The MOSDEF Survey: Untangling the Emission-line Properties of $z \sim 2.3$ Star-forming Galaxies
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ABSTRACT

We analyze the rest-optical emission-line spectra of $z \sim 2.3$ star-forming galaxies in the complete MOSFIRE Deep Evolution Field (MOSDEF) survey. In investigating the origin of the well-known offset between the sequences of high-redshift and local galaxies in the $[\text{O}\,\text{III}]\lambda5008/H\beta$ vs. $[\text{N}\,\text{II}]\lambda6585/H\alpha$ (“[N II] BPT”) diagram, we define two populations of $z \sim 2.3$ MOSDEF galaxies. These include the high population that is offset towards higher $[\text{O}\,\text{III}]\lambda5008/H\beta$ and/or $[\text{N}\,\text{II}]\lambda6585/H\alpha$ with respect to the local SDSS sequence and the low population that overlaps the SDSS sequence. These two groups are also segregated within the $[\text{O}\,\text{III}]\lambda4960,5008$/[O II] $\lambda3727,3730$ (O$_{32}$) vs. $([\text{O}\,\text{III}]\lambda4960,5008+[\text{O}\,\text{II}]\lambda3727,3730)/H\beta$ (R$_{23}$) diagram, which suggests qualitatively that star-forming regions in the more offset galaxies are characterized by harder ionizing spectra at fixed nebular oxygen abundance. We also investigate many galaxy properties of the split sample and find that the high sample is on average smaller in size and less massive, but has higher specific star-formation rate and star-formation-rate surface density values and is slightly younger compared to the low population. From Cloudy+BPASS photoionization models, we estimate that the high population has a lower stellar metallicity (i.e., harder ionizing spectrum) but slightly higher nebular metallicity and higher ionization parameter compared to the low population. While the high population is more $\alpha$-enhanced (i.e., higher $\alpha$/Fe) than the low population, both samples are significantly more $\alpha$-enhanced compared to local star-forming galaxies with similar rest-optical line ratios. These differences must be accounted for in all high-redshift star-forming galaxies – not only those “offset” from local excitation sequences.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Rest-frame optical emission-line spectroscopy is one of the most important observational tools for understanding galaxy formation...
and evolution. Such spectra provide a wealth of information about a galaxy, including its star-formation rate (SFR), dust extinction, AGN activity, virial and non-virial dynamics (e.g., outflows) and properties of the ionized interstellar medium such as the metallicity, electron density ($n_e$), and ionization parameter ($U$). Accordingly, knowledge about the emission-line properties of star-forming galaxies across cosmic time is essential for understanding the evolution of the stellar and gaseous content in galaxies. It is of particular interest to study rest-optical emission-line spectra of galaxies at $z \sim 2$, which represents the epoch of peak star formation in the universe (Madau & Dickinson 2014) and a time before the modern Hubble sequence was fully in place.

In early work, Baldwin et al. (1981) showed how diagnostic diagrams measuring the intensity ratios of $\text{[O III]} \lambda 5007/\text{H}$β vs. $\text{[N II]} \lambda 6585/\text{H}$α, i.e., the “[N II] BPT diagram,” can be used to distinguish between star formation and active galactic nucleus (AGN) activity as the ionizing source for a galaxy. Other authors have also considered the $\text{[O III]} \lambda 5007/\text{H}$β vs. [S II] $\lambda 6718,6733/\text{H}$α diagram (originally introduced in Veilleux & Osterbrock 1987 and referred to hereafter as the “[S II] BPT diagram”) when investigating the ionization mechanism of a galaxy. Indeed, the shape of the ionizing spectrum as well as the typical ionization parameter are different in gas excited by an AGN as opposed to by hot stars. Accordingly, AGNs and star-forming galaxies occupy distinct regions within rest-optical emission-line diagrams. These diagnostic diagrams also reveal information about the physical properties of the galaxies. For example, stellar mass ($M_*$) and metallicity have been found to increase with decreasing $\text{[O III]} \lambda 5007/\text{H}$β and increasing $\text{[N II]} \lambda 6585/\text{H}$α along the local star-forming sequence in the [N II] BPT diagram (e.g., Masters et al. 2016).

Another diagram commonly used to describe star-forming galaxies is the $\text{[O III]} \lambda 4960,5007/\text{O II} \lambda 3727,3730$ ($\text{O}_{32}$) vs. $\text{[O III]} \lambda 4960,5007+\text{[O II]} \lambda 3727,3730/\text{H}$β ($R_{23}$) diagram. $O_{32}$ and $R_{23}$ are rough tracers for ionization parameter and metallicity, respectively. This diagram allows us to probe such physical quantities in star-forming galaxies (e.g., Lilly et al. 2003; Nakajima et al. 2013). For local galaxies, there is an increase in metallicity from the high excitation end ($high$ $O_{32}$ & $R_{23}$) to the low excitation tail (low $O_{32}$ & $R_{23}$) on this diagram (Andrews & Martini 2013; Shapley et al. 2015).

Early studies with Keck/NIRSPEC found that the location of galaxies on the [N II] BPT diagram is redshift dependent, as galaxies with $z > 1$ are found to be offset from local Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) galaxies, showing elevated $\text{[O III]} \lambda 5007/\text{H}$β at fixed $\text{[N II]} \lambda 6585/\text{H}$α (or vice versa; e.g. Shapley et al. 2005; Erb et al. 2006; Liu et al. 2008). Based on new observations with multi-object near-infrared spectrographs on 8-10-meter class telescopes, the sample of high-redshift galaxies with measurements of the BPT diagram emission lines now numbers in the hundreds. Of note, two large surveys of the high-redshift BPT diagram include the MOSFIRE Deep Evolution Field (MOSDEF; Kriek et al. 2015) survey and the Keck Baryonic Structure Survey (KBSS; Steidel et al. 2014), which find, based on much more robust statistical evidence, that high-redshift galaxies tend to have elevated $\text{[O III]} \lambda 5007/\text{H}$β and/or $\text{[N II]} \lambda 6585/\text{H}$α compared to local galaxies (Steidel et al. 2014; Shapley et al. 2015, 2019; Sanders et al. 2016; Strom et al. 2017).

Understanding this offset in emission-line ratios is vital because we use strong rest-optical emission-lines as empirical tracers for many physical properties (e.g., gas-phase oxygen abundance Pettini & Pagel 2004) of the interstellar medium (ISM). Due to the observed offset for $z > 1$ galaxies, it is unclear if local metallicity calibrations, e.g., Pettini & Pagel (2004), yield accurate metallicities when applied in the high-redshift universe. Therefore, it is essential to gain a complete understanding of why high-redshift galaxies have elevated $\text{[O III]} \lambda 5007/\text{H}$β and/or $\text{[N II]} \lambda 6585/\text{H}$α compared to the local SDSS sample. There have been many proposed explanations of this systematic offset, Possible explanations include variations in physical properties of galaxies such as H II region electron densities (or proportionally pressures), density structure, H II region ionization parameter, H II region ionizing spectra at fixed metallicities, gas-phase N/O abundance ratio differences, unresolved AGN activity, and shocks (e.g. Liu et al. 2008; Brinchmann et al. 2008; Wright et al. 2010; Kewley et al. 2013; Yeh et al. 2013; Masters et al. 2014; Coil et al. 2015; Sanders et al. 2016; Steidel et al. 2016; Strom et al. 2017; Freeman et al. 2019; Kashino et al. 2019; Shapley et al. 2019; Topping et al. 2020b). Galaxy selection effects could also be potential factors in this offset (Juneau et al. 2014).

