST) data. In these papers it was demonstrated observationally that, in nearby galaxies ($z < 0.1$), Ly α emission extends away from the star-forming regions where the Ly α photons were originally generated, forming the so-called Ly α haloes.

Young starburst galaxies are expected to be very bright in Ly α (Partridge & Peebles 1967). For the past 15 years, star-forming galaxies have been successfully detected at $z > 2$ by identifying their strong Ly α emission line. The principal method used is the narrow-band technique (e.g., Cowie & Hu 1998; Rhoads et al. 2000; Ouchi et al. 2008; Gronwall et al. 2007; Nilsson et al. 2009): Ly α emitters (LAEs) present an excess in a narrow band (covering the redshifted Ly α wavelength) with respect to a broad-band filter (covering the rest-frame UV continuum). Because Ly α photons are easily absorbed by dust grains and are scattered by neutral hydrogen (HI), LAEs were thought to be a *special* population of galaxies with *special* dust and HI amounts and distribution. Although extensive studies have been carried out to characterize LAE physical properties and their special conditions (Nilsson et al. 2011; Acquaviva et al. 2012; McLinden et al. 2014; Vargas et al. 2014; Hagen et al. 2014, among the most recent ones), the results have been inconclusive. The mechanisms (e.g., interstellar medium geometry and kinematics) controlling the escape of Ly α photon are still debated.

The morphology of the rest-frame UV and optical continua provides information about galaxy formation and evolution (e.g., star-forming region distribution, merger events, Conselice 2003; Lotz et al. 2004). From the ground LAEs were observed to be compact in the rest-frame UV, but multiple components were identified in deep HST-resolution images (Bond et al. 2009, 2012). There have also been a few attempts to quantify the morphology of the Ly α emission itself. Bond et al. (2010) explored a sample of seven LAEs placed at $z \approx 3.1$ (observed-frame $\lambda(\text{Ly}\alpha) \sim 5000 \text{ \AA}$) by using HST Wide Field Camera2 (WFPC2) F502N narrow-band imaging. They found that, for one source, Ly α emission extended till 1.5 kpc (≤ 1 kpc for the other six), a just-slightly-larger scale than the UV continuum. Also, this source was composed of two main clumps both in the rest-frame UV and in Ly α . Finkelstein et al. (2011a) spatially resolved three spectroscopically confirmed LAEs placed at $z \approx 4.5$ (observed-frame $\lambda(\text{Ly}\alpha) \sim 6570 \text{ \AA}$) by using the HST Advanced Camera for Surveys (ACS) F658N narrow band. Two out of the three systems showed Ly α emission significantly more extended than the UV continuum.

Recently, evidence of extended Ly α emission was found in the stack of a large sample of Lyman break galaxies, (Steidel et al. 2011), which are generally more massive and dustier than LAEs, and of galaxies located in overdense regions (Matsuda et al. 2012). By stacking hundreds of $z \approx 2.2$, $z \approx 3.1$, $z \approx 3.7$, and $z \approx 5.7$ LAEs from deep ground-based imaging, Momose et al. (2014) discovered extended Ly α emission, with scale lengths in the range of 5–10 kpc. However, by stacking their sample of LAEs Feldmeier et al. (2013) just found a marginal detection at $z \sim 3.1$ and a non-detection at $z \approx 2.07$. It is clear that depth and image resolution were the main factors affecting their results.

Instead, giant Ly α nebulae, powered by active galactic nuclei, have been studied by a few authors to assess the role of

HI scattering and Ly α radiative transfer effects (e.g., Humphrey et al. 2013a; Prescott et al. 2015)

Local starbursts (Overzier et al. 2008, 2009, 2010; Hayes et al. 2013, 2014; Petty et al. 2014; Östlin et al. 2014) are unique laboratories for studying the rest-frame UV in detail and optical light distribution, morphology, and to investigate the mechanisms, that allow Ly α photons to escape. In Östlin et al. (2014, hereafter Paper I) we presented the Lyman alpha reference sample (LARS), which is composed of 14 star-forming galaxies at $z < 0.2$. These galaxies were observed during HST cycle 18 (P.I. G. Östlin) in a set of rest-frame UV (ACS/SBC F125LP, F140LP, F150LP) and optical (WFC3/UVIS F336W/F390W, F438W/F475W, F775W/F850LP, F502N, F656N, and ACS/WFC F502N/F505N/F551N, F656N/F716N/F782N) filters. Ly α maps were generated by estimating the continuum at rest-frame $\lambda(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 1216 \text{ \AA}$, through modelling the galaxy spectrum as a composite population of young stars, old stars, and nebular gas. LARS images were published in Hayes et al. (2013, hereafter Paper 0) and further analysed in Hayes et al. (2014, hereafter Paper II). We found that the Ly α emission profile appeared different from the rest-frame UV and it flattened on scales larger than the rest-frame UV. The majority of the 14 galaxies showed a negative Ly α equivalent width at small radii and then an increase farther out. We concluded that this was due to scattering on neutral hydrogen, which is able to shape the Ly α emission into the form of haloes. Also, by comparing LARS Ly α with global physical properties, it appeared that the Ly α photon escape was favoured in the system with weaker dust reddening and low stellar mass.

The neutral hydrogen content of LARS galaxies was presented in Pardy et al. (2014, hereafter Paper III). The spectral lines of HI were detected in 11 of the 14 observed LARS galaxies and it was also found that the Ly α escape was favoured in low HI-mass systems. LARS interstellar medium kinematics will be presented in Rivera-Thorsen et al. (2015), Duval et al. (in prep.), and Orlitová et al. (in prep.).

In this paper, number IV of the series, we address the question whether specific galaxy morphological properties could be related to the escape of Ly α photons and escape in haloes. Note that in Paper I the present paper was termed paper 7, due to a previous numbering. In Sect. 2, we briefly explain how we measured morphological parameters (details are given in Appendix A) and the process adopted to simulate how some local ($z < 0.2$) galaxies would appear at high redshift ($z > 2$). In Sect. 3, we describe the morphological properties of the sample of local galaxies and compare them with local-Universe and high- z galaxy populations. In Sect. 4, we study the morphological properties of the high- z -simulated galaxies. In Sect. 5, we present the stacking of the high- z -simulated sample and compare with high- z stacks in the literature. In Sect. 6 and 7, we discuss and summarize the main results of the paper.

Throughout we adopt AB magnitudes and assume a Λ CDM cosmology of $(H_0, \Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda) = (70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}, 0.3, 0.7)$ as in Hayes et al. (2013, 2014).

2. Method

We present the morphology of the local ($0.03 < z < 0.2$) LARS galaxies and investigate how it would change if the same galaxies were observed at high redshift. As explained above, in Paper II we isolated the contributions of the rest-frame UV ($\sim 1220 \text{ \AA}$), optical ($\sim 6570 \text{ \AA}$), Ly α (1216 \AA), and H α (6563 \AA). In this work, we measure the morphological parameters of these

contributions. The LARS galaxies are hereafter referred to as L_n , where n ranges from 01 to 14 (see Paper 0).

2.1. Morphological parameter estimation

With the aim of quantifying the morphology of LARS galaxies, we calculated their sizes and performed non-parametric measurements of morphological parameters (see Appendix A and Fig. A.1 for details).

We calculated sizes, in terms of Petrosian semi-major axis (rP20, e.g., Lotz et al. 2004; Lisker 2008), circular Petrosian radius (Petrosian 1976), and radii containing 20%, 50%, and 80% of the flux (r_{20} , r_{50} , r_{80}). A comparison between these radii gives an idea of the distribution of the light in the galaxy. We also estimated asymmetry (A), concentration (C), clumpiness (S), Gini coefficient (G), and second-order moment of the brightest 20% of the galaxy's flux (M20, see e.g., Conselice 2003; Lotz et al. 2004; Scarlata et al. 2007; Micheva et al. 2013).

The asymmetry quantifies the symmetry of a galaxy with respect to a 180-degree rotation; the concentration describes how much the light is concentrated in the centre of a galaxy; the clumpiness measures the amount of small-scale structures within a galaxy; the Gini coefficient provides the information on how uniform is the light distribution; M20 traces the spatial distribution of any bright knots, and also off-centre clumps, its definition is very similar to that of C , but M20 is more sensitive to merger structures, such as off-centre components.

We first ran the Source Extractor (SExtractor) software (Bertin & Arnouts 1996). It provided the galaxy centroid and the elliptical aperture, containing the entire galaxy and characterized by semi-major axis (sma) equal to rP20. The photometry was performed within this SExtractor detection aperture.

We adopted configuration parameters like in Bond et al. (2009; DETECT_THRESH = 1.65, DETECT_MINAREA = 30, DEBLEND_MINCONT = 1). They were optimized to provide morphological measurements in deep HST rest-frame UV observations at $z > 2$. To prevent SExtractor from breaking up the clumpy, resolved $z \sim 0$ LARS galaxies into smaller fragments, we assumed a larger value of DETECT_MINAREA. This parameter sets the number of contiguous pixels required for a detection to be accepted by SExtractor. We measured fluxes at SExtractor centroid within elliptical apertures, by using the ELLIPSE task in *iraf.stsdas.isophote* and within circular apertures, by using the PHOT task in *iraf.digiphot.apphot*. ELLIPSE and PHOT outputs served to infer sizes, A , and C at minimum asymmetry ($C^{\min A}$), as explained in Appendix A and previously adopted in Bershadsky et al. (2000), Conselice (2003), Micheva et al. (2013).

The non-parametric measurements and signal-to-noise estimations were performed counting the flux of pixels belonging to a segmentation map. We defined the segmentation map in two ways, one is an ellipse with semi-major axis equal to rP20 (Scarlata et al. 2007) and orientation given by SExtractor; one contains the pixels with surface brightness larger than the value at the Petrosian radius (Lotz et al. 2004) measured in the smoothed image (smoothed by a kernel of width rP20/5). We calculated M20, S and Gini coefficient by considering the pixels within these segmentation maps. The Gini coefficients measured in these two segmentation maps are denoted by G^{rP20} and $G^{SB-rP20S}$ respectively. As described in Scarlata et al. (2007), G^{rP20} was defined to be consistent for redshift comparisons, thus we prefer it over $G^{SB-rP20S}$ throughout the paper when we compare with high redshift.

To test our code, we applied it to template galaxies with known profiles and compared the output to the results by Bershadsky et al. (2000) and Lotz et al. (2006). We recovered the expected values as described in Appendix A.

2.2. Combination of morphological parameters

As shown in Conselice (2003) and Lotz et al. (2004), combinations of morphological parameters can give information about galaxy history (e.g., star-formation and merging episodes). First of all the rest-frame UV morphology is sensitive to the current star formation; the rest-frame optical traces the structure of the entire galaxy stellar population (Lee et al. 2013; Bond et al. 2014). The combinations of parameters (see previous section) we adopted are,

- Asymmetry vs. concentration, asymmetry vs. clumpiness, together with clumpiness vs. concentration, as presented by Conselice (2003)
- Gini coefficient vs. M20 bright-pixel moment, as presented in Lotz et al. (2004).

The concentration depends on the galaxy star-formation history in the sense that a rapid gravitational collapse can produce high concentration. The presence of disk and intergalactic gas which cools onto the disk tends to produce a lower concentration value. Disk galaxies are characterized by $3 < C < 4$, ellipticals by $C > 4$ (Bershadsky et al. 2000). The asymmetry is sensitive to any feature that produces asymmetric light distributions (e.g., star-formation knots, interactions, and mergers). It is commonly assumed also at high z that large asymmetry ($A > 0.38$) indicates a major merger (Aguirre et al. 2013; Conselice 2003). Spiral galaxies and systems composed of more than one component are characterized by $A > 0.1$. The clumpiness is sensitive to the presence of star-forming clumps as well, but background noise can make it difficult to detect low surface brightness regions and increase the appearance of the galaxy as a mix of clumps. The Gini coefficient can be strongly correlated with C . By definition, $G = 1$ means that the light is all concentrated in one pixel, $G = 0$ that the light is equally distributed across the galactic body. In the case of a shallow light profile, both G and C are low. When more than one clump contains a significant fraction of light, G can be much larger than zero, but C still low. M20 traces the spatial distribution of off-centre bright regions.

In general, starburst and irregular galaxies are expected to have large A , large S , and intermediate C , merging systems and perturbed disks show large M20 and intermediate G .

2.3. High-redshift simulation

We simulated the observations of LARS galaxies (all at $z < 0.2$) at higher redshift by transforming their original science- and weight-map images (Paper I) according to the following steps (see also Overzier et al. 2008; Adamo et al. 2013).

1. The images were resampled preserving the flux (*IDL* frebin function). The size of the output image was defined by fixing the physical size of the galaxies. We chose mainly a $z \sim 2$ sampling to be able to compare with the interesting results obtained by surveys of Lyman alpha emitters in the last recent 5 years (Nilsson et al. 2009; Guaita et al. 2010; Hayes et al. 2010; Nakajima et al. 2012; Sandberg, in prep.). Also, the size changes a little with redshift.
2. Continuum subtraction (Hayes et al. 2009) was applied to the resampled images to generate rest-frame UV continuum

Table 1. 10σ detection limits applied to high- z simulated LARS images.

$F(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$	$m(\text{rest-frame UV})$ AB	$F(\text{H}\alpha)$ erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$	$m(\text{rest-frame optical})$ AB
5E-19	30	2E-19	29
3E-18	29	6E-19	28
8E-18	28	1E-18	27
2E-17	27	3E-18	26
5E-17	26	1E-17	25

Notes. Noise corresponding to the detection limits given in the table was added to LARS continuum and line images. As LARS Ly α and H α (rest-UV and optical continua) images are in units of flux (flux density), the image depths are given in units of erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$ (AB magnitudes). The MUSYC (Guaita et al. 2010; Bond et al. 2012) NB3727 survey implied a 10σ detection limit of $F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 5\text{E-17}$ erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$. MUSYC U,B (HUDF V606) 10σ detection limits were about 26(29.5). Assuming a NB3727 filter width and transmission profile, a source with $m_{\text{AB}}(\text{rest-frame UV}) = 30$ and $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 20$ Å is characterized by $F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 5\text{E-19}$ erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$. $m_{\text{AB}}(\text{rest-frame UV}) = 30, 29, 28$ are consistent with HUDF09, GOODS, and GEMS survey depths (Bond et al. 2009). Lee et al. (2012) survey was characterized by a 10σ detection limit of 22.9 in NB210 and 23.7 in K. CANDELS wide(deep) F160W 10σ detection limit was 25.8(26.5). Assuming a NB210 filter width, a source with $m_{\text{AB}}(\text{rest-frame optical}) = 27$ and $EW(\text{H}\alpha) = 20$ Å is characterized by $F(\text{H}\alpha) = 2\text{E-19}$ erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$.

and Ly α line, rest-frame optical continuum and H α line images. The line images are in units of flux (erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$), while the continuum images are in units of flux densities (erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$ Å $^{-1}$).

- The image pixel values were scaled based on luminosity distance and surface brightness dimming (i.e., Hubble & Tolman 1935; Bouwens et al. 2004).
- Gaussian noise, corresponding to a certain simulated survey depth, was added to the resampled and rescaled images by running the MKNOISE task in *iraf.artdata*. To calculate uncertainty on galaxy sizes and morphological parameters we performed Monte Carlo simulations by repeating 100 realizations of a noisy image. The noise applied was defined as the 10σ detection within a ~ 50 pixel (equivalent to a square aperture of $\sim 0.2''$ on a side for HST ACS optical filters) area, similar to the limits given for the Hubble Ultra Deep Field (HUDF, Beckwith et al. 2006). We do not show simulations in which we only resampled the pixel scale to that of a ground-based telescope and instrument, because the main effect on continuum and line images was produced by survey depth and ground-based point spread function (PSF, see Sect. 5).

To choose reasonable ranges of detection limits (Table 1) to apply, we referred to the MULTi-wavelength Survey by Yale-Chile (MUSYC) NB3727 narrow band (Guaita et al. 2010; Bond et al. 2012), to the triple narrow band by Nakajima et al. (2012), CANDELS/HUDF (McLure et al. 2013) broad band, and to the dual narrow-band survey by Lee et al. (2012).

3. LARS galaxies at $z \sim 0$

To be able to compare the Ly α , H α , and continuum properties of LARS galaxies with those of high- z Ly α emitters (LAEs), we focused on the twelve LARS galaxies with $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 1$ Å as measured in Paper II. Thus, we excluded from this analysis the two galaxies of the sample (L04 and L06) characterized by null Ly α maps. LARS galaxies with integrated $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 20$ Å

composed the subsample of LARS-LAEs (consisting of six galaxies). Various physical characteristics of the LARS galaxies (including their coordinates) are discussed in Paper II.

In Fig. 1¹ we present the red giant branch (RGB) images of the twelve LARS galaxies. Most of the galaxies show localized knots of star formation superposed on extended rest-frame optical emission; the Ly α emission is extended on larger angular scales (the Ly α haloes).

We investigated the properties of LARS galaxies in the context of other galaxy populations, to assess the fairness of our comparison. In Figs. 2 and 3 we show the location of the LARS galaxies in the half-light radius vs. stellar mass (r_{50} vs. $\log(M_*/M_\odot)$) and the half-light radius vs. UV absolute magnitude (r_{50} vs. M_{UV}) diagrams, to understand if the LARS galaxies harbour stellar masses and UV magnitudes comparable to values in the literature. These diagrams have been designed for local galaxies, for which sizes could be easily measured in the rest-frame optical bands (Shen et al. 2003). However, measurements in the rest-frame UV could also be performed at high redshift. Following the method described in Sect. 2, we estimated the half-light radius as r_{50} in the rest-frame optical and also in the rest-frame UV images.

The high- z studies we adopted for comparison all performed size and morphological measurements by using HST images. These include,

- Continuum-selected Lyman break galaxies (LBGs) at $z \sim 3$, with and without Ly α in emission (Pentericci et al. 2010); at $z \sim 1, 2$, and 3 (Mosleh et al. 2011), at $1.5 < z < 3.6$ (Law et al. 2012); at $z \sim 1.8$ (Lotz et al. 2004); z -drop outs at $z \sim 7$ (Grazian et al. 2012); high signal-to-noise z - and Y -drop outs detected in the Hubble Ultra Deep Field, UDF12 (Ono et al. 2013).
- Compact star-forming galaxies (cSFGs) at $2 < z < 3$ (Barro et al. 2013). These authors have pointed out that, based on their number densities, masses, sizes, and star formation rates, $z \sim 2-3$ compact, star-forming galaxies were likely progenitors of compact, quiescent, massive galaxies at $z < 2$.
- Star-forming galaxies selected based on their $B-z$ and $z-K$ colour (sBzK, Yuma et al. 2012; Lee et al. 2013); passive and star-forming galaxies selected based on their $B-z$ and $z-K$ colour (pBzK and sBzK, Lee et al. 2013).
- Star-forming galaxies at $z \sim 2-3$ by Law et al. (2012). These authors found a typical value of the Gini coefficient ($G^{SB-rP20S} = 0.4$) for the sources with the strongest Ly α emission, characterized by $M_* \sim 1.5 \times 10^{10} M_\odot$.
- Great Observatories Origins Deep Survey (GOODS) and UDF (Ultra Deep Survey) $z \sim 4$ and GOODS $z \sim 1.5$ sources from the study of Lotz et al. (2006).
- Sub-millimeter galaxies (SMGs, Aguirre et al. 2013).
- Narrow-band selected Lyman alpha emitters at $z \simeq 2.07$ and $z \simeq 3.1$ (Bond et al. 2009, 2012) belonging to the MUSYC survey. We considered the stack of the $z \sim 2.07$ entire sample and of subsamples separated by photometric properties, UV-faint(UV-bright) with $R > 25.5(<25.5)$, IRAC-faint(IRAC-bright) with $f_{3.6 \mu\text{m}} < 0.57(>0.57) \mu\text{J}$, low-(high)- EW with $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha) < 66(>66)$ Å, red-(blue-)LAE with $B-R > 0.5(<0.5)$ (Guaita et al. 2011).
- Narrow-band selected Lyman alpha emitters at $z \sim 5.7, 6.5$, and 7.0 (Jiang et al. 2013), the first very-high-redshift sample

¹ We took advantage of this codification of the Lupton et al. (2004) prescription to produce RGB images: http://dept.astro.lsa.umich.edu/~msshin/science/code/Python_fits_image/




Fig. 1. False-colour images of the LARS galaxies analysed in this paper. Red encodes rest-frame optical continuum, green rest-frame UV continuum, and blue shows continuum-subtracted Ly α . Scales in kpc are given on the side. Intensity cut levels are set to show details.

where non-parametric morphological measurements were performed.

