



Publication Year	2021
Acceptance in OA	2022-01-05T10:05:47Z
Title	The extension of the Fundamental Metallicity Relation beyond the BPT star-forming sequence: evidence for both gas accretion and starvation
Authors	Kumari, Nimisha, Maiolino, Roberto, Trussler, James, MANNUCCI, FILIPPO, CRESCI, GIOVANNI, Curti, Mirko, Marconi, Alessandro, BELFIORE, FRANCESCO MICHEL CONCETTO
Publisher's version (DOI)	10.1051/0004-6361/202140757
Handle	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12386/31313
Journal	ASTRONOMY & ASTROPHYSICS
Volume	656

The extension of the Fundamental Metallicity Relation beyond the BPT star-forming sequence: evidence for both gas accretion and starvation

Nimisha Kumari^{1,2,3,*}, Roberto Maiolino^{2,3}, James Trussler^{2,3}, Filippo Mannucci⁴, Giovanni Cresci⁴, Mirko Curti^{2,3}
Alessandro Marconi⁴ and Francesco Belli⁴

¹ AURA for the European Space Agency, Space Telescope Science Institute, 3700 San Martin Drive, Baltimore, MD 21218, US,

² Kavli Institute for Cosmology, University of Cambridge CB3 0HA, UK,

³ Cavendish Laboratory, University of Cambridge CB3 0HE, UK,

⁴ INAF - Osservatorio Astrofisico di Arcetri, Largo E. Fermi 5, I-50125, Firenze, Italy

Received ; accepted

ABSTRACT

Context. The fundamental metallicity relation (FMR) of galaxies is a 3D relation between the gas-phase metallicity, stellar mass and star-formation rate (SFR). It has been studied so far only for galaxies identified as star-forming (SF) on the BPT diagrams (BPT-SF), but not for galaxies with LI(N)ER/AGN classification (BPT-non-SF), mainly due to the lack of diagnostics for estimating their gas-phase metallicities in the latter cases.

Aims. We extend the FMR to BPT-non-SF galaxies.

Methods. To this end, we exploit the recent nebular line empirical calibrations derived specifically for galaxies classified as non-SF in the BPT diagrams. Moreover, we study an alternative representation of the FMR where we consider the offsets in metallicity and SFR with respect to Main Sequence (MS) galaxies.

Results. We find that galaxies with SFR higher than the MS are more metal-poor than their counterparts on the MS, which is interpreted in terms of gas accretion, boosting star formation and diluting the metallicity. Low-mass galaxies below the MS (i.e. towards quiescence) have metallicities higher than their MS counterparts, which is interpreted in terms of starvation, (i.e. suppression of fresh gas supply) hampering star formation and reducing the dilution effect, hence resulting in a higher level of internal chemical enrichment. Massive galaxies below the MS have gas metallicity much closer to their MS counterparts and much lower than expected from their stellar metallicities; this result suggests a scenario where massive nearly-quiescent galaxies with LI(N)ER-like nebular emission have recently accreted gas from the circum/intergalactic medium.

Key words. ISM: abundances– ISM:evolution– galaxies: evolution –galaxies: abundances.

1. Introduction

The metallicity scaling relations of galaxies provide important information on the galaxy evolutionary processes and tight constraints to models and numerical cosmological simulations (Maiolino & Mannucci 2019). The tightest scaling relation is between the stellar mass of galaxies and their gas-phase metallicity, the so-called mass-metallicity relation (MZR, Lequeux et al. 1979; also see Tremonti et al. 2004), which is often interpreted in terms of the deeper gravitational potential well of massive galaxies being more effective in retaining metals than low-mass galaxies. However, additional secondary relation of the gas metallicity with other galactic properties have been found. Mannucci et al. (2010) utilised the vast dataset of star-forming (SF) emission line galaxies from the seventh data release (Abazajian et al. 2009) of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS, York et al. 2000) to explore the relationship between the galactic stellar mass (M_*), star-formation rate (SFR) and gas-phase metallicity ($12+\log(\text{O}/\text{H})$). Following the works of Ellison et al. (2008), they identified a secondary relation according to which, at a given stellar mass, the gas-phase metallicity of galaxies anticorrelated with the SFR.

Such anticorrelation has been often interpreted in terms of gas accretion from the inter-galactic/circum-galactic medium which dilutes the gas metallicity and foster star formation. Mannucci et al. (2010) showed that the resulting three dimensional (3D) relation between stellar mass, SFR and metallicity exhibited little scatter in metallicity. This three-dimensional relation was also found not to evolve in redshift, and was dubbed the fundamental metallicity relation (FMR).

Several studies based on observations (e.g. Mannucci et al. 2011; Cresci et al. 2012; Brisbin & Harwit 2012; Yates et al. 2012; Roseboom et al. 2012; Andrews & Martini 2013; Nakajima & Ouchi 2014; Salim et al. 2014; Lian et al. 2015; Hunt et al. 2016; Kashino et al. 2016; Telford et al. 2016; Cresci et al. 2019; Curti et al. 2020), simulations (e.g. Davé et al. 2011; De Rossi et al. 2015; Lagos et al. 2016; Genel 2016; De Rossi et al. 2017; Matthee & Schaye 2018; Torrey et al. 2018; Bustamante et al. 2018) and analytical models (e.g. Dayal et al. 2013; Lilly et al. 2013; Forbes et al. 2014; Spitoni et al. 2017) have explored various aspects of the FMR. Though most observational studies agree on the general shape of the FMR, there have been discrepancies on the FMR behaviour typically at high stellar masses which are postulated to depend on various systematic effects

* E-mail: kumari@stsci.edu (NK)

such as selection of galaxies on the basis of signal-to-noise (S/N) ratio in emission lines (e.g. Yates et al. 2012; Telford et al. 2016) and calibration methods of SFR and gas-phase metallicities (e.g. Andrews & Martini 2013; Cresci et al. 2019). The overall normalization of the FMR is shown to depend critically on adopted metallicity calibration (Curti et al. 2020). The physics of the FMR is well explained by analytical models (e.g. Dayal et al. 2013; Lilly et al. 2013) whereby different components of the gas-regulator model play significant roles in shaping the form of the FMR.

Some studies (e.g. Bothwell et al. 2013, 2016a; Brown et al. 2018) have explored a similar relation where the SFR is replaced by the gas content and found that, once the much lower statistics is taken into account, the resulting 3D relation is even tighter. More specifically, the anticorrelation between metallicity and gas content is tighter than the anticorrelation between metallicity and SFR, suggesting that the former is more fundamental while the latter is a by-product resulting from the dependence of the SFR on gas via the Schmidt-Kennicutt relation (Schmidt 1959; Kennicutt 1998). These findings further support the interpretation that the primary driver of the FMR is due to gas accretion diluting the gas-phase metallicity and fostering star formation.