Preliminary results from the MOSDEF survey (Shapley et al. 2015; Sanders et al. 2016) suggested that the offset in emission-line ratios is primarily due to elevated N/O at fixed O/H abundance patterns in $z > 2.3$ galaxies relative to local ones. Studies using KBSS data (Steidel et al. 2016; Strom et al. 2018, 2017) argued for a harder ionizing spectrum at fixed nebular metallicity as the main cause of the offset while other works using the Fiber Multi-Object Spectrograph (FMOS)-COSMOS survey (Kashino et al. 2017, 2019) or local analogues of high redshift galaxies (Bian et al. 2020) attribute the observed $\text{[N II]} \lambda 5007/\text{H}$α offset to a higher ionization parameter. More recent results from the MOSDEF survey using the complete MOSDEF data set now suggest a harder ionizing spectrum drives the BPT offset (Shapley et al. 2019; Sanders et al. 2020a, 2020b, 2020c).

The completed MOSDEF survey provides an ideal data set of high-redshift galaxies to help explore the observed offset on the [N II] BPT diagram. This survey provides access to spectra of ~1500 galaxies in the $z = 1.4 - 3.8$ redshift range, with full spectroscopic coverage of all the emission-lines needed to complete the [N II] BPT. [S II] BPT, and $O_{32}$ vs. $R_{23}$ diagrams in the $z = 1.4 - 2.6$ redshift range.

In this work, we improve upon the previous $z > 1$ BPT offset studies based on early MOSDEF data by Shapley et al. (2015) and Sanders et al. (2016). We now have the full MOSDEF sample in hand and apply a more careful spectral energy distribution (SED) fitting method that incorporates corrections to broadband photometric measurements for rest-optical emission-line fluxes. Accordingly, we infer unbiased age and stellar mass measurements, and can conduct a more thorough and complete investigation of the emission-line ratio properties of the MOSDEF sample. As an example of the level of improvement enabled by the full MOSDEF sample, the initial work by, Shapley et al. (2015) explored the location of 53 star-forming galaxies at $1.9 \leq z \leq 2.7$ on the [N II] BPT diagram, and investigated the $M_*$, specific SFR (sSFR), and SFR surface density ($\Sigma_{\text{SFR}}$) of the sample. In this study, the sample increases to 180 star-forming galaxies on the [N II] BPT diagram, and we also investigate additional galaxy parameters such as the galaxy effective radius ($R_e$), SFR, $n_e$, and stellar population age. Sanders et al. (2016) investigated how a sample of 53 star-forming galaxies at $1.9 \leq z \leq 2.7$ translated from the [N II] BPT diagram to the [S II] BPT diagram and $O_{32}$ vs. $R_{23}$ diagram. In the current study, that number is more than doubled to 122. Our more comprehensive analysis enables a better understanding of the observed offset between the MOSDEF sample and local galaxies on the [N II] BPT diagram.
diagram. Through the analysis outlined above, we aim to determine the underlying physical causes of this offset.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly describe the MOSDEF survey, and review our survey sample selection and data reduction. Section 3 presents the results of this study. Section 4 discusses the results and how they relate to photoionization models. Section 5 presents a summary of key results and looks ahead to future analyses. We adopt the following abbreviations for emission-line ratios used frequently throughout the paper.

\[
N_2 = \frac{[\text{N II}].6585}{\text{H} \alpha} 
\]

\[
S_2 = \frac{[\text{S II}].6718,6733}{\text{H} \alpha} 
\]

\[
O_3 = \frac{[\text{O III}].4900/\text{H} \beta} 
\]

\[
R_{23} = \frac{([\text{O III}].4960,5008 + [\text{O II}].3727,3730)/\text{H} \beta} 
\]

\[
O_{32} = \frac{[\text{O III}].4960,5008/[\text{O II}].3727,3730} 
\]

\[
O3N2 = O3/N2 
\]

Emission lines at z \sim 2.3

\[0.19, 2.0, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7\]

We imposed further restrictions to reach our final sample. Galaxies containing an AGN were identified and removed from the sample based on their IR colors, X-ray luminosity, or if N2 > 0.5 (Coil et al. 2015; Azadi et al. 2017; Leung et al. 2017). We also require a S/N \gtrsim 3 for each emission-line in our analysis. These criteria yielded a sample of 180 galaxies for initial classification in the [N II] BPT diagram, of which 122 galaxies are additionally detected in [S II].6718,6733 and [O II].3727,3730 and have size measurements from the Hubble Space Telescope (HST). The redshift distribution of the 180 MOSDEF star-forming galaxies at z \sim 2.3 with [N II] BPT diagram classifications is shown in Figure 1.

We correct H\alpha and H\beta line fluxes for stellar Balmer absorption as described in Kriek et al. (2015) and Reddy et al. (2015). We also dust correct emission-line ratios for which the member features differ significantly in wavelength, including O32 and R23. For such corrections, we assumed the Cardelli et al. (1989) dust attenuation curve and an unreddened H\alpha/H\beta ratio of 2.86. In the case of emission-line ratios for which the lines are close in wavelength (O3, N2, and S2) dust correction was not applied.

In this study, we investigate additional galaxy photometric, spectroscopic, and structural properties for the MOSDEF sample in order to try to better understand the observed rest-optical emission-line properties. The Hao et al. (2011) calibration for a Chabrier (2003) initial mass function (IMF) is used to estimate SFR(H\alpha) from stellar-Balmer-absorption-corrected, dust-corrected, and slit-loss-corrected H\alpha luminosities (Reddy et al. 2015; Kriek et al. 2015; Shivaei et al. 2015). We used the SED fitting code, FAST (Kriek et al. 2009) to obtain key stellar population parameters including stellar mass and age. For this modeling, as a default we assumed star-formation histories of the delayed-\tau form, where SFR \propto t \times e^{-t/\tau}. Here \tau is the time since the onset of star formation (i.e., age), and \tau is the characteristic star-formation timescale. Given the range of best-fit \tau values, the meaning of absolute ages is not necessarily clear. In order to obtain a better gauge of the relative maturities of the galaxy stellar populations in our sample, we used both normalized ages (i.e., t/\tau), and also the age (t) obtained from constant star formation (CSF) models. Galaxy sizes, R_e, are taken as the F160W galaxy half-light radii from the van der Wel et al. (2014) catalog, which were estimated using single-component Sérsic profile fits to
the two-dimensional light distribution of galaxies in the CANDELS and 3D-HST fields. We combine SFR(Hα) and $R_e$ to estimate the SFR surface density, $\Sigma_{\text{SFR}}$ as:

$$\Sigma_{\text{SFR}} = \frac{\text{SFR}(H\alpha)}{2\pi R_e^2} \quad (7)$$

We estimate the sSFR using SFR(Hα) and $M_*$ of both of which are described above.