The local-Universe studies, we adopted for comparison, include,

- Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) early- and late-type galaxy relations obtained from the analysis of images in the z band (Shen et al. 2003).
- Lyman break analogues (LBAs) at $z \approx 0.2$. These are local starbursts that share typical characteristics of high- z LBGs, such as stellar mass, metallicity, dust extinction, star-formation rate, and physical size. We considered a sample of 30 LBAs from Overzier et al. (2009, 2010). They were characterized by a median absolute UV magnitude of -20.3 , almost one magnitude fainter than typical LBGs.

We found that the LARS galaxies occupy a quite wide range of r_{50} . Their rest-frame UV and optical sizes (Table 2) are broadly consistent with LBAs, LBGs, and SMGs. Their stellar mass tend to be larger than LAEs, consistent with LBAs and LBGs. However, there is an overlap in stellar mass between LARS-LAEs ($M_* < 10^{10} M_\odot$) and the most massive LAEs in the sample of Bond et al. (2012). Also, LARS galaxies are less massive than cSFGs. The largest half-light radii characterize the LARS galaxies with the most distorted morphology (see also Fig. B.2). LARS M_{UV} magnitudes (and so star-formation rate, SFR_{UV}) are comparable with those of $z \approx 2.07$ LAEs and $z \geq 7$ LBGs. There is an overlap with $z > 5$ LAEs. However, the measurements of LARS sizes in the rest-frame UV are larger than those of $z \geq 7$ LBGs.

Therefore, LARS galaxies could be considered as LBAs, with size, stellar mass, and star-formation rate similar to $2 < z < 3$ star-forming galaxies.

3.1. Continuum morphology of LARS galaxies at $z \sim 0$

Following the method described in Sect. 2, we estimated the non-parametric measurements for the LARS galaxies (Table 3).

Combinations of morphological parameters (see Sect. 2.2) can give information about a galaxy's star-formation history. Lotz et al. (2004) proposed a criterion for separating perturbed disks or merging systems from normal galaxies, by studying local ultra luminous infrared galaxies (ULIRGs). The criterion identifies a region in the G vs. $M20$ diagram, which is $G^{SB-rp20S} > -0.115 \times M20 + 0.384$. For $z < 1.2$ galaxies observed in a rest-frame optical band (4000 \AA) at HST resolution, Lotz et al. (2008) proposed a slightly different relation to identify merging systems, $G^{SB-rp20S} > -0.14 \times M20 + 0.33$. Also, Conselice (2003) distinguished the region where irregular or starburst galaxies were located in the A-C^{minA} and A-S planes.

As seen in Fig. 4 and Table 3, LARS galaxies, in particular the LARS-LAEs, tend to avoid the location of normal galaxies and to occupy the region of perturbed disks or merging systems and of irregular or starburst galaxies. The values of G , $M20$, C , and A , we calculated for LARS galaxies, are consistent with the ones measured by Overzier et al. (2010) for LBAs. Even if our sample is just composed of twelve sources, we do not see any significant dependency between G and $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha)$. L08 is




Fig. 2. Half-light radius measured using elliptical apertures in the rest-frame UV (*upper panel*) and optical (*lower panel*) as a function of stellar mass. LARS values at $z \sim 0$ from this work (red diamonds) are shown together with previous rest-frame UV measurements: [Overzier et al. \(2009\)](#) individual LBA values estimated in the HST ACS/SBC *F150LP* and ACS/HRC *F330W* filter (open blue squares), [Yuma et al. \(2012\)](#) median estimations in the *F850W* filter for sBzK (green star), [Bond et al. \(2012\)](#) LAE sample stack and subsamples (magenta square, blue and magenta stars, small black circle), [Aguirre et al. \(2013\)](#) individual SMG values measured in the HST *F110W* filter (big black dots), and [Pentericci et al. \(2010\)](#) average values of LBGs with and without $\text{Ly}\alpha$ in emission (green dots); and rest-frame optical measurements: [Overzier et al. \(2009\)](#) individual LBA values estimated in the HST (Wide Field and Planetary Camera2) *WFC2/F606W* and ACS/WFC *F850LP* filter (open blue squares), [Yuma et al. \(2012\)](#) median estimations in the *F160W* filter for sBzK (green star), [Mosleh et al. \(2011\)](#) median values of UV-bright sources (GALEX-LBGs at $z \sim 0.6\text{--}1.5$, LBG at $z \sim 2.5\text{--}3.5$, and continuum-selected star-forming galaxies at $z \sim 1.5\text{--}2.5$, blue diamonds), [Aguirre et al. \(2013\)](#) individual SMG values measured in *F160W* filter, [Law et al. \(2012\)](#) mean value of all the sample of star-forming galaxies at $1.5 < z < 3.6$ estimated in the *F160W* filter (yellow triangles), and [Barro et al. \(2013\)](#) values for compact star-forming galaxies at $2 < z < 3$ also calculated in the *F160W* filter (green triangles). We also show the curve derived by [Shen et al. \(2003\)](#) for local SDSS early- and late-type galaxies. As these curves were obtained in z -bands for local galaxies, it is more meaningful to compare them to the radii in the rest-frame optical. However, for reference, we show them in the *upper panel* as well. The stellar masses are all corrected to Salpeter-IMF values and the size measurements are all scaled to be comparable to half-light radii. LARS stellar masses were calculated in Paper II. L09 and L11 are outside the graph, due to their half-light radius larger than 6 kpc.

the most massive of the LARS-LAEs, but equally concentrated within the segmentation map. L02 is the largest- $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ emitter, characterized by one of the smallest stellar masses and the largest $G^{SB-rP20S}$ among the LARS-LAEs.

3.2. $\text{Ly}\alpha$ morphology of LARS galaxies at $z \sim 0$

One of the goals of our work was to quantify and compare the morphologies of LARS galaxies in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ and in the continuum. We present morphological parameters measured in the continua and in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ of LARS images in Figs. 5 and 6. G^{rP20} , M20, concentration, and ellipticity are smaller; while clumpiness and asymmetry are generally larger in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ than in the rest-frame UV continuum. The LARS-LAEs tend to be characterized by the highest concentration, lowest asymmetry, and lowest clumpiness

in $\text{Ly}\alpha$. G^{rP20} and M20 measured in the rest-frame optical are consistent with the values measured in $\text{Ly}\alpha$.

4. LARS galaxies as seen at $z \sim 2$

We applied the procedure described in Sect. 2.3 to simulate LARS galaxies at $z \sim 2$. We named the high- z simulated galaxies as z2LARS and the subsample of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emitters as z2LARS-LAEs. We estimated sizes and calculated morphological parameters (Tables 5 and 6) in the same way we did for the original images in Sect. 2.1.

The purpose of this test was to understand whether we could expect to detect LARS-type galaxies and LARS-type $\text{Ly}\alpha$ haloes in current high- z surveys. In particular, we wanted to understand how galaxy size and morphological parameters changed when varying the survey depth (Table 1). The results show that, in a




Fig. 3. Half-light radius measured using elliptical apertures in the rest-frame UV image as a function of the absolute rest-frame UV magnitude. LARS measurements from this work (red diamonds) are shown together with the literature estimations by Overzier et al. (2010) corresponding to the median value of their $z < 0.3$ LBAs, observed in the near-infrared bands, by Jiang et al. (2013) for a sample of $z \sim 5.7, 6.5, 7.0$ LAEs (cyan dots), by Bond et al. (2012) for the stack and subsamples of LAEs at $z \approx 2-3$ (black circles, magenta squares), by Grazian et al. (2012) which measured SExtractor half-light radii for a sample of z -drop outs (green triangles), and by Ono et al. (2013) for a sample of high signal-to-noise z - and Y -drop outs detected in *Hubble* Ultra Deep Field, UDF12 (black stars).

sufficiently deep survey, faint galaxy structures in between bright knots remain connected together and SExtractor is able to detect just one source (the entire galaxy) in the image. In a shallower survey, the faint connecting structures tend to be lost in the noise and a galaxy appears to be composed of separated clumps. In that case SExtractor identifies more than one source and photometry is performed by locating the photometric aperture around the brightest clump. In Figs. B.1–B.3, we show how LARS galaxies would appear if detected in the deepest continuum and line surveys simulated here, while Figs. B.4–B.6 show the results for shallower surveys. In Appendix C, we present the corresponding surface brightness profiles.

In the following sub-sections, we describe the detection of LARS galaxies in the simulated surveys with 10σ detection limits presented in Table 1. In the first sub-section, we give details on the detection of L01 as an example. We proceed to describe the cases of the LARS-LAEs and of the galaxies with the faintest $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission. Then, we explain the variations in size and ellipticity versus clumpiness owing pixel resampling and survey depth. In Sect. 4.6, we quantify the morphology of z2LARS and compare with high- z observations from the literature.

4.1. Detection of L01 in high-redshift surveys

In Fig. 7, we show the rest-frame UV, $\text{Ly}\alpha$, optical, and $\text{H}\alpha$ images of L01 simulated to be at $z \sim 2$ (z2L01) as they would be observed in the deepest surveys probed here; SExtractor detection apertures are over-plotted. The detection parameters we adopted are sensitive enough that (at the deepest simulated surveys) this galaxy is detected as a single source. As described in detail in Paper I and II, L01 consists of a bright UV star-forming

centre with an extended tail, also seen in $\text{H}\alpha$ and in the rest-frame optical. The $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission is coincident with the bright UV knot and extends in a fan-like structure possibly indicating the presence of an expanding bubble. The main features of emission (dark red pixels in Fig. 7) and absorption (white pixels), observed in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ thanks to the HST resolution and the careful continuum subtraction presented in Paper II, are clearly visible in the $z \sim 2$ simulation as well. However, the extremely detailed $\text{Ly}\alpha$ structures close to the centre of the galaxy (see Paper I, Fig. 1) are not visible. The last panel of Fig. 7 shows L01 $\text{Ly}\alpha$ image, convolved with a ground-based seeing. From the ground L01 $\text{Ly}\alpha$ morphology would appear smoothed.

We show the surface brightness profiles of z2L01 in Fig. 8. The rest-frame UV and $\text{Ly}\alpha$ profiles (left column panels) are preserved when observed in a survey with sensitivity deeper than $m_{\text{rest-UV}}^{\text{lim}} = 28$ and $F(\text{Ly}\alpha)^{\text{lim}} = 8\text{E-18 erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$. However, on scales larger than 4 kpc, the profiles are indistinguishable from the background noise. In shallower surveys, the profiles start to be affected by the simulated-survey noise on smaller scales and z2L01 could not be detected by adopting a SExtractor detection threshold, DETECT_THRESH = 1.65. Therefore, size and morphological parameter measurements could not be performed either. We define $m_{\text{rest-UV}}^{\text{lim}}$ and $F(\text{Ly}\alpha)^{\text{lim}}$ as the limits for detection and morphological parameter measurement. These limits are $m_{\text{rest-optical}}^{\text{lim}} = 26$ and $F(\text{H}\alpha)^{\text{lim}} = 3\text{E-18 erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ for L01 rest-frame optical and $\text{H}\alpha$.

The lower left panel of Fig. 8 shows that the rest-frame UV continuum profile is steeper than the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ profile. The lower right panel shows that the rest-frame optical continuum tends to be shallower than the rest-frame UV and the $\text{H}\alpha$, and more similar to the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ profiles.

Table 2. Size of the original LARS galaxies at $z \sim 0$.

(1) LARS	(2) $rP20^{\text{ell}}$ kpc	(3) $rP20^{\text{circ}}$ kpc	(4) $rP20^{\text{minA}}$ kpc	(5) r_{20} kpc	(6) r_{50} kpc	(7) r_{80} kpc
Rest-UV						
L01	2.63	1.34	0.81	0.86	1.20	2.11
L02	2.42	2.28	1.49	0.69	1.28	2.17
L03	1.40	0.97	0.77	0.33	0.63	1.17
L05	1.71	1.46	0.84	0.35	0.69	1.45
L07	1.13	0.90	0.81	0.33	0.60	0.95
L08	5.98	3.35	2.08	1.67	3.01	4.96
L09	18.72	1.11	0.59	2.73	8.52	13.81
L10	4.73	3.71	3.09	0.77	2.08	3.93
L11	23.77	18.56	18.56	6.12	12.21	19.41
L12	1.84	1.20	1.05	0.41	0.75	1.76
L13	4.42	3.70	1.23	1.95	2.47	3.75
L14	1.83	1.71	0.98	0.67	0.98	1.52
Rest-optical						
L01	4.87	2.15	2.44	1.28	2.11	4.01
L02	7.12	2.23	2.51	1.08	2.63	5.62
L03	5.73	1.98	1.83	0.72	2.00	4.59
L05	2.32	1.79	1.84	0.41	0.98	1.79
L07	3.95	2.89	1.96	0.62	1.51	3.18
L08	5.28	3.17	3.29	1.48	2.63	4.22
L09	20.54	3.06	2.07	5.98	10.27	14.74
L10	7.14	3.93	3.93	1.08	2.83	5.57
L11	19.13	14.52	14.52	4.83	9.82	15.43
L12	3.68	3.15	1.20	0.64	1.46	2.97
L13	11.41	5.04	5.35	2.31	5.30	9.15
L14	3.72	3.78	1.22	0.73	1.28	2.80

Notes. Size measurements from elliptical and circular aperture photometry of the original LARS images. (1) LARS id; (2) Petrosian semi-major axis; (3) circular Petrosian radius; (4) Petrosian radius at minimum of asymmetry; (5) radius containing 20%; (6) 50%; and (7) 80% of the total flux. The measurements were performed in the bands corresponding to the rest-frame UV (either F140 or F150) and to the rest-frame optical (either F775, F814, or F850). The step in semi-major axis is 1 pixel (~ 0.02 kpc at $z \sim 0.03$) and in circular radius is 2 pixels (~ 0.05 kpc at $z \sim 0.03$).

4.2. Detection of the LARS-LAEs in high-redshift surveys

The LARS-LAE galaxies show more than one bright knot, connected by filaments, in the continua. They also show an intense $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission close to their centres and $\text{Ly}\alpha$ structures in their outskirts. The $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission is accompanied by regions of absorption. As a typical trend, in increasingly shallower surveys the filaments, seen in the continua, show lower surface brightness, while their $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission become increasingly localized in the galaxy centre. Only L14, the galaxy brightest in $\text{Ly}\alpha$, could be detected in the shallowest $\text{Ly}\alpha$ survey probed here. The magnitude and flux limits for z2LARS-LAE detection are shown in Table 4.

4.3. Detection of the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ -faint z2LARS galaxies

In general these LARS galaxies are bright enough in UV, optical, and $\text{H}\alpha$ (see Paper II) to be detected as a single source in our SExtractor run. The exception is L13 (Fig. B.3): this galaxy is detected as two possibly blended sources (dashed-line aperture in Fig. B.3) in UV and $\text{H}\alpha$, and photometry was performed locating the aperture on the (brightest) right clump. In the shallow simulated surveys (Figs. B.4–B.6) low surface brightness filaments connecting the main continuum knots disappear into the background noise making the sources appear to be composed of several clumps. In increasingly shallow surveys, fewer clumps could be detected. For example, only the brightest clump is detected for L13 at $m_{\text{rest-UV}} = 29$ and $m_{\text{rest-optical}} = 26$. Only L09,

the brightest galaxy in $\text{H}\alpha$, could be detected in the shallowest $\text{H}\alpha$ survey probed here.

In general these galaxies could not be detected in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ surveys shallower than $F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 3\text{E-}18$ erg s^{-1} cm^{-2} . The galaxies presenting the strongest $\text{Ly}\alpha$ absorption (white pixels in Fig. B.2) of the sample could be detected only in the deepest $\text{Ly}\alpha$ survey probed here.

4.4. Size

The Petrosian radius measured within elliptical apertures ($rP20^{\text{ell}}$) is the quantity adopted for the comparison of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ versus continuum size estimations (Appendix A and Paper 0). The $rP20^{\text{ell}}$ estimated in the z2LARS continuum and $\text{Ly}\alpha$ images could vary by up to 20% in median (Fig. 9). The variation depends on the specific morphology.

As proposed in Paper 0, we define the quantity ξ to estimate the size of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ with respect to the size of $\text{H}\alpha$ (Eq. (1)) and continuum (Eq. (2)) emission,

$$\xi(\text{Ly}\alpha/\text{H}\alpha) = \frac{rP20^{\text{ell}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)}{rP20^{\text{ell}}(\text{H}\alpha)} \quad (1)$$

$$\xi(\text{Ly}\alpha/\text{UV}) = \frac{rP20^{\text{ell}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)}{rP20^{\text{ell}}(\text{rest-UV})}. \quad (2)$$

A ξ larger than 1 indicates that $\text{Ly}\alpha$ photons extend to larger scales than UV and $\text{H}\alpha$ due to neutral hydrogen scattering; the

Table 3. Morphological parameters of the original LARS galaxies at $z \sim 0$.

(1) LARS	(2) G^{rP20}	(3) $G^{SB-rP20S}$	(4) M20	(5) ell	(6) C^{circ}	(7) C^{ell}	(8) C^{minA}	(9) SN_{pixel}	(10) A	(11) S
Rest-UV										
L01	0.70	0.68	-0.87	0.61	1.34	1.94	1.73	251.40	0.42	0.16
L02	0.73	0.72	-0.79	0.53	3.14	2.50	3.49	52.26	0.50	0.26
L03	0.63	0.64	-1.17	0.30	2.20	2.71	2.76	83.18	0.21	0.11
L05	0.72	0.68	-1.26	0.34	3.11	3.07	3.27	408.69	0.33	0.15
L07	0.62	0.62	-1.02	0.40	1.99	2.28	1.24	696.00	0.26	0.09
L08	0.62	0.65	-0.89	0.33	1.95	2.36	1.43	21.98	0.37	0.29
L09	0.71	0.75	-2.33	0.80	1.76	3.52	3.35	23.86	0.21	0.24
L10	0.67	0.68	-1.52	0.52	3.53	3.53	2.76	32.83	0.33	0.24
L11	0.58	0.79	-1.22	0.87	3.40	2.51	3.40	44.05	0.30	0.31
L12	0.67	0.68	-1.50	0.34	2.56	3.15	2.82	583.81	0.28	0.04
L13	0.72	0.67	-0.77	0.21	1.23	1.42	2.61	89.17	0.33	0.23
L14	0.74	0.68	-0.71	0.27	1.51	1.78	2.72	622.68	0.21	0.02
Rest-optical										
L01	0.59	0.61	-1.09	0.64	1.72	2.48	2.53	21.91	0.29	0.09
L02	0.59	0.64	-1.36	0.69	2.96	3.58	2.89	4.25	0.14	0.31
L03	0.61	0.62	-2.16	0.45	3.32	4.02	3.42	50.72	0.09	0.05
L05	0.64	0.67	-1.57	0.73	3.27	3.22	4.77	64.96	0.33	0.15
L07	0.60	0.61	-1.68	0.60	3.28	3.56	2.97	14.60	0.24	0.10
L08	0.54	0.55	-1.05	0.23	2.10	2.28	1.78	36.82	0.31	0.16
L09	0.62	0.74	-1.13	0.83	2.03	1.96	4.35	11.38	0.45	0.34
L10	0.57	0.58	-1.87	0.54	3.08	3.56	3.31	9.95	0.13	0.15
L11	0.50	0.60	-1.25	0.85	3.46	2.52	3.46	18.70	0.20	0.23
L12	0.64	0.63	-1.90	0.46	3.70	3.34	3.35	54.74	0.33	0.13
L13	0.58	0.62	-1.52	0.55	2.43	2.99	3.67	3.98	0.18	0.30
L14	0.76	0.72	-1.32	0.10	2.92	2.92	3.01	35.24	0.32	0.13

Notes. Morphological parameters estimated for the original LARS galaxies, following the equations in Appendix A. (1) LARS id; (2) Gini coefficient estimated within the fixed-size segmentation map; (3) Gini coefficient estimated within the segmentation map built from the pixels with surface brightness larger than the value corresponding to that at the Petrosian radius; (4) M20; (5) SExtractor ellipticity 1-B/A; (6) concentration from circular apertures; (7) concentration from elliptical apertures; (8) concentration corresponding to the minimum of asymmetry; (9) signal-to-noise per pixel; (10) asymmetry; (11) clumpiness. As discussed in Appendix A, we could expect an uncertainty of $\sim 10\%$ in G , of $<5\%$ in M20, and of $\sim 20\%$ in C . We could expect an even larger uncertainty in S . The difference in G^{rP20} and $G^{SB-rP20S}$ is generally marginal.

Table 4. Limits of detection for LARS galaxies simulated to $z \sim 2$.