The existence of the FMR has been explored also on spatially-resolved scales (e.g. Barrera-Ballesteros et al. 2017; Cresci et al. 2019; Sánchez Almeida & Sánchez-Menguiano 2019; Sánchez et al. 2019) by using the integral field spectroscopic data from surveys such as MaNGA (Bundy et al. 2015), CALIFA (Sánchez et al. 2012) and SAMI (Bryant et al. 2015). Although different studies have reached somewhat different conclusions, there are indications that the FMR also holds for subgalactic regions (see discussion in Maiolino & Mannucci 2019). Questions have also been raised about the evolution of the FMR with redshift (e.g. Mannucci et al. 2010; Troncoso et al. 2014; Sanders et al. 2018; Cresci et al. 2019; Sanders et al. 2020). It has been shown that once the metallicity calibrations and uncertainties are taken into account the FMR does not evolve up to $z \sim 2.5$ and possibly even to $z \sim 3.5-4$ (Cresci et al. 2019; Sanders et al. 2020), although testing the evolution to very high redshift is made difficult by the potential evolution of the metallicity diagnostics and the limited availability of metallicity tracers with ground-based observations.

The existence of the FMR has also been used to explain the redshift evolution of the mass-metallicity relation (Maiolino et al. 2008; Troncoso et al. 2014; Mannucci et al. 2010; Sanders et al. 2020), in the sense that high redshift galaxies are more star forming and therefore populate the region of the FMR with lower metallicities, resulting into an evolution of the MZR.

However, the past observational studies of the FMR have only focused on those galaxies classified as ‘star forming’ according to the classical emission line diagnostic diagrams (the so-called BPT diagrams Baldwin et al. 1981; Kewley et al. 2006; Kauffmann et al. 2003a). This is primarily because the nebular line metallicity diagnostics (derived either empirically or through photoionization models) have mostly been calibrated on, and therefore applicable to, ‘star forming’ galaxies classified as such based on the BPT diagrams. These diagrams provide a useful way to broadly divide the excitation mechanism of the interstellar medium in galaxies in different classes, specifically: galaxies which have ongoing star formation and host young O and B stars, and the population of non-star forming galaxies as those including low-ionization (sometimes nuclear) emission region, (LI(N)ERs, Belfiore et al. 2016), with little star formation activity possibly ionized by evolved asymptotic giant branch (AGB) stars, post-AGB stars (Singh et al. 2013), white dwarfs

(Stasińska et al. 2008), shocks (Heckman 1980), or radiation leaked by star forming regions, as well as active galactic nuclei (AGNs) powered by a central mass-accreting super-massive black hole. Yet, different types of galaxies are classified in these diagrams by ‘razor-cut’ dividing lines, which are certainly oversimplistic demarcations. The distribution of galaxies in these diagrams is not bimodal, but it shows a continuous distribution across the dividing lines. It is unrealistic to think that galaxies suddenly change excitation mechanism as they cross the dividing lines. Variation in properties such as nitrogen abundance, ionization parameter, age of the stellar population, can result in galaxies to spread beyond the dividing lines without necessarily implying a change in excitation mechanisms. Therefore, imposing a sharp selection based on an assumed dividing line in the BPT diagrams may introduce biases in the galactic properties and, therefore, on the inferred scaling relations with metallicity. Moreover, the nebular lines used in the BPT diagrams are also used in most metallicity diagnostics, therefore selecting galaxies through line ratios that are somehow linked with the ratios used to measure the metallicity may result in biases in the resulting metallicity measurements. Ideally, the selection of galaxies should not rely on any selection based on nebular line ratios that are used to measure the metallicity of galaxies or which can bias the properties of the selected galaxy population.

An additional problem in selecting only star forming galaxies based on their BPT classification is that it limits our capability of fully exploring the metallicity scaling relations even beyond ‘classical’ star forming galaxies on the BPT diagram. When galaxies decrease their star formation and move towards quiescence, they generally still have plenty of gas (Gobat et al. 2018), but which has no longer the emission line ratios of star forming galaxies. When detected in nebular emission lines, quiescent or (many of) ‘green valley’ galaxies have generally LI(N)ER-like emission line ratios (Belfiore et al. 2018), which are typically associated with Diffuse Ionized Gas (DIG) excited either by evolved star (e.g. hot post-AGB stars), or by hardened, leaked radiation from residual star forming regions, as discussed above. However, as the metallicity diagnostics for galaxies in this region of the BPT diagram have not been calibrated until recently, these important stages of galaxy evolution have not been included in the metallicity scaling relations. Chemical evolution studies of non star-forming galaxies have been either restricted to the use of stellar metallicities (Gallazzi et al. 2014; Peng et al. 2015; Spitoni et al. 2017; Trussler et al. 2020, 2021), analytical models (Spitoni et al. 2017) and cosmological simulations (Romeo Velonà et al. 2013) where gas-phase metallicity measurements are not needed. It would be important to investigate the same process by probing the gas phase metallicities in green valley and passive galaxies.

Hence, the main caveat in addressing the various issues outlined above, i.e. for extending FMR to galaxies classified as non-star forming in the BPT diagrams, has been the lack of suitable metallicity calibrators for estimating the gas-phase metallicity of such systems. In order to overcome this problem, Kumari et al. (2019) utilised the IFS data of 24 nearby star-forming galaxies taken with the MUSE instrument on the Very Large Telescope (VLT) to identify and correct biases in the metallicity measurements of low ionization emission regions (LIERs), or regions dominated by DIG. The method consisted in comparing the emission line properties of LIER/DIG regions to those of nearby H II regions with similar levels of chemical enrichment, thus devising novel calibrations for the DIG/LIERs. Since the emission line ratios of DIG/LIERs fall on the same region occupied by the galaxy populations classified as non-SF in the

BPT diagrams, the DIG/LIER calibrators are also applicable to the non-star-forming/passive/quiescent galaxy populations, and hence enable measurements of their gas-phase metallicities (see discussion in Kumari et al. 2019).

The aim of this paper is to extend the FMR to the massive emission line galaxies lying beyond the star-forming sequence on the BPT diagrams. Henceforth, we use the terms "BPT-SF" for galaxies lying below the dividing star-forming line on the classical BPT diagrams (Figure 1, while "BPT-non-SF" for galaxies lying beyond the dividing star-forming line, occupied by the AGN/LI(N)ERs, as explained in more detail in Section 2). We mainly focus on emission line galaxies because the gas-phase metallicities of these systems can be estimated from the recent prescriptions from Kumari et al. (2019), based on the strong emission lines $H\beta$, $[O\ III]\lambda 5007$, $H\alpha$ and $[N\ II]\lambda 6584$. For this purpose, we use the vast dataset of SDSS-DR7 available from the Max Planck for Astrophysics and Johns Hopkins University groups (MPA-JHU) which has successfully been used for such studies in the past. We not only study the conventional form of FMR, (i.e. the 3D relation between M_* , SFR and $12 + \log(O/H)$), but we also build upon the previous work of Peng et al. (2015) and Trussler et al. (2020) to explore the difference of gas-phase metallicities of green valley and quiescent galaxies and the Main Sequence (MS) galaxies while considering the offset in their SFR activity from the Main Sequence population, in order to investigate their chemical composition and processes that might lead to quenching.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the SDSS dataset and the selection criteria, along with the methods to estimate the gas-phase and stellar metallicities, stellar masses and star-formation rates of BPT-SF and BPT-non-SF galaxies in the sample. Section 3 presents the FMR for BPT-SF sample, BPT-non-SF sample and the combined sample of BPT-SF and BPT-non-SF samples, where we use the $[N\ II]$ -BPT and $[S\ II]$ -BPT diagnostic diagrams to classify the SF and non-SF galaxies. We also study an alternative representation of the FMR for the combined sample of BPT-SF and BPT-non-SF galaxies for an easier interpretation. Section 4 discusses and summarises our main results.

