

# H-ATLAS/GAMA: The nature and characteristics of optically red galaxies detected at submillimetre wavelengths

A. Dariush<sup>1\*</sup>, S. Dib<sup>2†</sup>, S. Hony<sup>3‡</sup>, D. J. B. Smith<sup>4</sup>, S. Zhukovska<sup>5</sup>, L. Dunne<sup>9,25</sup>, S. Eales<sup>8</sup>, E. Andrae<sup>28</sup>, M. Baes<sup>14</sup>, I. Baldry<sup>27</sup>, A. Bauer<sup>6</sup>, J. Bland-Hawthorn<sup>23</sup>, S. Brough<sup>10</sup>, N. Bourne<sup>25</sup>, A. Cava<sup>18</sup>, D. Clements<sup>7</sup>, M. Cluver<sup>24</sup>, A. Cooray<sup>17</sup>, G. De Zotti<sup>16</sup>, S. Driver<sup>20,33</sup>, M. W. Grootes<sup>28</sup>, A. M. Hopkins<sup>6</sup>, R. Hopwood<sup>7,22</sup>, S. Kaviraj<sup>7,13</sup>, L. Kelvin<sup>34</sup>, M. A. Lara-Lopez<sup>32</sup>, J. Liske<sup>26</sup>, J. Loveday<sup>31</sup>, S. Maddox<sup>9</sup>, B. Madore<sup>12</sup>, M. J. Michałowski<sup>15</sup>, C. Pearson<sup>13,19,22</sup>, C. Popescu<sup>29,30</sup>, A. Robotham<sup>20</sup>, K. Rowlands<sup>33</sup>, M. Seibert<sup>12</sup>, F. Shabani<sup>21</sup>, M. W. L. Smith<sup>8</sup>, E.N. Taylor<sup>11</sup>, R. Tuffs<sup>28</sup>, E. Valiante<sup>8</sup>, J.S. Virdee<sup>13,19</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute of Astronomy, University of Cambridge, Madingley Road, Cambridge, CB3 0HA, UK*

<sup>2</sup>*Niels Bohr Institute & Centre for Star and Planet Formation, University of Copenhagen, Øster Voldgade 5-7., DK-1350, Copenhagen, Denmark*

<sup>3</sup>*Zentrum für Astronomie der Universität Heidelberg, Institut für Theoretische Astrophysik, Albert-Ueberle-Straße 2, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany*

<sup>4</sup>*Centre for Astrophysics, Science & Technology Research Institute, University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9AB, UK*

<sup>5</sup>*Max-Planck-Institut für Astrophysik, Karl-Schwarzschild-Str. 1, D-85741 Garching, Germany*

<sup>6</sup>*Australian Astronomical Observatory, PO Box 915, North Ryde, NSW 1670, Australia*

<sup>7</sup>*Physics Department, Imperial College London, Prince Consort Road, London, SW7 2AZ, UK*

<sup>8</sup>*School of Physics and Astronomy, Cardiff University, the Parade, Cardiff, CF24 3AA, UK*

<sup>9</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Canterbury, Private Bag 4800, Christchurch, 8140, NZ*

<sup>10</sup>*Australian Astronomical Observatory, PO Box 296, Epping, NSW, 1710, Australia*

<sup>11</sup>*School of Physics, the University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia*

<sup>12</sup>*Observatories of the Carnegie Institution for Science, 813 Santa Barbara Street, Pasadena, CA 91101, USA*

<sup>13</sup>*Oxford Astrophysics, Denys Wilkinson Building, University of Oxford, Keble Rd, Oxford OX1 3RH*

<sup>14</sup>*Sterrenkundig Observatorium, Universiteit Gent, Krijgslaan 281S9, 9000 Gent, Belgium*

<sup>15</sup>*SUPA, Institute for Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Royal Observatory, Edinburgh, EH9 3HJ*

<sup>16</sup>*INAF-Osservatorio Astronomico di Padova, Vicolo Osservatorio 5, I-35122 Padova, Italy, and SISSA, Via Bonomea 265, I-34136 Trieste, Italy*

<sup>17</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697 USA*

<sup>18</sup>*Observatoire de Genève, Université de Genève, 51 Ch. des Maillettes, 1290 Versoix, Switzerland*

<sup>19</sup>*RAL Space, STFC Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Harwell Oxford, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0QX, UK*

<sup>20</sup>*International Centre for Radio Astronomy Research (ICRAR), University of Western Australia, 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley, WA 6009, Australia*

<sup>21</sup>*Finnish Centre for Astronomy with ESO (FINCA), University of Turku, Väisäläntie 20, FI-21500 Piikkiö, Finland*

<sup>22</sup>*Department of Physical Sciences, The Open University, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA, UK*

<sup>23</sup>*Sydney Institute for Astronomy, School of Physics A28, University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia*

<sup>24</sup>*University of the Western Cape, Robert Sobukwe Road, Bellville, 7535, South Africa*

<sup>25</sup>*Institute for Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Royal Observatory, Blackford Hill, Edinburgh EH9 3HJ, UK*

<sup>26</sup>*European Southern Observatory, Karl-Schwarzschild-Str. 2, 85748 Garching, Germany*

<sup>27</sup>*Astrophysics Research Institute, Liverpool John Moores University, IC2, Liverpool Science Park, 146 Brownlow Hill, Liverpool, L3 5RF*

<sup>28</sup>*Max Planck Institut fuer Kernphysik, Saupfercheckweg 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany*

<sup>29</sup>*Jeremiah Horrocks Institute, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, PR1 2HE, UK*

<sup>30</sup>*The Astronomical Institute of the Romanian Academy, Str. Cutitul de Argint 5, Bucharest, Romania*

<sup>31</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Sussex, Brighton, BN1 9RH*

<sup>32</sup>*Instituto de Astronomía, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, A.P. 70-264, 04510 México, D.F., México*

<sup>33</sup>*School of Physics & Astronomy, University of St Andrews, North Haugh, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 9SS, UK*

<sup>34</sup>*Institut für Astro- und Teilchenphysik, Universität Innsbruck, Technikerstraße 25, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria*

**ABSTRACT**

We combine Herschel/SPIRE sub-millimeter (submm) observations with existing multi-wavelength data to investigate the characteristics of low redshift, optically red galaxies detected in submm bands. We select a sample of galaxies in the redshift range  $0.01 \leq z \leq 0.2$ , having  $>5\sigma$  detections in the SPIRE 250  $\mu\text{m}$  submm waveband. Sources are then divided into two sub-samples of *red* and *blue* galaxies, based on their UV-optical colours. Galaxies in the *red* sample account for  $\approx 4.2$  per cent of the total number of sources with stellar masses  $M_* \gtrsim 10^{10} M_\odot$ . Following visual classification of the *red* galaxies, we find that  $\gtrsim 30$  per cent of them are early-type galaxies and  $\gtrsim 40$  per cent are spirals. The colour of the *red*-spiral galaxies could be the result of their highly inclined orientation and/or a strong contribution of the old stellar population.

It is found that irrespective of their morphological types, *red* and *blue* sources occupy environments with more or less similar densities (i.e., the  $\Sigma_5$  parameter). From the analysis of the spectral energy distributions (SEDs) of galaxies in our samples based on MAGPHYS, we find that galaxies in the *red* sample (of any morphological type) have dust masses similar to those in the *blue* sample (i.e. normal spiral/star-forming systems). However, in comparison to the *red*-spirals and in particular *blue* systems, *red*-ellipticals have lower mean dust-to-stellar mass ratios. Besides galaxies in the *red*-elliptical sample have much lower mean star-formation/specific-star-formation rates in contrast to their counterparts in the *blue* sample. Our results support a scenario where dust in early-type systems is likely to be of an external origin.

**Key words:** Galaxy

**1 INTRODUCTION**

Galaxies display a wide variety of physical and observational properties. It is well known that the distribution of galaxy optical colours is bimodal, e.g. blue cloud versus the red sequence (Strateva et al. 2001; Baldry et al. 2004; Taylor et al. 2015). The bimodality of the galaxy population exists at least out to  $z \simeq 1$  (e.g. Bell et al. 2004a; Tanaka et al. 2005; Cooper et al. 2006; Cucciati et al. 2006; Willmer et al. 2006). A number of different mechanisms (taking place in different environments) have been proposed for the observed bimodality of the galaxy population, including, but not limited to, galaxy merging (major and minor), galaxy strangulation and harassment, ram-pressure stripping as well as AGN feedback (e.g. Mulchaey 2000; Croton et al. 2006; Conselice 2014). Such mechanisms could regulate the observed optical colours of galaxies by influencing their key physical parameters such as star formation history (SFH), mean age of stellar populations, the amount of dust attenuation, dust geometry and metallicity (Bruzual et al. 2003; Burgarella, Buat & Iglesias-Páramo 2005; da Cunha et al. 2008; Conroy, Gunn & White 2009).

Besides, there are substantial differences between galaxy populations in the field and those in clusters and groups. According to Dressler (1980), galaxy morphology is a strong function of galaxy density, i.e. the morphology-density relation, and numerous studies since then have shown the dependence of galaxy properties on the local environment (Binggeli, Tammann, & Sandage 1987; Lewis et al. 2002; Balogh et al. 2004b; Ball et al. 2008). For example, the red population is substantially dominated by early-type galaxies

and thus preferentially found in high-galaxy density environments, while blue galaxies are predominantly late-type systems and mostly found in low-galaxy density environments, i.e. the colour-density relation. Moreover, vast majority of galaxies in the blue cloud are actively forming stars while the red sequence consists mainly of passive galaxies with little or no ongoing star formation. There are also additional contributions to the red cloud from (a) heavily obscured star-forming or edge-on galaxies and (b) galaxies with passive disks, e.g. red spirals showing signs of low-level of star formation, which are known to be considerably redder and more massive than their blue/star-forming counterparts (van den Bergh 1976; Wolf et al. 2009; Masters et al. 2010; Cortese 2012a). It is noteworthy that the morphology-density and color-density relations evolve with redshift (e.g. Butcher & Oemler 1984; Poggianti et al. 2009, 2010).

Analyses of the dust attenuation in active/star-forming galaxies suggest that in contrast to passive galaxies, they are heavily affected by dust (Driver et al. 2007; Johnson et al. 2007; Wyder et al. 2007; Cortese et al. 2008; Tojeiro et al. 2009; Grootes et al. 2013). It has been shown that the bulk of the dust in late-type galaxies is in the cold phase and as consequence emits at  $>100 \mu\text{m}$ , i.e. the far-infrared (FIR) and submm wavelengths (Sodroski et al. 1997; Odenwald et al. 1998; Dunne & Eales 2001; Popescu et al. 2002; Popescu & Tuffs 2002; Vlahakis et al. 2005; Dale et al. 2007, 2012; Bendo et al. 2012). Such wavelengths are covered by the instruments on board the *Herschel Space Observatory* (Pilbratt et al. 2010)<sup>1</sup>. Thus, the data collected by *Herschel* is uniquely suited to probe the dusty component, e.g. its characteristics and origin, in all type of galaxies, in particular early-type galaxies which contain significantly less dust than late-type systems.

\* AD: adariush@ast.cam.ac.uk

† SD: sdib@nbi.dk

‡ SH: sacha.hony@free.fr

<sup>1</sup> Herschel is an ESA space observatory with science instruments provided by European-led Principal Investigator consortia and with important participation from NASA.

The existence of dust in early-type galaxies has been first reported from studying the absorption of stellar light (Bertola & Galletta 1987; Ebneter et al. 1985; Goudfrooij et al. 1994) and since then several studies have been conducted in order to shed light on the quantitative dust content of early-type galaxies (Knapp et al. 1989; Temi et al. 2004, 2007; Leeuw et al. 2004; Savoy et al. 2009). However, submm data provided by *Herschel* have enabled us to study dust properties, e.g. its total luminosity, mass and temperature in early-type galaxies in an unprecedented manner due to a better sensitivity, resolution and/or the long wavelength coverage necessary (Boselli et al. 2010; Davies et al. 2010; De Looze et al. 2010; Auld et al. 2013; Smith et al. 2012b; di Serego Alighieri et al. 2013).

Among various surveys, the *Herschel* Astrophysical Terahertz Large Area Survey (H-ATLAS; Eales et al. 2010) is the widest extragalactic survey undertaken in submm with *Herschel*. The large coverage of H-ATLAS helps to have a better statistical view of the dust content and its characteristic among galaxies spanning a broad range of luminosities, colours and morphologies. Results from Dariush et al. (2011) as part of the H-ATLAS Science Demonstration Phase (SDP) and based on the UV-optical colour classification, show that the majority of sources ( $\simeq 95$  per cent) with submm detections at low redshift ( $z \lesssim 0.2$ ), are blue/star-forming galaxies with UV-optical colours  $\text{NUV} - r \leq 4.5$ . This earlier study suggested that the submm-detected/optically-red galaxies ( $\text{NUV} - r > 4.5$ ), with a contribution of  $\lesssim 5$  per cent to the total number of detections, are more likely to be star-forming galaxies and that their red colors are due to obscuration by dust.

From a stacking analysis at submm wavelengths, Bourne et al. (2012) performed a large-scale statistical study of the submm properties of optically selected galaxies (based on the rest-frame color  $g - r$ ) at  $z \lesssim 0.35$ , and found that approximately 20 per cent of low-redshift galaxies in H-ATLAS are red.

In the mean time, there have been several H-ATLAS studies trying to shed light on the existence and properties of dust in early-type galaxies. For instance Rowlands et al. (2012) used data from the H-ATLAS SDP to study dust properties and star formation histories in a sample of low redshift galaxies ( $z \lesssim 0.5$ ) detected at submm wavelengths. Followed by classification of their sample based on optical morphology, Rowlands et al. (2012) found that  $\simeq 4.1$  per cent of all detections are early-type systems and that  $\simeq 3.8$  per cent (19 out of 496) of spiral galaxies with submm detections are passive. In another study and by using samples of early-type galaxies at low redshifts ( $0.013 \lesssim z \lesssim 0.06$ ), Agius et al. (2013) found that early-type galaxies with H-ATLAS detections (based on Phase 1 Version 2.0 internal release of the H-ATLAS catalogue), are not only bluer in the UV-optical colours but also are significantly brighter in NUV in comparison to their H-ATLAS none-detected counterparts.