The electron density, $n_e$, is estimated with the [OII] and [SII] emission-line doublets using the method described in Sanders et al. (2016). In that study, the [OII] and [SII] electron densities agree within the uncertainties; both reliable tracers of the density within HII regions. [OII] is the preferred choice because the doublet typically has a higher S/N. We only use [SII] measurements when we do not have adequate [OII] data. This scenario arises for the following reasons:

(i) Low S/N. A S/N $\geq 3$ is required for each emission-line in the doublet to estimate $n_e$; however, a less restrictive requirement of S/N $\geq 3$ for the overall doublet is sufficient for a galaxy to be included in the [SII] BPT and $O_32$ vs. $R_{32}$ diagrams. We only require S/N $\geq 3$ for the individual doublet members when investigating the $n_e$ of the sample.

(ii) Rejection of the [OII] doublet based on visual inspection. Such cases occur when skylines affect the [OII] doublet but not the [SII] doublet, spurious detections, and poor fits.

We set the lower limit for $n_e$ to be 1 cm$^{-3}$.

2.2 SDSS Comparison Sample

Throughout this study, we compare our high-redshift MOSDEF sample to local galaxies. For this comparison, we use archival data from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS; York et al. 2000) Data Release 7 (DR7; Abazajian et al. 2009). We obtain galaxy properties and emission-line measurements from the MPA-JHU DR7 release of spectrum measurements. SDSS galaxies are selected within the 0.04 $\leq z \leq$ 0.10 redshift range. We impose similar restrictions on our SDSS sample to those applied to the MOSDEF sample by requiring that each emission-line used in the analysis has a S/N $\geq 3$. For the SDSS sample, we remove AGN using equation 1 from Kauffmann et al. (2003). Galaxies are also identified as having an AGN component if N2 $>$ 0.5. These criteria result in a comparison sample of 103,422 SDSS galaxies when considering the [NII] BPT diagram alone, and 74,726 SDSS galaxies when considering galaxies with simultaneous detections across all four emission-line diagrams analyzed in this work ([NII] BPT, [SII] BPT, and $O_32$ vs. $R_{32}$).

3 RESULTS

3.1 The [NII] BPT Diagram

We start by investigating the locations of $z \sim 2.3$ star-forming galaxies in the [NII] BPT diagram based on the complete MOSDEF sample (Figure 2). We include the 180 galaxies with $\geq 3\sigma$ detections for all four emission-lines ($H\beta$, [OIII] $\lambda\lambda$4960,5008, Hα, and [NII] $\lambda$6585) and the corresponding SDSS sample with the same four emission-lines detected. Similar to previous MOSDEF studies (e.g. Shapley et al. 2015; Sanders et al. 2016; Shapley et al. 2019; Topping et al. 2020b) and other studies from the literature (e.g., Shapley et al. 2005; Erb et al. 2006; Steidel et al. 2014), there is a systematic offset observed for the high-redshift MOSDEF sample from the local sequence (Figure 2). The MOSDEF galaxies appear on average to be shifted towards the AGN region of the diagram with elevated N2 and/or O3 values, with some galaxies on the AGN side of the Kauffmann et al. (2003) AGN/SF boundary. There are even a small number of galaxies past the maximum starburst line from Kewley et al. (2001) as well.

To search for any biases in the sample based on the $\geq 3\sigma$ detection requirement in all four [NII] BPT lines, we construct spectral stacks for all MOSDEF galaxies at $1.9 \leq z \leq 2.7$ with Hα emission detected at S/N $\geq 3$. There are four spectral stacks, divided into bins of stellar mass (see Sanders et al. 2018 for a full description of the method for constructing composite spectra). The emission-line ratios measured from stacked spectra follow the distribution of datapoints measured from MOSDEF galaxies with individual detections in all [NII] BPT lines. Therefore, the sample of individual detections seems to represent the parent $z \sim 2.3$ MOSDEF data set with minimal bias. The four stacks, similarly to the individually detected galaxies, are offset from the local SDSS sample with elevated N2 and/or O3 values.

3.2 Dividing the $z \sim 2.3$ Sample in the [NII] BPT Diagram

Figure 2 shows that on the [NII] BPT diagram, part of the MOSDEF sample sits on or near the local SDSS sequence, while the remainder of the galaxies lie off the SDSS sequence and are shifted towards the local AGN region. We can investigate if the location of a high-redshift galaxy – either on or offset from the local SDSS sequence – is connected to other physical properties of the galaxy. For this analysis, we examine how galaxies on the [NII] BPT diagram populate the [SII] BPT and $O_32$ vs. $R_{32}$ diagrams, and therefore require the sample to have $\geq 3\sigma$ detections for all emission-lines on these diagrams: [OII] $\lambda$3727,3730, Hβ, [OIII] $\lambda\lambda$4960,5008, Hα, [NII] $\lambda$6585, and [SII] $\lambda\lambda$6718,6733. There are 123 MOSDEF galaxies that meet this criterion. One galaxy was removed because it does not have a $R_e$ measurement, which brings the final sample to 122 MOSDEF galaxies.

For this analysis, we split the final sample of 122 galaxies into two groups using the functional form presented in Shapley et al. (2015), and adjusting the y-intercept so that our sample is divided in half. The equation used to split the MOSDEF sample into two groups of 61 galaxies each, which has a lower y-intercept of 0.055 compared to equation 1 in Shapley et al. (2015), is

$$\log([OIII]/H\beta) = \frac{0.67}{\log([NII]/H\alpha) - 2.0} + 1.065 \quad (8)$$

This splitting of the sample on the [NII] BPT diagram is shown in the upper left panel of Figure 3, where galaxies above the curve are indicated with blue symbols and those below with red symbols. Hereafter, we refer to the galaxies above the curve on the [NII] BPT diagram as the high sample, and the group below the curve as the low sample, following the nomenclature in Topping et al. (2020b). We plot the two samples on both the [SII] BPT diagram (upper right panel of Figure 3) and the $O_32$ vs. $R_{32}$ diagram (bottom panel of Figure 3). We also include running median lines for both the high (blue) and low (red) populations. These running medians are binned by $\log([OIII]/N2)$ for the [NII] BPT diagram, $\log([OIII]) - \log([S2])$ for the [SII] BPT diagram, and $\log([OIII]) + \log([R_{32}])$ for the $O_32$ vs. $R_{23}$ diagram. The binning schemes above were adopted because they divide our sample into subgroups segregated roughly along
the local star-forming sequence. For both the high and low samples, each of which contain 61 galaxies, there are four equally sized bins (three bins of 15 galaxies and one bin of 16).

For completeness, we checked for potential bias between the smaller sample of 122 galaxies with detections across all three emission-line diagrams and the parent sample of 180 galaxies defined based on detections in the [N II] BPT diagram alone. Of the 58 galaxies that were removed, 32 are above the curve dividing our sample (Equation 8) and 26 are below it on the [N II] BPT diagram. Because these two groups are approximately equal in size, we can expect that the smaller subset with [O II] and [S II] also detected (122 galaxies) has approximately the same average BPT offset as the larger [N II] BPT only sample (180 galaxies). Therefore, we can conclude that the cuts to create the sample of 122 galaxies with detections across all three emission-line diagrams do not introduce biases when compared to the larger parent sample of 180 galaxies.