ID	$m_{rest-UV}$		$F(Ly\alpha)$	
	AB	AB	erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$	erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$
L01lae	28	26	8E-18	3E-18
L02lae	29	27	8E-18	1E-18
L03	29	25	3E-18	3E-18
L05lae	27	26	8E-18	3E-18
L07lae	28	26	2E-17	3E-18
L08lae	28	25	8E-18	3E-18
L09	28	27	5E-19	1E-17
L10	28	25	5E-19	1E-18
L11	28	26	3E-18	3E-18
L12	26	26	3E-18	3E-18
L13	28	27	8E-18	3E-18
L14lae	27	27	5E-17	1E-17

Notes. Almost all LARS galaxies would be detected in $Ly\alpha$ at a 10σ detection limit depth of $3E-18$ erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$. The exceptions are L09 and L10, which show strong absorption in their $Ly\alpha$ images (Fig. C.4). LARS-LAEs would be detected in shallower surveys. Also, the majority of LARS galaxies would be detected in $H\alpha$ at a depth of $3E-18$ erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$.

galaxy presents a $Ly\alpha$ halo. The left panel of Fig. 10 compares ξ measured in the high- z simulated image with that of the original LARS image. Even if the $rP20^{ell}$ estimated in the high- z simulation is larger than in the original image, the ξ values remain consistent within the errors. The ratio between $\xi(Ly\alpha/UV)$

measured in the z2LARS and original LARS images is 1.1 ± 0.8 on average. The ratios $\xi(Ly\alpha/UV)$ or $\xi(Ly\alpha/H\alpha)$ vary between 1 and 5 among the LARS galaxies, implying that $Ly\alpha$ haloes are common in the LARS sample. However, the total extension of the haloes depends on the depth of the simulated survey and the limits of detection in $Ly\alpha$, UV, and $H\alpha$ (Sects. 4.1–4.3). The sizes of z2LARS for each simulated survey probed here are presented in Table 5. For comparison Finkelstein et al. (2011b) reported size measurements of three LAEs at $z \sim 4.5$ of 1–2 kpc in the rest-frame UV and of 1–3 kpc in $Ly\alpha$. Similarly Bond et al. (2010) estimated 2 kpc both in UV and in $Ly\alpha$.

In Fig. 10, we also show

$$\xi(\text{optical}/UV) = \frac{rP20^{ell}(\text{rest} - \text{optical})}{rP20^{ell}(\text{rest} - UV)}. \quad (3)$$

From the right panel of the figure, we see that the ratio between $\xi(\text{optical}/UV)$ measured in the z2LARS and in the original LARS images is 1.1 ± 0.3 on average.

4.5. Ellipticity and clumpiness

As noticed in Bond et al. (2009), it is not possible to easily understand if clumps in high- z broad-band images are merging components rather than star-forming regions connected by low surface brightness structures. Gronwall et al. (2011), Bond et al. (2012) observed that the rest-frame UV emission from a typical LAE was neither smooth nor spheroidal; its ellipticity




Fig. 4. Combinations of rest-frame optical morphological measurements, used in the literature as diagnostics of galaxy past and current history. $G^{SB-rP20S}$ vs. $M20$ (upper left), A vs. C^{minA} (upper right), and A vs. S (lower right). The lower left panel shows stellar mass vs. the rest-frame UV $G^{SB-rP20S}$. The typical value of $G^{SB-rP20S} = 0.4$ for the strongest $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emitters of the sample by Law et al. (2012) is reported as a red star. The twelve LARS galaxies analysed here are presented as squares, LARS-LAEs are rounded by open circles. The colour scale corresponds to $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha)$. For comparison, green stars correspond to the Frei et al. (1996) sample of normal galaxies and light blue triangles correspond to the ULIRG sample of Borne et al. (2000) as processed by Lotz et al. (2004). Black triangles correspond to a sample of starburst galaxies presented in Conselice (2003). Dashed and solid lines correspond to the separation between ULIRGs and normal galaxies, proposed by Lotz et al. (2004) and Lotz et al. (2008) respectively (see text).




Fig. 7. Simulated $z \sim 2$ rest-frame UV, $\text{Ly}\alpha$, rest-frame optical, and $\text{H}\alpha$ emission for L01 as it would be observed in the deepest surveys probed here (first four panels starting from the left). The last panel shows the original-pixel-scale $\text{Ly}\alpha$ image convolved with a Gaussian kernel, resembling a ground-based seeing point spread function, PSF, of $1.32''$. Every panel is 20×17 kpc wide. The reddish ellipses indicate SEx apertures, corresponding to the assumed detection parameters: DETECT_THRESH = 1.65, DETECT_MINAREA=30, and DEBLEND_MINCONT = 1 from Bond et al. (2009). The log colour scaling is chosen to show a visually consistent background noise.

was about 0.6, suggesting the presence of elongated structures due to merging activity or clumps of star formation. However, Shibuya et al. (2014) found that the LAEs in their sample with $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 100 \text{ \AA}$ tended to be characterized by a small ellipticity both in the rest-frame UV and optical. This is supported by the theoretical results of Verhamme et al. (2012) and Laursen et al. (2009), which showed that $\text{Ly}\alpha$ photons could more easily escape from face-on disks (ellipticity ~ 0), generally characterized by low column density of HI along the line of sight.

LARS galaxies do not show any clear trend between continuum ellipticity and $\text{Ly}\alpha$ equivalent width (Table 3). After pixel

resampling the rest-frame UV ellipticity varied by up to 60% for some of the LARS galaxies and no trend remains between continuum ellipticity and $\text{Ly}\alpha$ equivalent width for the z2LARS galaxies.

In shallow surveys, bright knots of star formation, seen without low surface brightness connectors, could appear aligned and lead to the galaxy appearing more elongated. Figures 11 and 12 show ellipticity versus clumpiness for a few z2LARS for which these measurements are significant. They also show how those parameters change when measured in the range of surveys probed here. Quantitatively z2LARS galaxies tend to have lower




Fig. 8. Normalized surface brightness profiles of z2L01. The semi-major axis of an elliptical aperture is indicated as sma. Black points with error bars correspond to the surface brightness profile of the original LARS images in the rest-frame UV, optical, and $\text{Ly}\alpha$ line. The red squares represent the profiles at the limits of detection. The profiles indicated with circles(triangles) correspond to the deepest(intermediate) depth surveys. In the *upper left* panel we show the original rest-frame UV profile and the one at a depth of $m_{\text{rest-UV}} = 30, 29$ (cyan) and 28(red). In the *upper right* panel the original rest-frame optical profile, the one at a depth of $m_{\text{rest-optical}} = 29, 28, 27$ (cyan), and 26(red). In the *lower left* the original $\text{Ly}\alpha$ profile, the one at a depth of $F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 5\text{E-}19, 3\text{E-}18$ (cyan), and $8\text{E-}18$ (red), together with the deepest-survey rest-frame UV profile (green circle and line). In the *lower right* the $\text{H}\alpha$ profile at a depth of $F(\text{H}\alpha) = 2\text{E-}19, 6\text{E-}19$ (cyan), and $1\text{E-}18$ (red), together with the deepest-survey rest-frame optical profile (green circle and line) and the deepest-survey rest-frame UV profile (black line with error bars).




Fig. 9. *Left:* $rP20^{\text{ell}}$ (kpc) measured in the original LARS images as a function of the value from the high- z simulated ones. The 1:1 relation is shown as a dashed line. *Right:* $\Delta \text{size} = \frac{rP20^{\text{ell}}(z2\text{LARS}) - rP20^{\text{ell}}(\text{LARS})}{rP20^{\text{ell}}(\text{LARS})}$ as a function of $rP20^{\text{ell}}$ measured in the original LARS images. The black dashed line indicates $\Delta = 0$; the dashed blue, green, and red lines the median Δ values for $\text{Ly}\alpha$, rest-frame UV, and optical. Open circles indicate LARS-LAEs; blue, green, and red dots correspond to the measurements in $\text{Ly}\alpha$, rest-frame UV, and optical images.

ellipticity in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ than in the rest-frame UV, optical continuum, and $\text{H}\alpha$. Also, z2LARS-LAEs tend to show lower S than the other LARS galaxies in $\text{Ly}\alpha$.

On average the ellipticity values increase in a shallower and shallower survey when measured in the rest-frame optical. We

evaluate the correlation between depth and ellipticity or clumpiness by calculating the difference between the morphological parameter measured in shallow surveys and in the deepest one. In the sample of LARS galaxies, 70% show a Spearman probability $p \sim 0.0$ and coefficient $r \sim -1$ for the correlation of ellipticity.




Fig. 10. $\xi(\text{Ly}\alpha/\text{rest-UV})$ (left) and $\xi(\text{rest-optical}/\text{rest-UV})$ (right) measured in the original as a function of the regridded LARS images. Open circles indicate LARS-LAEs. The dashed line shows a 1:1 relation.




Fig. 11. Ellipticity as defined by SEx ($1-B/A$, where A and B are the semi-major and minor axes of the detection ellipse) as a function of clumpiness for the rest-frame UV and optical continuum. Diamonds represent z2LARS measurements in the deepest survey, triangle and circles in increasingly shallower surveys. Dashed line is a 1:1 relation drawn to aid the eye.




Fig. 12. Ellipticity versus clumpiness as in Fig. 11 for measurements performed in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ and $\text{H}\alpha$ images.




Fig. 13. *Left:* G^{rP20} vs. $M20$ measured in the rest-frame optical images of z2LARS (big diamonds). Open circles indicate z2LARS-LAEs. Data from the literature are presented as small symbols: LBGs detected in the *Hubble* Deep Field-North and measured by Lotz et al. (2004, green squares), passive and star-forming BzK (Lee et al. 2013, grey diamonds and yellow squares), and $z \sim 2.5$ SMGs (Aguirre et al. 2013, black circles), where the measurements are all performed on HST images. The dashed line indicates the separation between normal galaxies and merging systems by Lotz et al. (2008). *Right:* G^{rP20} vs. $M20$ measured in the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ images of z2LARS (big diamonds). The colour coding for LARS galaxies is as used throughout this paper. The dashed red line represents the rest-frame optical (*left panel*) separating region, drawn to guide the eye.

Also, 85% of the LARS galaxies show a correlation between depth and S estimated in the rest-optical. For the z2LARS-LAEs the ellipticity increases when measured in the rest-frame UV as well. Therefore, some of the high- z observations of large ellipticity and clumpy systems could be explained in terms of survey depth. Only a small change in S and ellipticity is seen in the $\text{H}\alpha$ images. In $\text{Ly}\alpha$ we generally measure a significant increase of S in shallow surveys. Of the LARS galaxies, 85% are characterized by a correlation between depth and S when measured in $\text{Ly}\alpha$. For a few galaxies the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ ellipticity also increases with the shallowness of the survey.

4.6. Morphological parameters of LARS at $z \sim 2$

As in the case of the original LARS images (Sect. 3.1), we performed non-parametric measurements of morphological parameters for z2LARS. To compare with high- z literature observations, we made use of the G vs. $M20$ diagram. We chose G^{rP20} which shows a better consistency for high- z comparisons (Scarlata et al. 2007). As shown in Appendix A, the pixel resampling has little effect on the measurements of G^{rP20} and $M20$ for LARS galaxies. The change of parameters owing to resampling has been studied in the literature by some groups (Lotz et al. 2006; Overzier et al. 2010; Huertas-Company et al. 2014; Petty et al. 2014). The changes for irregular galaxies are in agreement with our findings for LARS galaxies. The non-parametric measurements for all the simulated surveys probed here are presented in Table 6. The left panel of Fig. 13 shows that z2LARS have morphology consistent with that of merging system, like $z \sim 2.5$ SMGs and some of the LBGs studied by Lotz et al. (2004). They tend to be separated from the location of $z \sim 2$ sBzK and pBzK galaxies (Lee et al. 2013). Some z2LARS-LAEs show a larger G^{rP20} per $M20$ value than the other z2LARS.

Lotz et al. (2006) built a criterion to identify merging systems based on their rest-frame UV. Since the rest-frame UV tends to be more disturbed than the optical, they defined two main regions in the G - $M20$ diagram. The condition $M20 \geq -1.1$, typical of well-separated double or multiple bright nuclei, was used to identify major mergers, while the condition $M20 < -1.6$, $G > 0.6$ to identify bulge-dominated systems. The left panel of

Fig. 14 shows that z2LARS galaxies have morphologies similar to that of high- z LAEs and LBGs in the rest-frame UV, and tend to be less compact than SMGs. In this diagram L01, L08, and L14 have morphologies consistent with that of major-merger systems. The non-LAE z2LARS galaxies, similar to the majority of the star-forming galaxies at high redshift, are characterized by intermediate $M20$ values. In the right panel of Figs. 13 and 14, we present G^{rP20} vs. $M20$ measured in the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ images. The subsample of z2LARS-LAEs tend to have lower G^{rP20} and lower $M20$ in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ than in the rest-frame optical and UV. Some of the z2LARS non-LAEs tend to have a more distorted (composed of more than one clump) morphology in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ than in the continua. It can be seen in Table 6 that the morphology of LARS galaxies does not change significantly in the rest-frame optical when non-parametric measurements were performed in simulated surveys with depths comparable with the limits of detection (Table 4). For a few z2LARS, G^{rP20} and $M20$ vary in a way that they approach the dashed line drawn in Fig. 13. In the rest-frame UV, G^{rP20} and $M20$ become characterized by larger uncertainties, while in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ z2LARS become increasingly compact and less composed of multiple structures.

5. Stacking of regridded LARS images

As extensively described in Paper 0 and II, a significant fraction of the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ photons in LARS galaxies is emitted from haloes. These haloes begin in the inner few kpc and extend outward to scales larger than those characterizing localized star-forming regions. $\text{Ly}\alpha$ maps were shown in Paper II as well as maps of $\text{Ly}\alpha/\text{H}\alpha$ ratio and dust-reddening maps. Since $\text{H}\alpha$ photons are emitted directly from the HII regions (i.e., they do not scatter), a value of the $\text{Ly}\alpha/\text{H}\alpha$ ratio that exceeds that of case B recombination is most probably related to HI scattering. Dust reddening and HI scattering together can contribute to the situation in which the number of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ photons observed on a particular sight-line is reduced. The re-processing of ionizing photons (e.g., Humphrey et al. 2008) in a region of the galaxy different from that of the star formation could contribute to an additional production of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ photons and a possible extended $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission. In this case, however, $\text{H}\alpha$ radiation will also be




Fig. 14. *Left:* G^{rP20} vs. $M20$ measured in the rest-frame UV images of z2LARS (big diamonds). Open circles indicate z2LARS-LAEs. Small symbols are data from literature: LAEs and LBGs at $z > 6$ (Jiang et al. 2013, cyan diamonds), GOODS $z \sim 1.5$ and GOODS/UDF $z \sim 4$ galaxies (Lotz et al. 2006, grey circles and yellow triangles), mean values for $z \sim 3$ LBGs with and without $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission (Pentericci et al. 2010, red triangle and black cross), and $z \sim 2.5$ SMGs (Aguirre et al. 2013, black circles), where the measurements are all performed in HST images. For comparison we also show the local galaxies regridded to be at $z \sim 1.5$ by Lotz et al. (2006): an elliptical (open circle), an Sb (open triangle), an Scb (open square), and a merging galaxy (open star). The dashed lines indicate the criteria introduced by Lotz et al. (2006) to identify major mergers and bulge-dominated systems. *Right:* G^{rP20} vs. $M20$ measured the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ images of z2LARS (big diamonds). The dashed green lines represent the rest-frame UV (left panel) separating regions, drawn to aid the eye. The colour coding for LARS galaxies is the same as in Fig. 13.

produced at large radii by the same recombinations that make $\text{Ly}\alpha$. The availability of $\text{H}\alpha$ images, together with those of $\text{Ly}\alpha$, has favoured an interpretation in which HI scattering plays a key role in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission, but it has proven difficult to disentangle the contribution of other factors. However, HI scattering would also produce a certain degree of polarization in the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission (e.g., Humphrey et al. 2013b; Hayes et al. 2011). At high redshift, $\text{Ly}\alpha$ haloes have been detected only in a minority of cases, indicating that their detection is challenging.

5.1. Literature results

Rauch et al. (2008) stacked $\text{Ly}\alpha$ spectra of a sample of faint ($V > 25.5$ for 80% of the sample) spectroscopically detected galaxies at $2.67 < z < 3.75$, reaching a $\text{Ly}\alpha$ surface brightness limit of $\sim 2\text{E-}19 \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ arcsec}^{-2}$ at 1σ . The resulting $\text{Ly}\alpha$ profile extended up to ~ 30 kpc from the centre. Matsuda et al. (2012) stacked narrow-band images of large subsamples of LBGs, separated based on their environment. They found that galaxies in overdense regions tend to show $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission on scales up to 40–60 kpc, and are larger than those of isolated galaxies. This could imply that $\text{Ly}\alpha$ haloes follow the dark matter distribution. Steidel et al. (2011, hereafter S11) also stacked $\text{Ly}\alpha$ images of subsamples of LBGs at $z \sim 2.65$, segregated by $\text{Ly}\alpha$ equivalent width. The galaxies came from surveys of three different fields, which were also characterized by over-densities. The stack of the entire sample reached a $\text{Ly}\alpha$ surface brightness limit of $\sim 1\text{E-}19 \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ arcsec}^{-2}$ (1σ), while the LAE ($EW(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 20 \text{ \AA}$) subsample reached $\sim 2.4\text{E-}19 \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ arcsec}^{-2}$. They found that the stacked $\text{Ly}\alpha$ profiles had a characteristic size up to 9 times larger than the stellar continua. Their detected $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission extended up to 80 kpc from the centre of the stacked source.

By stacking images of 187 narrow-band selected $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emitters at $z \approx 2.07$, Feldmeier et al. (2013) found no evidence of extended $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission, but did observe a 5–8 kpc halo in a stack of about 200 LAEs at $z \approx 3.1$. These

field-galaxy stacks reached a $\text{Ly}\alpha$ surface brightness 1σ limit of just $9.9\text{E-}19 \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ arcsec}^{-2}$ at $z \approx 2.07$ and $6.2\text{E-}19 \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ arcsec}^{-2}$ at $z \approx 3.1$. Recently, Momose et al. (2014, hereafter M14) succeeded in detecting extended haloes, by stacking over 3500, 300, and 350 narrow-band detected LAEs at $z \sim 2.2$, ~ 3.1 , and $z \sim 5.7$ from Subaru surveys (not necessarily in overdense regions). They reached a $\text{Ly}\alpha$ surface brightness 1σ limit of $1.6\text{E-}20$, $1.7\text{E-}19$, and $5.5\text{E-}20 \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ arcsec}^{-2}$, respectively. Both these last two studies performed LAE selection in deep (5σ detection limit of 25 AB for Feldmeier; Guaita et al. 2010; Gronwall et al. 2007) and very deep (5σ detection limit of 25.1–25.7 AB for Momose; Nakajima et al. 2012) narrow-band images. Also, they treated the sources of uncertainty in a very careful way. However, the detected haloes ($r_e \sim 8$ kpc at $z = 2.2$) were not as extended as the ones claimed by S11 ($r_e \sim 25$ kpc at $z = 2.65$). A few attempts to detect $\text{Ly}\alpha$ haloes from individual high- z LAEs were performed by Bond et al. (2010) and Finkelstein et al. (2011a) in HST-filter images. Bond et al. (2010) presented a morphological study of LAE $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission at $z \approx 3.1$ (F502N filter, 1σ detection limit of $3\text{E-}17 \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ arcsec}^{-2}$ for 1 arcsec source). Their images were very shallow and did not show significant extended haloes ($\xi(\text{Ly}\alpha/\text{UV}) \sim 1$, Table 5). An estimation at $z \sim 4.5$ was presented in Finkelstein et al. (2011a) (F658N filter, 1σ detection limit of about $2\text{E-}18 \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ for 1 arcsec source). They studied $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission from three spectroscopically confirmed LAEs and found evidence of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ haloes in two of them ($\xi(\text{Ly}\alpha/\text{UV}) \sim 1.5$).

5.2. Stacking procedure and stacked surface brightness of LARS at high redshift

By following the steps listed in Sect. 2, we simulated the appearance of LARS galaxies at $z \sim 2$ and $z \approx 5.7$. After adding noise to the simulated high- z images, we stacked the observations of individual galaxies the same way it is done at high redshift to increase the signal-to-noise. We used the

Table 7. Size of stacked Ly α and continuum images.