2. Sample selection and measurement of FMR parameters

2.1. Galaxy sample

We use the SDSS-DR7 MPA-JHU catalogue¹, which provides the emission line fluxes, star-formation rates and stellar masses. As we describe in Section 2.2, our analysis is dependent on the use of the $[N\ II]$ -BPT diagnostic diagram for applying the metallicity calibrations, as this is the diagram used by Curti et al. (2017) to select SF galaxies for their empirical calibration, which has then been extended by Kumari et al. (2019) to the non-SF regions. However, we note that the results do not change significantly if the classification of galaxies (used to apply the metallicity calibrations) is based on the $[S\ II]$ -BPT diagram (the results based on this classification are shown in the appendix A). We apply a S/N cut of 3 on the $H\alpha$ and $H\beta$ lines and a S/N cut of 2 on $[O\ III]\lambda 5007$ and on $[N\ II]\lambda 6584$. Such a S/N cut ensures the clean BPT diagnostic diagrams with no spurious line ratios. We have verified that the results do not change significantly by increasing the S/N thresholds, simply resulting in lower statistics. In addition to S/N cuts, we also remove all galax-




Fig. 1. $[O\ III]/H\beta$ versus $[N\ II]/H\alpha$ diagram. In the upper panel, the data-points are colour-coded with respect to the gas-phase metallicity ($12 + \log(O/H)$) using the O3N2 diagnostic. We use recipes given in Curti et al. (2017) and Kumari et al. (2019) to estimate gas-phase metallicities of BPT-SF and BPT-non-SF galaxies, respectively. In the lower panel, the data points are color-coded with respect to stellar mass. On both panels, the solid black curve corresponds to the line dividing star forming galaxies from non-star forming galaxies empirically derived by Kauffmann et al. (2003a), where the galaxies lying below and beyond solid black curves are referred to as BPT-SF and BPT-non-SF galaxies, respectively. The error bars in the bottom-right corner shows the uncertainty on the emission line ratios.

ies whose photometric flags consists of DEBLEND_NOPEAK or DEBLEND_AT_EDGE, and restrict the sample to galaxies with total stellar masses in the range 10^7 - $10^{13} M_\odot$ thus ensuring the inclusion of low-mass dwarfs as well as massive galaxies. Different studies have assumed different redshift cuts in the previous FMR studies. We found that a lower-limit on redshift do not affect the higher-mass end of the FMR, which is the regime we want to probe in this work. Still, we have imposed a redshift

¹ Available at <http://www.mpa-garching.mpg.de/SDSS/DR7>

cut of $z > 0.016$, which ensures that the SDSS fibres cover at least ~ 1 kpc on the selected galaxies. This results in a sample of $\sim 10^5$ galaxies.

2.2. Gas-phase metallicity

We aim to extend the FMR study to the BPT-non-SF galaxies which requires their metallicity calibration. As already discussed, Kumari et al. (2019) provides the first metallicity calibrations for the DIG/LIER and for the BPT-non-SF galaxies. These empirical calibrations for BPT-non-SF galaxies are based on two distinct diagnostics, O3N2 ($= \log([\text{O III}]/\text{H}\beta) - \log([\text{N II}]/\text{H}\alpha)$) and O3S2 ($= \log([\text{O III}]/\text{H}\beta + [\text{S II}]/\text{H}\alpha)$). However, the O3S2 values exhibited by the full SDSS sample selected here lies within ~ -0.4 -1.6, which is beyond the range in which the O3S2 diagnostic has been calibrated (~ -0.5 -0.8, see e.g. Maiolino & Mannucci (2019)). Hence, we only use metallicities derived from the O3N2 diagnostic for the entire analysis.

Figure 1 (upper-panel) shows the [N II]-BPT diagnostic diagram (i.e. $[\text{O III}]/\text{H}\beta$ versus $[\text{N II}]/\text{H}\alpha$) along with the empirical starburst line from Kauffmann et al. (2003a), which is used to classify the SF and non-SF galaxies. We do not remove the AGNs from non-SF sample as such a recipe is not available for [N II]-BPT diagram. Moreover, Kumari et al. (2019) make the case that their new metallicity calibration also extend to the AGN/Sy population (thanks to the $[\text{O III}]/\text{H}\beta$ corrective term mentioned below), though further tests on AGN needs to be done. However, in Appendix A we show that the inclusion or removal of AGNs (based on the [SII]-BPT classification) hardly affects the overall results.

In Figure 1 (upper-panel), BPT-SF and BPT-non-SF samples are colour-coded with respect to their gas-phase metallicities estimated by using the empirical prescriptions given in Curti et al. (2017) and Kumari et al. (2019), and can also be expressed as the following equations.

$$12 + \log(\text{O}/\text{H})_{\text{BPT-SF}} = 7.64 + 0.22 \times \sqrt{25.25 - 9.072 \times \text{O3N2}}, \quad (1)$$

$$12 + \log(\text{O}/\text{H})_{\text{BPT-non-SF}} = 7.673 + 0.22 \times \sqrt{25.25 - 9.072 \times \text{O3N2}} + 0.127 \times \text{O3}, \quad (2)$$

where $\text{O3} = \log([\text{O III}]/\text{H}\beta)$.

2.3. Stellar metallicity

We use the gas-phase metallicities of BPT-SF and BPT-non-SF galaxies for the majority of our analysis. However, we will also compare these results with stellar metallicities of the Main Sequence, green valley and passive galaxies sample taken from Trussler et al. (2020). Briefly, a χ^2 -minimisation code FIREFLY (Wilkinson et al. 2017) is used to fit the input galaxy spectra using a combination of stellar population models of Maraston & Strömbäck (2011), stellar spectra from the MILES (Sánchez-Blázquez et al. 2006) and stellar libraries assuming a Kroupa initial mass function (Kroupa 2001), and hence mass-weighted stellar metallicities are obtained.

2.4. Stellar mass

We use the total stellar masses of our galaxy sample from the MPA-JHU catalogue. They are obtained by using fits to the to-

tal photometric magnitudes of these galaxies and are different than the method based on spectral-indices adopted by Kauffmann et al. (2003b) or Gallazzi et al. (2005) though these differences are quite small (a median offset of -0.01 dex between mass estimates from spectral indices and photometric magnitudes²). We have restricted our sample to a stellar mass-range of $10^{7-13} M_{\odot}$.

The lower panel of Figure 1 shows the distribution of galaxies in our sample on the [NII]-BPT diagram, color-coded by their stellar mass. The figure clearly shows that studies selecting only BPT-SF galaxies miss a large population of massive galaxies.