3.2.2 Physical Properties of the Galaxies

The fact that there is a segregation in all three plots in Figure 3 implies that there are some key differences between galaxies offset from the local SDSS sequence and galaxies that overlap with it. We now investigate several galaxy physical properties to uncover any differences between the galaxies that fall into these two categories. In this study, as described in Section 2.1, we focus on: $M_*$, log($t/\tau$) of the stellar population assuming a constant star formation history, SFR(Hα), sSFR, $\Sigma_{SFR}$, $R_e$, and $n_e$. We have measurements of these properties for all 122 galaxies in the sample except for $n_e$. As discussed in Section 2.1, a more stringent requirement of a S/N $\geq 3$ for each component of the [O II] or [S II] doublet is needed to estimate $n_e$ while a S/N $\geq 3$ for the combined doublet is needed to be plotted on the [S II] BPT and O32 vs. R23 diagrams. Accordingly, while our fiducial sample for analysis contains 122 galaxies, only 90 of them (44 high and 46 low) have reliable $n_e$ estimates.

We show how the high and low samples divide in the space of each of these parameters using histograms, marking the median value of the parameter with solid lines for each high and low population (Figure 4). Showing the data in this format clearly highlights how the high and low samples separately distribute in each of the galaxy parameters and, accordingly, which of the galaxy parameters are correlated with the location of galaxies on the [N II] BPT diagram. The median values for the high and low populations are listed with 1σ uncertainties derived from bootstrap resampling in Table 1.

While the distributions of the high and low samples significantly overlap for some galaxy parameters, there are several parameters for which the high and low distributions are measurably offset in the median and spread. These results indicate that high sample of

---

**Figure 2.** [N II] BPT diagram. Green points indicate $1.9 \leq z \leq 2.7$ MOSDEF galaxies with S/N $\geq 3$ for all four plotted emission-lines. Large magenta stars represent measurements of stacks from composite spectra, binned by stellar mass, for $1.9 \leq z \leq 2.7$ MOSDEF galaxies. The grayscale 2D histogram indicates local SDSS galaxies. The cyan curve is the fit to the MOSDEF sample from Shapley et al. (2015). The orange curve is a fit to the $z \sim 0$ star-forming locus (Kewley et al. 2013). The red curve is the best fit to the $z \sim 2.3$ galaxies from the Keck Baryonic Structure Survey (KBSS; Steidel et al. 2014). The black curve is the maximum starburst line from Kewley et al. (2001). The blue curve is the empirical AGN/star-forming galaxy dividing line from Kauffmann et al. (2003).
MOSDEF galaxies tend to have a smaller $R_e$ and $M_*$, but a larger sSFR and $\Sigma_{\text{SFR}}$ compared to the low sample. We also note that even though $R_e$, sSFR, and $\Sigma_{\text{SFR}}$ are correlated with $M_*$, at fixed $M_*$ the high sample is still found to be smaller with larger sSFR and $\Sigma_{\text{SFR}}$ values compared to the low sample. With smaller significance, the high sample is also younger (smaller median $t/\tau$ and CSF $t$). We find no mutual correlation for either $n_e$ or SFR with the location of galaxies on the [N II] BPT diagram.

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Comparison with Previous Work

We have divided the $z \sim 2.3$ MOSDEF sample according to location in the [N II] BPT diagram. When separated in this manner, our sample also shows segregation in the [S II] BPT and O$_{32}$ vs. R$_{23}$ diagrams. These results update earlier MOSDEF work (Shapley et al. 2015; Sanders et al. 2016), and are in agreement with more recent MOSDEF studies (e.g., Shapley et al. 2019; Topping et al. 2020b). Our findings for the population segregation on the [S II] BPT diagram are also in agreement with those of Strom et al. (2017), in which a similar segregation in the [S II] BPT diagram is found for $z \sim 2.3$ star-forming galaxies from the KBSS survey when separated by [N II] BPT location. Strom et al. (2017) did not consider the relative positions of the KBSS equivalent of our high and low galaxies on the O$_{32}$ vs. R$_{23}$ diagram. However, these authors do show how photoionization models with different input parameters (i.e., varying ionizing spectrum at fixed nebular metallicity) vary across the O$_{32}$ vs. R$_{23}$ parameter space. Specifically, it is shown that models with harder ionizing spectra at fixed nebular metallicity are offset towards higher R$_{23}$ at fixed O$_{32}$. Strom et al. (2017) additionally show that models with harder ionizing spectra produce higher O3 at both fixed S2 and N2. These separations are at least qualitatively similar to that observed between our high and low samples.

The suggested implication of these segregations on both [S II]
Emission lines at $z \sim 2.3$.

Figure 4. Distribution of physical properties for the 122 galaxy MOSDEF sample shown in Figure 3 where the blue and red bins correspond to the high and low samples, respectively. The green lines are the median values for the high population, while the yellow lines are the median values for the low population. The median values with uncertainties for both populations are given in Table 1. The following galaxy properties are shown: (a) $M_*$, (b) $\log(t/\tau)$ of the stellar population using a delayed-$\tau$ star formation model, (c) $t$ of the stellar population assuming a constant star formation history, (d) SFR(H$\alpha$), (e) sSFR, (f) $\Sigma_{\text{SFR}}$, (g) $R_e$, and (h) $n_e$ estimated from the [O II] or [S II] doublet emission-lines. We find that the median $M_*$, sSFR, $\Sigma_{\text{SFR}}$, and $R_e$ differ significantly based on their location in the [N II] BPT Diagram, while the other properties are within the uncertainties of each other.

BPT and O$_{32}$ vs. R$_{23}$ diagrams is a harder ionizing spectrum at fixed O/H, relative to local galaxies (e.g., Strom et al. 2017; Shapley et al. 2019; Topping et al. 2020b). A harder ionizing spectrum at fixed nebular metallicity in $z \sim 2.3$ galaxies may arise due to $\alpha$-enhancement (i.e., super-solar O/Fe values) in the massive stars exciting the ionized gas in star-forming regions. Such abundance patterns may arise naturally in high-redshift galaxies, given the young median ages of their stellar populations (e.g., Steidel et al. 2016; Sanders et al. 2020a; Topping et al. 2020b).

We have also shown in Figure 4 that the high sample is associated with more compact (i.e., smaller $R_e$ and higher $\Sigma_{\text{SFR}}$), and intense (i.e., higher sSFR) star formation than the low sample. These differences between the two populations exist at fixed stellar mass as well. It will be important to explore the links between these global galaxy properties and the abundance patterns of massive stars using realistic galaxy formation simulations (e.g., FIRE-2; Hopkins et al. 2018).

4.2 Comparison with Photoionization Models

4.2.1 Modeling Methodology

We use photoionization models to explain simultaneously the joint distributions of high and low galaxies in the [N II] and [S II] BPT and O$_{32}$ vs. R$_{23}$ diagrams. For this analysis, we use a combination of the code Cloudy (v17.01; Ferland et al. 2017) and the Binary Population And Spectral Synthesis (BPASS) v2.2.1 models (Eldridge et al. 2017; Stanway & Eldridge 2018). BPASS generates the spectra of model stellar populations, which we used as the input ionizing
spectrum to Cloudy. We assume a constant star-formation history in the BPASS models, as constructed in Topping et al. (2020b). Additionally, we use stellar population models that follow a Chabrier (2003) IMF and set 100 $M_\odot$ as the high-mass cutoff.