The aim of this work is to examine in more detail the nature of submm detected red galaxies using the data of H-ATLAS. The main difference between this work and those conducted by Rowlands et al. (2012) and Agius et al. (2013) is that all sources in our sample are detected in H-ATLAS and classified by means of the UV-optical colour index. Our main objectives are: to segregate intrinsically red galaxies from heavily obscured star forming galaxies, and subsequently discuss the origin and the role of the dust in passive systems. The main improvements compared to our previous study come from:

- a larger area coverage (by a factor of  $\sim 10$ ) and therefore a better statistics

- the inclusion of complimentary wavelengths in the mid-infrared (MIR) bands
- the extraction of various physical parameters from multi-wavelengths observations of sources by means of the SED fitting.

The paper is organized as following: In Section 2, we present the data from H-ATLAS phase 1 and select a sample of low redshift galaxies, all detected with *Herschel* in the SPIRE 250 $\mu\text{m}$  submm band. In Section 3, we select sub-samples of optically blue and red galaxies and analyze their physical characteristics such as star formation activities and dust properties as inferred from fitting their spectral energy distributions. Our main finding and conclusion are given in Section 4. Throughout the paper, we assume a concordance CDM cosmology with  $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ ,  $\Omega_m = 0.3$  and  $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$ .

## 2 DATA

We use data from the H-ATLAS Phase 1 Version 3.0 internal release which contains the IDs of  $>5\sigma$  SPIRE detections at 250  $\mu\text{m}$  and is reduced in a similar way to the SDP data, as described by Ibar et al. (2010), Pascale et al. (2011), Rigby et al. (2011) and Smith et al. (2011). The Phase 1 ID catalogues have been produced in a similar way to Smith et al. (2011) and will be presented in Bourne et al. (2015, ; in prep).

Initially observed time-line data from SPIRE and PACS instruments were processed by using the Herschel Interactive Processing Environment (HIPE) based on a custom reduction scripts. High-pass filtering was then applied to the data time-lines in order to correct the thermal drift in bolometer arrays. Cross-scan time-line observations were projected by using the naive map-making method of HIPE. For point like sources, catalogue of  $>5\sigma$  submm fluxes were produced from the 250  $\mu\text{m}$  PSF filtered map, using the MADX algorithm (Maddox et al. in prep), as described in Rigby et al. (2011). For extended sources, larger apertures were chosen such that they match the extent of the source submm emission. For each 250  $\mu\text{m}$  source, corresponding 350 and 500  $\mu\text{m}$  flux densities were estimated by using the 350 and 500  $\mu\text{m}$  maps (noise-weighted/beam-convolved) at the source position extracted from the 250  $\mu\text{m}$  map. Finally 100 and 160  $\mu\text{m}$  aperture flux densities were measured following matching each 250  $\mu\text{m}$  source to the nearest PACS sources within a radius of 10 arcsec. A likelihood-ratio analysis (Sutherland & Saunders 1992) was performed by Bourne et al. (2015) to match 250  $\mu\text{m}$  sources to the SDSS DR7 (Abazajian et al. 2009) sources brighter than  $r = 22.4$  mag within a 10 arcsec radius. The probability that an optical source is associated with the submm source has been used to define the reliability of an association. According to Bourne et al. (2015), objects with reliability  $\geq 0.8$  are considered to be true matches to submm sources.

The H-ATLAS fields are along the celestial equator centred at RA of 9h(G09), 12h(G12) and 14.5h(G15). 144  $\text{deg}^2$  out of the 161  $\text{deg}^2$  covered by H-ATLAS overlap with the Galaxy and Mass Assembly (GAMA I) survey (Driver et al. 2009, 2011). The GAMA survey re-processes and combines optical data from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS DR6; Adelman-McCarthy et al. 2008), NIR data from the UKIRT Infrared Deep Sky Survey (UKIDSS) Large Area Survey (LAS DR4; Lawrence et al. 2007), and UV from the Galaxy Evolution Explorer (GALEX; Morrissey et al. 2005). The pre-processing of the GAMA, SDSS and UKIDSS archive data is described in detail in Hill et al. (2011). For all galaxies with  $r \leq 19.4$  mag in G09 and G15 as well as  $r \leq 19.8$  mag in G12, redshifts have been measured using the Anglo Australian Telescope

and for brighter galaxies, redshift estimates are taken from other existing redshift surveys such as SDSS, the 2dF Galaxy Redshift Survey (2dFGRS) and the Millennium Galaxy Catalogue (MGC; Liske et al. 2015; Driver et al. 2005). Furthermore, the GAMA-*WISE* (the Wide-field Infrared Survey Explorer; Wright et al. 2010) catalogue adds coverage in four MIR bands at  $3.4\mu\text{m}$ ,  $4.6\mu\text{m}$ ,  $12\mu\text{m}$  and  $22\mu\text{m}$  (Cluver et al. 2014).

In summary, we have at our disposal UV, optical and MIR data as well as redshift estimates for the submm galaxies within the H-ATLAS/GAMA-overlapping area where all submm selected sources in our sample satisfy the following criteria:

- They all have  $>5\sigma$  submm detected at SPIRE  $250\mu\text{m}$ .
- They fall within the redshift range  $0.01 \leq z \leq 0.2$ . We only select objects with a sufficiently reliable spectroscopic determination (i.e.  $n_Q \geq 3$ ; Driver et al. 2011).
- All submm galaxies have a reliability parameter ( $\text{reliability} \geq 0.8$ ) of being associated with an optical counterpart in the SDSS  $r$ -band catalogue, for which multi-wavelength photometry is available. As such, in addition to the  $250\mu\text{m}$  emission, all sources (7131 objects) have corresponding fluxes (all corrected for Galactic extinction) via aperture matched photometry in other bands ranging from UV to MIR.
- Since a crucial aspect of our selection of red galaxies is based on the UV-optical ( $\text{NUV}-r$ ) colour, we remove from our sample those galaxies for which their NUV fluxes as estimated in GAMA, differ by more than  $>0.5$  magnitude from those retrieved through *GALEX* GR6 Data Release based on the All-Sky Imaging survey (AIS) data products (NUV depth  $\sim 20.8$  mag). In addition, all selected sources have NUV magnitude errors, as provided by *GALEX*-GR6, which are  $\leq 0.2$  mag. This guarantees that all sources in our sample have enough signal-to-noise ratio in UV. The above constraints on UV fluxes, reduces our sample to 4016 sources.
- Finally since the physical parameters inferred for each galaxy are based on SED fitting techniques, an extra criterion has been applied in order to exclude sources (234 in total) with poor quality SED fits (see Sec. 3.3).

After applying these selection criteria, we find 3782 galaxies with detections in at least NUV +  $u, g, r, i, z$  and  $250\mu\text{m}$  bands. Distributions of the SDSS  $r$ -band and NUV magnitudes for all galaxies as well as those qualified to be included for the subsequent data analysis are shown in panels of Fig.1. According to the first panel, approximately  $\approx 13$  per cent of the initial submm sources were excluded following the requirement of a UV detection for inclusion in the sample. But that does not seem to exclude systematically any particular type of sources as a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (KS test) suggests a  $\gtrsim 70.0$  per cent probability that the distribution of sources detected at  $250\mu\text{m}$  is similar to the one being observed simultaneously in the  $250\mu\text{m} + \text{NUV}$  bands. However by limiting errors in the NUV band to  $\lesssim 0.2$  mag, more sources ( $\approx 31$  per cent) are excluded in particular faint objects in the NUV band.

A subset of sources have also detections in *GALEX* FUV, PACS ( $100\mu\text{m}$ ,  $160\mu\text{m}$ ) and SPIRE ( $350\mu\text{m}$ ,  $500\mu\text{m}$ ) submm bands. *WISE* data are available and recently have been cross-matched, with extended sources from *WISE* accounted for correctly, for all GAMA fields. Yet at the time of analysing galaxy SEDs in this work, *WISE* data were only available for the G12 and G15 fields. Thus, out of the 3782 sources, 2622 ( $\approx 70$  per cent) have also aperture-matched *WISE*-MIR data.

### 3 ANALYSIS

#### 3.1 Selection of intrinsically red objects

Though the vast majority of galaxies at low redshift with submm detection are star-forming and optically blue, a small fraction of them are red in optical bands (e.g.  $u-r, g-r$ ). We separate blue and red galaxies in the sample using the UV-optical index. This is more robust than optical colour indices as it is more sensitive to recent star-formation activity (e.g., Kaviraj et al. 2007). Dariusz et al. (2011) separate red and blue galaxies in the H-ATLAS sample at  $\text{NUV}-r = 4.5$ , estimated through fitting a double Gaussian to the  $\text{NUV}-r$  colour distribution of galaxies, with redshifts  $0.01 \leq z \leq 0.2$  (i.e. similar to the present work), in the H-ATLAS SDP data. Hence any source with  $\text{NUV}-r \geq 4.5$  mag is considered as *red*, while *blue* objects are those with  $\text{NUV}-r < 4.5$  mag. As Fig.1a shows, the majority of the *red* galaxies in our sample have apparent  $r$ -band magnitudes  $\lesssim 17.5$  mag and NUV magnitudes  $\gtrsim 19.0$  mag.

##### 3.1.1 Contamination by radio AGN

In order to ensure that none of the submm emission has been contaminated by synchrotron emission from radio-jets hosted by active galactic nuclei (AGNs), we find and exclude radio AGN as follows. We cross matched the SDSS position of our sources with those from the full, unfiltered radio-source catalogue of Virdee et al. (2012). The radio catalogue consists of all sources detected in the H-ATLAS Phase 1 field by the NRAO VLA Sky Survey (NVSS; Condon et al. 1998) and, as such, contains 7823 sources. The outcome is 117 matches having separations of  $< 1.0$  arcsec. In order to determine whether the radio emission was consistent with the presence of a radio-loud AGN, we calculated  $q_{250}$ , defined as:

$$q_{250} = \log_{10}\left(\frac{S_{250}}{S_{1.4}}\right), \quad (1)$$


where  $S_{250}$  and  $S_{1.4}$  are fluxes at  $250\mu\text{m}$  and 1.4-GHz for all matched sources respectively. If  $q_{250} < 1.4$  then part of the radio-emission is due to AGN activity (Jarvis et al. 2010). Conservatively, we exclude any source which satisfies this criterion in order to ensure none of the submm emission may be contaminated by radio AGN activity. Out of 117 sources with radio counterparts, only 13 sources (1 *red* and 12 *blue* galaxies) have  $q_{250} < 1.4$  and are thus excluded from the subsequent analysis.

##### 3.1.2 Morphology of the red galaxies

The SDSS postage-stamp images of all *red* sources together with their SEDs (inferred as described in Sec.3.3) are presented in Appendix.A.

The morphology of all 117 galaxies were examined from their SDSS  $r$ -band images, following independent visual inspection by three team members. Galaxies were classified into three categories of elliptical (E), spiral (S) and uncertain (U). The number of sources in each morphological type is 37, 48 and 32 for the E, S and U galaxies respectively (see Fig.2). Many of sources classified as U are too small in the SDSS images to judge their morphology and can be of any type, i.e. spiral, elliptical or merging galaxies.

In order to test the validity of this morphological classification, we compared our classification to an independent morphological classification based on the Sérsic index  $n$  which we obtained from the SDSS DR7 galaxy catalogue Simard et al. (2011). Different studies have adopted different thresholds of the Sérsic index



**Figure 1.** Distributions of the SDSS  $r$ -band (panel a) and NUV (panel b) magnitudes for all galaxies as well as those qualified to be included for the subsequent data analysis. ‘Dotted-line’ represents all galaxies detected in  $250 \mu\text{m}$  while the ‘black-solid-line’ shows those observed in NUV with a subset of them (dashed-line) having NUV errors  $\leq 0.2$  and  $\Delta\text{NUV} \leq 0.5$  (i.e. the absolute difference between the GAMA and GALEX NUV flux measurements). Finally the ‘gray-thick-line’ represents sources with good quality SED fits as described in Sec. 3.3. Sources were also divided into two categories of *red* (filled histogram) or *blue* based on their UV-optical  $\text{NUV}-r$  colours as discussed in Sec. 3.1. The vertical ‘dashed-dotted’ line in panel b shows the GALEX AIS (All-Sky Imaging Survey) NUV depth which is around  $\approx 20.8$  magnitude.

above/below which a galaxy is considered as early/late type. For instance, Ravindranath et al. (2004) adopts  $n=2.0$  to divide their sample into early and late types though Sérsic indices of  $n > 2.5$  have been also used to describe early-type sources (e.g., Bell et al. 2004b; Barden et al. 2005).

Fig. 3 (panel a) displays the distributions of Sérsic indices for all galaxies in our sample, i.e. the *blue* sample as well as the morphologically classified *red* galaxies<sup>2</sup>. From this figure, it is clear that the distribution of Sérsic indices for the *red*-E sample peaks around  $\approx 4$ . This is larger than those estimated for the S galaxies (either *blue* or *red*). The Sérsic index distribution of the *red*-U galaxies lies somewhat between those of the S and E samples.

An inspection of the ellipticity parameter<sup>3</sup> of all galaxies in the sample (Fig. 3, panel b) reveals that, not surprisingly, in *red* sources of type S,  $e \gtrsim 0.5$  whereas in *red* galaxies of type E,  $e \lesssim 0.5$ . In fact the disk structure is extremely pronounced in highly inclined spiral galaxies and therefore the majority of galaxies in the S category are those having larger ellipticities. This is better shown in Fig. 3c where histograms of galaxy inclination angles ( $i$ ) for *blue*, *red*-S, *red*-E as well as *red* S+U samples are plotted. Inclinations are determined from the relation

$$\cos^2 i = [(b/a)^2 - p^2](1 - p^2)^{-1} \quad (2)$$

in which  $p$  is the ratio of the smallest to the largest axis of an oblate spheroid of rotation. We assume  $p = 0.20$  which is an appropriate value to use for the intrinsic flattening of the distribution of the light of galactic spheroids (e.g.; van den Bergh 1988).

Unlike *blue* and *red*-E galaxies, the majority of *red*-S galaxies are highly inclined. Note that, even in the combined *red*-U + *red*-S sample, there is still an excess of galaxies with relatively large inclination angles in comparison to the *blue* and *red*-E samples.