2.5. Star-formation rate

We obtain the SFR of all galaxies including the SF, LINERs, AGNs and composite galaxies from the MPA-JHU catalogue. These SFR estimates are obtained by fitting the models of Charlot & Longhetti (2001) to the SF galaxies as discussed in Brinchmann et al. (2004) with slight modifications³, for LINERs, AGNs, composites and for low S/N SF galaxies. Some of these modifications correspond to estimating the average conversion factor from observed $\text{H}\alpha$ luminosity to SFR for low S/N galaxies, different dust-attenuations and appropriate aperture corrections for galaxies with low level of star-formation following Salim et al. (2007).

We use the SFR estimates from MPA-JHU catalogue mainly because it provides the SFR within the 3 arcsec aperture of the SDSS fibre. The other SFR estimates of the SDSS sample (e.g. Salim et al. 2016; Bourne et al. 2016; Oemler et al. 2017) may provide an improvement over the total SFR estimates from the MPA-JHU catalogue but are not suitable for the purposes of this work. Since the eventual aim of our work is to study the correlation between SFR and gas-phase metallicity, it is more appropriate to study these quantities within the same spatial region. In particular, gas accretion resulting into metallicity dilution and star formation boosting can only be properly probed by measuring metallicity and SFR in the same aperture. Given that we only have information on the gas-phase metallicity within the galactic region covered by the fibre, we prefer to use the fibre SFR. Stellar masses, on the other hand, acts more like a clock telling us about the evolution stage of a galaxy (see Section 4) as well as a tracer of the overall gravitational potential well of the galaxy, therefore we used the total M_{\star} in this work.

We note that a few FMR studies (e.g. Mannucci et al. 2010) have estimated SFRs from $\text{H}\alpha$ luminosities following the prescription of Kennicutt (1998). However, this calibration is only suitable for SF galaxies or H II regions as there is an inherent assumption of photoionization by hot O and B stars, rather than other more evolved stellar populations (or even AGNs) which are likely the source of ionization within non-SF galaxies.

Figure 2 shows SFR versus M_{\star} for the BPT-SF (upper-panel) and BPT-non-SF (lower-panel) samples identified on the basis of the [N II]-BPT selection. The solid black line shows the location of the star formation Main Sequence. The latter is derived by taking the median of the SFRs of the BPT-SF galaxies in the stellar mass bins of 0.3 dex. Note that different definitions of Main Sequence have been proposed by various groups, (e.g. Renzini & Peng 2015; Popesso et al. 2019) which are valid in different stellar mass ranges and generally fitted by a linear form, but may show bending depending on the SFR recipes adopted. However,

² https://www.mpa.mpa-garching.mpg.de/SDSS/DR7/mass_comp.html

³ <https://www.mpa.mpa-garching.mpg.de/SDSS/DR7/sfrs.html>




Fig. 2. SFR versus M_* for the BPT-SF (upper-panel) and BPT-non-SF (lower-panel) samples identified on the basis of $[\text{N II}]$ -BPT. The data points are colour-coded with respect to the gas-phase metallicity ($12 + \log(\text{O}/\text{H})$) using the O3N2 diagnostic described in Section 2.2. On both panels, the black Main sequence line is derived from fitting a median to the SF galaxies. The errorbars in the bottom-right corner indicate the median uncertainties on SFR and M_* within each subsample and are estimated from the percentiles provided in the MPA-JHU catalogue. The uncertainty on gas-phase metallicity is of the order of 0.09 dex.

these other studies use the *total* SFR and stellar mass, hence are not suitable for this work which uses the star-formation activity within the spatial region (3 arcsec SDSS fibre) and the related metallicity enrichment/dilution.

Figure 2 shows, not surprisingly, that the BPT-non-SF galaxies have SFRs typically below the SF Main Sequence, even by up to 3 dex lower, so they are quite suitable for our goal of extending the FMR to galaxies approaching quiescence.

About 10% of BPT-non-SF galaxies have SFRs higher than the Main Sequence. This is in agreement with the results of

Leslie et al. (2016), who find that there are galaxies classified as “composite” or “ambiguous” in the SDSS sample which lie on or above the star-forming Main Sequence. These results are also in line with Oemler et al. (2017), who report a large population of quiescent galaxies with disproportionately high SFRs. The reason why these highly star forming galaxies are not classified as SF in the BPT-diagram may be a consequence of heavy obscuration (which leaves only the outer, LI(N)ER like regions visible), the presence of shocks, or nitrogen enrichment, and highlights how the simple BPT classification may be inadequate and that it can result into seriously biasing the sample. However, we find that only $\sim 2\%$ of BPT-non-SF galaxies are massive ($(\log(M_*/M_\odot) > 11)$) and have SFRs above the Main Sequence, thus ensuring that FMR results presented here are not biased by this galaxy population.

3. Results: extending the FMR to BPT-non-SF galaxies

3.1. Conventional FMR

Figure 3 shows the two projections of the conventional form of the FMR, i.e. the relation between stellar mass, gas-phase metallicity and star-formation rate. We estimated the median gas-phase metallicities in the bins of stellar mass and SFR of 0.3 dex and we retain only those which have at least 30 galaxies in each bin. The left-hand panels (Figure 3) show the mass versus metallicity colour-coded with respect to the SFR, while the right-hand panels (Figure 3) show the SFR versus metallicity colour-coded with respect to stellar mass, for the three samples as described below.

- *BPT-SF Galaxies* (Figure 3, Upper panel): The left-hand panel shows that at low-stellar masses, the SF galaxies with higher SFR have lower metallicity while at high-stellar masses, there appears to be a small inversion (~ 0.05 dex) in this trend, i.e. metallicity increases with SFR. The same systematic dependence of metallicity on SFR for different stellar mass is shown in the another projection of the FMR (right-hand panel), where gas-phase metallicity is plotted with respect SFR and each curve is colour-coded with respect to the $\log M_*$.

The inversion at the high-mass end, though quite small, aligns with previous studies (e.g. Yates et al. 2012; Lara-López et al. 2013), but is in contrast to the results of Mannucci et al. (2010), the first FMR study of SF galaxy which instead shows a flattening of the gas-phase metallicity at high stellar-mass. Such a difference is explained by a combined effect of different S/N cuts and different methods to estimate SFR and metallicities (Cresci et al. 2019). We reproduce the results of Mannucci et al. (2010) if we perform a S/N cut of 25 on $\text{H}\alpha$ emission line as done in their work. Such a high S/N cut on $\text{H}\alpha$ emission line is needed to avoid introducing metallicity biases in the lower-metallicity regime, where $[\text{N II}]$ is significantly fainter than $\text{H}\alpha$, but this S/N cut only includes SF galaxies with very high SFR, that defies the purpose of this work focussing on the extension of the FMR to BPT-non-SF galaxies and must also include the galaxies with very low SFRs. Our relaxed requirement on the S/N on $\text{H}\alpha$ and $\text{H}\beta$ enables us to explore lower levels of SFR; more specifically, the minimum SFR bin in our work corresponds to $\log(\text{SFR}/M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1}) \sim -3.2$ which is significantly lower than -1.45 of Mannucci et al. (2010). The S/N cut on the $[\text{NII}]$ line may potentially introduce a bias in the metallicity distribution, however, as we will discuss, this would make our