Using the BPASS input ionizing spectrum, Cloudy predicts the rest-optical emission-line strengths for different combinations of physical properties. For this analysis, we set the N/O abundance ratio using equation (2) in Pilyugin et al. (2012), use the Asplund et al. (2009) [S II] abundance pattern, and assume that $n_e = 250$ cm$^{-3}$, which is characteristic of $z \sim 2.3$ galaxies (Sanders et al. 2016; Strom et al. 2017; Harshan et al. 2020). This value for $n_e$ is slightly lower than the median values of our high and low samples; however, it is within the uncertainties of the low population and not significantly less than the lower limit of the high population median. The best-fit $n_e$ values from this study also agree within the uncertainties with the those reported in Sanders et al. (2016) and Strom et al. (2017). In addition, we use Cloudy to estimate the contribution from the nebular continuum and added this into the BPASS stellar population models. To estimate this nebular contribution, we assume $\log(U) = -2.5$ and $\log(Z_{\text{neb}}/Z_\odot) = -0.2$, which are typical of $z \sim 2.3$ galaxies (Sanders et al. 2016). Changing these conditions does not significantly affect the nebular continuum, which is small contribution to the overall spectrum. Therefore, adjustments to the initial parameters for the nebular continuum have minimal impact on the final model fitting (Topping et al. 2020b). As a sanity check on our models, we are able to reproduce the results from Steidel et al. (2016) using their initial input parameters.

For our Cloudy+BPASS model grids, we varied the following parameters: stellar metallicity ($Z_\star$), $t$ (i.e., age), of the stellar population assuming a constant star formation history, gas-phase oxygen abundance ($Z_{\text{neb}}$), and ionization parameter ($U$). We find that our choice of $t$ over the range $10^7$ to $10^{9.5}$ yr (Topping et al. 2020b) has a negligible effect of the position of models on all three diagrams, so we chose a value of $10^{8.5}$ yr because it is approximately the median $t$ (assuming a constant star-formation history) of the $z \sim 2.3$ MOSDEF sample in this study.

In the photoionization model grids, ionization parameter and nebular metallicity range between $-3.60 \leq \log(U) \leq -1.40$ and $-1.3 \leq \log(Z_{\text{neb}}/Z_\odot) \leq 0.20$, respectively. Within the ranges of interest ($-3.40 \leq \log(U) \leq -2.40$ and $-1.00 \leq \log(Z_{\text{neb}}/Z_\odot) \leq 0.00$), these grids are finely sampled in steps of 0.02 dex. Outside of these regions, $\log(U)$ changes in steps of 0.20 dex. We also include three additional values for $\log(Z_{\text{neb}}/Z_\odot)$: 0.10 and 0.20, extending up towards higher metallicity, and $-1.30$ to round out the low-metallicity extreme. The stellar metallicity of the BPASS models includes discrete values of $Z_\star = 0.00001, 0.0001, 0.001, 0.002, 0.003, 0.004, 0.006, 0.008, 0.01, 0.014, 0.02$, and 0.03. We assume Asplund et al. (2009) solar abundance (i.e., $Z_\star = 0.014$).

### 4.2.2 Fixed $Z_\star$ Models

In a recent MOSDEF study, Topping et al. (2020b) combined rest-UV and rest-optical spectra for a sample of 62 star-forming galaxies at $z \sim 2.3$ and constructed high and low samples using a similar methodology as this study (i.e. based on offset from the local sequence on the [N II] BPT diagram). Fitting composite rest-frame UV spectra from their high and low stacked spectra resulted in best-fit $Z_{\text{neb}}$ values of 0.001 and 0.002, respectively. Best-fit $Z_{\text{neb}}$ and $\log(U)$ values were then based on comparing the emission-line ratios measured from the stacked spectra with those generated by the same Cloudy photoionization model described above assuming the stellar metallicities obtained from the rest-UV spectra. We do not have rest-UV spectra for the full sample of 122 galaxies in our emission-line analysis, and therefore cannot obtain tight constraints on the median $Z_\star$ for the high and low samples of this work from our rest-optical data alone. Accordingly, we adopt the best-fit $Z_\star$ values from Topping et al. (2020b) for our two MOSDEF populations. This is a reasonable assumption because 45/62 (73%) of the galaxies in Topping et al. (2020b) are in this work, and the high and low samples are reasonably well matched to the corresponding samples in Topping et al. (2020b).

Figure 5 shows Cloudy+BPASS photoionization models overplotted with our data, assuming $Z_\star$ values of 0.001 (left column; high sample) and 0.002 (right column; low sample). Using the solar value of $12+\log(O/H) = 8.69$ (Asplund et al. 2009), we convert $\log(Z_{\text{neb}}/Z_\odot)$ to $12+\log(O/H)$. Each curve corresponds to a different $12+\log(O/H)$ value, as indicated by color. The triangular points along each nebular metallicity curve comprise the sequence of $\log(U)$ values. The points are smallest for $\log(U) = -3.60$ and largest for $-1.40$, therefore, increasing in size as $\log(U)$ increases. The Cloudy+BPASS model grids are overplotted on the MOSDEF and SDSS data. The green and yellow squares on the [N II] BPT, [S II] BPT, and O$_{32}$ vs. R$_{32}$ diagrams indicate, respectively, the median values of the high and low samples. Uncertainties for these median values were obtained through bootstrap resampling and perturbing each resampled data point by its individual error according to a normal distribution. The sample median was calculated for each bootstrapped, perturbed sample, and then the 16th and 84th percentiles of the distribution of medians were taken as the lower and upper bounds, respectively, as the 1σ confidence interval on the plotted median value.

Using stellar metallicities of 0.001 and 0.002, respectively, for the high and low populations, we then estimate the best-fit $12+\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$ values for the sample median data points using a $\chi^2$ method that compares the N2, S2, O3, and O$_{32}$ emission-line ratios between the models and data. R$_{32}$ is not used because it is not independent of the other emission-line ratios (i.e., R$_{32}$ can be found from a combination of O3 and O$_{32}$). While Figure 5 displays $12+\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$ in large steps, we use the finer grids of 0.02 dex spacing for both physical properties when estimating the best-fit sample values. The results for the best-fit $12+\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$ values with 1σ uncertainties from the bootstrap resampling are shown in Table 2. The corner plot showing the distributions of these two properties obtained using the bootstrapped, perturbed N2, S2, O3, and O32 medians are shown in the top left panel of Figure 6.