To illustrate this, we show in Fig. 3c the distribution of inclination angles as expected from a random sampling. The observed difference between the distribution of *red*-(S+U) galaxies in comparison to a sample of simulated inclinations, suggests that the fraction of highly inclined systems in *red*-(S+U) sample is more than one would expect for a random distribution. This shows that the inclination angle plays a non-negligible role in the observed red colour of *red*-S systems.


The main conclusion is that the *red*-E sample consists of intrinsically red objects while the *red*-S sample contains galaxies where inclination could be a dominant factor in determining the observed red optical colours. Although these inclined sources are not the main interest of this paper, we do discuss some of their ensemble properties in Sec. 3.5.1.

### 3.2 Environmental density of red galaxies


In order to explore the environmental density of *red* galaxies and see if it plays an important role in shaping their observed proper-

<sup>2</sup> We perform a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (KS test), associated to different estimated parameters, for each pair of galaxy types. The results ( $p$ -values) are reported in the KS-test Table. 2.

<sup>3</sup> The ellipticity for each galaxy has been estimated as ( $e = 1 - b/a$ ) where  $a$  and  $b$  are the galaxy’s semi-major and semi-minor axes as measured in the SDSS.



**Figure 3.** Distributions of morphology related parameters in all *blue* (thick solid line) and *red* sources. E (red dashed line), S (green dotted line) and U (cyan line) labels represent the morphology of individual *red* source as explained in Sec.3.1.2. Each histogram is normalized by its integral. Panels represent distributions of galaxy (a) Sérsic index, (b) ellipticity and (c) inclination angle. In addition, the 'black dotted line' and 'gray filled histogram' in panel c represent the distribution of *red*-S+R galaxies and random distribution of inclination angles respectively.



**Figure 2.** Percentage of each morphological type in the sample of 117 *red* galaxies (see §3.1.2). Labels represent elliptical (E), spiral (S) and undefined (U) galaxies.

ties, we compute the projected surface density around each galaxy. This is based on counting the number of nearest neighbours, i.e. the density within the distance to the Nth nearest neighbour. Hence, the surface density to the fifth nearest neighbour is calculated as:

$$\Sigma_5 (\text{Mpc}^{-2}) = \frac{5}{\pi d_5^2}, \quad (3)$$

where  $d_5$  is the projected co-moving distance to the fifth nearest neighbour within a volume-limited density-defining population and relative velocity  $\pm 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  (Wijesinghe et al. 2012; Brough et al. 2013). The density-defining population (DDP) are galaxies brighter than  $M_r \leq -20.0$ . Densities are calculated for galaxies with  $r_{\text{Petro}} \leq 19.4$  (where  $r_{\text{Petro}}$  is the r-band Petrosian magnitude),  $0.01 \leq z \leq 0.18$  and with reliable redshifts ( $n_Q \geq 3$ ;


Driver et al. 2011). Although Eq. 3 is a 2D estimate, the redshift information of each galaxy is used to remove the background and foreground sources.

Fig. 4 displays histograms of the projected densities for *blue* and *red* galaxies within the redshift range of  $0.01 \leq z \leq 0.18$  and for all systems having  $M_r \leq -20.0$ . This decreases the overall number of *red* galaxies by  $\approx 4.2$  per cent (out of 117 *red* galaxies, two have  $z > 0.18$  and three have  $M_r > -20.0$ ). Although the highest observed density ( $1.5 \lesssim \log(\Sigma_5) \lesssim 2.5$ ) is populated by a small fraction of the *red* -E type systems which indeed are relatively massive galaxies, there is no significant difference between the distribution for the *red* sources in any morphological type with respect to the one corresponding to the *blue* sample. This indicates that all galaxies, irrespective of their morphologies, reside in environments with similar densities. It is worth mentioning however that within the redshift range considered here, the survey area does not contain very dense, cluster-like, environments.

### 3.3 UV-to-Submm SED fitting

We derive the basic properties of galaxies by fitting their SEDs which makes use of the data (§. 2) going from the NUV up to all available Herschel bands. The SED of each galaxy is fitted using MAGPHYS (Multi-wavelength Analysis of Galaxy Physical Properties; da Cunha et al. 2008). MAGPHYS infers the galactic properties by matching the observed SED with a large library of calculated SEDs. These templates are constructed by considering the spectral evolution of stellar populations that are born with a Chabrier (2003) initial mass function (IMF) in combination with infrared dust spectral libraries as described in da Cunha et al. (2008). The model assumes that the energy from UV-optical radiation emitted by the stellar populations is absorbed by dust and re-radiated in the FIR. It uses also the two-component dust model of Charlot & Fall (2000) in order to account for the attenuation of starlight by dust. The model also accounts for the enhanced attenuation of stellar radiation for stars located in star forming regions in comparison to older stars found elsewhere within the galaxy .

As the MAGPHYS analysis is based on AB magnitudes, all




**Figure 4.** Distributions of the projected surface density  $\Sigma_5$  estimated according to Eq.3 in *blue* (thick solid line) and *red* sources. E (red dashed line), S (green dotted line) and U (cyan line) labels represent the morphology of individual *red* source. Each histogram is normalized by its integral.

available photometry (aperture matched) has been converted to the AB magnitude system before estimating their associated fluxes in units of Jansky (Jy). Additional errors have been added to non-submm fluxes before running MAGPHYS to account for the total flux measurements and calibrations between the different surveys. These include adding 10 per cent of the flux values in quadrature for all optical-NIR bands and 20 per cent for the UV bands. For each output parameter, MAGPHYS produces a probability density function (PDF), in addition to the median value of each PDF. The 16th and 84th percentiles of the PDF have been considered as a measure of the uncertainty.

Smith et al. (2012a) showed that it is insufficient to identify bad SED fits based on a simple  $\chi^2$  threshold, instead deriving a threshold which depends on the number of bands of photometry available, above which there is  $< 1$  per cent chance that the photometry is consistent with the MAGPHYS model. Sources exceeding this varying threshold are identified as bad fits, and excluded from the subsequent analysis. We use the H-ATLAS SED fits over the entire phase 1 area, derived using the same method as in Smith et al. (2012a), with updated PACS coverage and including data from *WISE*.

For the purpose of our study, we have focused on a number of galactic parameters that are inferred by fitting the observed SEDs with MAGPHYS. These are: the galactic stellar mass ( $M_*$ ), the dust mass ( $M_D$ ), the star formation rate (SFR), and the fraction of total dust luminosity contributed by the diffuse interstellar medium ( $f_\mu$ ;  $0 \leq f_\mu \leq 1.0$ ). Large values of  $f_\mu$  indicate that dust is heated by the old stellar populations while lower values suggest that ongoing star formation has a more prominent role in heating the dust. An example of a SED fit for a submm source in our *red* sample is shown in Fig. 5. We find that the distribution of  $\chi^2$  in our sources, does not show any correlation with galaxy  $\text{NUV}-r$  colour indices. It is worth mentioning that the comparison of the results from MAGPHYS, with and without the MIR



**Figure 6.** Distribution of galaxy stellar masses in *blue* (thin solid line) and *red* samples (*red-S* : dashed line, *red-U* : dotted line, *red-E* : thick solid line). Each histogram is normalized by its integral.


constraints from *WISE*, shows that including the *WISE* data modifies the output results from MAGPHYS. The inclusion of *WISE* data improves the fits of the SEDs and provides better estimates of some of the parameter, and notably of the SFR. For this reason, we include in the following sections only those galaxies for which *WISE* data are available (e.g.  $\approx 2/3$  of the main sample). This in turn, reduces the size of our sample from 3782 to 2622 sources with 78 having  $\text{NUV}-r \geq 4.5$  mag and therefore are *red*.

Figure 6 displays the mass distribution of galaxies in the *blue* and *red* samples (in different categories). In our sample,  $\approx 73$  per cent of *blue* sources have stellar masses  $\log(M_*/M_\odot) \geq 10.0$ , while the same number for the *red* galaxies is  $\approx 97$  per cent, accounting for  $\approx 4.2$  per cent of the total number of sources with  $\log(M_*/M_\odot) \geq 10.0$ . As expected, bins associated to largest stellar masses are accupied by the *red-E* galaxies (see Table. 1).

### 3.4 Dust properties

It is important to compare the inferred parameters derived from MagPhys to other determinations. We compare the estimated dust-to-stellar mass ratio ( $M_D/M_*$ ) for all sources as computed by MAGPHYS to those derived for a sample of  $\sim 300$  nearby galaxies from the HRS (*Herschel* Reference Survey; Cortese et al. 2012b). The total dust mass of a given galaxy as estimated by MAGPHYS is the sum of the three components which includes the mass contributed by dust in thermal equilibrium in stellar birth clouds, as well as warm and cold dust components in the ambient interstellar medium (da Cunha et al. 2008).

Fig. 7 displays the distribution of  $M_D/M_*$  inferred from MAGPHYS for our sample against  $\text{NUV}-r$  for all *red* and *blue* sources. Overlaid are the  $M_D/M_*$  estimates from the HRS using all SPIRE bands. For HRS non-detections (triangles), the submm upper-limit fluxes have been determined assuming a  $3\sigma$  signal over



**Figure 5.** Top panel: A typical MAGPHYS rest-frame SED fit of an H-ATLAS *red* source. Observed UV to submm fluxes are shown with plus symbols. The green line is the best-fitting model while the blue line is the unattenuated stellar fitted spectrum. Bottom panel: The fit residuals  $\sigma$  in per cent estimated according to  $(L_{\lambda}^{\text{obs}} - L_{\lambda}^{\text{model}})/L_{\lambda}^{\text{obs}}$ , where  $L_{\lambda}^{\text{obs}}$  and  $L_{\lambda}^{\text{model}}$  are the observed and model fluxes in a given photometric band.


a circular aperture of radius  $0.3\times$ ,  $0.8\times$  and  $1.4\times$  of the optical radius for the HRS E, S0 and spirals, respectively.

Note that in determining dust masses  $M_D$ , both MAGPHYS and Cortese et al. (2012b) adopt a dust emissivity index  $\beta = 2.0$  for cold dust but different dust mass absorption coefficients  $\kappa_{\nu}$ . Cortese et al. (2012b) use a dust mass absorption coefficient  $\kappa_{350}$  of  $0.192 \text{ m}^2\text{kg}^{-1}$  at  $350 \mu\text{m}$  whereas da Cunha et al. (2008) assume  $\kappa_{850} = 0.077 \text{ m}^2\text{kg}^{-1}$  at  $850 \mu\text{m}$ . Given the scaling relations  $M_D \propto \kappa_{\nu}^{-1}$  and  $\kappa_{\nu} \propto \nu^{-\beta}$  one finds that  $\kappa_{850}$  in MAGPHYS can be scaled down (assuming  $\beta = 2.0$ ) to  $0.45 \text{ m}^2\text{kg}^{-1}$  at  $350 \mu\text{m}$  and that dust masses as measured by Cortese et al. (2012b) are  $\approx 2.36$  times larger than those estimated by MAGPHYS. Thus in Fig. 7, the HRS sample are scaled down for  $\approx 0.37$  dex to account for the differences between the two measurements of dust masses.

It can be seen that the  $M_D/M_*$  ratios for both the *blue* or *red* galaxies agrees reasonably well with estimates from the HRS detected objects. Furthermore, the *red* sources of type E exhibit, on average,  $M_D/M_*$  ratios that are noticeably lower than those of *blue* galaxies. This is even more clear in the right panel of Fig.8 which displays the distributions  $M_D/M_*$  in all sources. The mean values as summarized in Table. 1 suggest that the *red* -E objects have values of the dust-to-stellar masses that are approximately an order of magnitude lower than those in the *blue* systems. Note that the distribution of specific dust mass of the *red* -S galaxies does not match the distribution of the *blue* star forming galaxies. We will discuss this further in Sec. 3.5.

### 3.5 Star formation rates

In Fig. 9, we compare the MAGPHYS derived values of the star formation rates (SFRs) to those estimated based on the spectral analysis of the  $\text{H}\alpha$  lines using the Second GAMA Data Release



**Figure 7.** The dust-to-stellar mass ratio as function of  $\text{NUV}-r$  colour for the *blue* (square) and *red* samples. E (triangle down), S (triangle up) and U (stars) labels represent the morphology of individual *red* source. The typical errors associated with our galaxies are indicated on the top-right corner. Overlaid are HRS (*Herschel* Reference Survey; Cortese et al. 2012b) detected (plus sign) and non-detected (open circle; downward arrows indicating upper limits) galaxies.

(GAMA-DR2) catalogues (Wijesinghe et al. 2012; Hopkins et al. 2013; Gunawardhana et al. 2013; Liske et al. 2015).

Galaxy SFRs in GAMA-DR2 are determined from the Kennicutt (1998) relation and based on the total aperture-corrected  $\text{H}\alpha$  luminosities observed through fibre spectroscopy. The  $r$ -band absolute magnitude of each galaxy have been used in order to correct for the Aperture and therefore recovering the total  $\text{H}\alpha$  luminosities (Hopkins et al. 2003; Gunawardhana et al. 2011). Dust corrections




Galaxy type	$\log(\text{SFR})[\text{M}_\odot\text{yr}^{-1}]$	$\log(\text{SFR}/M_*)[\text{yr}^{-1}]$	$\log(M_D/M_\odot)$	$\log(M_*/M_\odot)$	$\log(M_D/M_*)$	$f_\mu$
<i>blue</i>	$0.43 \pm 0.57$	$-9.72 \pm 0.80$	$7.84 \pm 0.54$	$10.42 \pm 0.47$	$-2.58 \pm 0.62$	$0.55 \pm 0.53$
<i>red</i> (type-S)	$-0.29 \pm 0.54$	$-11.11 \pm 0.65$	$7.74 \pm 0.44$	$10.86 \pm 0.37$	$-3.12 \pm 0.51$	$0.88 \pm 0.31$
<i>red</i> (type-U)	$-0.71 \pm 0.53$	$-11.34 \pm 0.53$	$7.67 \pm 0.39$	$10.83 \pm 0.29$	$-3.16 \pm 0.44$	$0.88 \pm 0.22$
<i>red</i> (type-E)	$-0.67 \pm 0.63$	$-11.70 \pm 0.62$	$7.62 \pm 0.49$	$11.06 \pm 0.26$	$-3.44 \pm 0.51$	$0.92 \pm 0.29$

**Table 1.** Mean values of various MAGPHYS output parameters estimated from distributions shown in Figs.8 and 10.

Parameter	<i>blue</i> vs. <i>red</i> -E	<i>blue</i> vs. <i>red</i> -S	<i>blue</i> vs. <i>red</i> -U	<i>red</i> -E vs. <i>red</i> -S	<i>red</i> -E vs. <i>red</i> -U	<i>red</i> -S vs. <i>red</i> -U
Sérsic index	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	0.098	0.056
ellipticity	< <b>0.001</b>	0.40	0.0045	< <b>0.001</b>	0.013	< <b>0.001</b>
$\log(\Sigma_5)$	0.25	0.43	0.13	0.71	0.46	0.63
$\log(M_*/M_\odot)$	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	0.94
$\log(\text{SFR})[\text{M}_\odot\text{yr}^{-1}]$	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	0.021	0.87	0.032
$\log(\text{SFR}/M_*)[\text{yr}^{-1}]$	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	0.10	0.012
$\log(M_D/M_\odot)$	0.50	0.0049	0.0021	0.029	0.89	0.23
$\log(M_D/M_*)$	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	0.014	0.012
$f_\mu$	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	< <b>0.001</b>	0.056	0.87	0.45

**Table 2.** The results of a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test ( $p$ -values) associated to parameter distributions shown in Figs.3, 4, 6, 8 and 10. We highlight with bold face fonts those parameters for which the KS-test indicates a significant difference in the underlying distributions, i.e.  $p < 0.001$ .