Fig. 3. Left-hand panel: The gas-phase metallicity ($12 + \log(\text{O}/\text{H})$) versus stellar mass ($\log M_*/M_\odot$) for BPT-SF galaxies (upper-panel), BPT-non-SF galaxies (middle panel) and their combined sample (bottom panel). The coloured curves on each plot in the left-hand panel correspond to median metallicities estimated in the bins of $\log M_*/M_\odot$ and star-formation rate ($\log \text{SFR}$) and color-coded with respect to $\log \text{SFR}$ in a given bin. Right-hand panel: The gas-phase metallicity ($12 + \log(\text{O}/\text{H})$) versus $\log \text{SFR}$ for BPT-SF (upper-panel), BPT-non-SF (middle panel) and their combined sample (bottom panel). The coloured curves on each plot in the right-hand panel correspond to the median metallicities estimated in bins of $\log \text{SFR}$ and $\log M_*/M_\odot$. The [N II]-BPT classification along with the maximum star-burst line from Kauffmann et al. (2003a) is used to separate SF (upper-panel) and non-SF galaxies (middle panel). The gas-phase metallicities of BPT-SF (upper-panel) and BPT-non-SF (middle panel) galaxies are obtained using the empirical calibrations involving the O3N2 diagnostic provided in Curti et al. (2017) and Kumari et al. (2019), respectively. The bottom panel consisting of both BPT-SF and BPT-non-SF galaxies and hence their metallicities are obtained from both SF (Curti et al. 2017) and non-SF (Kumari et al. 2019) calibrations, depending on the type of galaxy populations.




Fig. 4. A comparison of metallicity difference versus stellar mass for the gas-phase metallicity as well as for stellar metallicity for the SDSS galaxies. The gas-phase metallicity difference $\Delta(\text{O}/\text{H})$ with respect to that of MS galaxies are estimated for the combined sample of BPT-SF and BPT-non-SF galaxies, identified using the $[\text{N II}]$ -BPT and are shown by thinner coloured curves corresponding to $\Delta\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}$ varying from -3.2 to 2.2. The thick maroon curve corresponds to the stellar metallicity difference between quiescent galaxies and MS galaxies ($Z_*(\text{QG}) - Z_*(\text{MS})$), while the thick dark green curve corresponds to the stellar metallicity difference between green valley galaxies and MS galaxies ($Z_*(\text{GVG}) - Z_*(\text{MS})$). The stellar metallicity differences are taken from Trussler et al. (2020).

findings even stronger. Anyhow, since the main purpose of this work is to extend the FMR into the LI(N)ER region (next section) where the $[\text{NII}]$ emission is as strong as $\text{H}\alpha$, we do not expect that the S/N cut on $[\text{NII}]$ introduces a significant bias.

- *BPT-non-SF Galaxies* (Figure 3, Middle panel): The left-hand panel shows that the gas-phase metallicity for BPT-non-SF galaxies increases with decreasing SFR for a given stellar mass lying in a range of $\log(M_*/M_\odot) \sim 10 - 11.5$. Similarly, the right-hand panel shows that the gas-phase metallicity of BPT-non-SF galaxies appears to be constant at high $\log \text{SFR}/M_\odot\text{yr}^{-1} (> 1.0)$ for a mass range spanning an order magnitude, though we find that the gas-phase metallicity increases with increasing stellar-masses for lower SFRs and that the anticorrelation of metallicity with SFR is observed primarily at $\log \text{SFR}/M_\odot\text{yr}^{-1} (< 1.0)$.

The high SFRs probed by this sub-sample is a bit counter-intuitive for galaxies classified as non-SF galaxies, however, as already mentioned, it is consistent with other works, such as Oemler et al. (2017), who report a large population of quiescent galaxies with disproportionately high SFRs. Such high SFRs for a non-SF classified sample, comprising LINERs and AGNs, are also consistent with the result of Leslie et al. (2016). Yet, this classification has allowed us to probe, as already discussed, the massive BPT-non-SF galaxies whose SFRs are ~ 1.5 dex below the minimum SFR values probed by galaxies classified as SF (see Figure 2), and (as already discussed) 3 dex below the Main Sequence, and thus enables us to probe a relatively quiescent population.

- *Combined sample of BPT-SF and BPT-non-SF galaxies* (Figure 3, Bottom panel): The left-hand panel shows that the

mass-metallicity relation for the combined sample of BPT-SF and BPT-non-SF galaxies at the high-mass end is dominated by the BPT-non-SF galaxies which results in a disappearance of inversion of curves seen for BPT-SF galaxies, suggesting that the latter was primarily a result of biases introduced by the BPT selection. Instead we find that in the global (unbiased) sample at high masses the metallicity tends to flatten with stellar mass for high SFR, but then starts to increase with decreasing SFR at $\log \text{SFR}/M_\odot\text{yr}^{-1} (< 0.0)$. These trends are also visible in the right-hand panel showing metallicity versus SFR where curves are colour-coded with respect to stellar mass.

3.2. Alternative representation of the FMR

Figure 4 shows an alternative representation of the FMR, where the absolute metallicity is replaced by the metallicity difference ($\Delta(\text{O}/\text{H})$) with respect to the metallicity of galaxies with the same stellar mass but located on the Main Sequence. More specifically, in Figure 4, $\Delta(\text{O}/\text{H})$ is plotted against total stellar mass and different curves on these plots are colour-coded with respect to the $\Delta\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}$, where we define $\Delta\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}} = \log(\text{SFR}) - \log(\text{SFR})_{\text{MS}}$, i.e. the difference between the SFRs with respect to the SFR of galaxies on the Main Sequence (MS) at a given stellar mass. The redder curves correspond to the galaxy populations with SFRs below the Main Sequence, while the bluer curves correspond to those galaxy populations whose SFRs are above the Main Sequence.

We find that the gas-phase metallicity of galaxy population with SFRs higher than MS galaxies are metal-poor compared

to that of Main Sequence galaxies, and the metal deficiency becomes more prominent the further galaxies deviate from the Main Sequence, although the effect is less prominent at high stellar masses. On the other hand, the gas-phase metallicity of galaxies with SFR lower than the Main Sequence are more metal-rich, but primarily this effect is seen at low stellar masses; the metallicity excess increases with deviation from the Main Sequence, but steeply decreases with increasing stellar mass, becoming consistent with Main Sequence galaxies and then the difference increases again at high stellar masses for galaxies well below the Main Sequence.

Note also that we are looking at the relative trends here where the relative uncertainty (due to binning) is much smaller than the absolute uncertainty on metallicity calibration, SFR and M_* . Therefore, relative variation although small are quite significant.

4. Discussion and conclusion

On the Main Sequence, galaxies are commonly believed to be in a quasi-steady equilibrium between inflows, outflows and star formation. An increase of star formation relative to the Main Sequence must be associated with either an increase of the additional gas from extra inflow, or an increased star formation efficiency. A decrease of star formation relative to the Main Sequence must be associated with either a shortage of gas due to removal by extra-outflows or due to processes (e.g. halo heating, Birnboim et al. 2007; van de Voort et al. 2011; Churchill et al. 2012; Johansson et al. 2012) preventing gas accretion hence resulting in ‘starvation’, or a decrease in star formation efficiency.