We find that both $12+\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$ are larger for the

| Physical Property | High Median (1) | Low Median (3) |
|-------------------|----------------|---------------|
| $\log(M_\star)\ (M_\odot)$ | 9.84 ± 0.07 | 10.19 ± 0.06 |
| $\log(t/yr)$ | 0.20 ± 0.16 | 0.40 ± 0.08 |
| $\log(n_{\text{H II}})$ (yr$^{-1}$) | 8.50 ± 0.08 | 8.60 ± 0.07 |
| SFR(H$_\alpha$) (M$_\odot$ yr$^{-1}$) | 42.7 ± 7.5 | 34.3 ± 4.9 |
| sSFR (yr$^{-1}$) | $-8.25 ± 0.07$ | $-8.58 ± 0.06$ |
| $\Sigma_{\text{SFR}}$ (M$_\odot$ yr$^{-1}$ kpc$^{-2}$) | 2.45 ± 0.56 | 0.70 ± 0.15 |
| $R_e$ (kpc) | 1.77 ± 0.20 | 2.75 ± 0.21 |
| $n_e$ (cm$^{-3}$) | 322 ± 58 | 300 ± 59 |

Table 1. Col. (1): Physical property of the galaxies in the sample shown in Figure 4. Col. (2): Median value with uncertainty of the high sample. Col. (3): Median value with uncertainty of the low sample.
Figure 5. Left column: $Z_*=0.001$ (solid lines). Right column: $Z_*=0.002$ (dashed lines). Cloudy+BPASS model emission-line ratios shown on the [N II] BPT (top row), [S II] BPT (middle row), and O$_32$ vs. R$_{23}$ diagrams (bottom row). The triangle data points on the curves increase in size as $12+\log(O/H)$ decreases and $\log(U)$ increases. To avoid overcrowding, we vary $\log(U)$ in steps of 0.20 dex and have nebular metallicity range between $-0.60 \leq 12+\log(O/H) \leq 0.20$ in 0.10 dex steps, with additional values that extend deeper into the subsolar regime included as well ($-0.80$, $-1.00$, and $-1.30$). We adopt an age of $10^{8.6}$ yr because it is the approximate median age of the MOSDEF sample (given a constant star-formation history), but the results are not sensitive to age. Also plotted are the local SDSS sample (grey 2D histogram) and the high (blue points) and low (red points) MOSDEF samples with running medians as shown in Figure 3. The green and yellow squares, with associated uncertainties, are the median values of the high and low populations.

The median data point of the high population ($12+\log(O/H) = 8.37^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$, $\log(U) = -2.88^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$) compared to the median data point of the low population ($12+\log(O/H) = 8.31^{+0.04}_{-0.02}$, $\log(U) = -3.08^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$). The difference in $\log(U)$ between the two samples is more statistically significant than the difference in $12+\log(O/H)$, as median values of the latter agree within the uncertainties. The high population also appears to be more $\alpha$-enhanced, due to it having a lower $Z_*$ but a higher $12+\log(O/H)$ compared to the low population. Based on the variation of best-fit $12+\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$ values between the high and low median data points, we conclude that quantifying both...
of these physical parameters, in addition to stellar metallicity (i.e., the hardness of the ionizing spectrum), is important when explaining the distribution of high-redshift galaxies in the [N II] BPT diagram. It is worth noting that we have shown the high population to be less massive (i.e., smaller $M_*$) but more metal-rich (i.e., larger 12+$\log(O/H)$) compared to the low population. This combination of physical properties is the opposite of what is expected based on results from previous studies investigating the mass-metallicity relationship (e.g., Tremonti et al. 2004; Steidel et al. 2014; Sanders et al. 2018, 2020a), which show that $M_*$ and 12+$\log(O/H)$ have a positive relationship.

For the most part, these results are in agreement with Topping et al. (2020b). The best fit 12+$\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$ values from both studies are in agreement within 1σ, except for the $\log(U)$ of the two high populations, which agree within 2σ. However, this study finds a larger difference in $\log(U)$ between the high and low samples, 0.20 dex, compared to Topping et al. (2020b), 0.07 dex. On the other hand, Topping et al. (2020b) find a larger variance in 12+$\log(O/H)$ between the two populations, 0.10 dex, compared to this study, 0.06 dex. These differences are due to the slightly different median rest-optical line ratios for the high and low populations in Topping et al. (2020b) and in the current work.

To characterize the variation of physical properties within each of our high and low populations, we apply the same methodology of finding the best-fit 12+$\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$ values, but in this case for the two endpoints of the running medians for the high and low samples in the [N II] BPT diagram. We use the same binning method for the [N II] BPT diagram (i.e., four equally sized bins based on O3N2 strength; see Section 3.2 above for complete details on binning) when calculating the median O3, N2, S2, and O32 emission-line ratios for the endpoints of both running medians. Uncertainties for the line ratios of the running median endpoints are estimated using the same methodology of bootstrap resampling coupled with perturbation of the datapoints of individual galaxies according to their error bars, as described above. On the [N II] BPT diagram, the running medians move primarily in the N2 direction, therefore, we refer to the endpoints of both running medians as “large-N2” and “small-N2”. It is important to note that the large-N2 endpoints of both high and low running medians have larger S2, and smaller O32 compared to the small-N2 endpoints. In other words, while the binning method was not the same on all three diagrams in Figure 3 (i.e., the four bins do not necessarily contain the same galaxies), the large-N2 bins on the [N II] BPT diagram have significant overlap with (and therefore roughly correspond to) the larger-S2, and smaller-O32 endpoints of the running medians on the [S II] BPT and O32 vs. R23 diagrams.

The results of Topping et al. (2020a) suggest that a positive correlation exists between N2 and $Z_*$ (i.e., stellar metallicity tends to be higher at larger N2 values). Therefore, we vary the $Z_*$ values that we assume for the large-N2 and small-N2 endpoints of the running medians accordingly. For the low population, we assume stellar metallicities of 0.003 and 0.001 (i.e., ±0.001 from the median $Z_*$) for the large-N2 and small-N2 points, respectively. Similarly, for the high population, we assume stellar metallicity values of 0.002 and 0.001 for the large-N2 and small-N2 points, respectively. We do not lower the stellar metallicity of the small-N2 point of the high population to our next available $Z_*$ model value (0.0001, a factor of 10 lower than the next highest $Z_*$ value) because the results from Topping et al. (2020a) do not suggest that such a significant variation in stellar metallicity is observed. It is important to note that while we do vary $Z_*$ in accordance with the results from Topping et al. (2020b), the best-fit 12+$\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$ for the large-N2 and small-N2 endpoints of the high and low populations do not change significantly if we use $Z_*$ = 0.001 and 0.002 (i.e., the $Z_*$ values used for the median high and low population data points). We will discuss this systematic effect of how our choice in $Z_*$ influences the best-fit 12+$\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$ in more detail below in Sections 4.2.3 and 4.2.4.

Median 12+$\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$ values for the large-N2 and small-N2 endpoints of the high and low populations are included in Table 2. The corner plots showing the distributions of 12+$\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$ for the large-N2 and small-N2 endpoints are shown in the top right and bottom panels, respectively, of Figure 6. In both samples we find an anti-correlation between 12+$\log(O/H)$ and

| Physical Property | High Median (1) | Low Median (2) |
|-------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Z_0               | 0.001          | 0.002         |
| 12+$\log(O/H)$   | 8.37$_{-0.04}^{+0.04}$ | 8.31$_{-0.02}^{+0.04}$ |
| $\log(U)$        | −2.88$_{-0.04}^{+0.04}$ | −3.08$_{-0.04}^{+0.02}$ |
| Large-N2         |                |               |
| Z_0               | 0.002          | 0.003         |
| 12+$\log(O/H)$   | 8.49$_{-0.04}^{+0.02}$ | 8.41$_{-0.04}^{+0.02}$ |
| $\log(U)$        | −3.04$_{-0.04}^{+0.04}$ | −3.26$_{-0.04}^{+0.04}$ |
| Small-N2         |                |               |
| Z_0               | 0.001          | 0.001         |
| 12+$\log(O/H)$   | 8.31$_{-0.04}^{+0.04}$ | 8.23$_{-0.04}^{+0.02}$ |
| $\log(U)$        | −2.60$_{-0.06}^{+0.06}$ | −2.94$_{-0.04}^{+0.02}$ |