**Figure 8.** Distributions of dust mass (left panel) as well as specific dust mass (right panel) in the *blue* (thick solid line) and *red* sources. E (red dashed line), S (green dotted line) and U (cyan line) labels represent the morphology of individual *red* source. Each histogram is normalized by its integral. The estimated mean value associated to each histogram is given in Table.1.

were estimated for each galaxy from the observed Balmer decrement. Finally stellar absorption corrections were applied to both  $H\alpha$  and  $H\beta$  fluxes which together with the  $H\alpha$  equivalent width (EW) allow to calculate the total aperture-corrected  $H\alpha$  luminosities as described in detail in Hopkins et al. (2003).

We find a strong correlation between the two estimates of SFRs such that (SFRs are in units of  $\text{M}_\odot\text{yr}^{-1}$ )

$$\log \text{SFR}_{\text{Magphys}} = 1.22_{-0.02}^{+0.02} \times \log \text{SFR}_{\text{GamaDR2}} - 0.35. \quad (4)$$

Give the Pearson correlation coefficient of  $r \simeq 0.71$  in the above equation, it is evident that in general, GAMA DR2  $H\alpha$  -derived SFRs are well correlated with those predicted by MAGPHYS through SED based measurements though on average MAGPHYS derived SFRs are  $\approx 0.3$  dex lower than those based on the  $H\alpha$  luminosities from GAMA. This may be due to different treatments applied in correcting for dust or aperture as explained in Wijesinghe et al. (2011).

The distribution of SFR related parameters are displayed in Fig. 10. The first two panels, show the SFR and the specific star formation rate (SSFR) of *blue* and *red* galaxies. The mean value of the SFR in the *red* -E galaxies is an order of magnitude lower than in the *blue* galaxies with  $\text{SFR}_{\text{blue}}/\text{SFR}_{\text{red-E}} \approx 13$  ( $\text{SSFR}_{\text{red-S}}/\text{SSFR}_{\text{red-E}} \approx 2.5$ ; see also Table. 1).

The difference between the two samples is even more pronounced when considering SFR normalized by galaxy's stellar mass  $M_*$  such that  $\text{SSFR}_{\text{blue}}/\text{SSFR}_{\text{red-E}} \approx 100$  ( $\text{SSFR}_{\text{red-S}}/\text{SSFR}_{\text{red-E}} \approx 4$ ). For both the SFR and the SSFR, the values estimated for the *red* -S type sources and the galaxies with uncertain morphology, lay between the *red* -E galaxies and the *blue* control sample. In comparison, Rowlands et al. (2012) (i.e. Table C1) measure  $-9.99_{-0.03}^{+0.03}$  and  $-10.85_{-0.14}^{+0.14}$  for SSFR in samples of 'H-ATLAS spiral' and 'H-ATLAS elliptical' galaxies respectively.

Figure. 10c shows the normalized distributions of  $f_\mu$  in the *blue* and *red* populations. The *red* -E galaxies have an average  $f_\mu \sim 0.92$ , well above the mean ( $\sim 0.55$ ) of the *blue* galaxies. This indicates that while about half of the observed FIR emission observed in the *blue* galaxies comes from dust in birth clouds, the FIR of *red* -E galaxies is dominated by dust in the diffuse interstellar medium (ISM). We note that the average derived  $f_\mu$  for the *red* -S systems is significantly higher than for the *blue* control sample and only slightly lower than for the sample of the *red* -E galaxies.

### 3.5.1 On the derived properties of the red -S sample

Even though the *red* -S galaxies are not the prime focus of this paper, this sample does display some interesting characteristics that are worth commenting on briefly. As can be derived from figures 6, 8b and 10 the deduced properties of the *red* -S galaxies do not match the *blue* galaxy properties. The *red* -S galaxies appear intermediate between the *red* -E and the *blue* galaxies in stellar mass, SFR and specific dust mass. This offset is primarily driven by the higher derived stellar masses and the correspondingly lower SFR. This is contrary to what one would expect if the red colours of the edge-on galaxies are *only* due to their high inclination.

Inclination does play a significant role in defining this sam-

ple, as can be concluded from Fig. 11. We show in this figure the inclination of the *blue* + *red* -S for the stellar masses above  $\log(M_*/M_\odot) \approx 10.0$ , i.e. the range of stellar masses of interest. There is a definite trend of the median inclination against observed optical redness and in particular the very reddest sources are almost exclusively very inclined sources.

We see two main interpretations — which could be at play simultaneously — that could explain these characteristics of the *red* -S sample.


- (i) High inclination is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for a star-forming disk galaxy to be submm detected *and* very optically red. In this case the red colour would apparently select preferentially the more massive disk galaxies. Perhaps the less massive disk galaxies have enough star formation in their periphery of their disks — which would not be strongly obscured, even in the case of strong inclination — to exhibit a blue-ish optical colour. Alternatively, the red colour of those massive disks could be a direct results of a dominant old stellar population.
- (ii) The galaxy parameters, derived from MAGPHYS, of the very inclined and dusty sources are systematically biased to higher stellar masses and less star formation. This is in line with the finding of da Cunha et al. (2010). These authors find that the derived SFR for edge-on galaxies is about a factor  $3 \times$  ( $\approx 0.48$  dex) below their face-on counterparts. They also find that this effect is also responsible for the lower dust masses (or dust luminosities) and higher  $f_\mu$  estimated for edge-on in comparison to face-on galaxies. The amplitude of this effect is insufficient to directly explain the difference we find between the blue sample and the *red* -S sample. Note however that da Cunha et al. (2010) describe the effect on an *inclined* sample of galaxies while the *red* -S sample is selected to have only galaxies with very red colours. The *inclined* sample contains galaxies with varying degrees of hidden star-formation whereas the *red* -S sample contains only galaxies with very obscured star-formation. We thus would expect to find a larger offset of the derived parameters in the *red* -S sample than in the *inclined* sample.

Clearly this red disk population of nearby galaxies deserves further attention in a dedicated study.

### 3.6 Dust mass correlations with galactic properties

We show in Fig. 12 correlation plots of the derived dust mass versus a number of key parameters ( $M_*$ , SFR, and  $f_\mu$ ) in the *red* -E and *blue* galaxies. These parameters have been chosen to elucidate the possible origin and role of the dust in the *red* -E galaxies. The first conclusion that can be drawn from the perusal of these diagrams is that the *red* -E galaxies clearly occupy a different parameter space from *blue* spiral galaxies.

Panel 12a shows a very different behaviour of the  $M_D$  as a function of  $M_*$  for the blue galaxies and the *red* -E sample. The blue sample shows a roughly linear correlation (with scatter) between the dust reservoir and the  $M_*$ . This relation is expected due to the  $M_*$ -SFR relation for normal galaxies, if the  $M_D$  is measuring the reservoir available for star formation. The *red* -E sample exhibits a totally different behaviour apart from being located in a distinctly different part of this diagram. While the host galaxies are all -- with one outlier -- of very similar mass ( $\approx 10^{11} M_\odot$ ) their



**Figure 9.** Ratio of MAGPHYS SFR over GAMA DR2 SFR in logarithmic scale vs  $M_*$  for all galaxies in our sample (see Eq. 4). Vertical histogram shows the distributions of data points along y-axis.


dust content spans more than two orders of magnitude. This complete decorrelation of stellar mass and dust content argues against a stellar origin (e.g. Cortese et al. 2012b) for the dust in those galaxies. While for blue galaxies the dust mass increases with stellar mass, the dust masses found for the *red* -E span  $\approx 2$  order of magnitudes for stellar masses that are roughly constant at  $\approx 10^{11} M_\odot$  (see Table. 3).

In panel 12b we show that there is a moderate correlation in the *red* -E galaxies between the derived SFR and  $M_D$  with a similar slope but offset from the *blue* sequence. We interpret the existence of this correlation as an indication that the star formation is probably taking place in the cold gas associated with the dust.

The observed offset between the *blue* control sample and the *red* -E sample implies that the same amount of dust in the *red* -E galaxies is associated with about an order of magnitude less star formation. This could be an indication that the physical state of the cold ISM phase in the *red* -E galaxies is significantly different perhaps due to the very different environment in which the cold gas is embedded. This interpretation is corroborated by panel 12c where we show that indeed the MAGPHYS derived fraction of the dust heating due to the interstellar radiation field, i.e.  $f_\mu$  is much higher in the *red* -E galaxies than their *blue* counterparts.

### 3.7 The origin of dust in *red* -E

In the classical definition of galactic types, ellipticals were classified as devoid of gas and dust (Hubble 1926; de Vaucouleurs 1959; Sandage 1961). In the subsequent years, dust emission in Ellipticals has been detected from the ground (Hawarden et al. 1981; Sadler & Gerhard 1985; Sparks et al. 1985; Kormendy & Stauffer 1987; Ebner et al. 1988; Pandey et al. 2001) and from space using the *Infrared Astronomical Satellite (IRAS)* (Jura et al. 1987; Knapp et al. 1989) and the *Spitzer Space Telescope* (Rocca-Volmerange et al. 2007). Dust lanes were observed early on along the minor axis of ellipticals (Bertola & Galletta 1978). When in some ellipticals the dust lanes and stars were observed to rotate in opposite direction, this was suggestive that this dust must have been accreted and can



**Figure 10.** Distributions of (a) star formation rate, (b) specific star formation rate and (c)  $f_{\mu}$ , e.g. the fraction of total dust luminosity contributed by the diffuse interstellar medium, in the *blue* (thick solid line) and the *red* sources. E (red dashed line), S (green dotted line) and U (cyan line) labels represent the morphology of individual *red* source. Each histogram is normalized by its integral. The estimated mean value associated to each histogram is given in Table.1.

Galaxy type	Y	X	s (slope)	$\pm$ err standard deviation	c (intercept)	r-value (Pearson correlation)	p-value
<i>blue</i> (panel a)	$\log(M_*/M_{\odot})$	$\log(M_D/M_{\odot})$	0.56	0.01	5.93	0.54	<0.001
<i>red</i> -E (panel a)	-	-	0.30	0.06	8.76	0.67	<0.001
<i>blue</i> (panel b)	$\log(\text{SFR}) [M_{\odot}\text{yr}^{-1}]$	$\log(M_D/M_{\odot})$	0.54	0.01	-3.89	0.56	<0.001
<i>red</i> -E (panel b)	-	-	0.54	0.18	-4.87	0.50	0.006

**Table 3.** Results of linear regression analysis to the observed data points in panels 'a' and 'b' of Figs. 12. Parameters in the table are associated to the linear model  $Y = s(\pm\text{err}) \times X + c$ .

not be accounted for by mass loss from evolved stars (Kormendy & Djorgovski 1989). Kinematic information is important in order to constrain the presence of counter-rotating gas (and dust) in ellipticals in order to establish the frequency of the accretion scenario (Bertola et al. 1988)


In this study, the unresolved red ellipticals detected in the submm do not have associated kinematic information. However, we attempt to establish whether the present dust masses in our sample of elliptical galaxies can be explained with stellar sources using a model of dust formation and evolution in ellipticals. We compare the specific dust masses ( $M_D/M_*$ ) with the predictions for dust mass return from a single stellar population (SSP) model and which represents an instantaneous burst of star formation. The star formation histories of the observed galaxies are more complex than that represented by a single burst of star formation. Their stellar masses and colours are however clearly dominated by the old stellar populations. Moreover, chemical evolution models of elliptical galaxies find very short timescales of their formation and high star formation efficiencies of the initial starburst (Pipino et al. 2005). The present SFR of  $\sim 0.1 M_{\odot}\text{yr}^{-1}$  in our sample is several orders of magnitude lower than that the SFR in the past responsible for the build-up of their stellar mass of  $\sim 10^{11} M_{\odot}$ . Therefore, for comparison with the dust model predictions, we assume that the entire stellar mass of each red-E galaxy is associated with a single burst with an age equal to its mass weighted age derived from the SED fitting. The observed dust mass in a galaxy is thus compared with the survived dust mass from the SSP with the same age. The model of the SSP adopted here was introduced in Zhukovska (2008) and was used to describe the chemical evolution of dust and gas in the

Milky Way and dwarf galaxies (Zhukovska et al. 2008; Zhukovska 2014). For the chemical evolution aspects of the SSP model, we adopt the same ingredients as in Zhukovska (2008) except for the IMF, for which we use the Chabrier (2003) form. This is consistent with the IMF that is adopted in the SED fitting with MAGPHYS.


The model includes dust production by type II supernovae (SNe) and by asymptotic giant branch (AGB) stars. Type Ia SNe are an important source of metallic iron in early type galaxies. Models of dust evolution imply that, with an assumption of high condensation efficiencies of metals into dust in their ejecta, they can dominate dust input in elliptical galaxies (e.g., Calura et al. 2008; Pipino et al. 2011). Far-infrared observational surveys of both warm and cool dust in remnants of type Ia SNe do not however find evidence of efficient dust formation, in contrast to remnants of type II SNe (Gomez et al. 2012). This is supported by theoretical models, which indicate that newly formed grains are small and are easily destroyed in shocked gas before being ejected into the ISM (Nozawa et al. 2011). Therefore, we neglect the dust input from type Ia SNe.