LARS stack	$r_{\text{circ}}^{\text{SEx}}$ kpc	$r_{\text{P20}}^{\text{ell}}$ kpc	$r_{\text{P20}}^{\text{circ}}$ kpc	$r_{\text{P20}}^{\text{minA}}$ kpc	r_{20} kpc	r_{50} kpc	r_{80} kpc
$z \sim 2$							
$F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 5\text{E-19}$							
LARS-LAE	5.26	6.67	6.00	3.34	1.33	2.67	5.34
LARSaverage	8.05	> 12	> 12	8.01	2.84	7.84	> 12
$F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 3\text{E-18}$							
LARS-LAE	3.55	6.84	5.00	3.67	1.50	2.67	5.67
LARSaverage	4.84	> 12	> 12	7.00	2.84	7.34	> 12
$F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 2\text{E-17}$							
LARS-LAE	2.16	4.00	5.34	3.67	1.17	2.50	4.00
LARSaverage	2.54	7.00	9.01	4.00	1.83	3.84	6.84
$z \simeq 5.7$							
$F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 5\text{E-19}$							
LARS-LAE	2.40	4.70	6.34	3.52	1.17	2.35	4.35
LARSaverage	2.72	11.98	11.75	5.87	2.11	5.17	10.34
$F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 3\text{E-18}$							
LARS-LAE	0.81	4.35	3.52	2.82	1.29	2.47	4.11
LARSaverage	0.82	5.05	3.29	4.70	1.76	3.17	5.17
$z \sim 2$							
$m_{\text{rest-UV}} = 30$							
LARS-LAE	2.28	2.17	1.33	1.33	0.50	1.00	1.83
LARSaverage	3.09	4.34	3.00	1.67	0.67	1.50	3.50
$z \simeq 5.7$							
$m_{\text{rest-UV}} = 30$							
LARS-LAE	1.28	1.88	1.41	0.94	0.35	0.82	1.53
LARSaverage	1.45	3.76	1.64	1.17	0.59	1.29	3.29

Notes. Size measurements from elliptical and circular aperture photometry. For three(two) simulated survey depths, we reported the Ly α emission sizes of the two stacks (LARS-LAE, LARSaverage) at $z \sim 2$ ($z \simeq 5.7$). We also reported the continuum emission sizes of the two stacks in the lower part of the table at a 10σ detection limit of $m_{\text{rest-UV}} = 30.0$. $F(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ is given in $\text{erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}$.

IMCOMBINE task in *iraf.images.immatch* to (average) stack every galaxy at the position of SExtractor centroid. We generated an average (LARSaverage), median stack of all the twelve high- z LARS galaxies (like in M11), and also an average stack of the six LARS-LAEs. It was only meaningful to look at the stacked profiles up to 12 kpc, which was the physical scale probed by the ACS/SBC detector common to all LARS images. However, narrow-band observations at high redshift are able to probe much larger scales. As the median stack provided very similar results as the average one, we only reported results from the LARS-LAE and LARSaverage stacks in the tables and figures. We chose to combine individual galaxy frames from simulated survey depth of $F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 5\text{E-19}$, 3E-18 , 2E-17 , and $1\text{E-15} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}$. The central value of $F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 2\text{E-17}$ is comparable to recent ground-based narrow-band surveys. The shallowest value was chosen to match the depth of Bond et al. (2010). At this depth we did not detect any Ly α emission from the stacks. The final depths depended on the number of sources in the stack, $F(\text{Ly}\alpha)/\sqrt{12}$ for LARSaverage and $F(\text{Ly}\alpha)/\sqrt{6}$ for LARS-LAEs. We applied the same code we ran on the individual z2LARS galaxies to obtain surface brightness profiles (Fig. 15) and sizes (Table 7) of the stacks at $z \sim 2$ and $z \simeq 5.7$. The LARS-LAE Ly α profile was the most peaked in the centre, and was also the most affected by background noise at large radii. The Sérsic indices of the LARS-LAE stack profiles were found to be 3.4 and 2.1, while the ones of the LARSaverage stacks are 2.5 and 2.0 at $z \sim 2$ and $z \simeq 5.7$, respectively.

We find that a depth of $F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 5\text{E-19} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}$ ($\sim 1.4\text{E-19} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}$ after stacking twelve sources) enables

us to recover Ly α haloes in the stacks of LARS galaxies at both $z \sim 2$ and $z \simeq 5.7$. A depth of $F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 2\text{E-17} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}$ ($\sim 5.8\text{E-18} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}$ after stacking twelve sources) is more realistic in terms of current surveys. Even the brightest galaxy (L14) would hardly be detectable individually. In a simulated $z \simeq 5.7$ survey with depth of $F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 3\text{E-18} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}$ ($\sim 0.9\text{E-18} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}$ after stacking twelve sources), the Ly α surface brightness profile reached the level of the background noise at a radius of 5 kpc.

In Fig. 16 we compare the rest-frame UV and Ly α line surface brightness. The figure shows that the UV profiles for the LARS-LAEs and LARSaverage stacks are very similar. They are also steeper than any other Ly α -stack at both redshifts, showing Sérsic indices $n \sim 9$ and $n \sim 11$ at $z \sim 2$ and $z \simeq 5.7$, respectively. The consequence of this is that the sizes of the Ly α -stacks are generally larger than the continuum ones (Paper 0, Table 7). The profile of the LARSaverage stack (composed of both $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 20 \text{ \AA}$ and $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha) < 20 \text{ \AA}$ sources) was also shallower and more extended than that of the LARS-LAEs; i.e. the Ly α emission of the LARS-LAE stack was more compact. As we described in Sect. 3.2, there are no unique conditions for Ly α photons to escape or unique morphologies. The conditions that make a galaxy a Ly α emitter (mainly Ly α flux concentrated around rest-frame UV bright star-forming regions) produce a consistent surface brightness profile, while variations in the dust and HI contents and distributions, which made Ly α photons eventually escape along the line of sight, produce a more complex, patchy, and extended emission.




Fig. 15. $\text{Ly}\alpha$ surface brightness profiles of the two stacks: LARS-LAE (upper) and LARSaverage (lower; see text for details). Left and right panels show the profiles at $z \sim 2$ and 5.7 , respectively, corresponding to three and two 10σ detection limits (blue circles, stars, and triangles). The cyan solid line represents the LARS-LAE profile of the deepest simulated survey and it is shown in the lower panels for comparison. The difference in the surface brightnesses in the left and right panels is the result of surface brightness dimming. The error bars correspond to the shallowest survey in each panel; for the other depths they are usually smaller than the symbols. The large error bars at $\text{sma} > 5$ kpc are produced by background noise.




Fig. 16. Left: surface brightness profiles for $\text{Ly}\alpha$ (units of $\text{erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2} \text{kpc}^{-2}$) at $z \sim 2$ (upper panel). LARS-LAEs are shown with the cyan circles and line, and LARSaverage with (blue triangles). Rest UV profiles (units of $\text{erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2} \text{kpc}^{-2} \text{\AA}^{-1}$) are shown for the LARS-LAE sample (green stars) and LARSaverage (green line with errorbars). The lower panel shows the equivalent profiles at $z = 5.7$. Right: from the upper left to the lower right: $\text{Ly}\alpha$ for the LARS-LAE and LARSaverage stacks; rest-frame UV continuum for LARS-LAEs and LARSaverage. The logarithmic colour scale is adjusted to match the background level. The elongated structures in the LARSaverage continuum frame come from L09 (vertical) and L11 (diagonal). The whitish structures in the LARSaverage $\text{Ly}\alpha$ come from the same galaxies, which are weak $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emitters but show strong absorption centrally. The cut-out size is about 15 kpc.

5.3. Ground-based PSF convolution and stacking of LARS at high redshift

To be able to properly compare with current observations at $z \sim 2$ and $z \approx 5.7$, we convolved LARS images with ground-based PSF (Fig. 17). As the ground-based PSF is much larger than the HST one, we applied a Gaussian

kernel with $\sigma = \text{PSF}(\text{pixel})/2.3548$, using the GAUSS task in *iraf.images.imfilter*. Feldmeier et al. (2013) data at $z \approx 2.07$ exhibited a $1.4''$ PSF in narrow-band observation and $1''$ in the broad band. S11 observations at $z \approx 2.64$ were performed in similar weather conditions ($\text{PSF} = 0.8''\text{--}1.2''$). The measurements reported in M14 were performed on frames smoothed to a $\text{FWHM} = 1.32''$. To be able to compare with their observations

Table 8. Size of the LARS-LAE stack convolved with ground-based PSF.

LARS stack	$r_{\text{circ}}^{\text{SEx}}$ kpc	$r_{\text{P20}}^{\text{ell}}$ kpc	$r_{\text{P20}}^{\text{circ}}$ kpc	$r_{\text{P20}}^{\text{minA}}$ kpc	r_{20} kpc	r_{50} kpc	r_{80} kpc
$z \sim 2$							
$F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 5\text{E-}19$							
LARS-LAE	5.26	6.67	6.00	3.34	1.33	2.67	5.34
Feldmeier2013, r_n						5.4	
LARS-LAE, PSF, F	9.40	9.51	9.34	6.00	3.00	5.00	7.84
Momose2014, r_n						7.9	
LARS-LAE, PSF, M	9.21	9.34	9.01	5.67	2.84	4.84	7.67
Steidel2011, r_n^{LAOnly}						28.4	
$m_{\text{rest-UV}} = 30$							
LARS-LAE	2.28	2.17	1.33	1.33	0.50	1.00	1.83
LARS-LAE, PSF, F	5.69	5.50	5.34	> 12	2.00	3.34	4.67
LARS-LAE, PSF, M	6.40	6.67	6.67	4.34	2.50	4.00	5.67
Steidel2011, r_n^{LAOnly}						2.9	
$z \simeq 5.7$							
$F(\text{Ly}\alpha) = 5\text{E-}19$							
LARS-LAE	2.40	4.70	6.34	3.52	1.17	2.35	4.35
Momose2014, r_n						5.9	
LARS-LAE, PSF, M	6.60	9.28	7.99	4.70	2.35	4.11	7.28
$m_{\text{rest-UV}} = 30$							
LARS-LAE	1.28	1.88	1.41	0.94	0.35	0.82	1.53
LARS-LAE, PSF, M	5.59	5.99	7.52	4.46	2.00	3.29	4.93

Notes. Sizes for the LARS-LAE stack before and after convolving with Feldmeier et al. (2013) (PSF, F) and Momose et al. (2014) (PSF, M) ground-based PSF. The values correspond to the Ly α and rest-frame UV continuum images. For reference we report the e-folding parameters of the best-fit exponential profile, $I(r)$, of the observed surface brightness by Feldmeier et al. (2013), by Momose et al. (2014), and by Steidel et al. (2011), where $I(r) \propto \exp(-r/r_n)$ and $r \gtrsim 10$ kpc.




Fig. 17. Left: Ly α surface brightness, $I(r)$, of the $z \sim 2$ LARS-LAE and LARSaverage stacks, before convolution with ground-based PSF (cyan circles and blue triangles). The PSF-convolved LARS-LAE stack is shown with the cyan line. The ground-based PSF profile from Feldmeier et al. (2013) is shown as a black line. The blue and red dashed-dotted lines represent the circumgalactic medium, as fit by Steidel et al. (2011) and Momose et al. (2014) at $z \simeq 2.2$, we extrapolated inwards. The blue and red solid lines represent the $I(r)$ fit on scales of 10–20 kpc derived from Fig. 9 of Steidel et al. (2011) and Fig. 3 of Momose et al. (2014). Middle: luminosity per kpc^2 for our PSF-convolved LARS-LAE stack in Ly α (cyan line), for the ground-based PSF profile from Feldmeier et al. (2013, black line), for the 10–20-kpc-scale fit from Steidel et al. (2011, blue line) and Momose et al. (2014, red line). Right: Ly α surface brightness of the $z \simeq 5.7$ LARS-LAE and LARSaverage stacks before convolving with ground-based PSF (cyan circles and blue triangles) together with that of the PSF-convolved LARS-LAE stack (cyan line). The red dashed-dotted line represents the circumgalactic medium fit by Momose et al. (2014) at $z \simeq 5.7$, we extended inwards. The red line shows the fit on scales of 5–15 kpc derived from Fig. 3 of Momose et al. (2014).

at both $z \simeq 2.2$ and $z \simeq 5.7$, we convolved line and continuum images with that same Gaussian kernel, before stacking. This convolution produced a profile close to Gaussian in the stacked images of both continuum and Ly α ; the central peak was suppressed and, as a consequence, the profile became shallower. However, the stacked Ly α profile remained more extended than that of the rest-frame UV (Table 8).

In the studies mentioned earlier the surface brightness of the circumgalactic medium (CGM) was estimated by fitting an exponential curve to radial profiles that excluded the first 2'' (~ 17 kpc at $z \sim 2$ and ~ 11 kpc at $z \sim 5.7$). Inside the first

2'', emission from the interstellar medium (ISM) dominates over that from the CGM. Moreover, the ground-based PSF will most likely dominate on these (and smaller) scales.

A fair comparison with high- z observations should have been performed to radii larger than those allowed by our HST observations, in which we mainly detected Ly α photons coming also from the interstellar media. Looking at Fig. 9 of S11 and Fig. 3 of M14, we derived the high- z Ly α profiles on scales of 10–20 ($z \sim 2$) and 5–15 ($z \simeq 5.7$) kpc, resembling the profiles typical of high- z interstellar media, with some contribution from the PSF. We show them in Fig. 17, labelled as

“Steidel ISM” and “Momose ISM”. The surface brightness of M14 stacked sample at $z \simeq 2.2$ was more than one order of magnitude fainter than Steidel’s and ours. LARS surface brightness profile was as bright as Steidel’s one and steeper than S11 and M14 samples. The characteristic scale of a fitted exponential profile, $I(r) \propto \exp(-r/r_n)$ was $r_n = 4$, almost half the value we calculated for S11 and M14 ISM profiles. At $z \sim 5.7$ we obtained a similar slope profile as in M14, with $r_n \sim 2.7$.

6. Discussion

In Sect. 3, we have presented the morphological properties of LARS galaxies; in Sect. 4, we have described the results of the test of simulating LARS galaxies at $z \sim 2$, following the methods explained in Sect. 2; in Sect. 5, we have performed the stacking of individual LARS galaxy frames to simulate their typical extended Ly α emission at $z \sim 2$ and $z \simeq 5.7$. Here we discuss the main results.

6.1. Local Universe LARS

As described in Paper II, LARS galaxies are irregular, star-forming galaxies. Compared to the non-LAE LARS galaxies, the LARS-LAEs are younger and are characterized by lower star-formation rates, by Ly α escape fractions larger than 10% (except L08), by low dust content in terms of the ratio H α /H β , and by lower masses. Figures 2 and 3 tell us that the LARS galaxies have sizes, stellar masses, and rest-frame absolute magnitudes similar to those of LBAs, and that they are also comparable to $2 < z < 3$ star-forming galaxies. The stellar masses of the LARS galaxies tend to be larger than those estimated for LAEs at $z \sim 2$ –3. Even if most of the LARS-LAEs have Ly α luminosities twice fainter than those of high- z Ly α emitters, they have stellar masses and sizes comparable to those of the subsample of the most massive LAEs from Guaita et al. (2011) and Bond et al. (2012). Therefore, LARS galaxies are analogues of 10^9 – $10^{11} M_\odot$ high- z star-forming galaxies; they also share some properties with the most massive Ly α emitters at high z .

The ratio between half-light radii estimated in the rest-frame optical and rest-frame UV have been adopted in the literature to identify the presence of multiple stellar populations. Within LARS, this ratio varies from 0.8 to 3, with a median value larger than 1 (~ 1.4). This shows that the young stellar populations are more localized than the old ones, consistent with the findings for $z \sim 2$ SMGs (Swinbank et al. 2010), sBzK (Yuma et al. 2012), and star-forming galaxies at $1.4 < z < 2.9$ (Bond et al. 2011).

The optical morphologies of LARS are typical of irregular or starburst galaxies and merging systems. They vary from the typical of early-stage mergers to closely-gathered clumps of intense star-formation. G and M20 are smaller when measured in Ly α than in the rest-frame UV. However, they are comparable when measured in the rest-frame optical and in Ly α (Fig. 6). This indicates quantitatively that the Ly α emission of LARS galaxies is generally characterized by one component in a structure that tends to be more extended in Ly α than in the bright UV continuum and seems to follow the entire galaxy stellar populations. Also, the LARS-LAEs are the ones characterized by the highest concentration, lowest asymmetry and lowest clumpiness in Ly α . A Ly α emitting galaxy with these properties would easily satisfy the $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ requirement adopted at high redshift to identify Ly α emitters.

With the aim of identifying any continuum morphological property that characterizes Ly α emitters and star-forming

galaxies, we study the correlations between morphological and physical parameters in Table 9. The LARS galaxies characterized by larger $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ tend to be smaller in the rest-frame UV and optical than the other galaxies. They also present a more symmetric Ly α emission. The galaxies which are younger ($\text{Age} \leq 10$ Myr), less massive ($M_* < 10^{10} M_\odot$), and characterized by larger specific star-formation rate (dust-corrected $sSFR_{UV} > -9.3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$) tend to present larger Gini coefficient for a fixed M20 value. These are mainly the LARS-LAEs where the merging components appear separated, like in early-stage mergers. In Fig. 18 we show the G vs. M20 diagram, in which the colour scale corresponds to the integrated physical parameters (Paper II).

In Ly α , LARS-LAEs tend to be composed of one bulge-like component and to harbour lower S and ellipticity. The other LARS galaxies are composed of patchy Ly α emission (see also Appendix B). Some LARS galaxies with large $E(B-V)_{\text{neb}}$ tend to be characterized by the lowest M20 in the rest-frame optical, typical of a bulge-like morphology. According to these results, it seems that early-stage mergers could be characterized by younger stellar populations and symmetrical, somewhat homogeneous Ly α emissions, which could satisfy high- z LAE selections. Late-stage mergers could instead be characterized by turbulent star-formation episodes and, as a consequence, patchy Ly α emissions, just like the ones observed within one galaxy with numerous star-forming regions. This may indicate that the clumpy Ly α emitting galaxies observed at high redshift (Bond et al. 2012; Gronwall et al. 2011; Shibuya et al. 2014) could also be experiencing early-stage merging events (Cooke et al. 2010). Of the twelve LARS galaxies, whose continuum morphologies are consistent with them being merging systems, six are LAEs. This does not mean that every observed LAE must necessarily be a merging system (Shibuya et al. 2014; Law et al. 2012). However, we can not verify the claim by Shibuya et al. (2014) that mergers are rare in LAEs with $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 100 \text{ \AA}$, because LARS galaxies all present lower Ly α equivalent widths.

6.2. LARS galaxies simulated to be at $z \sim 2$

To investigate the detectability of LARS galaxies and haloes at high redshift, we performed simulations. The LARS galaxies were resampled at $z \sim 2$ as described in Sect. 2.3. We find that the effects of pixel resampling and simulated survey noise are dependent on the irregular structures of each individual galaxy.

First of all we defined the detection limits in the continuum and line images (Table 4). In a survey shallower than the detection limit, the background noise dominates the continuum and line surface brightness profiles. Interestingly all LARS galaxies would be detected in the rest-frame UV in surveys like HUDF09 and GOODS, and at the rest-frame optical in a survey like CANDELS (deep), if located at $z \sim 2$. However, even more interesting is that Ly α emission extended up to 5 kpc would be visible in 70% of the sample at a 10σ depth of $3\text{E-}18 \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ (Table 5 and Appendix C). The LARS galaxies characterized by the faintest integrated Ly α flux show an even more extended emission. This should be taken into account when designing Ly α spectroscopic observations (see also the discussion in Paper I), which aim to detect as much of the Ly α flux as possible. In the current Ly α surveys (typically characterized by $F(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 2\text{E-}17 \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$) only L14, the brightest LARS-LAE, would be detected. Even if the Ly α size can be as large as 5 times the UV, the extremely detailed Ly α structures (Figs. 1 and 7) could only be identified in the original HST-resolution images.

Table 9. Spearman coefficient and probability of the correlations between morphological and physical parameters.