Table 2. Col. (1): Physical property of the sample. Col. (2): Median value with uncertainty of the high sample. Col. (3): Median value with uncertainty of the low sample. For Columns (2) & (3), the $Z_*$ values were selected and were not obtained from fitting the data. Also, the more finely spaced grids that vary 12+$\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$ in steps of 0.02 dex were used.
Emission lines at $z \sim 2.3$

Figure 6. Corner plots comparing the distributions of $12+\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$ for the high (blue) and low (red) MOSDEF populations. The distributions for the sample median points, i.e. green and yellow squares in Figure 5, (upper left), large-N2 endpoint of the sample running medians (top right) and small-N2 endpoint of the sample running medians (bottom center) are included. We assume $Z^*$ values of 0.001 and 0.002 (median points; top left panel), 0.002 and 0.003 (large-N2 points; top right panel), and 0.001 and 0.001 (low-N2 points; bottom panel) for the high and low populations, respectively. The dashed lines on the histograms mark the median value and 1σ uncertainties (16th and 84th percentiles) for the distributions of $12+\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$, and the three contours on the diagonal mark the 1, 1.5, and 2σ regions in the 2-D $12+\log(O/H)-\log(U)$ parameter space. It is shown that moving from large- to small-N2 corresponds to decreasing nebular metallicity and increasing ionization parameter. In each of the three distributions, the high population has a higher $12+\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$.

4.2.3 Variable $Z^*$ Models

As described above, thus far we have assumed $Z^*$ values of 0.001 and 0.002 for the high and low population median points to match the best-fit values from modeling the rest-frame UV spectra of $z \sim 2.3$ MOSDEF galaxies (Topping et al. 2020b). While this is a reasonable assumption, we also investigate how relaxing our requirement on stellar metallicity affects the best-fit nebular metallicity and ionization parameter values of the two populations. For this additional analysis, we use the same $\chi^2$ method described above (i.e., fitting the N2, S2, O3, and O32 emission-line ratios). However, we not only fit for $12+\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$, but also treat $Z^*$ as a free parameter. We investigate two different model grids: one that allows a small range of $Z^*$ for the high and low samples, including the best-fit stellar metallicities from Topping et al. (2020b) for each population and those that are adjacent to the best-fit values, and a fully unrestricted method that allows all $Z^*$ values used by the BPASS models ranging from 0.00001 to 0.03.

This analysis shows that when we relax the constraints provided by rest-UV spectra (both with limited freedom and in a fully
Figure 7. Left column: $Z_e = 0.0001$, $n_e = 250$ cm$^{-3}$ (dotted lines). Right column: $Z_e = 0.001$, $n_e = 1000$ cm$^{-3}$ (dot-dashed lines). Cloudy+BPASS model emission-line ratios shown on the [N II] BPT (top row), [S II] BPT (middle row), and O$_{32}$ vs. R$_{23}$ diagrams (bottom row). A comparison of these models with the corresponding panels in Figure 5 shows how raising the electron density and lowering stellar metallicity affects the predicted emission-line ratios. The correspondence between colors and symbol size and, respectively, $12+\log(O/H)$ and $\log(U)$, matches that in Figure 5. Once again, we adopt an age of $10^{8.6}$ yr because it is the approximate median age of the MOSDEF sample (given a constant star-formation history) and include the local SDSS sample (grey 2D histogram), the high (blue) sample, and low (red) sample with running medians as shown in Figure 3. The green and yellow squares, with associated uncertainties, are the median values of the high and low populations as shown in Figure 5. Aside from at roughly solar and supersolar nebular metallicities, a higher electron density has a minimal affect on the Cloudy+BPASS model grids and cannot reach the elevated O$_3$ and O$_{32}$ galaxies. A lower stellar metallicity is able to reach these values, suggesting that the most offset galaxies have the hardest ionizing spectrum.
unconstrained manner), the rest-optical emission lines tend to favor higher stellar metallicities. When we allow for limited freedom in Z, the stellar metallicities for the high and low samples prefer the largest allowed Z, i.e., 0.002 and 0.003, respectively. When all stellar metallicity values are allowed, the high and low populations favor Z values about 4–5 times greater than those found by Topping et al. (2020b) based on fitting rest-UV spectra. These shifts demonstrate the importance of imposing external constraints from a more direct probe of massive stars and stellar metallicity, i.e., the rest-UV continuum, as opposed to relying only on a joint fit of rest-optical emission lines. We also note that, while the best-fit values of Z increase when stellar metallicity is allowed to vary, the low population still always favors a higher Z than the high population.

The best-fit 12+log(O/H) and log(U) values for the single-Z, and limited freedom Z, models are significantly consistent (i.e., within 1σ) for both the high and low populations. For the high sample, the best-fit values for the single-Z, and fully unconstrained Z, models are consistent significantly as well. For the low sample, only some of the best-fit values for the single-Z, and fully unconstrained Z, models are consistent within 1σ; however, all values are consistent within 2σ. In addition, similar to what we find for the single-Z models, we find that O/H increases and log(U) decreases with increasing N2 in both free-Z models.

4.2.4 The Importance of α-Enhancement

In summary, using rest-optical emission line ratios alone without the constraints from fitting rest-UV spectra, we infer systematically higher Z values for both high and low samples. At the same time, when multiple rest-optical emission lines ratios are measured (N2, S2, O3, and O32), the inferred median nebular parameters (12+log(O/H) and log(U)) and their variation across the BPT diagram, do not depend strongly on the allowed range of Z. However, the inclusion of constraints on Z from rest-UV fitting is essential for our understanding of the abundance patterns (i.e., α-enhancement) of z ~ 2.3 galaxies and we adopt the constrained values of Topping et al. (2020b) for our fiducial modeling procedure (Table 2). Because we see variation in Z, 12+log(O/H), and log(U) at the median and large- and small-N2 endpoints for the high and low samples, we conclude that constraints on all three of these physical properties are required for fully understanding the observed distribution of z ~ 2.3 star-forming galaxies in the [N II] BPT diagram.

It is also important to note that while the high sample is more α-enhanced with a harder ionizing spectrum compared to the low sample, both populations are α-enhanced and both are characterized by a harder ionizing spectra when compared with their equivalents (i.e., galaxies with similar rest-optical line ratios) at low redshift. Notably, such physical differences apply to the low population, even though it overlaps with the local [N II] BPT sequence. Specifically, an overlap in emission-line ratios does not correspond to the same properties for the ionizing radiation field and ionized gas.

In addition, the differences between the high and low populations found in both this section and in Section 3.2.2 suggest that z ~ 2.3 galaxies in the high sample that generally have a lower Z, with higher 12+log(O/H) and log(U) values are also typically smaller with higher sSFR and 2ΣIR values. Looking ahead, we must understand why there exists a connection between the local properties of ionized star-forming regions and the overall compactness/intensity of star formation. However, exploring this phenomenon is outside the scope of the current work.

4.2.5 Discrepancies Between Data and Models

It is worth noting that in all three diagrams in Figure 5, there are galaxies that do not lie within the Cloudy+BPASS grid space. On the [N II] BPT and [S II] BPT diagrams, there are galaxies with O3 values that exceed the extremes of the model grids. Similarly on the O32 vs. R23 diagram, we observe MOSDEF galaxies with higher R23 values than what the Cloudy+BPASS models predict. These offsets are primarily found among the high population. Such extreme galaxies are not specific to this study, as Strom et al. (2017) find similar discrepancies between data and models in the corresponding emission-line diagnostic diagrams.