Recent works investigating the gas content in galaxies have revealed that deviations from the Main Sequence result from the variation in the gas content as well as in the star formation efficiency (Schreiber et al. 2016; Saintonge et al. 2017; Tacconi et al. 2018; Piotrowska et al. 2020; Zhang et al. 2019; Dou et al. 2020). The metallicity of galaxies provides an additional dimension to investigate these aspects. For instance, as discussed in Mannucci et al. (2010) and in Bothwell et al. (2013, 2016b) the lower metallicity observed for highly star forming galaxies is likely associated with an increase of gas inflow that both boosts star formation and dilutes the gas-phase metallicity (an alternative explanation is that the increased star formation drives more powerful metal-loaded outflows, but the stronger anti-correlation with gas content favours the inflow-dilution scenario). As already mentioned in the introduction, Peng et al. (2015) and Trussler et al. (2020) show that the average *stellar* metallicity of passive and green-valley galaxies is higher than Main Sequence galaxies (especially for what concerns high redshift progenitors of passive galaxies) and that this can only be explained in terms of quenching being primarily associated with ‘starvation’, i.e. suppression of gas inflow that on the one hand results into suppression of star formation (as the residual gas is being consumed by star formation), while on the other hand it results into an increase of the metallicity as the dilution effect of inflow is reduced.

We now have the opportunity to investigate the same effects by using the *gas* metallicity for galaxies spanning a broad range of offset from the Main Sequence, including galaxies not classified as star-forming in the BPT diagrams, hence enabling us to delve better into the green valley and quiescent region, where galaxies typically have LINER-like emission lines (which were generally excluded by previous studies of the FMR).

We can now interpret the metallicity trends shown in Fig 4 relative to Main Sequence galaxies in the context of the scenarios discussed above. Those galaxies with positive $\Delta\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}$,

i.e. above the Main Sequence have metallicities lower than their counterparts on the Main Sequence. i.e. $\Delta(\text{O}/\text{H})$ is always < 0 . As mentioned above, this effect can be interpreted in terms of gas inflows dominating the galaxies lying above the Main Sequence, which both dilute the gas-phase metallicity and boost the star formation.

The behaviour of galaxies below the Main Sequence (negative $\Delta\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}$) is more complex. At low masses the gas metallicity is clearly higher than in Main Sequence galaxies, therefore favouring a chemical evolution of these systems in which the metallicity increases as a consequence of lack of dilution from the inflow of fresh gas, i.e. starvation scenario. In these galaxies the chemical enrichment tend to proceed more in a closed-box or leaky-box scenario, in which galaxies are out of equilibrium and the metallicity increases more steeply than for the Main Sequence galaxies in which star formation and outflows are balanced by inflows. Qualitatively, this is the same result obtained by Peng et al. (2015) and Trussler et al. (2020) for the stellar metallicities. However, quantitatively the result is quite different. The stellar metallicity difference between passive and Main Sequence galaxies (and between green valley and Main Sequence galaxies), as inferred from Trussler et al. (2020), is illustrated in Fig. 4 with a thick red line (and with a thick green line for green valley galaxies). At low stellar masses the gas metallicity differences are similar to the stellar metallicity difference, supporting the same starvation scenario. However at high/intermediate stellar masses ($\gtrsim 10^{10} M_{\odot}$), although there is still some visible effect of the gas metallicity difference increasing with the deviation from the Main Sequence, quantitatively the gas metallicity differences are much smaller than the stellar metallicity differences. This is clearly indicating that the stellar population of massive galaxies below the Main Sequence has not formed out of gas with the same chemical properties as the gas that we are currently observing in these systems.

A possible scenario is that in the case of the massive galaxies below the Main Sequence for which we can measure the gas-phase metallicity we are observing them in a peculiar evolutionary stage. Indeed, in order to measure the metallicity we need to detect nebular emission lines that, for passive/green-valley galaxies, region are typically characterized by LI(N)ER-like ratios, especially in the central region probed by the SDSS fibre (Belfiore et al. 2017). However, the majority of passive galaxies are line-less, so for the majority of quiescent galaxies we cannot really measure the gas metallicity. Therefore, a likely scenario is that the small fraction of quiescent galaxies that have nebular emission (and for which we can measure the gas metallicity) may have an excess of gas because they have recently accreted gas from the CGM/IGM (hence typically with metallicity lower than the stellar metallicity of the accreting massive galaxy) and, therefore, in this case the observed gas is anomalously metal poor relative to their quiescent parent population. In a few cases this gas accretion may result into a rejuvenation event, with the accreted gas forming stars, as indeed observed in some massive galaxies (Chauke et al. 2019). However, as already emphasised, in most cases the accreted gas has LIER-like emission, i.e. not associated with star formation: it is likely ionized by the hard radiation field of the evolved (post-AGB) stars. Such hard radiation field is likely responsible for keeping the accreted gas hot and ionized and preventing it from forming stars. Such accreted gas may also likely be expelled at later times by the SNIa cumulative energy (see Trussler et al. 2020; Pipino & Matteucci 2004; Matteucci et al. 2006) and also by the energy injected by a weak AGN (Ciotti & Ostriker 2007; Ciotti et al. 2009). This effect of gas accretion with little SF associated with it, may also be re-

sponsible for the offset between stellar and gas metallicity for galaxies below the Main Sequence at low/intermediate masses. We also find that $\sim 78\%$ of galaxies lying in the mass range $8 < \log(M_*/M_\odot) < 9$, have $\Delta(O/H) > 0$, implying that a majority of dwarf galaxies are going through a starvation phase rather than dilution via gas accretion.

Summarizing, our results support the scenario in which for galaxies above the Main Sequence the lower metallicity is associated with the dilution effect of gas accretion. For galaxies below the Main Sequence, at low masses their higher metallicity support the scenario in which their quenching is involving starvation (suppression of gas inflows); outflows may also play a role in quenching, but starvation is necessary to account for the increased gas-phase metallicity relative to Main Sequence galaxies. At high masses the fact that galaxies below the Main Sequence have gas-phase metallicities closer to the Main Sequence galaxies, while their stellar metallicities are much higher than galaxies on the Main Sequence, suggests that we are observing these galaxies in a peculiar phase, in which they have recently accreted gas, but that such accreted gas is prevented from forming stars (in agreement with the independent findings that the efficiency of star formation decreases drastically toward the quiescent region).

This study has allowed us to extend the FMR to the BP-non-SF galaxies in the local Universe, and is a step-forward in piecing together different evolutionary stages of BPT-non-SF galaxies dominated by different physical processes. Recent surveys have pointed out the presence of a substantial population of non-SF/quiescent galaxies in the high redshift Universe, though spectroscopy information on these populations is still sparse (McCracken et al. 2012; Straatman et al. 2016; Muzzin et al. 2013; Schreiber et al. 2018; Morishita et al. 2019; Whitaker et al. 2013; Glazebrook et al. 2017; Santini et al. 2019; Merlin et al. 2018). The upcoming Multi-Object Optical and Near-infrared Spectrograph (Cirasuolo et al. 2020) on the VLT will enable the extensive spectroscopic follow-up of such imaging surveys (Maiolino et al. 2020), hence enabling us to explore the FMR for BPT-non-SF galaxies in the distant Universe, and will allow us to understand the physical processes driving quenching and chemical enrichment at different epochs in the history of the Universe.