Parameter	rP20 ^{ell}	$G^{SB-rP20S}$	M20	$C^{min}A$	A	S	ell	$\xi(\text{Ly}\alpha/\text{rest-UV})$
Rest-UV								
<i>EW</i> (Ly α)	(−0.64, 0.03)	(0.25, 0.44)	(0.49, 0.11)	(−0.20, 0.53)	(0.22, 0.50)	(−0.29, 0.37)	(−0.11, 0.74)	
<i>fesc</i> (Ly α)	(−0.22, 0.48)	(0.24, 0.45)	(0.43, 0.16)	(0.09, 0.77)	(0.38, 0.22)	(0.01, 0.98)	(0.18, 0.59)	
Age	(0.52, 0.08)	(0.01, 0.98)	(−0.41, 0.18)	(0.11, 0.75)	(0.20, 0.54)	(0.68, 0.01)	(0.30, 0.34)	
<i>sSFRuv_corr</i>	(−0.57, 0.05)	(0.07, 0.84)	(0.25, 0.43)	(0.00, 0.99)	(−0.30, 0.34)	(−0.74, 0.01)	(−0.16, 0.61)	
M_*	(0.74, 0.01)	(0.06, 0.86)	(−0.33, 0.30)	(−0.02, 0.96)	(0.09, 0.78)	(0.63, 0.03)	(0.16, 0.62)	
<i>E</i> ($B - V$)neb	(0.01, 0.97)	(−0.44, 0.15)	(−0.20, 0.53)	(−0.23, 0.48)	(−0.31, 0.32)	(−0.13, 0.69)	(−0.42, 0.17)	
Rest-optical								
<i>EW</i> (Ly α)	(−0.60, 0.04)	(0.24, 0.46)	(−0.03, 0.93)	(−0.57, 0.05)	(−0.13, 0.70)	(−0.36, 0.25)	(−0.18, 0.57)	
<i>fesc</i> (Ly α)	(−0.38, 0.22)	(0.11, 0.73)	(0.24, 0.44)	(−0.31, 0.33)	(0.01, 0.98)	(0.03, 0.93)	(0.24, 0.46)	
Age	(0.58, 0.05)	(−0.62, 0.03)	(0.05, 0.88)	(−0.17, 0.60)	(−0.39, 0.21)	(0.26, 0.42)	(0.01, 0.98)	
<i>sSFRuv_corr</i>	(−0.69, 0.01)	(0.62, 0.03)	(−0.16, 0.62)	(0.08, 0.81)	(0.50, 0.10)	(−0.27, 0.40)	(−0.01, 0.98)	
M_*	(0.66, 0.02)	(−0.55, 0.07)	(0.24, 0.46)	(0.21, 0.51)	(−0.13, 0.70)	(0.36, 0.25)	(0.14, 0.66)	
<i>E</i> ($B - V$)neb	(0.08, 0.81)	(−0.32, 0.31)	(−0.42, 0.17)	(0.20, 0.54)	(−0.10, 0.75)	(−0.18, 0.58)	(−0.41, 0.18)	
Ly α								
<i>EW</i> (Ly α)	(−0.22, 0.53)	(0.51, 0.09)	(0.03, 0.93)	(0.59, 0.04)	(−0.70, 0.01)	(−0.61, 0.04)	(−0.42, 0.17)	(0.25, 0.49)
<i>fesc</i> (Ly α)	(−0.52, 0.13)	(0.20, 0.53)	(0.42, 0.17)	(0.18, 0.57)	(−0.67, 0.02)	(−0.76, 0.00)	(−0.19, 0.56)	(−0.22, 0.53)
Age	(−0.01, 0.99)	(0.60, 0.04)	(0.22, 0.50)	(−0.32, 0.31)	(0.61, 0.04)	(0.84, 0.00)	(0.57, 0.05)	(−0.24, 0.51)
<i>sSFRuv_corr</i>	(0.02, 0.96)	(0.65, 0.02)	(−0.38, 0.23)	(0.27, 0.40)	(−0.56, 0.06)	(−0.90, 0.00)	(−0.54, 0.07)	(0.49, 0.15)
M_*	(−0.03, 0.93)	(−0.45, 0.14)	(0.31, 0.33)	(−0.50, 0.10)	(0.76, 0.00)	(0.80, 0.00)	(0.56, 0.06)	(−0.47, 0.17)
<i>E</i> ($B - V$)neb	(0.53, 0.12)	(−0.19, 0.55)	(−0.34, 0.29)	(0.02, 0.95)	(0.52, 0.08)	(0.57, 0.05)	(−0.06, 0.85)	(0.31, 0.38)

Notes. The number pairs in the table correspond to the Spearman coefficient, r , and probability, p , for the correlations between physical (column, y) and morphological (row, x) parameters, measured in the rest-frame UV, optical, and Ly α images. For instance, for $x = G^{SB-rP20S}$ and $y = sSFRuv_corr$, the Spearman (x, y) calculation tells us that the probability that x and y are uncorrelated datasets is only $p = 3\%$ and there is a positive ($r = 0.62$) correlation. Bold face indicates the most significant correlations.

Second of all we quantified the morphological parameters of high- z LARS galaxies. The z2LARS-LAEs tend to be smaller in the rest-frame UV, optical, and H α than the other LARS galaxies. This is consistent with the observed high- z findings (Gronwall et al. 2011; Bond et al. 2012). Also, the z2LARS-LAEs present a large range of asymmetry values in UV and optical, but do show symmetric morphologies of Ly α emission.

The low surface brightness structures tend to disappear within the background in shallow surveys, making a clumpier and sometimes more elliptical galaxy in the continuum. As a consequence the ellipticity values we measured in the rest-frame UV and optical of z2LARS-LAEs increase as the survey depth decreased. Also, the continuum clumpiness tends to significantly increase. Some of the high- z observations of large ellipticity and clumpy systems could be explained in terms of depth (Gronwall et al. 2011; Bond et al. 2012), but we cannot explain the decrease in the merger fraction and ellipticity for $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 100 \text{ \AA}$ LAEs found by Shibuya et al. (2014). However, the clumpiness measured in Ly α also increases for decreasing survey depth (Figs. B.1–B.3), making the integrated EW more difficult to estimate. This happens for the LARS-LAEs as well, which eventually become close to impossible to detect as Ly α emitters. In our sample L08 is the LARS galaxy with the lowest rest-frame optical ellipticity in the original, high- z simulated, and shallow-survey images. It is a massive face-on irregular galaxy in the rest-frame optical, with multiple star-formation clumps seen in the rest-frame UV (Fig. B.2), but it is characterized by the lowest $EW(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ among the LARS-LAEs.

Continuum G and M20 values are preserved after pixel resampling and adding noise (see also Appendix A). Therefore, we adopted these two parameters for characterizing LARS galaxies at high redshift (Fig. 13). LARS galaxies have a morphology consistent with merging systems even when simulated at high z .

Some z2LARS-LAEs have both rest-frame optical and UV morphologies consistent with being mergers (Fig. 14).

The asymmetry we estimated decreases after adding noise. A merger information calculated just adopting a large-asymmetry criterion could lead to a mis-interpretation of our sample in a shallow survey. This was also noticed in Shibuya et al. (2014), Gronwall et al. (2011) for low signal-to-noise sources.

In general the Ly α morphology tends to be significantly affected in shallow surveys, because Ly α detailed structures are very sensitive to depth and resolution.

6.3. Ly α haloes of LARS galaxies and their implications

There is still open debate about the conditions necessary for the formation of Ly α haloes in high- z galaxies, but it seems that HI scattering is the main factor at the scale of LARS galaxies (Paper II). At high redshift, Ly α halo studies have been performed in stacked data obtained from various samples of galaxies. To be able to compare with high- z results, we simulated how the Ly α haloes of LARS galaxies would appear at $z \sim 2$ and $z \simeq 5.7$. This was performed by stacking subsamples of our galaxies and assuming a range of survey depths. In this test we have the advantage of knowing the original morphology and halo profile.

By simply examining the RGB mosaics in Fig. 1, we see that stacking images with very different irregular structures can be very complicated, but it is commonly done at high redshift to increase the signal-to-noise. Background noise, survey depth, and ground-based PSF are the primary limits of the detection of Ly α haloes. We find that a depth comparable to the M14 survey is ideal to recover these haloes at both $z \sim 2$ and $z \simeq 5.7$ (see Sect. 5.1, Fig. 15). The stacked Ly α surface brightness profile of the LARS-LAEs is peaked in the centre, whereas the

LARSaverage stack contains contributions from more diverse (asymmetric, patchy, and eventually more extended) Ly α morphologies; the result is a more irregular and extended profile. It seems reasonable that the conditions under which a galaxy may emit Ly α (mainly Ly α flux concentrated around the UV-bright knots of star formation), would produce a consistent surface brightness profile. However, variations in the dust and HI contents and distributions, which may cause Ly α photons escape along the line of sight ($EW(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 0 \text{ \AA}$, but not necessarily $> 20 \text{ \AA}$), would produce a more complex, patchy, and extended emission. This is seen in the LARSaverage stack and also in the stack observed in high- z LBGs.

Ground-based observations of high- z galaxies allow us to construct Ly α profiles which extend much farther from the centre (see S11 and M14) than low- z galaxies observed with the HST. The continuum subtraction procedure (Hayes et al. 2009), described in Paper II to isolate Ly α emission, takes advantage of the HST resolution to provide a detailed Ly α mapping within and just outside the interstellar medium. Within the first 10 kpc Ly α scattering already begins to produce halo-like structures in LARS galaxies, while it is at radii above 10–20 kpc that high- z studies are performed because no spatial information is available inside the PSF. A fair comparison between low and high- z observations could only be made by applying the same procedure to extract Ly α from the rest-frame UV emission at high redshift and by investigating the medium on the same scales and the same PSF conditions.

We convolved our HST images with typical ground-based PSFs and compared our smoothed Ly α profile with ground-based observations at comparable scales. Even in this case the $z \sim 2$ LARS Ly α stacked profile is steeper than the one derived for the complete sample by M14 and for the LAE-only subsample of S11. In Feldmeier’s survey, the LARS Ly α profile would be indistinguishable from the ground-based PSF on scales larger than 6 kpc. At $z \sim 5.7$, LARS Ly α profile is as steep as the one from M14, which is brighter than the profile they obtained at $z \sim 2$.

With LARS we cannot probe as large scale as the current high- z observations do, due to smaller field-of-view of HST. However, we could still expect some differences between LARS and Feldmeier’s sample because of observational depth, and between LARS and the S11 sample because LARS are not located in overdense regions. Also, we may expect differences between LARS and M14 sample at large scale due to the difference in physical properties of the two samples.

The $z \simeq 2.2$ LAE sample studied by Momose et al. is characterized by dust reddening ($E(B - V) < 0.1$), metallicity ($Z \sim 0.2 Z_{\odot}$), and stellar mass ($M_{*} < 10^{10} M_{\odot}$) lower than LARS. Since Ly α photons are sensitive to the presence of dust grains and to the scattering on neutral hydrogen (e.g., Paper II), Ly α morphology (extension and features) is expected to depend on the larger dust and HI contents (Paper III and Rivera-Thorsen et al. 2015). The dust grains, able to absorb Ly α photons close to the knots of star-formation, also prevent their escape at large scales, where HI scattering plays the role of making haloes. There are other phenomena, such as gas kinematics, we are investigating within the LARS survey, which could favour the escape of Ly α photons from the HII regions and ultimately allow the formation of Ly α haloes. Rivera-Thorsen et al. (2015), Duval et al. (in prep.), and Orlitová et al. (in prep.) are dedicated to studying the gas kinematics in LARS galaxies from HST spectroscopy.

7. Conclusions

This paper is the fourth of a series. In this work we have characterized and quantitatively studied the morphology of a sample of starburst galaxies at $z < 0.2$: the Lyman alpha reference sample, LARS.

- LARS galaxies have continuum sizes and stellar masses similar to those of local Lyman break analogues and $2 < z < 3$ star-forming galaxies. The stellar mass and luminosities also match the two samples, respectively. Therefore, LARS galaxies can be studied as a reference of 10^9 – $10^{11} M_{\odot}$ high- z star-forming galaxies; they also share some properties with the most massive Ly α emitters at high redshift.
- The rest-frame optical morphology of LARS galaxies is the typical of merging systems. This is also valid for the LAEs within LARS.
- For the first time we were able to quantify the morphology of Ly α emission. LARS-LAEs are on average characterized by more concentrated and symmetrical, while LARS non-LAEs can present patchier and irregular Ly α emissions. LARS-LAEs are more compact in Ly α , even when regridded to high redshift.
- We have simulated LARS galaxies at high redshift and explored their detection: all LARS galaxies would be detected in the continuum in current deep surveys, but they would not be easily detected in the current Ly α surveys at $z \sim 2$.
- In a shallow survey, it is the morphology of Ly α that is most affected by background noise, because the detailed Ly α structures strongly depend on depth and resolution. This may affect high- z Ly α observations.
- The measured ellipticity and clumpiness tend to increase in shallow surveys for most of the LARS galaxies. This could explain some of the high- z observations of large ellipticity and clumpy systems in LAE samples.
- We stacked the Ly α images of LARS galaxies simulated at high redshift. The LARS-LAE stack is peaked in the centre, whereas the LARSaverage stack contains contributions from more diverse Ly α morphologies resulting in a more irregular and extended profile. Variations in the dust and HI contents and distributions may produce more complex, patchy, and extended emission like the one seen in the LARSaverage stack and also in the stack observed in high- z LBGs.
- The Ly α haloes we study in LARS galaxies probe much-smaller-scale media than high- z observations. We find that LARS-halo-profile slope is steeper than $z \sim 2$ and as steep as with $z \simeq 5.7$ observations at ~ 10 -kpc scales, after applying ground-based PSF.

A sample like LARS, at slightly larger redshift, could allow studying circumgalactic medium-scale haloes and relating them to other galaxy properties. Physical properties (as presented in Paper II), HI-mass estimations (from Paper III), and kinematics (analysed in Rivera-Thorsen et al. 2015; Duval et al., in prep., and Orlitová et al., in prep.) already helped in clarifying the Ly α -photon propagation within the interstellar medium. With the large-scale halo information we would be able to also investigate the mechanisms that transport Ly α photons from the interstellar to the circumgalactic medium.

Acknowledgements. We thank the Referee, Andrew Humphrey, for giving us useful comments which have improved our manuscript. We would also like to thank Nick Bond, Claudia Scarlata, Masami Ouchi and his research group, Suraphong Yuma, Rieko Momose, Takatoshi Shibuya, Yoshiaki Ono, and Caryl Gronwall for useful discussions; Shiyin Shen and Christopher J. Conselice

for key inputs on size and morphological parameter measurements. L.G. sincerely thanks Eric Gawiser and Nelson Padilla for their *always* useful comments and support. G.Ö. and M.H. acknowledge financial support from the Swedish Research 4 Council (VR) and the Swedish National Space Board (SNSB). J.E.G. acknowledges research funding from the Wenner-Gren Foundations. J.M.M.H. has been funded by MINECO grant AYA2012-39362-C02-01. H.O.F. was funded by a post-doctoral UNAM grant and is currently granted by a Cátedra CONACyT para Jóvenes Investigadores. I.O. has been supported by GACR grant 14-20666P of Czech Science Foundation, and long-term institutional grant RVO:67985815. P.L. acknowledges support from the ERC-StG grant EGG-278202. Dark Cosmology Centre is funded by DNRF. D.K. has been financially supported by the CNES (Centre National d'Études Spatiales)/ CNRS 131425 grant. H.A. was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) advanced grant "Light on the Dark" (LIDA) and the Centre National d'Études Spatiales (CNES).

References

- Acquaviva, V., Vargas, C., Gawiser, E., & Guaita, L. 2012, *ApJ*, **751**, L26
- Adamo, A., Östlin, G., Bastian, N., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, **766**, 105
- Aguirre, P., Baker, A. J., Menanteau, F., Lutz, D., & Tacconi, L. J. 2013, *ApJ*, **768**, 164
- Barro, G., Faber, S. M., Pérez-González, P. G., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, **765**, 104
- Beckwith, S. V. W., Stiavelli, M., Koekemoer, A. M., et al. 2006, *AJ*, **132**, 1729
- Bershady, M. A., Jangren, A., & Conselice, C. J. 2000, *AJ*, **119**, 2645
- Bertin, E., & Arnouts, S. 1996, *A&AS*, **117**, 393
- Bond, N. A., Gawiser, E., Gronwall, C., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, **705**, 639
- Bond, N. A., Feldmeier, J. J., Matković, A., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **716**, L200
- Bond, N. A., Gawiser, E., & Koekemoer, A. M. 2011, *ApJ*, **729**, 48
- Bond, N. A., Gawiser, E., Guaita, L., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, **753**, 95
- Bond, N. A., Gardner, J. P., de Mello, D. F., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, submitted [[arXiv:1403.7463](https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.7463)]
- Borne, K. D., Bushouse, H., Lucas, R. A., & Colina, L. 2000, *ApJ*, **529**, L77
- Bouwens, R. J., Illingworth, G. D., Blakeslee, J. P., Broadhurst, T. J., & Franx, M. 2004, *ApJ*, **611**, L1
- Conselice, C. J. 2003, *ApJS*, **147**, 1
- Conselice, C. J., Bershady, M. A., & Jangren, A. 2000, *ApJ*, **529**, 886
- Cooke, J., Berrier, J. C., Barton, E. J., Bullock, J. S., & Wolfe, A. M. 2010, *MNRAS*, **403**, 1020
- Cowie, L. L., & Hu, E. M. 1998, *AJ*, **115**, 1319
- Cowie, L. L., Barger, A. J., & Hu, E. M. 2011, *ApJ*, **738**, 136
- Feldmeier, J. J., Hagen, A., Ciardullo, R., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, **776**, 75
- Finkelstein, S. L., Cohen, S. H., Windhorst, R. A., et al. 2011a, *ApJ*, **735**, 5
- Finkelstein, S. L., Hill, G. J., Gebhardt, K., et al. 2011b, *ApJ*, **729**, 140
- Frei, Z., Guhathakurta, P., Gunn, J. E., & Tyson, J. A. 1996, *AJ*, **111**, 174
- Grazian, A., Castellano, M., Fontana, A., et al. 2012, *A&A*, **547**, A51
- Gronwall, C., Ciardullo, R., Hickey, T., et al. 2007, *ApJ*, **667**, 79
- Gronwall, C., Bond, N. A., Ciardullo, R., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, **743**, 9
- Guaita, L., Gawiser, E., Padilla, N., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **714**, 255
- Guaita, L., Acquaviva, V., Padilla, N., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, **733**, 114
- Hagen, A., Ciardullo, R., Gronwall, C., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, **786**, 59
- Hayes, M., Östlin, G., Mas-Hesse, J. M., et al. 2005, *A&A*, **438**, 71
- Hayes, M., Östlin, G., Mas-Hesse, J. M., & Kunth, D. 2009, *AJ*, **138**, 911
- Hayes, M., Östlin, G., Schaerer, D., et al. 2010, *Nature*, **464**, 562
- Hayes, M., Scarlata, C., & Siana, B. 2011, *Nature*, **476**, 304
- Hayes, M., Östlin, G., Schaerer, D., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, **765**, L27 (Paper 0)
- Hayes, M., Östlin, G., Duval, F., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, **782**, 6 (Paper II)
- Holwerda, B. W., Muñoz-Mateos, J.-C., Comerón, S., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, **781**, 12
- Hubble, E., & Tolman, R. C. 1935, *Contributions from the Mount Wilson Observatory/Carnegie Institution of Washington*, **527**, 1
- Huertas-Company, M., Kaviraj, S., Mei, S., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, submitted [[arXiv:1406.1175](https://arxiv.org/abs/1406.1175)]
- Humphrey, A., Villar-Martín, M., Sánchez, S. F., et al. 2008, *MNRAS*, **390**, 1505
- Humphrey, A., Binette, L., Villar-Martín, M., Aretxaga, I., & Papaderos, P. 2013a, *MNRAS*, **428**, 563
- Humphrey, A., Vernet, J., Villar-Martín, M., et al. 2013b, *ApJ*, **768**, L3
- Jiang, L., Egami, E., Mechtley, M., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, **772**, 99
- Laursen, P., Razoumov, A. O., & Sommer-Larsen, J. 2009, *ApJ*, **696**, 853
- Law, D. R., Steidel, C. C., Shapley, A. E., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, **745**, 85
- Lee, J. C., Ly, C., Spitler, L., et al. 2012, *PASP*, **124**, 782
- Lee, B., Giavalisco, M., Williams, C. C., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, **774**, 47
- Lisker, T. 2008, *ApJS*, **179**, 319
- Lotz, J. M., Primack, J., & Madau, P. 2004, *AJ*, **128**, 163
- Lotz, J. M., Madau, P., Giavalisco, M., Primack, J., & Ferguson, H. C. 2006, *ApJ*, **636**, 592
- Lotz, J. M., Davis, M., Faber, S. M., et al. 2008, *ApJ*, **672**, 177
- Lupton, R., Blanton, M. R., Fekete, G., et al. 2004, *PASP*, **116**, 133
- Matsuda, Y., Yamada, T., Hayashino, T., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, **425**, 878
- McLinden, E. M., Rhoads, J. E., Malhotra, S., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, **439**, 446
- McLure, R. J., Dunlop, J. S., Bowler, R. A. A., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, **432**, 2696
- Micheva, G., Östlin, G., Bergvall, N., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, **431**, 102
- Momose, R., Ouchi, M., Nakajima, K., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, **442**, 110
- Mosleh, M., Williams, R. J., Franx, M., & Kriek, M. 2011, *ApJ*, **727**, 5
- Nakajima, K., Ouchi, M., Shimasaku, K., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, **745**, 12
- Nilsson, K. K., Tapken, C., Möller, P., et al. 2009, *A&A*, **498**, 13
- Nilsson, K. K., Östlin, G., Möller, P., et al. 2011, *A&A*, **529**, A9
- Ono, Y., Ouchi, M., Curtis-Lake, E., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, **777**, 155
- Östlin, G., Hayes, M., Kunth, D., et al. 2009, *AJ*, **138**, 923
- Östlin, G., Hayes, M., Duval, F., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, **797**, 11 (Paper I)
- Ouchi, M., Shimasaku, K., Akiyama, M., et al. 2008, *ApJS*, **176**, 301
- Ouchi, M., Shimasaku, K., Furusawa, H., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **723**, 869
- Overzier, R. A., Heckman, T. M., Kauffmann, G., et al. 2008, *ApJ*, **677**, 37
- Overzier, R. A., Heckman, T. M., Tremonti, C., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, **706**, 203
- Overzier, R. A., Heckman, T. M., Schiminovich, D., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, **710**, 979
- Pardy, S. A., Cannon, J. M., Östlin, G., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, **794**, 101 (Paper III)
- Partridge, R. B., & Peebles, P. J. E. 1967, *ApJ*, **147**, 868
- Pentericci, L., Grazian, A., Scarlata, C., et al. 2010, *A&A*, **514**, A64
- Petrosian, V. 1976, *ApJ*, **209**, L1
- Petty, S. M., Armus, L., Charmandaris, V., et al. 2014, *AJ*, **148**, 111
- Prescott, M. K. M., Martin, C. L., & Dey, A. 2015, *ApJ*, **799**, 62
- Rauch, M., Haehnelt, M., Bunker, A., et al. 2008, *ApJ*, **681**, 856
- Rhoads, J. E., Malhotra, S., Dey, A., et al. 2000, *ApJ*, **545**, L85
- Rivera-Thorsen, T., Hayes, M., Östlin, G., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, in press [[arXiv:1503.01157](https://arxiv.org/abs/1503.01157)]
- Scarlata, C., Carollo, C. M., Lilly, S., et al. 2007, *ApJS*, **172**, 406
- Shen, S., Mo, H. J., White, S. D. M., et al. 2003, *MNRAS*, **343**, 978
- Shibuya, T., Ouchi, M., Nakajima, K., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, **785**, 64
- Steidel, C. C., Bogosavljević, M., Shapley, A. E., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, **736**, 160
- Swinbank, A. M., Smail, I., Chapman, S. C., et al. 2010, *MNRAS*, **405**, 234
- Vargas, C. J., Bish, H., Acquaviva, V., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, **783**, 26
- Verhamme, A., Dubois, Y., Blaizot, J., et al. 2012, *A&A*, **546**, A111
- Yuma, S., Ohta, K., & Yabe, K. 2012, *ApJ*, **761**, 19