For the Cloudy+BPASS model grids in this study, two possible solutions could be to either elevate ne or lower Z. Increasing ne has been shown to cause elevated O3 and N2 values (Kewley et al. 2013). Since the high population (defined by its elevated O3 and/or N2 values) also has elevated R23 values on average, increasing ne in our Cloudy+PASS models theoretically could push the curves to higher R23. The models in this study, which were constructed by Topping et al. (2020b), set ne = 250 cm⁻³, which is typical of z ~ 2.3 galaxies in both the KBSS sample (Strom et al. 2017) and early MOSDEF work (Sanders et al. 2016). It is also comparable with the median electron densities reported in this work. The models employed in Strom et al. (2017) use ne = 300 cm⁻³, and similarly cannot reach the highest observed O3 and R23 values in the KBSS survey.

Using Z = 0.001, we explore raising ne to 1000 cm⁻³ in the Cloudy+BPASS models (right column of Figure 7). Comparing the elevated electron density models with the Z = 0.001, ne = 250 cm⁻³ scenario (left column of Figure 5) shows the differences in the predicted emission line ratios caused by isolating variations in ne on the [N II] BPT, [S II] BPT, and O32 vs. R23 diagrams. We find that elevating ne to such an extreme value has only a small effect on the emission-line ratios, and the models still do not encompass the galaxies observed at the highest N2, S2, O3, and R23 values.

A more promising approach is to lower the stellar metallicity. The left column of Figure 7 gives the model grids for Z = 0.0001, which reach the majority of the extreme data points. Therefore, a very low Z (i.e., a very hard ionizing spectrum) is the more likely than variations in ne to be cause for these outliers.

In addition to a low Z, other effects may also lead to a harder ionizing spectrum (e.g., variations in the IMF slope and high-mass cutoff or AGN partially contributing to the integrated emission lines). Systematic uncertainties such as the BPASS models underpredicting the hardness of the ionizing spectrum at a given Z (particularly at lower values of Z), different star-formation histories, or uncertainties in the dust corrections applied to O32 and R23 could play a role in the observed discrepancies between models and a minority of the sample as well.

5 SUMMARY

We present results on the emission-line properties of a sample of 122 star-forming galaxies at 1.9 ≤ z ≤ 2.7 from the complete MOSDEF survey with ≥ 3σ detections for the [O II]λλ3727,3730, Hβ, [O III]λλ4960,5007, Hα, [N II]λλ6585, and [S II]λλ6718,6731 emission lines. To investigate the observed systematic offset of z > 1 star-forming galaxies on the [N II] BPT diagram relative to local systems, the MOSDEF sample is split into the high (offset with elevated O3 and/or N2 values) and low (overlapping with the local SDSS sequence) samples. We compare the location of galaxies...
in both populations on the [S II] BPT and O$_{32}$ vs. R$_{32}$ diagrams. Additionally, we compare physical properties – SFR, $M_*$, $R_e$, sSFR, $\Sigma_{\text{SFR}}$, $n_e$, and $t$ (i.e., stellar population age) – of the galaxies in both groups using additional CANDELS and 3D-HST ancillary data. Finally, we use Cloudy+BPASS photoionization models to investigate potential differences in the stellar metallicity, nebular metallicity, and ionization parameter of the high and low groups.

The main results are as follows:

(i) On the [S II] BPT and O$_{32}$ vs. R$_{32}$ diagrams, the high sample is offset on average towards higher S2 at fixed O3 (or vice versa) and higher R$_{32}$ value at fixed O$_{32}$, respectively, relative to the low sample. These results update earlier work from MOSDEF (Sanders et al. 2016) and are consistent with results from Strom et al. (2017), based on the KBSS survey.

(ii) The high sample has a smaller median $R_e$ and $M_*$, but higher median sSFR and $\Sigma_{\text{SFR}}$ compared to the low sample. The observed differences in $R_e$, sSFR, and $\Sigma_{\text{SFR}}$ are present at fixed stellar mass. The high sample is also slightly younger in median age ($t$); however this age difference is not significant within the uncertainties. There is not a significant variation in SFR or $n_e$ for the two populations. These results imply that the high population is associated with more concentrated and intense star formation than the low population.

(iii) Using photoionization models, we find that the high population has larger 12+log(O/H) and log(U) values compared to the low population. These conclusions hold both when we use the results from Topping et al. (2020b) and assume $Z_*$, $t$, and $U$ as free parameters, respectively, as when we use the Topping et al. results as a free parameter. Also, while the lower $Z_*/Z_{\text{neb}}$ ratio of the high population implies that this sample is more $\alpha$-enhanced than the low population, both samples are significantly $\alpha$-enhanced relative to local star-forming galaxies with similar emission-line ratios assuming typical local galaxies have roughly solar $\alpha$/Fe. These differences in the properties of the ionizing radiation field are critical to include when describing high-redshift galaxies – even those that overlap the local emission-line sequences.

(iv) Combining the results from the median galaxy properties of the high and low samples with the Cloudy+BPASS model grids leads to the conclusion that galaxies with a harder ionizing spectrum are associated with smaller sizes and higher sSFR and $\Sigma_{\text{SFR}}$.

(v) A harder ionizing spectrum at fixed nebular metallicity is favored as one of the key drivers of the [N II] BPT offset. In this study, we find that variation in multiple physical parameters drives the variation in emission-lines in the MOSDEF sample, including $Z_*$, 12+log(O/H), and log(U). However, even in regions where the $z \sim 2.3$ galaxies overlap local ones in the space of emission-line ratios, the inferred underlying physical parameters for $z \sim 2.3$ galaxies are distinct from those of local galaxies. The full set of these parameters must be understood through modeling both rest-UV and rest-optical spectra, in order to understand the translation between empirical emission-line ratios and key physical quantities such as the gas-phase oxygen abundance.

Understanding the global properties of high-redshift galaxies using large samples at $z \sim 2.3$ is essential when comparing them with local galaxies. The use of large high-redshift samples has enabled us to discover more subtle trends in the MOSDEF data that were not found with more limited data sets (e.g. Shapley et al. 2015; Sanders et al. 2016). The work from this study has shown that galaxies with a harder ionizing spectrum also tend to be smaller in size with more intense and compact star formation. Why these factors are linked is not yet clear, and combining large $z \sim 2.3$ samples of star-forming galaxies with realistic galaxy formation simulations (e.g., FIRE-2; Hopkins et al. 2018) will be important in finding this connection.

It has also been shown in both this work and in Strom et al. (2017) that models are not yet able to reach the highest observed O3 and R$_{32}$ values for $z \sim 2.3$ star-forming galaxies on the [N II] BPT, [S II] BPT, and O$_{32}$ vs. R$_{32}$ diagrams. The local sequence does not reach such elevated O3 and R$_{32}$ values, and unlike their high redshift counterparts, do not greatly exceed the data space covered by the model grids. This discrepancy indicates a need to develop both stellar population and emission-line models that better match the now large data sets of $z \sim 2.3$ star-forming galaxies.
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