The net input from type II SNe is still debated. We add their contribution for completeness, as they produce dust for a limited period of time after stars have formed ( $\sim 40$  Myr). We adopt relatively low efficiencies of dust condensation in the SNe ejecta. These are constrained by meteoritic data and the observed metallicity-dust to gas ratio relation in dwarf galaxies (Zhukovska et al. 2008; Zhukovska 2014).

The mass- and metallicity-dependent dust yields for AGB stars are taken from the work of Ferrarotti (2006) with additional models from Zhukovska et al. (2008). These dust yields were computed for stellar metallicity ranging from  $Z = 0.001$  up to the



**Figure 13.** The evolution of the dust mass relatively to the stellar mass of as a function of the age of single stellar population. The left, middle and right panel indicate initial metallicities of  $Z = Z_{\odot}$ ,  $Z = 2 Z_{\odot}$  and  $Z = 3 Z_{\odot}$ , respectively. The value of the solar metallicity adopted here is  $Z_{\odot} = 0.014$  (Asplund et al. 2009). The solid lines shows the evolution of the cumulative dust mass returned in the SSP. The evolution of dust mass for the same SSP model with dust destruction by thermal sputtering on the timescales of 1 Gyr and 100 Myr are shown with the dashed and dotted lines, respectively. The filled red circles represent the sample of *red*-E galaxies which have been grouped in metallicity bins of  $[0.5 - 1.5] Z_{\odot}$ ,  $[1.5-2.5] Z_{\odot}$ , and  $> 2.5 Z_{\odot}$ . The specific dust masses of each *red*-E galaxy in the sample is plotted versus the mass weighted age of its stellar populations and the metallicity of each galaxy is obtained from the SDSS DR4 (Gallazi et al. 2005).



**Figure 11.** Distribution of galactic inclination angles  $i$  for *blue* and *red*-S galaxies, having stellar masses  $\log(M_*/M_{\odot}) \geq 10.0$ , vs.  $\text{NUV}-r$  colour. Each box extends from the lower to upper quartile values of data, with a line at the median (red line). Inclination angles are computed using Eq. 2. Dashed lines extending vertically from the boxes indicating variability outside the upper and lower quartiles. Individual data points indicate outliers. The vertical dashed-dotted line intersects the x-axis at  $\text{NUV}-r = 4.5$  above which galaxies are classified as *red*.

suprasolar values of 0.04 and for the stellar mass range  $[1 - 7] M_{\odot}$ . We extrapolate the dust yields in the mass range  $[7 - 8] M_{\odot}$ . Only one galaxy in the *red*-E sample is old enough for stars with masses below  $1 M_{\odot}$  to contribute to the dust budget. However, stars in

this mass range lose a large fraction of their envelopes during Red Giant Branch evolution characterised by inefficient dust formation (Gail et al. 2009; McDonald et al. 2011a, 2015). Some amount of dust is condensed during following AGB stage, but the total dust mass returned to the ISM is very low. Estimates based on the gas mass-loss rates derived in McDonald et al. (2011b) and McDonald et al. (2015) point to  $\lesssim 10^{-3} M_{\odot}$  of dust per star. Given this low value, we choose not to extrapolate the dust yields down to  $0.8 M_{\odot}$  and neglect dust input from these stars.


The ISM in elliptical galaxies is dominated by hot rarefied gas with temperatures of  $\sim 10^7$  K (Mathews & Brighenti 2003). Grains can be rapidly sputtered in high-temperature gas due to collisions with ions (mostly with abundant  $\text{H}^+$ ) (Draine & Salpeter 1979; Itoh 1989). The time scale of destruction by thermal sputtering can be approximated as

$$\tau_{\text{sput}} = 10^5 \left( 1 + (10^6 \text{K}/T)^3 \right) \frac{a/0.1\mu\text{m}}{n/\text{cm}^{-3}} \text{yr}, \quad (5)$$

where  $n$  and  $T$  are the number density and temperature of the hot gas, respectively, and  $a$  is the grain radius. The total stardust mass  $M_D(t)$  is reduced by thermal sputtering in the hot gas at the rate:

$$\frac{dM_D(t)}{dt} = -\frac{M_D(t)}{\tau_{\text{sput}}}. \quad (6)$$

The temperature and density of the hot gas are derived from observations of extended X-ray emission. For simplicity, we assume single values for the electron density and temperature of the gas of  $10^{-3} \text{ cm}^{-3}$  and  $1.5 \times 10^7$  K, respectively (Mathews & Brighenti 2003) resulting in  $\tau_{\text{sput}} = 100$  Myr. Note that  $\tau_{\text{sput}}$  depends only weakly on temperature in the regime appropriate for the hot ISM of elliptical galaxies and a value of  $T = 10^6$  K results in the time scale of 200 Myr. A similarly low value of the timescale of interstellar dust destruction, only 46 Myr, is derived for ETGs detected in FIR by *Spitzer* observations (Clemens et al. 2010). For



**Figure 12.** Distribution of dust mass  $M_D$  against (a) stellar mass  $M_*$  (b) star formation rate SFR and (c)  $f_\mu$  in blue (blue square), red-E (red circle). In addition, horizontal and vertical histograms show the distributions of data points along x and y axes with blue/thick and red/dashed lines representing blue and red-E. Each histogram is normalized by its integral. Typical errors associated to various parameters are indicated on the bottom-left corner. Results of linear regression analysis to blue and red-E observed data points in panels 'a' and 'b' are given in Table. 3.

a comparison, we also ran calculations of the SSP evolution with a longer dust destruction timescale of 1 Gyr which corresponds to a lower gas density of  $10^{-4} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ . This long timescale may also account for the fact that many early type galaxies may harbour cold gas (Mathews & Brighenti 2003; Alatalo et al. 2013; Young et al. 2014), where grains are protected for some time from the thermal sputtering and can survive longer. Another mechanism of dust destruction is inertial sputtering in SN shocks, which is thought to be the dominant mechanism of dust destruction in spiral galaxies. However, in a hot rarefied medium one SN destroys 20 times less dust compared to the local ISM conditions (McKee 1989). We therefore do not consider dust destruction by type Ia SNe and restrict our consideration to the thermal sputtering in hot gas. Dust mass in an early type galaxy can also be substantially reduced by the galactic winds (not considered in the present model). Our estimates should therefore be considered as the upper limit for the stardust mass.

Fig. 13 compares the specific dust masses we have derived for the sample of red -E to the results of the SSP models<sup>4</sup>. The data are grouped in three metallicity bins of  $[0.5 - 1.5] Z_\odot$ ,  $[1.5 - 2.5] Z_\odot$ , and  $> 2.5 Z_\odot$  and compared to three sets of SSP models with  $Z = Z_\odot$  (left panel),  $Z = 2Z_\odot$  (middle panel), and  $Z = 3Z_\odot$  (right panel). The specific dust masses of each red -E galaxy in the sample is plotted versus the mass weighted age of its stellar populations and the metallicity of each galaxy is obtained from the SDSS DR4 (Gallazzi et al. 2005). The figure clearly shows that, as expected, SSP models with no dust destruction tend to over-predict the amount of dust in these ellipticals. On the other hand, more realistic models with dust sputtering fail to reproduce the observed  $M_D/M_*$  ratio even when a relatively long dust destruction timescale of 1 Gyr is considered. The SSP models with dust destruction under-predicts the ratio of  $M_D/M_*$  by more than two order of magnitude. These estimates demonstrate that dust return into ISM from stellar sources is not sufficient to explain the observed  $M_D/M_*$ . This implies an external origin of the dust via minor mergers and/or efficient dust growth in the dense ISM.

The amount of dust in the sub-mm detected galaxies as well as its correlation with the present day star-formation rate (Fig. 12, panel b) suggests a connection between the dust and the dense ISM in agreement with Alatalo et al. (2013), who find that the distribution of the CO and dust in nearby ETG is spatially correlated. The timescale for dust growth in molecular clouds is short and of the order of a few to several  $10^7$  yrs (Hirashita 2000). We estimate an upper bound on the dust mass that may result from dust growth in the dense ISM in the following manner. Assuming a specific mass of molecular gas  $M_{H_2}/M_*$  of 0.01 and a value of 0.06 for the specific mass of the atomic gas  $M_{HI}/M_*$  (these are the observed upper limits in Young et al. (2014)), a dust-to-hydrogen mass ratio of 0.018 (i.e., about 3 times the solar value), and a complete condensation of heavy elements into dust in the molecular gas, this yields a specific dust mass  $M_D/M_*$  of  $0.07 \times 0.018 \approx 1.3 \times 10^{-3}$  which is only slightly higher than the largest specific dust masses measured for the sample of red Ellipticals that are displayed in Fig. 13. This means that it is difficult, but not impossible, to explain the measured dust masses as resulting from grain growth in the dense gas inside the elliptical galaxies. It should be noted that dust growth does not preclude the role of minor mergers because the molecular gas may have an external origin (Davis et al. 2011).

<sup>4</sup> Value of the solar metallicity adopted here is  $Z_\odot = 0.014$  (Asplund et al. 2009).

#### 4 CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we examine the properties of low redshift galaxies detected in  $250\mu\text{m}$  ( $>5\sigma$ ) using H-ATLAS DR1 catalogue. We define two sub-samples of *red* and *blue* galaxies based on  $\text{NUV}-r$  colours. Our aim is to understand the nature of the *red* subset in comparison to those in the *blue* sub-sample. We can summarize our findings as follow:

- Within the redshift range  $0.01 \leq z \leq 0.2$  of our sample, *red* sources with the UV-optical colour indices of  $\text{NUV}-r \geq 4.5$ , constitute  $\approx 4.2$  per cent of the total number of systems in H-ATLAS. The fraction of *red* sources increases with the galaxy stellar mass such that in  $\gtrsim 97$  per cent of the *red* sample,  $M_* \gtrsim 10^{10} M_\odot$ .
- Following the visual inspection of galaxies, sources in the *red* sample were grouped into three categories of elliptical (E), spiral (S) and uncertain (U). We find that at least  $\gtrsim 30$  per cent of the *red* sources are of type E and more than  $\gtrsim 40$  per cent of sources belong to type S.
- Both *blue* and *red* sources, seem to occupy environments with similar densities (e.g. having similar  $\log(\Sigma_S)$  distributions) though in comparison to *blue* and *red* objects of type S and U, a slightly larger fraction of *red* -E sources are in relatively denser regions with  $\log(\Sigma_S/\text{Mpc}^{-2}) \gtrsim 1.5$ .
- The SED analysis of galaxies in our sample based on MAGPHYS, reveals that the *red* galaxies (either type S or E) span a similar range of dust masses but different dust-to-stellar mass ratios in comparison to the *blue* galaxies. The specific dust masses in the *blue* and *red* -S galaxies are, on average, larger than those found for the *red* -E sample by a factor of  $7\times$  and  $2\times$  respectively. Similarly, galaxies of type E have lower levels of mean SFR and SSFR in contrast to sources in the *blue* and *red* -S samples. Furthermore, analysis of  $f_\mu$  shows that unlike *blue* galaxies where star-forming regions have the main contribution to the observed submm fluxes, FIR emission in the *red* systems of type E is mainly from the dust in the ISM.

- The UV-optical colours of the *red* -S sample could be the result of their highly inclined orientation and/or a strong contribution of the old stellar population. However, in the current work we did not further investigate the contribution of each factor to the observed colour of the *red* -S sources.

- Finally, the comparison of specific dust masses ( $M_D/M_*$ ) of the *red* elliptical galaxies to the dust evolution in single stellar populations models excludes that the origin of the dust is from internal stellar sources. Dust growth in molecular clouds and/or gas and dust accretion through minor mergers provide more realistic and appealing alternatives (e.g., Gomez et al. 2010; Smith et al. 2012b).

Our results show that there exist a population of early-type galaxies, containing a significant level of cold dust similar to those observed in blue/star-forming galaxies. The origin of dust in such early-type galaxies is likely to be of external origin (e.g. fuelled through mergers and tidal interactions). Hence, it is interesting to know the difference between *red* galaxies which are detected in  $250\mu\text{m}$  and those without any submm detection in the hope to find the mechanisms that are responsible for tuning the dust content in passive and/or early-type galaxies.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank the anonymous referee for his valuable comments and suggestions which helped to improve this paper.

S. D. is supported by a Marie-Curie Intra European Fellowship under the European Community's Seventh Framework Program FP7/2007-2013 grant agreement no 627008. SH acknowledges support from the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG) in the collaborative research project SFB881 The Milky Way System (subprojects B1). RJL, LD and SJM acknowledge support from the European Research Council Advanced Grant, cosmicism. S. Z. acknowledge support by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through SPP 1573: Physics of the Interstellar Medium. G. dZ. acknowledge financial support from ASI/INAF Agreement 2014-024-R.0 for the *Planck* LFI activity of Phase E2. K. R. acknowledges support from the European Research Council Starting Grant SEDmorph (P.I. V. Wild).