Acknowledgements. NK acknowledges the fellowship from the Schlumberger Foundation which supported her stay at KICC where most of the work was accomplished. MC, RM and JT acknowledge ERC Advanced Grant 695671 “QUENCH” and support by the Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC). This research made use of the on SDSS archival data, that can be retrieved from <https://www.mpa.mpa-garching.mpg.de/SDSS/DR7/> and Astropy, a community-developed core Python package for Astronomy (Astropy Collaboration et al. 2013).

References

Abazajian, K. N., Adelman-McCarthy, J. K., Agüeros, M. A., et al. 2009, *ApJS*, 182, 543
 Andrews, B. H. & Martini, P. 2013, *ApJ*, 765, 140
 Astropy Collaboration, Robitaille, T. P., Tollerud, E. J., et al. 2013, *A&A*, 558, A33
 Baldwin, J. A., Phillips, M. M., & Terlevich, R. 1981, *PASP*, 93, 5
 Barrera-Ballesteros, J. K., Sánchez, S. F., Heckman, T., Blanc, G. A., & The MaNGA Team. 2017, *ApJ*, 844, 80
 Belfiore, F., Maiolino, R., Bundy, K., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 477, 3014
 Belfiore, F., Maiolino, R., Maraston, C., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 466, 2570
 Belfiore, F., Maiolino, R., Maraston, C., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 461, 3111
 Birnboim, Y., Dekel, A., & Neistein, E. 2007, *MNRAS*, 380, 339
 Bothwell, M. S., Maiolino, R., Cicone, C., Peng, Y., & Wagg, J. 2016a, *A&A*, 595, A48
 Bothwell, M. S., Maiolino, R., Kennicutt, R., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 433, 1425
 Bothwell, M. S., Maiolino, R., Peng, Y., et al. 2016b, *MNRAS*, 455, 1156

Bourne, N., Dunne, L., Maddox, S. J., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 462, 1714
 Brinchmann, J., Charlot, S., White, S. D. M., et al. 2004, *MNRAS*, 351, 1151
 Brinbin, D. & Harwit, M. 2012, *ApJ*, 750, 142
 Brown, T., Cortese, L., Catinella, B., & Kilborn, V. 2018, *MNRAS*, 473, 1868
 Bryant, J. J., Owers, M. S., Robotham, A. S. G., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 447, 2857
 Bundy, K., Bershady, M. A., Law, D. R., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 798, 7
 Bustamante, S., Sparre, M., Springel, V., & Grand, R. J. J. 2018, *MNRAS*, 479, 3381
 Charlot, S. & Longhetti, M. 2001, *MNRAS*, 323, 887
 Chauke, P., van der Wel, A., Pacifici, C., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 877, 48
 Churchill, C. W., Kacprzak, G. G., Steidel, C. C., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 760, 68
 Ciotti, L. & Ostriker, J. P. 2007, *ApJ*, 665, 1038
 Ciotti, L., Ostriker, J. P., & Proga, D. 2009, *ApJ*, 699, 89
 Cirasuolo, M., Fairley, A., Rees, P., et al. 2020, *The Messenger*, 180, 10
 Cresci, G., Mannucci, F., & Curti, M. 2019, *A&A*, 627, A42
 Cresci, G., Mannucci, F., Sommariva, V., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 421, 262
 Curti, M., Cresci, G., Mannucci, F., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 465, 1384
 Curti, M., Mannucci, F., Cresci, G., & Maiolino, R. 2020, *MNRAS*, 491, 944
 Davé, R., Finlator, K., & Oppenheimer, B. D. 2011, *MNRAS*, 416, 1354
 Dayal, P., Ferrara, A., & Dunlop, J. S. 2013, *MNRAS*, 430, 2891
 De Rossi, M. E., Bower, R. G., Font, A. S., Schaye, J., & Theuns, T. 2017, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 472, 3354–3377
 De Rossi, M. E., Theuns, T., Font, A. S., & McCarthy, I. G. 2015, *MNRAS*, 452, 486
 Dou, J., Peng, Y., Renzini, A., et al. 2020, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2010.03579
 Ellison, S. L., Patton, D. R., Simard, L., & McConnachie, A. W. 2008, *ApJ*, 672, L107
 Forbes, J. C., Krumholz, M. R., Burkert, A., & Dekel, A. 2014, *MNRAS*, 443, 168
 Gallazzi, A., Bell, E. F., Zibetti, S., Brinchmann, J., & Kelson, D. D. 2014, *ApJ*, 788, 72
 Gallazzi, A., Charlot, S., Brinchmann, J., White, S. D. M., & Tremonti, C. A. 2005, *MNRAS*, 362, 41
 Genel, S. 2016, *ApJ*, 822, 107
 Glazebrook, K., Schreiber, C., Labbé, I., et al. 2017, *Nature*, 544, 71
 Gobat, R., Daddi, E., Magdis, G., et al. 2018, *Nature Astronomy*, 2, 239–246
 Heckman, T. M. 1980, *A&A*, 500, 187
 Hunt, L., Dayal, P., Magrini, L., & Ferrara, A. 2016, *MNRAS*, 463, 2002
 Johansson, P. H., Naab, T., & Ostriker, J. P. 2012, *ApJ*, 754, 115
 Kashino, D., Renzini, A., Silverman, J. D., & Daddi, E. 2016, *ApJ*, 823, L24
 Kauffmann, G., Heckman, T. M., Tremonti, C., et al. 2003a, *MNRAS*, 346, 1055
 Kauffmann, G., Heckman, T. M., White, S. D. M., et al. 2003b, *MNRAS*, 341, 33
 Kennicutt, Jr., R. C. 1998, *ApJ*, 498, 541
 Kewley, L. J., Groves, B., Kauffmann, G., & Heckman, T. 2006, *MNRAS*, 372, 961
 Kroupa, P. 2001, *MNRAS*, 322, 231
 Kumari, N., Maiolino, R., Belfiore, F., & Curti, M. 2019, *MNRAS*, 485, 367
 Lagos, C. d. P., Theuns, T., Schaye, J., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 459, 2632
 Lara-López, M. A., López-Sánchez, Á. R., & Hopkins, A. M. 2013, *ApJ*, 764, 178
 Lequeux, J., Peimbert, M., Rayo, J. F., Serrano, A., & Torres-Peimbert, S. 1979, *A&A*, 80, 155
 Leslie, S. K., Kewley, L. J., Sanders, D. B., & Lee, N. 2016, *MNRAS*, 455, L82
 Lian, J. H., Li, J. R., Yan, W., & Kong, X. 2015, *MNRAS*, 446, 1449
 Lilly, S. J., Carollo, C. M., Pipino, A., Renzini, A., & Peng, Y. 2013, *ApJ*, 772, 119
 Maiolino, R., Cirasuolo, M., Afonso, J., et al. 2020, *The Messenger*, 180, 24
 Maiolino, R. & Mannucci, F. 2019, *A&A Rev.*, 27, 3
 Maiolino, R., Nagao, T., Grazian, A., et al. 2008, *A&A*, 488, 463
 Mannucci, F., Cresci, G., Maiolino, R., Marconi, A., & Gnerucci, A. 2010, *MNRAS*, 408, 2115
 Mannucci, F., Salvaterra, R., & Campisi, M. A. 2011, *MNRAS*, 414, 1263
 Maraston, C. & Strömbäck, G. 2011, *MNRAS*, 418, 2785
 Matteucci, F., Panagia, N., Pipino, A., et al. 2006, *MNRAS*, 372, 265
 Matthee, J. & Schaye, J. 2018, *MNRAS*, 479, L34
 McCracken, H. J., Milvang-Jensen, B., Dunlop, J., et al. 2012, *A&A*, 544, A156
 Merlin, E., Fontana, A., Castellano, M., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 473, 2098
 Morishita, T., Abramson, L. E., Treu, T., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 877, 141
 Muzzin, A., Marchesini, D., Stefanon, M., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 777, 18
 Nakajima, K. & Ouchi, M. 2014, *MNRAS*, 442, 900
 Oemler, Augustus, J., Abramson, L. E., Gladders, M. D., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 844, 45
 Peng, Y., Maiolino, R., & Cochrane, R. 2015, *Nature*, 521, 192
 Piotrowska, J. M., Bluck, A. F. L., Maiolino, R., Concas, A., & Peng, Y. 2020, *MNRAS*, 492, L6
 Pipino, A. & Matteucci, F. 2004, *MNRAS*, 347, 968
 Popesso, P., Concas, A., Morselli, L., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 483, 3213
 Renzini, A. & Peng, Y.-j. 2015, *ApJ*, 801, L29