Fig. 5. Non-parametric measurements performed in the Ly α images versus the ones performed in the rest-frame UV. From the *upper left* to the *lower right*: G^{rP20} , $M20$, $C^{\min A}$, A , S , and SExtractor ellipticity ($1 - B/A$, where A and B are the semi-major and semi-minor axes of the detection ellipse). The dashed line indicates the 1:1 relation. The numbers reported in each panel correspond to the Spearman test coefficient, r , and probability, p , of uncorrelated datasets. $r = 0$ indicates no correlation, $r = 1(-1)$ indicates direct(indirect) proportionality.




Fig. 6. Non-parametric measurements performed in the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ images versus the ones performed in the rest-frame optical. From the *upper left* to the *lower right* we show the same parameters as in Fig. 5.




Fig. 18. $G^{SB-rP20S}$ vs. $M20$ measured in the rest-frame optical (left panels) and $\text{Ly}\alpha$ (right panel) of the original LARS galaxies (squares). LARS-LAEs are indicated with open circles. In each row the colour scale corresponds to an integrated physical property derived in Paper II (vertical colour bar). From the top row the integrated physical properties are stellar mass, $\text{Ly}\alpha$ escape fraction, dust-corrected specific star formation rate, nebular reddening, and age. The dashed lines indicate the regions of separation between merging system, normal galaxies, and bulge-dominated systems as presented in Figs. 13 and 14.

Table 5. Size of high- z simulated LARS galaxies.

Continuum	rP20 ^{ell}	σ rP20 ^{ell}	rP20 ^{minA}	σ rP20 ^{minA}	r_{50}	σr_{50}
line	kpc $\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{ell}})$	kpc $\sigma\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{ell}})$	kpc $\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{minA}})$	kpc $\sigma\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{minA}})$	kpc $\xi(r_{50})$	kpc $\sigma\xi(r_{50})$
Bond2010($z \sim 3.1$)						
Rest-UV ^{F606W}					1.3	
Ly α ^{F502N}					~ 1	
Finkelstein2011($z \sim 4.5$)						
Rest-UV ^{F775W} _1					0.67 ^{0.07} _{0.07}	
Ly α ^{F658N} _1					1.1 ^{3.5} _{0.4}	
Rest-UV ^{F775W} _2					1.07 ^{0.27} _{0.20}	
Ly α ^{F658N} _2					1.3 ^{1.1} _{0.6}	
Rest-UV ^{F775W} _3					0.67 ^{0.07} _{0.00}	
Ly α ^{F658N} _3					2.0 ^{1.3} _{0.7}	
L01						
Rest-UV						
30	2.58	0.20	1.33	0.33	1.17	0.17
29	2.16	0.41	1.32	0.34	1.08	0.19
28	1.83	0.47	1.32	0.50	0.94	0.26
Rest-optical						
29	4.38	0.20	3.18	0.37	2.00	0.17
28	4.51	0.29	3.19	0.46	2.01	0.17
27	4.37	0.49	3.17	0.80	1.98	0.20
26	4.25	0.87	3.35	1.42	1.88	0.28
Ly α						
5E-19	2.20	0.22	2.57	0.37	1.82	0.28
3E-18	2.08	0.28	2.05	0.59	1.73	0.21
8E-18	1.78	0.52	1.74	0.89	1.59	0.39
H α						
2E-19	0.47	0.04	0.37	0.12	0.53	0.09
6E-19	0.49	0.05	0.34	0.11	0.57	0.09
1E-18	0.48	0.05	0.35	0.12	0.54	0.09
3E-18	0.45	0.06	0.35	0.12	0.51	0.10
L02						
Rest-UV						
30	3.57	1.42	1.86	0.45	2.10	0.91
29	3.53	1.39	2.54	1.43	2.09	0.92
Rest-optical						
29	10.62	0.89	8.82	1.45	4.16	0.25
28	9.76	1.48	6.89	2.02	4.08	0.40
27	7.07	2.30	5.34	2.38	3.48	0.71
Ly α						
5E-19	3.12	0.31	2.43	0.63	2.53	0.16
3E-18	2.63	0.39	1.72	0.68	2.40	0.41
8E-18	1.77	0.80	1.24	0.57	1.71	0.71
H α						
2E-19	0.16	0.09	0.13	0.05	0.20	0.14
6E-19	0.23	0.03	0.23	0.04	0.33	0.04
1E-18	0.24	0.04	0.23	0.05	0.34	0.05

Notes. Sizes in the continuum are reported as rP20^{ell}. Owing pixel re-sampling, the Petrosian radius can have a variation of 20% with respect to the value estimated in the original image. The Ly α effective radii of two existent individual-source measurements are also shown (Bond et al. 2010; Finkelstein et al. 2011b).

Table 5. continued.

Continuum	rP20 ^{ell} kpc	σ rP20 ^{ell} kpc	rP20 ^{minA} kpc	σ rP20 ^{minA} kpc	r_{50} kpc	σr_{50} kpc
line	$\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{ell}})$	$\sigma\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{ell}})$	$\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{minA}})$	$\sigma\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{minA}})$	$\xi(r_{50})$	$\sigma\xi(r_{50})$
L03						
Rest-UV						
30	1.81	0.87	1.38	0.40	0.77	0.31
29	2.15	4.58	1.79	3.65	0.89	1.38
Rest-optical						
29	9.05	2.23	5.82	0.43	3.63	2.00
28	7.95	1.08	4.92	0.83	3.09	0.98
27	7.23	1.71	4.35	0.83	2.98	1.40
26	6.32	1.17	4.06	0.89	2.47	0.30
25	5.47	1.57	4.06	0.89	2.50	0.54
Ly α						
5E-19	7.90	4.45	8.97	11.29	9.19	9.00
3E-18	5.21	11.83	4.00	9.81	8.00	16.92
H α						
2E-19	0.20	0.02	0.29	0.06	0.18	0.05
6E-19	0.20	0.02	0.29	0.06	0.18	0.05
1E-18	0.21	0.02	0.29	0.06	0.18	0.05
3E-18	0.22	0.02	0.29	0.08	0.21	0.05
L05						
Rest-UV						
30	2.50	0.17	2.33	0.34	1.32	0.17
29	2.54	0.18	2.26	0.40	1.26	0.19
28	2.66	0.22	2.26	0.69	1.33	0.19
27	2.81	0.67	2.46	1.89	1.38	0.22
Rest-optical						
29	2.73	0.20	2.33	0.33	1.27	0.19
28	2.77	0.22	2.35	0.35	1.36	0.18
27	2.87	0.27	2.57	0.61	1.46	0.22
26	3.02	0.41	2.43	1.26	1.52	0.24
Ly α						
5E-19	1.96	0.10	1.76	0.16	1.75	0.13
3E-18	1.93	0.21	1.71	0.33	1.74	0.15
8E-18	1.96	0.37	1.76	0.47	1.86	0.23
H α						
2E-19	0.92	0.06	1.00	0.20	1.05	0.13
6E-19	0.93	0.07	0.93	0.18	1.13	0.15
1E-18	0.96	0.07	0.98	0.31	1.15	0.14
3E-18	1.03	0.11	1.03	0.26	1.24	0.15
L07						
Rest-UV						
30	1.52	0.18	1.00	0.34	0.67	0.17
29	1.57	0.20	1.05	0.36	0.67	0.17
28	1.57	0.24	1.12	0.39	0.72	0.18
Rest-optical						
29	4.14	0.25	3.34	0.34	1.72	0.19
28	4.02	0.21	3.39	0.38	1.67	0.17
27	4.21	0.36	3.31	0.78	1.73	0.20
26	3.99	0.65	3.00	1.12	1.62	0.27
Ly α						
5E-19	4.54	1.30	3.97	0.39	4.15	2.19
3E-18	3.59	0.59	3.85	0.84	3.22	0.39
8E-18	3.12	0.72	3.45	1.28	3.08	0.58
H α						
6E-19	0.32	0.04	0.30	0.10	0.48	0.10
wE-19	0.32	0.04	0.30	0.10	0.48	0.10
1E-18	0.32	0.04	0.31	0.10	0.47	0.10
3E-18	0.34	0.08	0.33	0.12	0.48	0.10

Notes. Sizes in Ly α and H α images are given as $\xi(\text{Ly}\alpha) = \frac{\text{size}(\text{Ly}\alpha)}{\text{size}(\text{rest-UV})}$ and $\xi(\text{H}\alpha) = \frac{\text{size}(\text{H}\alpha)}{\text{size}(\text{rest-optical})}$, where the sizes are rP20^{ell}, rP20^{minA}, and r50. $\xi(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ is the most meaningful due to the resonant nature of Ly α .

Table 5. continued.

Continuum	rP20 ^{ell} kpc	σ rP20 ^{ell} kpc	rP20 ^{minA} kpc	σ rP20 ^{minA} kpc	r_{50} kpc	σ_{r50} kpc
line	$\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{ell}})$	$\sigma\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{ell}})$	$\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{minA}})$	$\sigma\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{minA}})$	$\xi(r_{50})$	$\sigma\xi(r_{50})$
L08						
Rest-UV						
30	7.94	2.62	6.55	1.13	4.40	1.69
29	7.57	2.13	5.92	2.35	3.45	1.08
28	6.67	2.05	5.85	2.75	3.71	0.99
Rest-optical						
29	10.32	1.55	8.67	0.38	4.48	1.40
28	9.86	1.89	8.53	0.54	4.33	1.64
27	9.51	1.97	8.29	0.69	4.06	1.40
26	9.17	1.82	7.67	0.96	3.94	1.28
25	8.17	1.28	7.67	0.96	3.77	0.27
Ly α						
5E-19	2.23	0.16	1.31	0.37	1.58	0.12
3E-18	1.35	0.44	0.73	0.28	1.34	0.39
8E-18	0.76	1.37	0.53	1.59	0.82	1.48
H α 2E-19	0.67	0.03	0.64	0.08	0.86	0.07
6E-19	0.63	0.03	0.57	0.05	0.80	0.04
1E-18	0.63	0.04	0.56	0.05	0.79	0.04
3E-18	0.95	0.27	0.60	0.11	1.13	0.37
L09						
Rest-UV						
30	20.34	3.32	2.18	1.31	10.34	1.50
29	5.60	2.65	5.67	2.57	3.19	1.84
28	5.09	3.56	1.41	1.03	2.34	2.19
Rest-optical						
29	21.71	0.41	18.01	0.33	12.17	0.17
28	21.81	0.80	18.08	0.49	12.44	0.23
27	15.72	8.35	10.87	5.30	9.00	4.68
Ly α						
5E-19	1.27	0.04	8.24	0.77	1.61	0.04
H α						
2E-19	0.66	0.19	0.19	0.06	0.50	0.14
6E-19	0.80	0.12	0.17	0.06	0.66	0.09
1E-18	0.73	0.25	0.19	0.08	0.67	0.31
3E-18	0.43	0.19	0.13	0.05	0.37	0.22
1E-17	0.19	0.08	0.10	0.04	0.14	0.06
L10						
Rest-UV						
30	4.68	0.43	3.23	0.41	2.04	0.18
29	4.64	0.66	3.34	0.80	2.10	0.23
28	4.39	1.19	3.45	1.56	2.10	0.37
Rest-optical						
29	9.65	0.36	6.37	0.37	4.08	0.20
28	9.22	0.49	6.16	0.50	3.85	0.20
27	9.09	0.75	5.72	0.86	3.85	0.27
26	8.28	1.23	5.34	1.59	3.76	0.45
Ly α						
5E-19	2.16	1.13	2.59	0.47	3.08	1.55
H α						
2E-19	0.52	0.07	0.48	0.09	0.54	0.05
6E-19	0.52	0.07	0.48	0.09	0.54	0.05
1E-18	0.50	0.08	0.43	0.12	0.53	0.06
L11						
Rest-UV						
30	28.66	1.20	13.18	0.64	15.17	0.31
29	25.51	2.83	9.64	3.72	13.50	0.72
28	14.59	4.83	6.46	2.49	9.15	2.73
Rest-optical						
29	25.29	6.73	17.64	3.71	12.49	2.77
28	28.06	1.24	17.12	1.17	13.93	0.23
27	24.95	1.90	13.64	2.29	13.67	0.66
26	18.75	3.33	8.51	2.63	11.32	1.53
Ly α						
5E-19	0.25	0.77	0.81	2.04	0.31	1.17

Table 5. continued.

Continuum	rP20 ^{ell} kpc	σ rP20 ^{ell} kpc	rP20 ^{minA} kpc	σ rP20 ^{minA} kpc	r_{50} kpc	σr_{50} kpc
line	$\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{ell}})$	$\sigma\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{ell}})$	$\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{minA}})$	$\sigma\xi(\text{rP20}^{\text{minA}})$	$\xi(r_{50})$	$\sigma\xi(r_{50})$
3E-18	0.15	0.08	0.24	0.33	0.14	0.12
H α						
2E-19	1.06	0.11	0.70	0.07	0.92	0.05
6E-19	0.81	0.08	0.56	0.09	0.85	0.10
1E-18	0.90	0.73	0.61	0.20	1.12	0.80
3E-18	0.58	0.10	0.38	0.12	0.66	0.07
L12						
Rest-UV						
30	3.38	0.18	1.67	0.33	1.33	0.17
29	3.44	0.20	1.67	0.34	1.33	0.17
28	3.55	0.25	1.63	0.41	1.32	0.18
27	3.12	0.94	1.70	0.68	1.10	0.35
Rest-optical						
29	4.79	0.21	1.68	1.02	2.05	0.18
28	4.83	0.24	2.25	1.47	2.05	0.19
27	5.09	0.30	2.82	1.59	2.19	0.22
26	5.66	1.53	2.33	1.58	2.66	1.24
Ly α						
5E-19	4.14	0.55	6.87	0.31	5.65	0.87
3E-18	3.81	1.70	6.55	1.07	5.67	2.43
H α						
2E-19	0.74	0.17	2.04	0.38	0.86	0.41
6E-19	0.71	0.04	1.99	0.20	0.81	0.08
1E-18	0.73	0.04	1.99	0.20	0.82	0.09
3E-18	0.73	0.07	1.84	0.34	0.84	0.09
L13						
Rest-UV						
30	5.29	2.55	1.66	0.34	2.40	2.26
29	4.56	2.08	1.59	0.37	1.80	1.92
28	2.27	0.72	1.54	0.38	0.93	0.22
Rest-optical						
29	12.57	2.48	6.47	0.37	5.94	0.91
28	13.43	0.33	6.35	0.37	6.44	0.20
27	9.31	3.13	6.02	0.43	5.70	1.71
Ly α						
5E-19	0.62	0.14	2.48	3.87	1.11	0.34
3E-18	0.84	0.60	1.74	0.86	1.16	1.03
8E-18	0.96	0.58	1.63	0.75	1.36	0.99
H α						
2E-19	0.61	0.12	0.31	0.05	0.55	0.14
6E-19	0.63	0.12	0.31	0.05	0.57	0.14
1E-18	0.58	0.13	0.31	0.05	0.48	0.18
3E-18	0.47	0.13	0.28	0.06	0.39	0.13
L14						
Rest-UV						
30	1.67	0.17	1.33	0.33	0.83	0.17
29	1.83	0.18	1.33	0.33	0.84	0.17
28	1.99	1.18	1.19	0.38	1.06	0.99
Rest-optical						
29	4.53	0.18	1.20	0.37	1.50	0.17
28	4.55	0.46	1.10	0.37	1.56	0.41
27	4.88	2.60	1.48	0.59	3.11	2.02
Ly α						
5E-19	3.55	0.33	2.50	0.25	3.00	0.22
3E-18	3.87	0.77	2.49	0.27	3.31	1.17
8E-18	3.50	0.53	2.45	0.29	3.09	0.25
2E-17	3.02	0.51	2.44	0.31	2.87	0.27
5E-17	2.96	0.61	2.44	0.49	2.93	0.38
H α						
2E-19	0.51	0.04	1.39	0.28	0.79	0.13
6E-19	0.54	0.04	1.39	0.28	0.86	0.12
1E-18	0.56	0.04	1.39	0.28	0.88	0.12
3E-18	1.17	0.60	1.39	0.30	2.34	1.57
1E-17	0.45	0.07	1.22	0.32	0.70	0.12

Table 6. Morphological parameters of high- z simulated LARS galaxies.