The *Herschel*-ATLAS is a project with *Herschel*; which is an ESA space observatory with science instruments provided by European-led Principal Investigator consortia and with important participation from NASA. The H-ATLAS website is <http://www.h-atlas.org/>. GAMA is a joint European-Australasian project based around a spectroscopic campaign using the Anglo-Australian Telescope. The GAMA input catalogue is based on data taken from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey and UKIRT Infrared Deep Sky Survey. Complementary imaging of the GAMA regions is being obtained by a number of independent survey programs including GALEX MIS, VST KIDS, VISTA VIKING, WISE, *Herschel*-ATLAS, GMRT and ASKAP providing UV to radio coverage. GAMA is funded by the STFC (UK), the ARC (Australia), the AAO, and the participating institutions. The GAMA website is <http://www.gama-survey.org/>. MAGPHYS is available via <http://www.iap.fr/magphys/magphys/MAGPHYS.html>

#### REFERENCES

- Agius, N. K., Sansom, A. E., Popescu, C. C., Andrae, E., Baes, M. et al., 2013, MNRAS, 431, 1929
- Alatalo, K., Davis, T. A., Bureau, M., Young, L. M., Blitz, L. et al. 2013, MNRAS, 432, 1796
- Adelman-McCarthy J. K., Agüeros, M. A., Allam, S. S., Allende Prieto, C., Anderson, K. S. J. et al., 2008, ApJS, 175, 297
- Asplund, M., Grevesse, N., Sauval, A.J., Scott, P., 2009, ARA&A, 47, 481
- Auld, R., Bianchi, S., Smith, M. W. L., Davies, J. I., Bendo, G. J. et al., 2013, MNRAS, 428, 1880
- Abazajian K. N. et al., 2009, ApJS, 182, 543
- Baldry, I. K., Glazebrook, K., Brinkmann, J., Ivezić, Z., Lupton, R. H. et al., 2004, ApJ, 600, 681
- Ball, N. M., Loveday, J., Brunner, R. J., 2008, MNRAS, 383, 907
- Balogh, M., Baldry, I. K., Nichol, R., Miller, C., Bower, R. et al., 2004, ApJL, 615, 101
- Barden, M., Rix, H., Somerville, R. S., Bell, E. F., Häußler, B. et al. 2005, ApJ, 635, 959
- Bell, E. F. et al., 2004a, ApJ, 608, 752
- Bell, E. F., McIntosh, D. H., Barden, M., Wolf, C., Caldwell, J. A. R. et al., 2004b, ApJ, 600, 11
- Bendo, G. J., Boselli, A., Dariush, A., Pohlen, M., Roussel, H. et al. 2012, MNRAS 419, 1833
- Bertola, F., Galletta, G. 1978, ApJ, 226, 115

- Bertola, F., Buson, L. M., Zeilinger, W. W. 1988, *Nature*, 335, 705
- Binggeli, B., Tammann, G.A., Sandage, A., 1987, *AJ*, 94, 251
- Bertola, F. & Galletta, G. 1978, *ApJ*, 226, L115
- Boselli, A., Eales, S., Cortese, L., Bendo, G., Chanical, P. et al., 2010, *PASP*, 122, 261
- Bourne, N., Maddox, S. J., Dunne, L., Auld, R., Baes, M. et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 421, 3027
- Bourne, N. et al., in prep.
- Brough, S., Croom, S., Sharp, R., Hopkins, A. M., Taylor, E. N. et al., 2013, *MNRAS*, 435, 2903
- Bruzual & Charlot, 2003, *MNRAS*, 344, 1000
- Burgarella, D., Buat, V., Iglesias-Páramo, J., 2005, *MNRAS*, 360, 1413
- Butcher, H., Oemler, A.Jr., 1984, *ApJ*, 285, 426
- Calura, F., Pipino, A., Matteucci, F. 2008, *A&A*, 479, 669
- Chabrier G., 2003, *PASP*, 115, 763
- Charlot S., Fall S. M., 2000, *ApJ*, 539, 718
- Clemens, M. S., Jones, A. P., Bressan, A., Baes, M., Bendo, G. J., 2010, *A&A*, 518, L50
- Cluver, M. E., Jarrett, T. H., Hopkins, A. M., Driver, S. P., Liske, J. et al., 2014, *ApJ*, 782, 90
- Condon, J. J., Cotton, W. D., Greisen, E. W., Yin, Q. F., Perley, R. A. et al., 1998, *AJ*, 115, 1693
- Conroy, C., Gunn, J.E., White, M., 2009, *ApJ*, 699, 486
- Conselice, C.J., 2014, *ARA&A*, 52 291
- Cooper M. C. et al., 2006, *MNRAS*, 370, 198
- Cortese, L., Boselli, A., Franzetti, P., Decarli, R., Gavazzi, G. et al., 2008, *MNRAS*, 386, 1157
- Cortese, L. 2012a, *A&A*, 543, 132
- Cortese, L., Ciesla, L., Boselli, A., Bianchi, S., Gomez, H. et al., 2012b, *A&A*, 540, 52
- Croton, D.J., Springel, V., White, S.D.M., De Lucia, G., Frenk, C.S. et al., 2006, *MNRAS*, 365, 11
- Cucciati O. et al., 2006, *A&A*, 458, 39
- da Cunha, E., Charlot, S., Elbaz, D. 2008, *MNRAS*, 388, 1595
- da Cunha, E., Eminian, C., Charlot, S., Blaizot, J., 2010, *MNRAS*, 403, 1894
- Dale, D. A., Gil de Paz, A., Gordon, K. D., Hanson, H. M., Armus, L. et al., 2007, *ApJ* 655, 863
- Dale, D. A., Aniano, G., Engelbracht, C. W., Hinz, J. L., Krause, O. et al., 2012, *ApJ* 745, 95
- Dariush A., Cortese L., Eales S., Pascale, E., Smith, M. W. L. et al., 2011, *MNRAS*, 418, 64
- Davies, J. I., Baes, M., Bendo, G. J., Bianchi, S., Bomans, D. J. et al., 2010, *A&A* 518, L48
- Davis, T. A., Alatalo, K., Sarzi, M., Bureau, M., Young, L. M. 2011, *MNRAS*, 417, 882
- De Looze, I., Baes, M., Zibetti, S., Fritz, J., Cortese, L. et al. 2010, *A&A* 518, L54
- de Vaucouleurs, G. 1959, *Handbuch der Physik*, 53, 275
- di Serego Alighieri, S., Bianchi, S., Pappalardo, C. et al., 2013, *A&A*, 552, 8
- Draine, B. T., Salpeter, E. E. 1979, *ApJ*, 231, 438
- Dressler, A., 1980, *ApJ*, 236, 351
- Driver, S.P., Liske, J., Cross, N.J.G., De Propriis, R. , Allen, P.D., 2005, *MNRAS*, 360, 81
- Driver, S. P., Popescu, C. C., Tuffs, R. J., Liske, J., Graham A. W. et al., 2007, *MNRAS*, 379, 1022
- Driver S. P., Norberg, P., Baldry, I. K., Bamford, S. P., Hopkins, A. M. et al., 2009, *Astron. Geophys.*, 50, 12
- Driver S. P., Hill, D. T., Kelvin, L. S., Robotham, A. S. G., Liske, J. et al., 2011, *MNRAS*, 413, 971
- Dunne, L., & Eales, S. 2001, *MNRAS*, 327, 697
- Eales, S., Dunne, L., Clements, D. Cooray, A., de Zotti, G. et al., 2010, *PASP*, 122, 499
- Ebner, K. & Balick, B. 1985, *AJ*, 90, 183
- Ebner, K., Djorgovski, S., Davis, M. 1988, *AJ*, 95, 422
- Ferrarotti, A. S., Gail, H.-P. 2006, *A&A*, 447, 553
- Gail, H., Zhukovska, S., Hoppe, P., , Trieloff, M., 2009, *ApJ*, 698, 1136
- Gallazi, A., Charlot, S., Brinchmann, J., White, S. D. M., Tremonti, C. A. 2005, *MNRAS*, 362, 41
- Gomez, H. L., Baes, M., Cortese, L., Smith, M. W. L., Boselli, A. et al., 2010, *A&A*, 518, 45
- Gomez, H. L., Clark, C. J. R., Nozawa, T., Krause, O., Gomez, E. L. et al., 2012, *MNRAS*, 420, 3557
- Goudfrooij, P., de Jong, T., Hansen, L., & Norgaard-Nielsen, H. U., 1994, *MNRAS*, 271, 833
- Grootes, M. W., Tuffs, R. J., Popescu, C. C., Pastrav, B., Andrae, E. et al., 2013, *ApJ*, 766, 59
- Gunawardhana M. L. P. et al., 2011, *MNRAS*, 415, 1647
- Gunawardhana M. L. P., Hopkins, A. M., Bland-Hawthorn, J., Brough, S., Sharp, R. et al., 2013, *MNRAS*, 433, 2764
- Hawarden, T. G., Elson, R. A. W., Longmore, A. J., Tritton, S. B., Corwin, H. G., 1981, *MNRAS*, 196, 747
- Hayward, C. C. & Smith, D. J. B., arXiv:1409.6332v2 [astro-ph.GA] 5 Nov 2014
- Hirashita, H. 2000, *PASJ*, 52, 585
- Hopkins A. M. et al., 2003, *ApJ*, 599, 971
- Hopkins A. M., Driver, S. P., Brough, S., Owers, M. S., Bauer, A. E. et al., 2013, *MNRAS*, 430, 2047
- Hubble, E. 1926, *ApJ*, 64, 321
- Knapp, G. R., Guhathakurta, P., Kim, D.-W., & Jura, M. A. 1989, *ApJS*, 70, 329
- Hill, D.T., Kelvin, L.S., Driver, S.P., Robotham, A.S.G., Cameron, E. et al., *MNRAS*, 2011, 412, 765
- Ibar E., Ivison, R. J., Cava, A., Rodighiero, G., Buttiglione, S. et al., 2010, *MNRAS*, 409, 38
- Itoh, H. 1989, *PASJ*, 41, 853
- Jarvis, M. J., Smith, D. J. B., Bonfield, D. G., Hardcastle, M. J., Falder, J. T. et al., 2010, *MNRAS*, 409, 92
- Johnson, B. D., Schiminovich, D., Seibert, M., Treyer, M. A., Charlot, S. et al., 2006, *ApJ*, 644, 109
- Johnson, B. D., Schiminovich, D., Seibert, M., Treyer, M., Martin, D. C. et al., 2007, *ApJS*, 173, 377
- Jura, M., Kim, D. W., Knapp, G. R., Guhathakurta, P. 1987, *ApJL*, 312, L11
- Kaviraj, S., Schawinski, K., Devriendt, J. E. G., Ferreras, I., Khochfar, S. et al., 2007, *ApJS*, 173, 619
- Kennicutt R. C., Jr, 1998, *ARA&A*, 36, 189
- Kennicutt, R. C., Calzetti, D. ,Aniano, G. et al., 2011, *PASP*, 123, 1347
- Knapp, G. R., Guhathakurta, P., Kim D. W., Jura, M. 1989, *ApJS*, 70, 329
- Kormendy, J., Stauffer, J. 1987, in *Structure and Dynamics of Elliptical Galaxies*, IAU Symp. No 127, ed. T. de Zeeuw, p. 405. Dordrecht: Reidel
- Kormendy, J., Sanders, D. B. 1992, *ApJ*, 390, 53
- Kormendy, J., Djorgovski, S. 1989, *ARA&A*, 27, 235
- Lawrence A. Warren S. J., Almaini, O., Edge, A. C., Hambly, N. C. et al., 2007, *MNRAS*, 379, 1599
- Leeuw, L. L., Sansom, A. E., Robson, E. I., Haas, M., & Kuno, N. 2004, *ApJ*, 612, 837
- Lewis et al. 2002 Lewis, I. et al., 2002, *MNRAS*, 334, 673

- Li, A. & Draine, B. T. 2002, *ApJ*, 572, 232
- Liske, J., Lemon, D.J., Driver, S.P., Cross, N.J.G., Couch, W.J., 2003, *MNRAS*, 344, 307
- Liske, J. et al., 2015, *MNRAS* submitted (arXiv:1506.08222v1)
- Masters, K. L., Mosleh, M., Romer, A. K., Nichol, R. C., Bamford, S. P. et al., 2010, *MNRAS*, 405, 783
- Mathews, W. G., Brighenti, F. 2003, *ARA&A*, 41, 191
- McDonald, I et al., 2011a, *AjSS*, 193, 23.
- McDonald, I et al., 2011b, *ApJ*, 730, 71.
- McDonald, I. et al., 2015, *MNRAS*, 448, 502.
- McKee, C. in the Proceedings of Interstellar Dust, IAU Symposium 135, Eds. L. J. Allamandola, A. G. G. M. Tielens, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 341
- Morrissey P., Schiminovich, D., Barlow, T. A., Martin, D. C., Blackkolb, B. et al., 2005, *ApJ*, 619, L7
- Mulchaey, J.S., 2000, *ARA&A*, 38, 289
- Nozawa, T., Maeda, K., Kozasa, T. et al, 2011, *ApJ*, 736, 45
- Odenwald et al., 1998, *ApJ*, 500, 554
- Pandey, S. K., Sahu, D. K., Kembhavi, A. K., McCarthy, P. J. 2001, *BASI*, 29, 449
- Pascale, E., Auld, R., Dariush, A., Dunne, L., Eales, S. et al., 2011, *MNRAS*, 415, 911
- Pilbratt G. et al., 2010, *A&A*, 518, 1
- Pipino, A., Kawata, D., Gibson, B. K., Matteucci, F., 2005, *A&A*, 434, 553
- Pipino, A., Fan, X. L., Matteucci, F., Calura, F., Silva, L. et al. 2011, *A&A*, 525, 61
- Poggianti, B.M., Fasano, G., Bettoni, D., Cava, A., Dressler, A. et al., 2009, *ApJ*, 697, 137
- Poggianti, B.M., De Lucia, G., Varela, J., Aragon-Salamanca, A., Finn, R. et al., 2010, *MNRAS*, 405, 995
- Popescu et al., 2002, *ApJ* 567, 221
- Popescu & Tuffs, 2002, *MNRAS* 335, 41
- Ravindranath, S., Ferguson, H. C., Conselice, C., Giavalisco, M., Dickinson, M. et al., 2004, *ApJ*, 604, 9
- Rigby, E. E., Maddox, S. J., Dunne, L., Negrello, M., Smith, D. J. B. et al., 2011, *MNRAS*, 415, 2336
- Rocca-Volmerange, B., de Lapparent, V., Seymour, N., Fioc, M. 2007, *A&A*, 475, 801
- Rowlands, K., Dunne, L., Maddox, S., Bourne, N., Gomez, H. et al., 2012, *MNRAS*, 419, 2545
- Sadler, E. M., Gerhard, O. E. 1985, *MNRAS*, 214, 177
- Sandage, A. 1961, *The Hubble Atlas of Galaxies*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Inst. Washington
- Savoy, J., Welch, G. A., & Fich, M. 2009, *ApJ*, 706, 21
- Schweizer, F. 1986, *Science*, 231, 227
- Simard, L., Mendel, J. T., Patton, D. R., Ellison, S. L., McConnell, A. W., 2011, *ApJS*, 196, 11
- Smith, D. J. B., Dunne, L., Maddox, S. J., Eales, S., Bonfield, D. G. et al., 2011, *MNRAS*, 416, 857
- Smith, D. J. B., Dunne, L., da Cunha, E., Rowlands, K., Maddox, S. J. et al., 2012a, *MNRAS*, 427, 703
- Smith, M. W. L., Gomez, H. L., Eales, S. A., Ciesla, L., Boselli, A. et al., 2012b, *ApJ*, 748, 123
- Sodroski, T. J., Odegard, N., Arendt, R. G., Dwek, E., Weiland, J. L. et al., 1997, *ApJ* 480, 173
- Sparks, W. B., Wall, J. V., Thorne, D. J., Jorden, P. R., van Breda, I. G. et al. 1985, *MNRAS*, 217, 87
- Strateva, I., Ivezić, Z., Knapp, G. R., Narayanan, V. K., Strauss, M. A. et al., 2001, *AJ*, 122, 1861
- Sutherland W., Saunders W., 1992, *MNRAS*, 259, 413
- Tanaka M., Kodama T., Arimoto N., Okamura S., Umetsu K., Shimasaku K., Tanaka I., Yamada T., 2005, *MNRAS*, 362, 268
- Taylor E. N., Hopkins, A. M., Baldry, I. K., Bland-Wawthorn, J., Brown, M. J. I. et al., 2015, *MNRAS*, 446, 2144
- Temi, P., Brighenti, F., Mathews, W. G., & Bregman, J. D. 2004, *ApJS*, 151, 237
- Temi, P., Brighenti, F., & Mathews, W. G. 2007, *ApJ*, 660, 1215
- Tojeiro, R., Wilkins, S., Heavens, A. F., Panter, B., Jimenez, R., 2009, *ApJS*, 185, 1
- van den Bergh, S., 1976, *ApJ*, 206, 883
- van den Bergh, S., 1988, *PASP*, 100, 344
- Virdee, J. S., Hardcastle, M. J., Rawlings, S., Rigopoulou, D., Mauch, T. et al., 2013, *MNRAS*, 432, 609
- Vlahakis, C., Dunne, L., Eales, S., 2005, *MNRAS*, 364, 1253
- Wijesinghe D. B. et al., 2011, *MNRAS*, 410, 2291
- Wijesinghe, D. B., Hopkins, A. M., Brough, S., Taylor, E. N., Norberg, P. et al., *MNRAS*, 2012, 423, 3679
- Willmer C. et al., 2006, *ApJ*, 647, 853
- Wright, E. L., Eisenhardt, P. R. M., Mainzer, A. K., Ressler, M. E., Cutri, R. M. et al. 2010, *AJ*, 140, 1868
- Wolf C. et al., 2009, *MNRAS*, 393, 1302
- Wyder T. K., Martin, D. C., Schiminovich, D., Seibert, M., Budavári, T. et al., 2007, *ApJS*, 173, 293
- Young, L. M., Scott, N., Serra, P., Alatalo, K., Bayet, E. et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 444, 3408
- Zhukovska, S. 2008, Ph.D Thesis
- Zhukovska, S., Gail, J.-P., Trieloff, M. 2008, *A&A*, 479, 453
- Zhukovska, S., 2014, *A&A*, 562, 76