- Romeo Velonà, A. D., Sommer-Larsen, J., Napolitano, N. R., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 770, 155
- Roseboom, I. G., Bunker, A., Sumiyoshi, M., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 426, 1782
- Saintonge, A., Catinella, B., Tacconi, L. J., et al. 2017, *ApJS*, 233, 22
- Salim, S., Lee, J. C., Janowiecki, S., et al. 2016, *ApJS*, 227, 2
- Salim, S., Lee, J. C., Ly, C., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 797, 126
- Salim, S., Rich, R. M., Charlot, S., et al. 2007, *ApJS*, 173, 267
- Sánchez, S. F., Barrera-Ballesteros, J. K., López-Cobá, C., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 484, 3042
- Sánchez, S. F., Kennicutt, R. C., Gil de Paz, A., et al. 2012, *A&A*, 538, A8
- Sánchez Almeida, J. & Sánchez-Menguiano, L. 2019, *ApJ*, 878, L6
- Sánchez-Blázquez, P., Peletier, R. F., Jiménez-Vicente, J., et al. 2006, *MNRAS*, 371, 703
- Sanders, R. L., Shapley, A. E., Kriek, M., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 858, 99
- Sanders, R. L., Shapley, A. E., Reddy, N. A., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 491, 1427
- Santini, P., Merlin, E., Fontana, A., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 486, 560
- Schmidt, M. 1959, *ApJ*, 129, 243
- Schreiber, C., Elbaz, D., Pannella, M., et al. 2016, *A&A*, 589, A35
- Schreiber, C., Glazebrook, K., Nanayakkara, T., et al. 2018, *A&A*, 618, A85
- Singh, R., van de Ven, G., Jahnke, K., et al. 2013, *A&A*, 558, A43
- Spitoni, E., Vincenzo, F., & Matteucci, F. 2017, *A&A*, 599, A6
- Stasińska, G., Vale Asari, N., Cid Fernandes, R., et al. 2008, *MNRAS*, 391, L29
- Straatman, C. M. S., Spitler, L. R., Quadri, R. F., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 830, 51
- Tacconi, L. J., Genzel, R., Saintonge, A., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 853, 179
- Telford, O. G., Dalcanton, J. J., Skillman, E. D., & Conroy, C. 2016, *ApJ*, 827, 35
- Torrey, P., Vogelsberger, M., Hernquist, L., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 477, L16
- Tremonti, C. A., Heckman, T. M., Kauffmann, G., et al. 2004, *ApJ*, 613, 898
- Troncoso, P., Maiolino, R., Sommariva, V., et al. 2014, *A&A*, 563, A58
- Trussler, J., Maiolino, R., Maraston, C., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 491, 5406
- Trussler, J., Maiolino, R., Maraston, C., et al. 2021, *MNRAS*, 500, 4469
- van de Voort, F., Schaye, J., Booth, C. M., Haas, M. R., & Dalla Vecchia, C. 2011, *MNRAS*, 414, 2458
- Whitaker, K. E., van Dokkum, P. G., Brammer, G., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 770, L39
- Wilkinson, D. M., Maraston, C., Goddard, D., Thomas, D., & Parikh, T. 2017, *MNRAS*, 472, 4297
- Yates, R. M., Kauffmann, G., & Guo, Q. 2012, *MNRAS*, 422, 215
- York, D. G., Adelman, J., Anderson, John E., J., et al. 2000, *AJ*, 120, 1579
- Zhang, C., Peng, Y., Ho, L. C., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 884, L52

Appendix A: Alternative FMR using [SII]-BPT with and without AGNs

Figure A1 shows the alternative representation of the FMR where star-forming and non-star-forming samples have been identified using the [S II]-BPT classification. The metallicities of the BPT-SF sample have been determined using O3N2 calibration from Curti et al. (2017) while for the BPT-non-SF sample, we applied the correction to these metallicities given by Kumari et al. (2019) for [S II]-BPT classification. The sample in the upper-panel also consists of AGNs while that in the lower-panel excludes AGNs. The overall behaviour of the FMR for both samples (with and without AGNs) selected on the basis of [S II]-BPT is similar to that found in Figure 4 where [N II]-BPT was used for sample selection. This shows that the FMR behaviour is independent of the inclusion or removal of AGNs. This strengthens our results from [N II]-BPT classification where AGNs could not be excluded for a lack of recipe. We find however that metallicity differences for the massive galaxies in the [S II]-BPT selected sample hardly go beyond 0 (Figure A1) in contrast to the [N II]-BPT selected sample (Figure 4). This is likely because the initial O3N2 calibration from (Curti et al. 2017) is devised from the [N II]-BPT selected sample and not [S II]-BPT selected sample.




Fig. A1. $\Delta(\text{O}/\text{H})$ versus stellar mass ($\log M_*/M_\odot$) for the entire sample comprising of BPT-SF and BPT-non-SF galaxies where [S II]-BPT is used for galaxy classification. The sample in the upper-panel includes AGNs while the sample in the lower panel excludes AGNs. The coloured curves on each plot correspond to median $\Delta(\text{O}/\text{H})$ estimated in bins of $\log M_*/M_\odot$ and $\Delta\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}$ and colour-coded with respect to $\Delta\text{SFR}_{\text{MS}}$ in a given bin.