Depth	G^{rP20}	σG^{rP20}	C^{minA}	σC^{minA}	M20	σ M20	A	σA	S	σS	ell	σ ell
L01												
Rest-UV												
30	0.73	0.01	2.39	0.00	-1.08	0.03	0.36	0.01	0.20	0.01	0.56	0.02
29	0.70	0.03	2.41	0.12	-1.16	0.34	0.28	0.02	0.18	0.05	0.50	0.06
28	0.67	0.04	2.46	0.45	-1.14	0.41	0.17	0.04	0.20	0.08	0.43	0.09
Rest-optical												
29	0.60	0.00	2.13	0.00	-0.91	0.08	0.26	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.58	0.01
28	0.61	0.01	2.16	0.31	-0.98	0.08	0.18	0.02	0.11	0.01	0.59	0.02
27	0.61	0.02	2.59	0.57	-1.03	0.10	0.10	0.03	0.22	0.04	0.58	0.03
26	0.60	0.03	2.53	0.67	-1.17	0.19	0.04	0.02	0.47	0.12	0.54	0.06
$\text{Ly}\alpha$												
5E-19	0.62	0.02	2.88	0.18	-1.66	0.20	0.28	0.04	0.23	0.06	0.30	0.03
3E-18	0.57	0.01	2.54	0.40	-1.60	0.15	0.15	0.02	0.49	0.09	0.33	0.09
8E-18	0.49	0.02	2.11	0.58	-1.61	0.28	0.09	0.04	0.70	0.15	0.20	0.08
$\text{H}\alpha$												
2E-19	0.67	0.01	2.39	0.00	-1.10	0.26	0.36	0.00	0.20	0.07	0.43	0.02
6E-19	0.68	0.01	2.39	0.00	-0.87	0.16	0.35	0.01	0.30	0.06	0.46	0.02
1E-18	0.67	0.01	2.39	0.00	-0.94	0.21	0.34	0.01	0.26	0.08	0.44	0.04
3E-18	0.64	0.02	2.40	0.28	-0.97	0.21	0.26	0.02	0.26	0.07	0.42	0.05
L02												
Rest-UV												
30	0.64	0.02	2.40	0.64	-1.41	0.22	0.21	0.03	0.36	0.06	0.69	0.03
29	0.62	0.03	2.29	0.65	-1.29	0.27	0.10	0.04	0.39	0.06	0.71	0.04
Rest-optical												
29	0.62	0.01	3.68	0.19	-1.81	0.08	0.02	0.01	0.36	0.04	0.63	0.02
28	0.60	0.01	3.38	0.32	-1.78	0.12	0.01	0.01	0.54	0.08	0.66	0.03
27	0.55	0.03	2.67	0.59	-1.59	0.19	0.01	0.02	0.60	0.13	0.68	0.05
$\text{Ly}\alpha$												
5E-19	0.61	0.01	3.06	0.35	-1.25	0.07	0.27	0.01	0.35	0.04	0.36	0.03
3E-18	0.51	0.01	2.84	0.43	-1.22	0.21	0.09	0.03	0.64	0.07	0.36	0.12
8E-18	0.45	0.02	2.05	0.52	-1.20	0.25	0.05	0.04	0.68	0.19	0.39	0.12
$\text{H}\alpha$												
2E-19	0.66	0.02	2.51	0.34	-1.29	0.12	0.34	0.02	0.15	0.07	0.28	0.14
6E-19	0.60	0.02	3.50	0.00	-0.93	0.12	0.26	0.03	0.25	0.07	0.61	0.04
1E-18	0.58	0.02	3.10	0.79	-0.96	0.19	0.21	0.04	0.26	0.07	0.62	0.05
L03												
Rest-UV												
30	0.67	0.03	2.54	0.27	-1.42	0.29	0.08	0.03	0.19	0.12	0.14	0.08
29	0.64	0.15	2.82	1.66	-1.58	1.49	0.06	0.14	0.38	1.02	0.20	0.50
Rest-optical												
29	0.63	0.06	3.38	0.10	-2.01	0.32	0.31	0.03	0.09	0.07	0.46	0.07
28	0.61	0.02	3.07	0.28	-2.00	0.19	0.10	0.03	0.13	0.03	0.46	0.04
27	0.63	0.03	2.98	0.36	-1.96	0.33	0.06	0.01	0.29	0.07	0.34	0.07
26	0.61	0.03	3.06	0.34	-2.04	0.13	0.03	0.01	0.53	0.11	0.27	0.07
25	0.57	0.02	3.06	0.34	-1.87	0.19	0.03	0.01	0.64	0.13	0.37	0.10
$\text{Ly}\alpha$												
5E-19	0.47	0.01	2.70	0.12	-1.78	0.15	0.10	0.02	0.62	0.03	0.30	0.06
3E-18	0.41	0.09	2.04	2.74	-0.93	0.90	0.02	0.10	0.76	0.60	0.50	0.75
$\text{H}\alpha$												
2E-19	0.67	0.00	3.01	0.00	-1.58	0.25	0.25	0.00	0.08	0.01	0.21	0.03
6E-19	0.66	0.01	3.01	0.00	-1.57	0.25	0.21	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.27	0.03
1E-18	0.67	0.01	3.02	0.05	-1.56	0.27	0.19	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.29	0.03
3E-18	0.65	0.01	2.99	0.33	-1.60	0.26	0.14	0.03	0.17	0.04	0.35	0.05

Notes. Non-parametric measurements are derived by following the equations in Appendix A. Only G^{rP20} and C^{minA} are reported here, because they are the ones used to compare z2LARS with high- z observations. The uncertainty on the parameters is obtained from the standard deviation of 100 realizations of a simulated survey depth.

Table 6. continued.

Depth	G^{rP20}	σG^{rP20}	$C^{\min A}$	$\sigma C^{\min A}$	M20	$\sigma M20$	A	σA	S	σS	ell	σell
L05												
Rest-UV												
30	0.70	0.01	3.88	0.07	-1.22	0.07	0.27	0.01	0.23	0.04	0.67	0.01
29	0.70	0.01	3.73	0.21	-1.13	0.10	0.19	0.02	0.35	0.12	0.71	0.02
28	0.70	0.01	3.68	0.48	-1.13	0.12	0.11	0.03	0.32	0.14	0.73	0.03
27	0.68	0.03	2.82	0.78	-1.22	0.25	0.05	0.04	0.36	0.13	0.73	0.05
Rest-optical												
29	0.74	0.01	3.89	0.00	-1.42	0.17	0.27	0.01	0.29	0.05	0.73	0.01
28	0.74	0.01	3.90	0.06	-1.40	0.18	0.19	0.02	0.27	0.07	0.76	0.02
27	0.75	0.02	3.93	0.24	-1.28	0.24	0.12	0.03	0.25	0.11	0.79	0.02
26	0.74	0.03	3.31	1.04	-1.26	0.29	0.06	0.03	0.33	0.17	0.81	0.03
Ly α												
5E-19	0.58	0.01	1.95	0.09	-1.42	0.06	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.01	0.13	0.03
3E-18	0.52	0.02	1.98	0.38	-1.48	0.08	0.13	0.02	0.39	0.08	0.17	0.05
8E-18	0.45	0.01	2.18	0.38	-1.40	0.13	0.05	0.03	0.64	0.11	0.27	0.10
H α												
2E-19	0.59	0.01	2.21	0.20	-0.79	0.01	0.31	0.01	0.27	0.01	0.44	0.02
6E-19	0.57	0.01	2.25	0.19	-0.76	0.02	0.26	0.03	0.24	0.04	0.52	0.02
1E-18	0.56	0.01	2.21	0.20	-0.76	0.02	0.21	0.04	0.22	0.04	0.56	0.03
3E-18	0.52	0.02	2.24	0.24	-0.75	0.09	0.11	0.04	0.27	0.06	0.64	0.04
L07												
Rest-UV												
30	0.72	0.01	2.39	0.00	-1.20	0.11	0.31	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.47	0.02
29	0.72	0.01	2.39	0.00	-1.12	0.23	0.27	0.01	0.07	0.10	0.50	0.03
28	0.72	0.02	2.43	0.24	-1.02	0.29	0.19	0.04	0.14	0.12	0.51	0.06
Rest-optical												
29	0.63	0.01	3.01	0.03	-1.54	0.12	0.23	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.59	0.03
28	0.62	0.01	3.05	0.13	-1.51	0.12	0.15	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.59	0.02
27	0.63	0.01	2.97	0.38	-1.54	0.13	0.07	0.02	0.20	0.04	0.61	0.02
26	0.63	0.02	2.70	0.65	-1.51	0.18	0.04	0.03	0.46	0.12	0.55	0.09
Ly α												
5E-19	0.64	0.01	3.44	0.10	-2.17	0.21	0.24	0.01	0.18	0.05	0.36	0.04
3E-18	0.57	0.01	3.18	0.27	-2.18	0.12	0.11	0.02	0.49	0.09	0.13	0.07
8E-18	0.51	0.02	2.85	0.48	-2.08	0.16	0.06	0.03	0.66	0.12	0.17	0.08
H α												
2E-19	0.65	0.01	0.88	0.00	-0.72	0.06	0.34	0.01	0.23	0.05	0.24	0.07
6E-19	0.65	0.01	0.88	0.00	-0.72	0.06	0.34	0.01	0.23	0.05	0.24	0.07
1E-18	0.66	0.01	0.88	0.00	-0.69	0.05	0.33	0.01	0.25	0.04	0.29	0.06
3E-18	0.64	0.02	1.16	0.58	-0.67	0.10	0.25	0.04	0.27	0.09	0.37	0.0
L08												
Rest-UV												
30	0.61	0.04	2.81	0.51	-0.84	0.06	0.10	0.04	0.39	0.09	0.37	0.04
29	0.60	0.03	2.58	0.55	-1.02	0.12	0.05	0.04	0.68	0.12	0.25	0.11
28	0.55	0.03	2.12	0.61	-1.07	0.22	0.01	0.02	0.72	0.13	0.54	0.10
Rest-optical												
29	0.59	0.03	2.71	0.03	-1.21	0.06	0.37	0.00	0.07	0.03	0.20	0.01
28	0.59	0.03	2.69	0.07	-1.24	0.09	0.16	0.02	0.13	0.03	0.16	0.02
27	0.60	0.02	2.63	0.11	-1.25	0.07	0.08	0.01	0.25	0.04	0.16	0.05
26	0.59	0.02	2.50	0.20	-1.26	0.09	0.04	0.01	0.47	0.07	0.17	0.07
25	0.54	0.02	2.50	0.20	-1.17	0.09	0.04	0.01	0.62	0.10	0.24	0.05
Ly α												
5E-19	0.55	0.00	2.77	0.35	-1.75	0.12	0.29	0.03	0.62	0.03	0.15	0.07
3E-18	0.45	0.01	2.06	0.43	-1.33	0.25	0.10	0.04	0.74	0.11	0.37	0.09
8E-18	0.41	0.11	1.81	2.61	-0.75	0.81	0.04	0.27	0.74	0.82	0.54	0.70
H α 2E-19												
6E-19	0.57	0.01	1.67	0.04	-0.91	0.04	0.36	0.01	0.23	0.02	0.16	0.06
1E-18	0.56	0.01	1.63	0.17	-0.88	0.03	0.28	0.01	0.29	0.03	0.11	0.02
3E-18	0.50	0.01	1.67	0.22	-1.00	0.13	0.11	0.02	0.60	0.13	0.47	0.11

Table 6. continued.

Depth	G^{rP20}	σG^{rP20}	$C^{\min A}$	$\sigma C^{\min A}$	M20	σ M20	A	σA	S	σS	ell	σ ell
L09												
Rest-UV												
30	0.70	0.02	3.59	0.63	-1.23	0.10	0.18	0.05	0.46	0.06	0.79	0.08
29	0.61	0.03	1.54	1.09	-0.90	0.22	0.19	0.08	0.46	0.10	0.57	0.17
28	0.69	0.05	2.46	0.56	-1.74	0.65	0.04	0.03	0.51	0.25	0.38	0.17
Rest-optical												
29	0.67	0.01	2.85	0.05	-0.98	0.01	0.36	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.81	0.00
28	0.65	0.01	2.84	0.12	-0.98	0.01	0.21	0.01	0.36	0.01	0.83	0.00
27	0.62	0.06	2.23	0.71	-1.01	0.26	0.15	0.05	0.50	0.13	0.57	0.22
$\text{Ly}\alpha$												
5E-19	0.47	0.00	0.82	0.10	-0.84	0.01	0.28	0.07	0.57	0.02	0.48	0.02
$\text{H}\alpha$												
2E-19	0.70	0.02	4.38	0.27	-1.46	0.14	0.23	0.03	0.33	0.12	0.67	0.03
6E-19	0.67	0.01	4.26	0.29	-1.49	0.23	0.19	0.01	0.40	0.04	0.79	0.00
1E-18	0.63	0.03	4.13	0.29	-1.49	0.50	0.16	0.02	0.46	0.09	0.71	0.15
3E-18	0.58	0.03	3.69	0.61	-2.04	0.84	0.11	0.03	0.49	0.16	0.59	0.12
1E-17	0.56	0.04	2.96	0.60	-1.81	0.44	0.06	0.04	0.58	0.20	0.36	0.14
L10												
Rest-UV												
30	0.59	0.02	2.11	0.25	-1.27	0.14	0.14	0.02	0.21	0.04	0.54	0.02
29	0.57	0.03	2.33	0.41	-1.30	0.13	0.07	0.02	0.37	0.09	0.60	0.05
28	0.53	0.04	2.27	0.60	-1.31	0.23	0.02	0.02	0.57	0.15	0.62	0.09
Rest-optical												
29	0.57	0.01	3.34	0.26	-1.97	0.04	0.12	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.55	0.02
28	0.59	0.01	3.35	0.16	-2.04	0.04	0.08	0.01	0.20	0.02	0.50	0.02
27	0.59	0.01	3.18	0.21	-1.98	0.09	0.04	0.01	0.41	0.05	0.52	0.03
26	0.57	0.01	2.95	0.34	-1.92	0.10	0.02	0.01	0.62	0.08	0.53	0.07
$\text{Ly}\alpha$												
5E-19	0.45	0.06	1.08	0.40	-0.82	0.66	0.17	0.13	0.74	0.18	0.41	0.11
$\text{H}\alpha$												
2E-19	0.58	0.01	2.38	0.70	-1.06	0.14	0.24	0.02	0.30	0.06	0.59	0.03
6E-19	0.58	0.01	2.38	0.70	-1.06	0.14	0.24	0.02	0.30	0.06	0.59	0.03
1E-18	0.55	0.02	2.56	0.68	-1.05	0.15	0.18	0.03	0.35	0.09	0.65	0.03
L11												
Rest-UV												
30	0.57	0.02	3.20	0.10	-1.21	0.08	0.30	0.04	0.39	0.03	0.88	0.08
29	0.56	0.04	2.58	0.53	-1.11	0.18	0.06	0.05	0.47	0.07	0.88	0.09
28	0.57	0.04	2.53	0.74	-0.70	0.18	0.04	0.03	0.69	0.10	0.62	0.15
Rest-optical												
29	0.51	0.01	2.95	0.46	-1.23	0.10	0.28	0.07	0.26	0.13	0.82	0.13
28	0.51	0.02	3.03	0.08	-1.33	0.03	0.18	0.06	0.28	0.01	0.87	0.00
27	0.49	0.02	2.94	0.17	-1.31	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.43	0.05	0.87	0.05
26	0.51	0.02	2.60	0.37	-0.89	0.12	0.01	0.01	0.64	0.07	0.75	0.12
$\text{Ly}\alpha$												
5E-19	0.44	0.34	1.62	1.54	-0.73	1.69	0.43	0.32	0.72	0.87	0.63	0.98
3E-18	0.39	0.05	1.81	0.54	-0.65	0.16	0.29	0.07	0.63	0.25	0.64	0.07
$\text{H}\alpha$												
2E-19	0.58	0.02	2.61	0.08	-0.89	0.10	0.23	0.01	0.37	0.03	0.88	0.01
6E-19	0.52	0.01	2.39	0.16	-1.11	0.14	0.13	0.02	0.37	0.11	0.81	0.18
1E-18	0.48	0.10	2.58	0.46	-0.67	0.36	0.10	0.12	0.73	0.29	0.44	0.64
3E-18	0.44	0.01	2.28	0.40	-1.01	0.11	0.03	0.02	0.63	0.10	0.73	0.13

Table 6. continued.

Depth	G^{rP20}	σG^{rP20}	$C^{\min A}$	$\sigma C^{\min A}$	M20	σ M20	A	σA	S	σS	ell	σ ell
L12												
Rest-UV												
30	0.69	0.00	3.33	0.23	-1.43	0.03	0.37	0.01	0.10	0.02	0.38	0.01
29	0.69	0.01	3.32	0.24	-1.44	0.04	0.25	0.03	0.11	0.01	0.41	0.01
28	0.70	0.01	3.29	0.30	-1.47	0.22	0.16	0.04	0.18	0.03	0.45	0.02
27	0.69	0.03	3.11	0.53	-1.84	0.41	0.11	0.04	0.39	0.19	0.27	0.17
Rest-optical												
29	0.65	0.01	3.09	0.22	-1.71	0.15	0.37	0.07	0.15	0.01	0.49	0.01
28	0.65	0.01	3.20	0.30	-1.65	0.10	0.25	0.01	0.15	0.01	0.52	0.01
27	0.66	0.01	3.35	0.39	-1.80	0.18	0.14	0.01	0.20	0.01	0.54	0.01
26	0.68	0.05	3.21	0.60	-1.54	0.48	0.07	0.04	0.41	0.12	0.54	0.09
Ly α												
5E-19	0.62	0.01	1.27	0.11	-2.26	0.25	0.37	0.03	0.44	0.10	0.27	0.03
3E-18	0.54	0.06	1.38	0.30	-1.81	0.87	0.13	0.07	0.75	0.15	0.47	0.13
H α												
2E-19	0.61	0.05	2.99	0.11	-1.54	0.22	0.34	0.05	0.19	0.14	0.39	0.06
6E-19	0.62	0.01	3.01	0.00	-1.66	0.16	0.28	0.00	0.19	0.06	0.40	0.02
1E-18	0.62	0.01	3.01	0.00	-1.83	0.20	0.26	0.01	0.17	0.05	0.41	0.02
3E-18	0.60	0.01	2.93	0.29	-1.60	0.30	0.17	0.01	0.23	0.03	0.44	0.03
L13												
Rest-UV												
30	0.72	0.03	1.60	0.36	-1.24	0.34	0.27	0.01	0.17	0.12	0.37	0.11
29	0.71	0.03	2.30	0.73	-1.35	0.24	0.23	0.03	0.23	0.13	0.38	0.08
28	0.65	0.03	2.36	0.65	-1.37	0.19	0.18	0.03	0.20	0.12	0.15	0.08
Rest-optical												
29	0.64	0.02	3.64	0.03	-1.32	0.22	0.31	0.00	0.24	0.15	0.47	0.06
28	0.62	0.01	3.52	0.08	-1.45	0.06	0.21	0.01	0.23	0.01	0.53	0.02
27	0.49	0.05	3.31	0.11	-0.98	0.16	0.16	0.01	0.49	0.15	0.53	0.11
Ly α												
5E-19	0.53	0.03	2.10	1.28	-0.52	0.12	0.40	0.07	0.61	0.09	0.40	0.12
3E-18	0.48	0.02	1.74	0.50	-1.18	0.32	0.28	0.07	0.55	0.09	0.24	0.10
8E-18	0.44	0.02	1.63	0.56	-1.22	0.25	0.12	0.06	0.72	0.13	0.40	0.11
H α												
2E-19	0.67	0.01	1.99	0.00	-1.90	0.09	0.16	0.00	0.17	0.03	0.23	0.07
6E-19	0.66	0.01	1.99	0.00	-1.87	0.10	0.16	0.01	0.24	0.03	0.25	0.07
1E-18	0.65	0.02	1.99	0.00	-1.93	0.43	0.14	0.01	0.30	0.11	0.28	0.17
3E-18	0.60	0.02	1.80	0.30	-1.91	0.32	0.09	0.02	0.44	0.15	0.34	0.16
L14												
Rest-UV												
30	0.64	0.00	2.39	0.00	-0.99	0.04	0.36	0.00	0.04	0.02	0.41	0.02
29	0.64	0.01	2.39	0.00	-0.77	0.11	0.32	0.01	0.11	0.07	0.52	0.03
28	0.65	0.05	2.38	0.09	-0.94	0.20	0.29	0.05	0.08	0.10	0.47	0.15
Rest-optical												
29	0.78	0.00	2.39	0.00	-1.06	0.09	0.39	0.00	0.19	0.01	0.09	0.02
28	0.78	0.01	2.39	0.00	-1.17	0.12	0.29	0.02	0.27	0.04	0.22	0.05
27	0.67	0.13	1.97	0.51	-0.93	0.34	0.28	0.11	0.36	0.18	0.50	0.12
Ly α												
5E-19	0.61	0.03	2.13	0.00	-1.47	0.07	0.29	0.00	0.16	0.01	0.17	0.01
3E-18	0.61	0.02	2.13	0.01	-1.51	0.09	0.24	0.01	0.20	0.03	0.24	0.04
8E-18	0.56	0.03	2.12	0.04	-1.48	0.09	0.19	0.01	0.28	0.07	0.21	0.04
2E-17	0.50	0.02	2.04	0.16	-1.44	0.09	0.12	0.02	0.40	0.11	0.15	0.05
5E-17	0.43	0.02	1.99	0.23	-1.33	0.12	0.05	0.03	0.60	0.11	0.23	0.09
H α												
2E-19	0.55	0.01	1.50	0.00	-1.07	0.03	0.20	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.39	0.01
6E-19	0.57	0.01	1.50	0.00	-1.08	0.01	0.21	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.42	0.01
1E-18	0.58	0.01	1.50	0.00	-1.09	0.01	0.18	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.45	0.02
3E-18	0.65	0.07	1.63	0.21	-0.91	0.30	0.19	0.09	0.23	0.18	0.43	0.13
1E-17	0.52	0.03	1.48	0.12	-1.35	0.12	0.10	0.02	0.14	0.07	0.19	0.08

Appendix A: Non-parametric measurements

In this section we explain the way we measured galaxy sizes and non-parametric quantities in detail, and show the results for galaxies with known-profiles.

In Fig. A.1 we summarize the equations adopted in this analysis and first introduced by Conselice et al. (2000) and Lotz et al. (2004).