## APPENDIX A: SDSS POSTAGE-STAMP IMAGES OF *red* GALAXIES AND THEIR SED FITS



index	HATLAS IAU ID	SDSS OBJID	SDSS Ra	SDSS Dec	NUV- <i>r</i> [mag]	$\log(\Sigma_5)$ [Mpc <sup>-2</sup> ]	<i>i</i> [deg]	type
1	HATLAS-J085450.2+021207	587727944563687568	8h54m50.22	+2h12m8.37	4.71	-0.693	56.3	U
2	HATLAS-J092342.9+012056	587727942956220488	9h23m42.94	+1h20m57.21	5.06	0.099	38.67	S
3	HATLAS-J084643.5+015034	587727944025964790	8h46m43.64	+1h50m35.95	5.44	0.997	70.88	S
4	HATLAS-J084345.2-003205	588848899354329167	8h43m45.22	-0h32m4.59	5.28	-0.08	66.09	U
5	HATLAS-J092110.3+021205	587726033304944826	9h21m10.43	+2h12m4.44	4.81	-1.143	82.92	S
6	HATLAS-J084305.0+010858	587726032227008788	8h43m5.15	+1h8m55.59	4.66	0.055	57.29	S
7	HATLAS-J092344.2-001113	588848899895591029	9h23m44.38	-0h11m14.06	4.72	-0.203	72.62	S
8	HATLAS-J084139.5+015346	587726033300619494	8h41m39.55	+1h53m46.57	4.7	-0.484	34.33	U
9	HATLAS-J084343.9-001243	587725074451595552	8h43m44.02	-0h12m43.98	4.67	0.035	73.62	S
10	HATLAS-J085946.8-000019	588848899892969689	8h59m46.88	-0h0m20.2	4.75	-0.323	69.26	S
11	HATLAS-J084713.9+012141	587727943489094075	8h47m14.09	+1h21m44.65	5.43	-0.648	35.45	E
12	HATLAS-J090911.8+000030	587725074991218943	9h9m11.88	+0h0m28.79	5.16	-0.644	79.06	S
13	HATLAS-J084632.0+001825	588848900428398906	8h46m32.24	+0h18m26.85	5.44	0.122	61.57	U
14	HATLAS-J090952.3-003019	588848899357147464	9h9m52.4	-0h30m16.72	4.72	-1.013	48.67	E
15	HATLAS-J085407.6+012716	587727943489880290	8h54m7.53	+1h27m18.01	4.52	-0.57	61.4	S
16	HATLAS-J084625.7+014913	587727944025899418	8h46m25.84	+1h49m11.11	4.92	-0.427	53.09	U
17	HATLAS-J083610.1+005604	587727942951043325	8h36m10.04	+0h56m0.54	4.72	0.665	53.86	U
18	HATLAS-J091612.2-004200	587725073918263574	9h16m12.16	-0h41m58.08	4.8	-0.4	56.76	S
19	HATLAS-J092158.0+023427	587727944566636774	9h21m58.05	+2h34m28.44	5.1	-1.051	39.17	E
20	HATLAS-J084933.2+014340	587726032764600581	8h49m33.08	+1h43m40.89	4.78	-0.227	54.61	E
21	HATLAS-J090752.4+012945	587727943491387551	9h7m52.23	+1h29m44.39	4.62	0.597	34.05	E
22	HATLAS-J090929.3+020326	587727944028455086	9h9m29.56	+2h3m25.69	5.5	-0.356	62.22	U
23	HATLAS-J084215.5+011605	587727943488569644	8h42m15.64	+1h16m5.77	4.67	0.221	74.86	S
24	HATLAS-J084630.9+015620	587726033301143661	8h46m31.0	+1h56m21.44	4.63	-0.706	80.33	S
25	HATLAS-J084324.4+005705	587727942951829819	8h43m24.52	+0h57m5.62	5.87	-0.245	37.25	E
26	HATLAS-J085738.4+010741	587727942953402664	8h57m38.51	+1h7m41.34	5.02	0.702	68.5	S
27	HATLAS-J091735.1+001931	588848900431741238	9h17m35.15	+0h19m30.52	5.06	-0.175	30.5	U
28	HATLAS-J084929.1-005350	588010931369083190	8h49m29.3	-0h53m44.48	4.58	nan	38.67	U
29	HATLAS-J085554.8-002832	588848899355639926	8h55m54.59	-0h28m26.59	6.41	0.669	46.49	E
30	HATLAS-J091333.6-001508	587725074454806843	9h13m34.04	-0h15m9.56	4.74	-0.996	28.72	U
31	HATLAS-J091143.6+012055	587726032230154446	9h11m43.76	+1h20m56.79	4.77	-1.367	60.52	U
32	HATLAS-J092232.9-005813	587729151452774559	9h22m33.11	-0h58m13.64	5.03	2.057	29.99	E
33	HATLAS-J085750.5-005517	587729151450022213	8h57m50.7	-0h55m17.26	4.97	0.825	68.92	S
34	HATLAS-J084043.4+010814	587726032226746692	8h40m43.12	+1h8m11.83	4.78	0.632	27.14	U
35	HATLAS-J092125.1-000341	588848899895328909	9h21m25.09	-0h3m43.62	4.86	-0.987	61.86	S
36	HATLAS-J085311.5+005530	587727942952878410	8h53m11.59	+0h55m34.59	5.94	-0.282	70.27	S
37	HATLAS-J085443.3+010539	587727942953074975	8h54m43.22	+1h5m45.35	5.07	-0.578	42.14	E
38	HATLAS-J114923.8-010501	587748927628902552	11h49m23.54	-1h5m1.79	4.6	0.22	75.72	S
39	HATLAS-J115841.9-011801	587724650867523744	11h58m41.95	-1h18m0.26	4.6	-0.833	81.55	S
40	HATLAS-J121840.2-001522	587722982815891459	12h18m40.23	-0h15m23.27	4.64	-0.417	45.72	U
41	HATLAS-J113955.6+013042	587728307494584346	11h39m55.86	+1h30m43.42	4.62	1.267	56.1	S
42	HATLAS-J115256.8+012929	587728307495960699	11h52m57.0	+1h29m30.38	4.76	-0.244	71.53	S
43	HATLAS-J120028.7-015138	587724650330849374	12h0m28.68	-1h51m38.87	5.21	-0.697	47.64	E
44	HATLAS-J120844.2-003226	588848899376742632	12h8m44.22	-0h32m27.03	5.23	-0.717	53.36	U
45	HATLAS-J120613.6-003423	588848899376480427	12h6m13.54	-0h34m23.79	4.54	-0.44	73.63	S
46	HATLAS-J115448.1+000154	587748929240105086	11h54m48.05	+0h1m54.31	4.73	-0.281	58.09	E
47	HATLAS-J121815.4-002151	587722982815826062	12h18m15.44	-0h21m53.46	4.63	0.002	62.11	S
48	HATLAS-J121700.2-004455	587722982278824126	12h17m0.41	-0h44m57.05	4.78	0.602	75.37	S
49	HATLAS-J115257.6+004210	588848900985651366	11h52m57.73	+0h42m9.72	5.17	-0.396	76.79	S
50	HATLAS-J120028.9-000725	588848899912696073	12h0m28.87	-0h7m24.87	5.81	0.612	56.89	E
51	HATLAS-J115754.8+001333	588848900449304761	11h57m54.83	+0h13m32.9	4.92	0.66	71.6	S
52	HATLAS-J115442.0-005447	588848898838364283	11h54m42.05	-0h54m49.15	4.59	-0.51	58.0	U
53	HATLAS-J114547.3-011709	587724650866081917	11h45m47.33	-1h17m8.13	4.57	0.401	65.02	S
54	HATLAS-J115525.5-002039	587748928703299628	11h55m25.47	-0h20m42.63	4.6	0.205	60.34	S
55	HATLAS-J114837.1-011246	587748927628837012	11h48m37.19	-1h12m46.2	6.28	1.702	39.33	E
56	HATLAS-J115827.6+004304	588848900986241088	11h58m27.7	+0h43m4.46	6.08	-0.541	56.33	E
57	HATLAS-J121636.4-005723	588848898840723542	12h16m36.51	-0h57m21.43	5.19	-0.79	63.45	E
58	HATLAS-J115122.7+000702	587748929239711890	11h51m22.64	+0h7m2.43	4.68	-0.597	23.1	U
59	HATLAS-J121747.1+003553	587722983889502322	12h17m47.17	+0h35m51.09	4.86	-0.583	72.32	S
60	HATLAS-J120454.4+011402	588848901523832979	12h4m54.65	+1h14m2.7	5.35	-0.172	26.47	E

Table A1. List of all red galaxies detected in HATLAS.

index	HATLAS IAU ID	SDSS OBJID	SDSS Ra	SDSS Dec	NUV- <i>r</i> [mag]	$\log(\Sigma_5)$ [Mpc <sup>-2</sup> ]	<i>i</i> [deg]	type
61	HATLAS-J114750.4-013710	587725041701159100	11h47m50.38	-1h37m11.31	4.86	0.558	49.64	U
62	HATLAS-J114828.1+001825	588848900448256260	11h48m28.25	+0h18m22.94	4.7	nan	56.22	E
63	HATLAS-J120212.5-014032	587724650331045959	12h2m12.24	-1h40m31.17	4.75	-0.764	63.17	S
64	HATLAS-J114930.0-010511	587748927628902442	11h49m30.15	-1h5m11.46	5.58	0.277	39.47	E
65	HATLAS-J115053.9-010830	587722981739069591	11h50m53.76	-1h8m29.65	4.93	0.115	37.35	U
66	HATLAS-J120008.3-003950	587748928166953080	12h0m8.17	-0h39m48.21	4.94	0.066	60.54	U
67	HATLAS-J120048.1-011117	587748927630147744	12h0m48.28	-1h11m17.6	5.01	-0.461	47.56	E
68	HATLAS-J113836.4-013713	587724650328424633	11h38m36.27	-1h37m14.05	4.52	0.554	22.58	E
69	HATLAS-J122026.8-011046	587722981742280865	12h20m26.87	-1h10m47.28	4.67	0.446	34.85	U
70	HATLAS-J120844.8+001220	587748929241612470	12h8m44.83	+0h12m21.46	4.98	-0.572	42.44	U
71	HATLAS-J121001.7-011516	587724650868768886	12h10m1.61	-1h15m17.01	5.68	-0.833	58.76	S
72	HATLAS-J113919.1-012012	587724650865361032	11h39m18.95	-1h20m18.19	5.05	-0.521	55.2	U
73	HATLAS-J114318.5-004414	587748928165118125	11h43m18.61	-0h44m17.11	4.53	-0.539	51.33	U
74	HATLAS-J120140.5+005138	587748930314567848	12h1m40.15	+0h51m38.71	5.01	-0.644	61.67	U
75	HATLAS-J121823.6-013038	587725041704501421	12h18m23.51	-1h30m37.86	4.83	-0.167	59.44	U
76	HATLAS-J120535.5+010445	588848901523898501	12h5m35.33	+1h4m44.34	5.53	0.479	49.35	U
77	HATLAS-J114526.8-002708	588848899374186712	11h45m26.58	-0h27m11.56	5.32	-0.914	29.57	E
78	HATLAS-J114849.6-005941	588848898837708980	11h48m49.57	-0h59m40.53	4.88	-0.6	53.97	U
79	HATLAS-J114609.3-010205	588848898837446812	11h46m9.18	-1h2m6.83	4.88	0.585	63.8	S
80	HATLAS-J120246.1+002207	588848900449829017	12h2m46.51	+0h22m3.61	6.64	-0.207	53.62	S
81	HATLAS-J120406.6+001411	588848900449960274	12h4m6.52	+0h14m9.77	4.98	-0.117	72.22	S
82	HATLAS-J145112.4-002724	588848899394568318	14h51m12.4	-0h27m24.76	4.71	0.187	75.01	S
83	HATLAS-J143224.5+005041	587722984441118986	14h32m24.62	+0h50m41.14	4.9	-0.133	86.81	S
84	HATLAS-J141501.6-005136	588848898853699826	14h15m1.74	-0h51m36.46	5.33	-0.412	82.77	S
85	HATLAS-J143143.3-011418	587729972324073647	14h31m43.38	-1h14m19.78	4.84	-1.137	77.59	S
86	HATLAS-J143801.4-001217	588848899929997456	14h38m1.53	-0h12m18.13	4.65	-0.479	69.75	S
87	HATLAS-J141126.2+011711	587726014009573415	14h11m26.23	+1h17m11.47	5.55	0.777	19.37	E
88	HATLAS-J142004.5-001852	587722982829130030	14h20m4.67	-0h18m53.29	4.6	0.053	33.78	U
89	HATLAS-J141611.6+015204	587726032263446738	14h16m11.83	+1h52m4.72	5.5	-0.575	62.73	U
90	HATLAS-J143012.5+001400	588848900465951018	14h30m12.5	+0h14m2.81	4.81	0.855	58.65	S
91	HATLAS-J144810.4+012203	587726014550442257	14h48m10.5	+1h22m1.93	4.57	-0.393	68.64	S
92	HATLAS-J141446.6-000417	588848899927441586	14h14m46.6	-0h4m17.37	5.26	-0.764	59.98	S
93	HATLAS-J142926.0+012315	587726031728017631	14h29m26.06	+1h23m16.62	4.56	-0.658	57.74	S
94	HATLAS-J141727.9+002857	587722983902609591	14h17m27.97	+0h28m57.99	5.19	0.713	40.76	E
95	HATLAS-J141310.5+014618	587726014546641064	14h13m10.5	+1h46m17.11	5.57	2.006	44.1	E
96	HATLAS-J144224.0+005430	587722984442232848	14h42m23.61	+0h54m28.79	5.01	-0.433	41.32	E
97	HATLAS-J142113.4-002756	588848899391226106	14h21m13.45	-0h27m59.63	4.94	-0.479	32.78	E
98	HATLAS-J142015.8+010252	587722984439808094	14h20m15.91	+1h2m51.5	4.81	0.17	65.57	S
99	HATLAS-J141539.0-002649	588848899390636315	14h15m39.07	-0h26m51.7	4.85	-0.098	57.74	U
100	HATLAS-J142429.3+015829	587726015084757174	14h24m29.34	+1h58m31.01	4.82	0.175	74.27	S
101	HATLAS-J142856.4+002130	588848900465819923	14h28m56.56	+0h21m32.39	5.67	-0.635	25.6	E
102	HATLAS-J142613.8-011122	587729972323483911	14h26m13.74	-1h11m24.01	5.29	0.195	39.73	E
103	HATLAS-J143052.0+011836	587726031728214195	14h30m52.04	+1h18m34.61	4.97	-0.672	71.24	S
104	HATLAS-J143731.7+000341	587722983367901556	14h37m31.92	+0h3m39.01	4.63	-0.87	72.71	S
105	HATLAS-J144532.2-010921	587729972325646543	14h45m32.17	-1h9m20.9	4.75	-0.757	79.16	S
106	HATLAS-J144346.1+004306	588848901004329189	14h43m46.24	+0h43m4.43	4.59	-0.767	61.13	U
107	HATLAS-J140753.5-001931	587722982827819184	14h7m53.34	-0h19m27.74	4.5	-0.396	27.39	E
108	HATLAS-J142831.0+014541	587726032264822925	14h28m31.19	+1h45m40.78	5.53	-0.599	35.48	E
109	HATLAS-J144718.4-010621	587729972325843159	14h47m18.4	-1h6m18.83	4.63	0.055	48.6	E
110	HATLAS-J142517.4-010304	587722981755977936	14h25m17.4	-1h3m6.24	5.18	0.139	33.86	U
111	HATLAS-J142437.5-013819	587729971786481829	14h24m37.35	-1h38m20.15	5.4	0.688	31.13	E
112	HATLAS-J145123.6+000025	587722983369474066	14h51m23.42	+0h0m25.48	4.94	-0.627	44.69	E
113	HATLAS-J141353.0-004527	587722982291603595	14h13m53.48	-0h45m27.18	5.07	0.484	22.97	E
114	HATLAS-J141325.9-004923	587722982291538161	14h13m25.85	-0h49m23.89	5.12	0.36	43.99	E
115	HATLAS-J145216.9+010631	587726014014030018	14h52m16.66	+1h6m34.3	5.01	-0.721	32.7	E
116	HATLAS-J142512.3-001858	587722982829719819	14h25m12.49	-0h19m0.67	4.92	-0.287	47.84	E
117	HATLAS-J141516.7-003941	587722982291734808	14h15m16.49	-0h39m40.61	5.29	-0.088	70.96	S

Table A2. Table. A1 Continued.

index	HATLAS IAU ID	$\log(M_*/M_\odot)$	$\log(\text{SFR})$ [ $M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1}$ ]	$\log(\text{SFR}/M_*)$ [ $\text{yr}^{-1}$ ]	$\log(M_D/M_\odot)$	$\log(M_D/M_*)$	$f_\mu$
1	HATLAS-J114923.8-010501	10.92	-0.09	-11.01	7.51	-3.41	0.72
2	HATLAS-J115841.9-011801	10.98	0.32	-10.66	8.08	-2.89	0.78
3	HATLAS-J121840.2-001522	11.29	-0.21	-11.5	7.77	-3.52	0.78
4	HATLAS-J113955.6+013042	11.2	-0.04	-11.25	7.82	-3.38	0.67
5	HATLAS-J115256.8+012929	10.61	-0.25	-10.86	7.97	-2.64	0.78
6	HATLAS-J120028.7-015138	10.95	-0.79	-11.75	7.87	-3.08	0.83
7	HATLAS-J120844.2-003226	11.05	-1.04	-12.08	7.39	-3.65	0.82
8	HATLAS-J120613.6-003423	10.59	0.02	-10.57	7.35	-3.24	0.68
9	HATLAS-J115448.1+000154	11.02	-0.35	-11.37	8.11	-2.9	0.78
10	HATLAS-J121815.4-002151	10.51	-2.67	-13.18	7.32	-3.18	0.98
11	HATLAS-J121700.2-004455	10.68	-0.84	-11.52	7.86	-2.83	0.74
12	HATLAS-J115257.6+004210	10.85	-0.62	-11.47	7.82	-3.03	0.8
13	HATLAS-J120028.9-000725	11.35	-0.87	-12.22	7.86	-3.49	0.8
14	HATLAS-J115754.8+001333	10.55	-0.34	-10.89	7.44	-3.11	0.86
15	HATLAS-J115442.0-005447	10.66	-2.27	-12.93	8.28	-2.37	0.85
16	HATLAS-J114547.3-011709	10.68	-0.23	-10.91	8.05	-2.63	0.72
17	HATLAS-J115525.5-002039	11.11	0.2	-10.91	7.67	-3.44	0.74
18	HATLAS-J114837.1-011246	11.52	-1.37	-12.89	8.26	-3.27	0.86
19	HATLAS-J115827.6+004304	10.92	-2.85	-13.77	6.65	-4.26	0.85
20	HATLAS-J121636.4-005723	10.9	-1.41	-12.31	7.1	-3.8	0.84
21	HATLAS-J115122.7+000702	10.88	-0.63	-11.51	6.87	-4.01	0.64
22	HATLAS-J121747.1+003553	10.71	-0.46	-11.17	7.3	-3.41	0.76
23	HATLAS-J120454.4+011402	11.02	-1.03	-12.05	7.41	-3.61	0.8
24	HATLAS-J114750.4-013710	10.71	-0.95	-11.66	7.16	-3.55	0.94
25	HATLAS-J114828.1+001825	11.14	-0.16	-11.3	7.78	-3.36	0.99
26	HATLAS-J120212.5-014032	10.95	-0.54	-11.49	8.07	-2.88	0.83
27	HATLAS-J114930.0-010511	10.81	-1.89	-12.69	6.46	-4.35	0.82
28	HATLAS-J115053.9-010830	10.73	-0.64	-11.37	8.2	-2.53	0.75
29	HATLAS-J120008.3-003950	9.6	-1.77	-11.36	5.91	-3.69	0.16
30	HATLAS-J120048.1-011117	10.83	-0.44	-11.27	8.06	-2.77	0.69
31	HATLAS-J113836.4-013713	10.89	-0.59	-11.48	6.87	-4.02	0.68
32	HATLAS-J122026.8-011046	10.68	-1.45	-12.13	7.56	-3.13	0.85
33	HATLAS-J121001.7-011516	10.29	-2.43	-12.72	7.32	-2.97	0.85
34	HATLAS-J113919.1-012012	10.5	-1.19	-11.69	7.36	-3.15	0.84
35	HATLAS-J114318.5-004414	10.54	-0.69	-11.23	7.21	-3.34	0.71
36	HATLAS-J120140.5+005138	10.94	-0.65	-11.58	7.41	-3.53	0.91
37	HATLAS-J121823.6-013038	10.57	-1.14	-11.72	6.95	-3.63	0.84
38	HATLAS-J120535.5+010445	10.75	-1.54	-12.29	7.36	-3.39	0.99
39	HATLAS-J114526.8-002708	10.99	-1.13	-12.11	7.2	-3.78	0.86
40	HATLAS-J114849.6-005941	11.25	-0.43	-11.68	7.54	-3.71	1.0
41	HATLAS-J114609.3-010205	10.66	-0.89	-11.55	7.57	-3.1	0.87
42	HATLAS-J120246.1+002207	11.27	-1.42	-12.69	7.66	-3.61	0.81
43	HATLAS-J120406.6+001411	10.92	-0.61	-11.53	6.93	-3.99	0.81
44	HATLAS-J145112.4-002724	10.63	-0.44	-11.07	7.68	-2.95	0.75
45	HATLAS-J143224.5+005041	11.29	0.03	-11.26	8.38	-2.91	0.79
46	HATLAS-J141501.6-005136	10.61	-0.79	-11.4	7.37	-3.24	0.81
47	HATLAS-J143143.3-011418	10.6	-0.43	-11.02	6.98	-3.61	0.73
48	HATLAS-J143801.4-001217	10.95	0.02	-10.93	8.11	-2.84	0.79
49	HATLAS-J141126.2+011711	11.03	-1.51	-12.54	6.87	-4.16	0.88
50	HATLAS-J142004.5-001852	10.36	-0.21	-10.57	7.05	-3.31	0.71
51	HATLAS-J141611.6+015204	11.03	-1.88	-12.91	8.12	-2.91	0.85
52	HATLAS-J143012.5+001400	10.69	-0.69	-11.38	7.37	-3.32	0.76
53	HATLAS-J144810.4+012203	9.89	-0.96	-10.85	6.56	-3.33	0.72
54	HATLAS-J142926.0+012315	11.09	-0.17	-11.27	7.88	-3.21	0.71
55	HATLAS-J141727.9+002857	10.97	-1.35	-12.31	7.15	-3.81	0.96
56	HATLAS-J141310.5+014618	11.03	-0.83	-11.86	6.96	-4.06	0.72
57	HATLAS-J144224.0+005430	10.95	-0.84	-11.79	6.85	-4.1	0.82
58	HATLAS-J142113.4-002756	11.09	-0.29	-11.38	7.53	-3.56	0.83
59	HATLAS-J142015.8+010252	10.9	-0.06	-10.96	7.52	-3.38	0.77
60	HATLAS-J141539.0-002649	10.73	-0.44	-11.17	7.32	-3.41	0.78

Table A3. MAGPHYS output parameters for the red galaxies having WISE observed photometric data.

index	HATLAS IAU ID	$\log(M_*/M_\odot)$	$\log(\text{SFR})$ [ $M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1}$ ]	$\log(\text{SFR}/M_*)$ [ $\text{yr}^{-1}$ ]	$\log(M_D/M_\odot)$	$\log(M_D/M_*)$	$f_\mu$
61	HATLAS-J142429.3+015829	10.19	-0.75	-10.94	6.78	-3.4	0.76
62	HATLAS-J142856.4+002130	11.45	-0.39	-11.83	7.88	-3.57	0.78
63	HATLAS-J142613.8-011122	10.87	-0.78	-11.65	6.93	-3.95	0.8
64	HATLAS-J143052.0+011836	11.19	-0.05	-11.24	8.01	-3.18	0.74
65	HATLAS-J143731.7+000341	10.59	-0.43	-11.02	7.19	-3.4	0.73
66	HATLAS-J144532.2-010921	10.38	-1.19	-11.57	7.32	-3.05	0.96
67	HATLAS-J144346.1+004306	10.25	-0.65	-10.89	6.77	-3.47	0.64
68	HATLAS-J140753.5-001931	10.91	-0.64	-11.55	6.92	-3.98	0.75
69	HATLAS-J142831.0+014541	11.06	-1.06	-12.11	7.5	-3.56	0.88
70	HATLAS-J144718.4-010621	11.2	-0.08	-11.28	7.51	-3.68	0.88
71	HATLAS-J142517.4-010304	11.06	-0.55	-11.61	7.65	-3.41	0.84
72	HATLAS-J142437.5-013819	11.0	-0.86	-11.86	7.28	-3.72	0.76
73	HATLAS-J145123.6+000025	10.1	-1.39	-11.49	6.04	-4.06	0.69
74	HATLAS-J141353.0-004527	11.17	-0.64	-11.81	7.86	-3.31	0.85
75	HATLAS-J141325.9-004923	10.87	-0.73	-11.6	7.94	-2.93	0.78
76	HATLAS-J145216.9+010631	11.06	-0.4	-11.46	7.2	-3.86	0.77
77	HATLAS-J142512.3-001858	10.95	-1.16	-12.11	7.65	-3.3	0.86
78	HATLAS-J141516.7-003941	10.93	-1.44	-12.37	7.65	-3.28	1.0

**Table A4.** Table. A3 Continued.