The code we developed makes a basic use of the ELLIPSE task in *iraf.stsdas.isophote* and the PHOT task in *iraf.digiphot.apphot*. We first ran the Source Extractor (SExtractor) software (Bertin & Arnouts 1996) on one galaxy image. This provided the centroid and the elliptical aperture containing the entire galaxy. We adopted configuration parameters like in Bond et al. (2009; DETECT_THRESH = 1.65 and DEBLEND_MINCONT = 1). We followed the choice of DETECT_MINAREA = 30 for the high- z simulations. Those parameters were optimized to provide significant morphological measurements in deep HST-band observations. A larger value of contiguous pixels was adopted to prevent SExtractor from breaking up the clumpy, resolved, original $z \sim 0$ LARS galaxies into smaller fragments.

We adopted SExtractor centroid, orientation angle, and ellipticity as the fixed ELLIPSE parameters and the SEx AUTO photometry semi-major axis as the reference semi-major axis length (sma0). We then measured flux within ellipses by varying the semi-major axis (sma). The task was able to fit elliptical isophotes at a pre-defined, fixed sma, and works better for well-defined galaxy profiles. As LARS galaxies are irregular, a better convergence of the task was performed by fixing the ellipse orientation and ellipticity.

The ELLIPSE task outputs surface brightness ($I(r)$) and integrated flux (F) within every sma (r_i, r_{i+1}, \dots). We used the given surface brightness to derive the Petrosian ratio (Bershady et al. 2000, $\eta = I(r)/\langle I(r) \rangle$) as a function of sma and the integrated flux to estimate r_{20}, r_{50}, r_{80} , the radii containing 20%, 50%, and 80% of the total source flux. The Petrosian semi-major axis (rP20^{ell}) corresponds to the sma where $\eta = 0.2$. We defined an elliptical concentration (C^{ell}), proportional to r_{80}/r_{20} . Applying a smoothing kernel with width equal to rP20/5, we also estimated a smoothed-image Petrosian radius (rP20S, Lotz et al. 2004).

The PHOT task outputs fluxes integrated within circular apertures. We derived the corresponding $I(r)$ and estimated the circular Petrosian radius (rP20^{circ}), the circular r_{20}^{circ} , and r_{80}^{circ} . The circular concentration (C^{circ}) was then proportional to $r_{80}^{\text{circ}}/r_{20}^{\text{circ}}$.

We also defined the signal-to-noise (SN) per pixel as

$$SN_{\text{pixel}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{S_i}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\text{sky}}^2 + |S_i|}},$$

where σ_{sky} is the standard deviation of means measured in more than three boxes around the galaxy, S_i the signal, and n the number of pixels belonging to a galaxy. The total SN of the galaxy was then obtained by multiplying the SN_{pixel} by \sqrt{n} . If $\sigma_{\text{sky}}^2 > |S_i|$,

$$SN_{\text{pixel}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{S_i}{\sigma_{\text{sky}}}.$$

The asymmetry (A) was calculated as the minimum value of the normalized difference between the galaxy image (I_0) and the same one rotated by 180° (I_{180}). We adopted the background (B)

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(r) &= \frac{I(r)}{\langle I(r) \rangle} = \frac{Fr_{i+1} - Fr_i}{Ar_{i+1} - Ar_i} \times \frac{Ar_i}{Fr_i} & \text{rP20} \mid \eta(\text{rP20})=0.2 & \text{Conselice2000,2003} \\ & & & \text{Lotz2004} \\ A &= \min \left(\frac{\sum |I_0 - I_{180}|}{2 \sum I_0} \right) - \min \left(\frac{\sum |B_0 - B_{180}|}{2 \sum B_0} \right) \\ C &= 5 \times \log(r_{80\%}/r_{20\%}) \\ G &= \frac{1}{\bar{X}n(n-1)} \sum_i^n (2i - n - 1)X_i & X_i \text{ within the segmentation map} \\ M_{20} &\equiv \log_{10} \left(\frac{\sum_i M_i}{M_{\text{tot}}} \right), \text{ while } \sum_i f_i < 0.2 f_{\text{tot}} & f_i \text{ within the segmentation map} \\ M_{\text{tot}} &= \sum_i M_i = \sum_i f_i [(x_i - x_c)^2 + (y_i - y_c)^2] \\ S &= \sum_{0.3 \text{ rP20}}^{1.5 \text{ rP20}} \frac{(I - I_{S=0.3 \text{ rP20}})}{I} \end{aligned}$$

Fig. A.1. Basic equations adopted to calculate galaxy size and non-parametric measurements of the LARS original and high- z simulated galaxies.

correction advised by Conselice et al. (2000) for low SN galaxies. Based on this definition, $0 < A < 1$ (e.g., Scarlata et al. 2007; Aguirre et al. 2013; Law et al. 2012). After calculating the position of minimum asymmetry, we ran PHOT on that position and calculated the Petrosian radius (rP20^{minA}), r_{20}^{minA} , and r_{80}^{minA} , corresponding to the minimum of asymmetry. The point of the galaxy of minimum asymmetry is generally close to its brightest pixel, but not necessarily to the SExtractor centroid. The concentration (C^{minA}) at minimum asymmetry was then calculated from the $r_{80}^{\text{minA}}/r_{20}^{\text{minA}}$ ratio (Conselice et al. 2000; Lotz et al. 2006; Jiang et al. 2013; Holwerda et al. 2014).

Bershady et al. (2000) defined C by measuring photometry inside circular apertures. They estimated that C could be underestimated up to 30%, in the case of an ellipticity of ~ 0.75 and circular aperture, but that it was within 10–15% for early-type galaxies. C^{minA} was the quantity we mainly used throughout the paper.

A galaxy was assumed to be composed of a certain number of pixels, constituting a segmentation map. The non-parametric measurements and SN estimation were performed counting the flux of pixels belonging to that segmentation map. We defined the segmentation map in two ways, one (the fixed-size segmentation map) is an ellipse with sma = rP20 and orientation given by SEx (see Scarlata et al. 2007); one described in Lotz et al. (2004), where the pixels belonging to the segmentation map have surface brightness larger than the value at rP20S. The fixed-size map was mainly concentrated in the central part of the galaxy, the second one could contain bright pixels in the galaxy outskirts.

The Gini coefficient (G) and M20 were also calculated by following the equations in Fig. A.1. X_i ($i = 1$ to n) correspond to the pixel values, sorted in increasing order, and \bar{X} the average pixel value, within the chosen segmentation map. f_i ($i = 1$ to n) correspond to the pixel values within the chosen segmentation map, but sorted in decreasing order; x_c and y_c are the pixels corresponding to SEx centroid. A first value of G (G^{rP20}) was estimated within the first segmentation map (Lotz et al. 2004, 2006; Jiang et al. 2013; Holwerda et al. 2014). A second value ($G^{\text{SEx-rP20S}}$) was estimated within the second segmentation map. The latter is sensitive to multiple knots in a galaxy full of structures. Within the fixed-sized segmentation map we measured M20 (Scarlata et al. 2007; Jiang et al. 2013; Aguirre et al. 2013; Holwerda et al. 2014) and S .




Fig. A.2. Simulated profiles used as a test of our code performance. From the *upper left* to the *lower right* panels: symmetric exponential profile, exponential profile with ellipticity equal to 0.5 and position angle 0° , exponential profile with ellipticity equal to 0.5 and position angle 45° , de Vaucouleurs profile, asymmetric exponential profile after adding a noise corresponding to a 10σ detection limit 7 times fainter (noise in Tables A.1 and A.2) and 3 times fainter than the fake galaxy flux. They were generated by running the MKOBJECT task in *iraf.artdata* and noise was added by running the MKNOISE task in *iraf.artdata*.

The clumpiness (S) was defined by Conselice (2003) as the normalized difference between the galaxy image (I) and the smoothed image ($I_{0.3 \times rP20}$, where the smoothing kernel sigma was $0.3 \times rP20$). The pixels belonging to the galaxy image are the ones within 0.3 and 1.5 times the $rP20$, i.e. we excluded the very central pixels, which are often unresolved.

We tested our code on the frames showed in Fig. A.2. The code calculations are shown in Fig. A.3. First of all we analytically calculated the theoretical (THEO in the figure) Petrosian ratio and radius of an exponential and de Vaucouleurs profiles. Then, we ran SExtractor and calculated the non-parametric measurements described above.

The results are listed in Tables A.1 and A.2. The $rP20^{ell}$ size better recovers the analytical value of an exponential profile. It also well recovers the value in the case of added noise and of a de Vaucouleurs profile. For this reason, we adopted $rP20^{ell}$ as the main size estimator throughout the paper. By comparing with the analytical solution and the estimations by Bershadsky et al. (2000) and Lotz et al. (2006), we noticed that we could underestimate C^{circ} of a de Vaucouleurs profile up to 30%, C^{minA} of an exponential(de Vaucouleurs) profile up to 10(20)%, and overestimate $G^{SB-rP20S}$ up to 10(5)% for an exponential(de Vaucouleurs) profile. M20 is well-recovered for all the profiles within 3%.

Also, we tested our code on the public galaxy stamps from COSMOS and compared the results with the ones obtained with the ZEST software (Scarlata et al. 2007). When assuming the brightest pixel as the centre of a galaxy, we recovered G^{rP20} values in more than 80% of the cases. As the fixed-size segmentation map is a better choice for redshift comparisons (Scarlata et al. 2007), we tended to prefer G^{rP20} rather than $G^{SB-rP20S}$ throughout the paper.

A.1. Comparison between original and simulated galaxy morphological parameters

Following the method described in the previous section, we estimated sizes and morphological parameters in the continuum and line images. We adopted the same method in the case a galaxy

Table A.1. Sizes from known profile galaxies of $Re = 10$ pixels.

Profile kpc	$rP20^{ell}$ kpc	$rP20^{circ}$ kpc	$rP20^{minA}$ kpc	r_{20} kpc	r_{50} kpc	r_{80} kpc
exp						
ell0	22.0	21.0	19.0	5.5	10.0	17.5
ell0.5,pa0	21.5	16.0	15.0	5.0	10.0	17.5
ell0.5,pa45	21.5	16.0	15.0	5.0	10.0	17.0
noise	19.0^{+5}_{-1}	16.0^{+7}_{-2}	23.0	5.0	10.0	16.0
deVauc						
	20.5	17.0	11.0	2.5	7.5	17.0

Notes. The analytical values for the ratio of $rP20$ and effective radius is 2.16 for an exponential and 1.82 for a de Vaucouleurs profile (Bershadsky et al. 2000).

was simulated to be at $z \sim 2$ and observed in different depth surveys. To quantify the morphological parameter variations owing pixel resampling and added noise, we defined $\Delta(\text{param})$,

$$\Delta(\text{param}) = \frac{\text{param}(z \sim 2, \text{noise}) - \text{param}(\text{original})}{\text{param}(\text{original})} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

which represented the difference between the measurement of a parameter in the simulated and in the original image, normalized to the value in the original image. By definition, $\Delta(\text{param})$ tended to be zero when the two measurements were very similar, tended to be equal to -1 when the measurement in the simulated image was much smaller than in the original one, and equal to 1 when the measurement in the simulated image was twice that in the original one. We calculated $\Delta(\text{param})$ for every galaxy and estimated the mean and the standard deviation.

In Fig. A.4 we show the results. A , C^{minA} , G^{rP20} , and M20 were all preserved after pixel resampling in the continuum images. Owing survey depth, A decreased.

Huertas-Company et al. (2014) studied the variation of A , G , and M20 due to resampling the rest-frame optical of local galaxies to $z > 1$. They found that A can increase up to 50%, G up to 10%, while M20 can decrease up to 10%. These trends were observed to be more pronounced for early-type galaxies; Lotz et al. (2006) resampled the rest-frame UV of a few sources from $z = 1.5$ to $z = 4$, finding that G and M20 were preserved, consistent with our results. Overzier et al. (2010) investigated the change of A , C , G , and M20 when resampling $z = 0.2$ Lyman break analogues to $z = 2$. They gave an R -value scale, where $|R| \sim 0$ when the difference between the median parameter measured in the resampled and in the original image was small and $|R| \sim 1$ when was comparable to the sample scatter. They found $R^A = -1.1$, $R^C = 0.02$, $R^G = -0.34$, and $R^{M20} = -0.43$ in the rest-frame UV and $R^A = -0.46$, $R^C = -0.52$, $R^G = -1.1$, and $R^{M20} = -0.26$ in the rest-frame optical. Recently, Petty et al. (2014) explored the variations of G and M20 of local LIRGS when simulated to be at $z = 0.5, 1.5, 2, 3$ and in a survey with the HUDF depth. Some of the galaxies in their sample, characterized by clumps and filamentary structures (typical of merging systems) in high-resolution HST images, tended to appear as disk-like galaxies by $z = 2$. Some others maintained merging systems' morphology. All these trends are in agreement with our findings, but they also tell us that the variations do not follow a specific trend for irregular galaxies.

In the Ly α images, A tended to decrease and C^{minA} could increase due to pixel resampling. Owing survey depth, all the four parameters tended to decrease and A significantly decreased.

Another way to study the change of morphological parameters is to look at pairs of them, like G^{rP20} vs. M20 and A




Fig. A.3. From the left to the right panels surface brightness, Petrosian ratio, and integrated flux. The upper(lower) row is obtained by using elliptical(circular) aperture and the *iraf* ELLIPSE(PHOT) task. For an effective radius, $R_e = 10$ pixels, we estimated photometry in the case of a symmetric exponential profile (solid line), exponential profile with ellipticity equal to 0.5 and either position angle 0 (dashed line) or 45 (dotted line) degrees, and of a de Vaucouleurs profile (triangles). The case of adding noise is represented by filled circles with and without errorbars. The analytical Petrosian ratios for exponential (THEOexp) and de Vaucouleurs (THEOdeVauc) profiles are presented in the *second-column panels* as blue and cyan solid curves respectively.

Table A.2. Morphology measurements from known profile galaxies of $R_e = 10$ pixels.

Profile	G^{rP20}	$G^{SB-rP20S}$	M20	ell	C^{circ}	C^{ell}	C^{minA}	A	S
exp									
ell0	0.4888	0.5229	-1.752	0.05	2.657	2.513	2.386	0.0	0.016
ell0.5,pa0	0.4923	0.5326	-1.836	0.5	2.559	2.720	2.559	0.0	0.036
ell0.5,pa45	0.4874	0.5333	-1.796	0.5	2.559	2.657	2.559	0.0	0.034
noise	0.4914	0.5164	-1.164	0.114	2.236	2.526	2.236	-0.0135	0.393
deVauc									
	0.6183	0.6271	-2.398	0.05	3.495	4.162	3.495	0.0	0.025

Notes. The analytical values of C^{circ} is 2.7 and 5.2 for an exponential and a de Vaucouleurs profile respectively (Bershady et al. 2000). Lotz et al. (2006) estimated $G^{SB-rP20S} = 0.473$, $M20 = -1.8$, $C^{minA} = 2.71$ for a noise-free image of an exponential profile and $G^{SB-rP20S} = 0.6$, $M20 = -2.47$, $C^{minA} = 4.34$ for a noise-free image of a de Vaucouleurs profile (half-light-radius equal to 600 resolution elements).

vs. C^{minA} . In Fig. A.5 we show the diagrams of two-parameters, measured in the rest-frame optical, UV, and $Ly\alpha$ images. Our analysis showed that the G and $M20$ estimations were not

affected by resolution and survey depth. Therefore, they were useful for comparisons at different redshifts and different survey depths throughout the paper.




Fig. A.4. Mean $\Delta(\text{param})$ as defined in Eq. (A.1) vs. simulated survey depth. *param* is A (upper left), $C^{\text{min}A}$ (upper right), G^{rP20} (lower left), and $M20$ (lower right) for the rest-frame optical, UV, and $\text{Ly}\alpha$ simulated images. The deepest simulated survey is represented by the most right data point in each panel. The error bars represent the standard deviation among all the high- z simulated LARS galaxies. In the case fewer-than-twelve galaxies are detected at a specific depth, the error bars are increased proportionally to the number of undetected galaxies. The numbers on the top right corner of each panel represent the Spearman test coefficient, r , and probability, p , of uncorrelated datasets, assuming that the depth vector indicates the deepest survey on the right of the x -axis.




Fig. A.5. G^{rP20} vs. M20 (first column) and A vs. C^{minA} (second column) measured in the rest-frame optical (upper), UV (middle), and Ly α (lower) images. Small and big diamonds with error bars indicate the parameters of the original and (deepest survey) high- z simulated LARS galaxies. The dashed and dotted-dashed lines indicate the separation between merging system and normal galaxies' parameter space. Owing pixel resampling the galaxies stay in the same region of the G^{rP20} vs. M20 diagram.

Appendix B: LARS galaxies simulated at high redshift in a deep and shallow survey

In this appendix, we show the continuum and line maps of the high- z simulated LARS galaxies. Figures B.1–B.3 present

rest-frame UV, $\text{Ly}\alpha$, rest-frame optical, and $\text{H}\alpha$ images in the deepest survey depth probed here, together with SEx detection apertures. In Figs. B.4–B.6, we show the same stamps but for a shallower simulated survey.




Fig. B.1. Rest-frame UV (*first column*), $\text{Ly}\alpha$ (*second column*), rest-frame optical (*third column*), and $\text{H}\alpha$ (*fourth column panels*) images for z2L01, z2L02, z2L03, z2L05, and z2L07 in the deepest survey, probed here. Every panel is 20×17 kpc wide. The reddish ellipses indicate SEx apertures (dashed curves indicate flagged sources according to SEx convention), corresponding to the assumed detection parameters: DETECT THRESH = 1.65, DETECT MINAREA = 30, and DEBLEND MINCONT = 1 from Bond et al. (2009). The colour scaling is logarithmic and chosen to show a visually consistent background noise.




Fig. B.2. As Fig. B.1 for z2L08, z2L09, z2L10, z2L11, and z2L12. In the case of z2L09 and z2L11 the size is 27×27 kpc and 33×30 kpc respectively to fit their elongated shapes. For these galaxies SEx apertures in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ happen to be outside the shown region.




Fig. B.3. As Fig. B.1 for z2L13 and z2L14. For z2L13 SEx aperture in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ happens to be outside the shown region. Also, two main sources connected by undetectable ($m_{\text{rest-UV}} > 30$ and $F(\text{H}\alpha) < 6\text{E-}19 \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$) surface brightness structures are seen in UV continuum and $\text{H}\alpha$. By using the chosen detection parameters, SEx found two sources as separated. As in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ and optical continuum the photometric measurements are done centring the aperture close to the right clump, we locate the aperture on that one for the photometry in UV and $\text{H}\alpha$ as well.




Fig. B.4. As B.1, but for a shallow simulated survey. The dashed-line apertures indicate that some detected source is blended to another (Bertin & Arnouts 1996).




Fig. B.5. As Fig. B.2, but for a shallow simulated survey. z2L09 and z2L10 are not detected in Ly α at a 10σ detection limit of $3\text{E-}18 \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$.




Fig. B.6. As Fig. B.3, but for a shallow simulated survey. Only the bright right clump of z2L13 is detected in UV at a 10σ detection limit of $m_{\text{rest-UV}} = 29$. Its Ly α emission is localized around the lower side of the right clump. In H α the two overlapping sources become well separated.

Appendix C: Surface brightness profiles of original and high- z simulated LARS galaxies

We present here the surface brightness profiles of eleven LARS galaxies studied in this paper. The profiles of L01 were shown

in Fig. 8. Every figure in this appendix shows four panels, rest-frame UV and optical continua, $\text{Ly}\alpha$ and $\text{H}\alpha$ lines. The profiles are normalized to 2 kpc to compare continuum and line profiles.




Fig. C.1. Normalized surface brightness profiles of L02. Black points with error bars correspond to the surface brightness profile of the original LARS images in the rest-frame UV, optical, and $\text{Ly}\alpha$ as explained in the text (Fig. 8). The red squares represent the profile affected by background noise, for a certain shallow survey.




Fig. C.2. Same colour coding as in Fig. C.1, but for z2L03 and z2L05. The deepest and intermediate depth surveys are shown for z2L03(z2L05) in magenta(red) symbols with error bars, as throughout the paper.




Fig. C.3. Same colour coding as in Fig. C.1, but for z2L07 and z2L08. The deepest and intermediate depth surveys are shown for z2L07(z2L08) in blue(light green) symbols with error bars.




Fig. C.4. Same colour coding as in Fig. C.1, but for z2L09 and z2L10. The deepest and intermediate depth surveys are shown for z2L09(z2L10) in black(dark red) symbols with error bars.




Fig. C.5. Same colour coding as in Fig. C.1, but for z2L11 and z2L12. The deepest and intermediate depth surveys are shown for z2L11(z2L12) in dark green(orange) symbols with error bars.




Fig. C.6. Same colour coding as in Fig. C.1, but for z2L13 and z2L14. The deepest and intermediate depth surveys are shown for z2L13(z2L14) in grey(pink) symbols with error bars.